

Writing Across Borders II Session C
Friday, February 18 2:45-4:15pm

C1

Eye and pen movements as indicators of subject-verb agreement processing during written sentence production

Denis Alamargot, University of Poitiers, France

Michel Fayol, University of Clermont-Ferrand, France

Christel Leuwers, University of Chambéry, France

Gilles Caporossi, HEC – GERAD – Montreal, Canada

Virginie Pontart, University of Poitiers, France

Ascensión Pagán, University of Poitiers, France

Kathleen O'Brien-Ramirez, University of Poitiers, France

David Chesnet, University of Poitiers, France

The symposium aims at investigating the time course of subject-verb agreement in adults and children, during the written production of French sentences, varying in their syntactic structure or in the phonological cues associated with the plural flexion. Several questions will be dealt with. (i) Are pauses and writing rates associated with the same grammatical processes? (ii) If pause and rate variations are linked to grammatical processes, these variations do not directly inform the nature of these processes nor the unit concerned; using specific analyses is necessary to determine the processes and the upon which they act. (iii) Eye movements during handwriting identify the unit focused (and potentially processed) at the point of inscription. Analyzing regressive fixations while producing the verb during subject-verb agreement informs about the dynamics of the agreement process.

The three presentations are complementary. The use of an “Eye and pen” device (Alamargot, et al., 2006) provides comparable results obtained in different contexts. Each study tries to determine the manner in which a more or less experienced writer gazes on the previously produced trace (actually on the noun phrase) in order to reactivate the grammatical number while producing the verb. This pregraphic control is described in adults (presentation 1 and 2) and in children (grade 5 – presentation 3).

Presentation 1:

Analysis of eye-movements during number agreement in the case of written sentences production.

This study examines the processing of grammatical subject-verb agreement during the production of written sentences. More precisely, we focus on the aspects of pregraphic control that enable the production of correct verbal forms during immediate written recall of complex sentences designed to trigger attraction errors : *la fille qui regarde les garçons mange* [the girl watching the boys eats] – N1subj pro N2 targetV). Pregraphic control requires attentional resources. It involves inhibiting an agreement procedure which is erroneous, but sufficiently automatic to escape the writer’s conscious awareness (Largy, Cousin & Dedeyan, 2005 ; Largy & Fayol, 2001). Our primary

hypothesis is that pregraphic control relies on visual re-inspection of the subject noun group, necessary for maintaining or reactivating number during verb production. In such a case, it would therefore be measurable through regressive fixations on this subject group during written production of the main verb. The syntactic characteristics of the sentences (Object-Subject relatives vs. Subject-Subject), and the number characteristics of the two nouns involved (plural then singular, or singular then plural) were manipulated in an immediate written recall task. Eye-movements and grapho-motor movements were recorded (with the Eye and Pen © system, Alamargot, Chesnet, Dansac & Ros, 2006), enabling us to measure the three parameters studied in graphic production: saccades, fixations, and smooth pursuits (Gowen & Miall, 2006). Our results show that success in producing verb agreement in the sentences requiring the greatest control (singular-noun subject + plural noun distractor) generate saccades of greater amplitude and shorter production time. Qualitative analysis of all instances of regressive fixations confirms the hypothesis that reinspection of Noun1 occurs during correct verb form production. These findings are important in modeling written verb production, since they appear to indicate the use of control procedures that are infrequent in oral production.

Presentation 2:

Impact of phonological cues during subject verb-agreement in written French: eye and pen movements analysis in adults.

Previous studies in subject-verb agreement have shown that in sentences type [N1 of N2 V] the pregraphic control mechanism is associated with a decrease in the speed of inflection of the verb when the working memory was loaded (a second task) and when the grammatical number of N1 and N2 were different (Largy, Cousin & Dédéyan, 2005 for a review). Largy & Fayol (2001) showed that the pregraphic control is located during the execution of the inflection of the verb. The aim of this experiment is to identify the nature of this pregraphic control mechanism analyzing the eye and graphomotor movements in parallel. We replicated Largy and Fayol's (2001) experiment. We asked 32 participants to recall by writing down 32 dictated sentences. We manipulated the load on working memory (recalling a list of 5 words), grammatical number matching between N1 and N2 (SS, SP, PP & PS) and the verb's phonology (regular verb (absence of phonological cues=silent letters) versus irregular verbs (presence of phonological cues)). The eye and graphomotor movements were recorded using the Eye and Pen device (Alamargot, Chesnet, Dansac, & Ros, 2006). We hypothesize that in the load condition and with regular verbs (absence the phonological cues), there will be regressive fixations to the N1 while executing the inflection, associated with a decrease in the execution speed. Data processing is still in progress at the moment of this submission.

Presentation 3:

On-line management of handwriting in children (grade 5): Eye and pen movements as indicators of number agreement proceduralization.

In an effort to further understand writing across the lifespan, this experiment replicates those previously described (Pagan, O'Brien-Ramirez, Alamargot, & Fayol, 2010; and Largy & Fayol, 2001) while changing the population from adults who have automatized noun-verb agreement, to children who directly apply declarative rules of number agreement as they write. Studies of sentence agreement have traditionally relied on counting errors in order to infer difficulties in sentence processing. Using Eye and Pen technology we are now able to document not only the online processes of error production, but also the actual time course of correct grammatical production within a complex sentential environment.

Studies of adult sentence processing in numerous languages have consistently shown an increased error rate when a plural noun phrase intervenes between the subject and its verb [*The smoke from the factories pollute.], particularly when the intervening NP differs in grammatical number from the preceding subject NP. Also, Fayol and Got (1991) demonstrated an effect of adding a working memory load in children, finding more errors of agreement when managing the plural, than when the entire sentence is singular: Errors are more frequent in PP, PS, and SP conditions than in the SS condition. We reproduce and examine that finding in more detail. By studying the time course of actual writing we can interpret cognitive effort and show how eye movements illustrate how and when children refer back to what they have previously written, both while planning what to write next and while editing their own written production. Using complex analyses of ocular and graphomotor movements we are able to offer a developmental perspective of number agreement proceduralization.

C2

Students, teachers, and classroom communities: Qualitative investigations of whole-class workshoping in composition classrooms

Ryan Woldruff, University of Tennessee, U.S.

Carolyn Wisniewski, University of Tennessee, U.S.

Megan Titus, Rider University, U.S.

While much has been written about writing groups and workshop pedagogy in the creative writing classroom, very little research has focused on workshops within a FYC classroom environment. Furthermore, research concerning workshops in FYC classrooms has been based primarily upon lore and personal experience rather than on empirical research (Brooke (1991) and Geissler (1990) are notable exceptions). In 2002, Ian Barnard issued a call to action for further research in this area, declaring, "Whole-class workshops are under-theorized and under-utilized in the composition classroom." Each presenter on this panel seeks to fill part of this gap by sharing results from interviews with students and teachers who participate in composition classes that use whole-class writing workshops. The study addresses questions such as, what skills do students learn from the whole-class workshop, and where else do they employ those skills? Does the workshop enable students to gain greater agency over their own writing? How does the workshop create a classroom community, and does that community enhance learning? What outcomes do teachers hope to achieve through whole-class workshops? How do teachers assess the success of a workshop? How do whole-class workshop methods enhance collaborative writing and knowledge-making between classroom and non-academic communities? By presenting results from interviews, this panel works to add empirical data to the scholarship on learning, writing, and skill transfer in whole-class writing workshops.

Speaker 1: Student Perceptions of the Benefits of Whole-Class Writing Workshop: An Interview-Based Study

Speaker 1 will present data gathered in the Fall of 2010 that asks how students view the benefits of the writing workshop. This presentation will share data from semi-structured, focused interviews (Mishler 1986) conducted with approximately five students who participated in whole-class writing workshops in the Spring of 2010. By conducting these interviews retrospectively, the researcher plans to collect responses that will reflect back on the whole-class workshop, which will allow the researcher to gain a broader sense of how students view the whole-class workshop rather than collecting in-the-moment perceptions of the workshop. Additionally, retrospective interviews will allow students to comment upon how they have applied skills learned in the whole-class workshop to other classes and writing situations. Through these interviews, the researcher hopes to discover first, the writing or rhetorical skills that students see the workshop building or enhancing; second, the students' perceptions of benefits and drawbacks of learning in a whole-class workshop environment; and third, the writing and rhetorical skills learned in the workshop that students draw on in other writing situations. Analysis of post-workshop interviews will show how students responded to and learned in the writing workshop and how participating in the workshop influenced later writing and

learning. This presentation will share findings about what kinds of learning students perceive themselves to be engaging in during the writing workshop and whether students act on that learning only within the confines of the writing class or if that learning extends beyond the FYC boundary.

Speaker 2: Where Does the ‘Whole-class’ End? Whole-class Workshops and Community Engagement

Speaker 2 uses whole-class writing workshops as an integral part of the writing process, particularly in student-community member creation of writing and information transfer based on collaboratively derived needs and negotiations. Based on mixed qualitative methods and teacher research, this project theorizes that the intersection of whole-class and cross institutional writing workshops, community literacy and community engagement is highly effectively for knowledge building and transfer, critical awareness of key social issues and the development of critically aware, civically engaged citizens. This presentation is an investigation of teaching and learning with non-academic community partners and centers around a qualitative case study of a semester-long researched writing course whose theme was food politics and critical food literacy under the larger umbrella of sustainability. This work makes an interesting and somewhat unique contribution to the promotion of whole-class workshop methodology, community engagement pedagogy, and teaching sustainability in the writing classroom.

Speaker 3: Workshopping the Composition Classroom: The Teacher’s Role in Building a Workshop

Through classroom observations and semi-structured interviews of eight teachers during the Spring and Fall of 2010, this research investigates the teacher’s role in constructing the workshop and explores perceived concerns and successes of eight teachers who currently use the workshop method as a main pedagogical tool. This project works toward the goal of discovering best practices for the teacher's role in the workshop environment. Specifically, this study examines how teachers insert themselves into the workshop conversation and how insertion influences the workshop discourse, how teachers' classroom personae impact the workshop environment, and how teachers assess the success of the workshop method in achieving desired course outcomes.

C3

Engineering writing in higher education

The Challenges of Integration: WAC in the Engineering Context

Tatiana Teslenko, The University of British Columbia, Canada

The importance of communication skills has been a constant theme in the industry-academe dialogue (Barry et al., 2008; MacLennan, 2008). In response to industry demands, engineering accreditation boards (ABET in the USA and CEAB in Canada) change their accreditation criteria for engineering programs. The newest challenge in engineering education is to “go global” (Davis, 2010). The expanding world of “global engineering” demands that engineers have advanced communication skills. In addition to analytical reading and interpretive skills, persuasion, ability to adapt messages for complex and varied audiences (MacLennan, 2008), the new requirements are collaboration within cross-functional teams, virtual-project team management, intercultural communication. However, most engineering schools do not provide students with systematic training in advanced communication skills (Reave, 2004; MacLennan, 2008). The implication for educators is that “we’re teaching the wrong stuff” (Felder, 2008).

At the University of British Columbia in Canada, the Faculty of Applied Science encourages its writing instructors to speed up the WAC/CAC process and integrate communication skills with the design experience. In 2006 our Technical Communication Centre was transformed into the Centre for Professional Skills Development, and several initiatives were launched. Over the years we developed partially-integrated communication modules in senior capstone courses, WAC programs for graduate students, and one fully-integrated second-year program, Mech 2. WAC integration with the mechanical engineering curriculum has presented a number of challenges; we had to learn and adapt quickly in order to counter them. Recent feedback from students has been positive, particularly on the cooperative, problem-based approach and the use of new educational technologies. Mech 2 won three international awards, including the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) 2005 Curriculum Innovation Award and two STLHE Alan Blizzard Awards that recognize collaboration in university teaching and learning.

One of our concerns is the disconnect between the status of academic writing skills in engineering education and in WAC/CAC literature. The over-arching focus in engineering is on design skills that should be expanded “through development of technical writing and professional skills”, as well as project management and teamwork skills. Engineering educators view writing skills as “generic skills important in professional engineering practice” that are fully transferable to the workplace (Birch et al., 2009). Popular integration models highlight project-based learning, team-based activities, and case studies. However, WAC authors who use genre theory and activity theory question the idea of transferability (Dias, Freedman, Medway and Pare, 1999; Smart and Brown, 2002) and provide a compelling argument that transformation of knowledge, rather than transfer, takes place. This paper will describe the challenges that WAC teachers at the University of British Columbia had to overcome during the six-year integration project.

References

- Barry, B., Brophy, S., Oakes, W, Banks, M., & Sharvelle, S. (2008). Developing professional competencies through challenge to project experiences. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 24 (6), 1148-1162.
- Birch, J., Jaramillo P., Wosczyzna-Birch K., Adrezin R., & Richards, B. (2009). Integrating professional skills in the 21st century engineering and technical curriculum. *IMECE 2008: Engineering Education and Professional Development*, vol. 9: 293-298.
- Davis, M. (2010). Assessing technical communication within engineering contexts. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication* 53 (1): 33-45.
- Dias, P., A. Freedman, P. Medway, & Pare, A. (1999). *Worlds Apart: Acting and Writing in Academic and Workplace Contexts*. Mahwah, NJ/ London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Downey, G.L. et al. (2006). The globally competent engineer: working effectively with people who define problems differently. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 107-22.
- Dunwoody, A.B., Cramond P.J., Nesbit S.E., C.S. Paterson, & Teslenko, T. (2006). *Fundamental Competencies for Engineers*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Felder, R.M. (2008). A whole new mind for a flat world. In J. MacLennan (Ed.), *Readings for Technical Communication* (pp.11-14). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Harlap, Y., ed. (2008). *Road to Global Citizenship: An Educator's Toolkit*. Vancouver, Canada: Univ. of British Columbia.
- MacLennan, J. Why communication matters. (2008). In J. MacLennan (Ed.), *Readings for Technical Communication* (pp.4-10). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Ostafichuk, P.M., et al. (2005). Mech 2: A fully-integrated second-year mechanical engineering curriculum. 2005 ASME Curriculum Innovation Award Winner. Retrieved from <http://www.asme.org/Governance/Honors/UnitAwards/9685.pdf>
- Reave, L. (2004). Technical communication instruction in engineering schools: A survey of top-ranked U.S. and Canadian programs. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 18, 452-490.
- Smart, G., & N. Brown. (2002). Learning transfer or transforming learning?: Student interns reinventing expert writing practices in the workplace. *Technostyle*, 18. 117-141.
- Shulman, L.J., M. Besterfield-Sacre, & J. McGourty. (2005). The ABET “professional skills” – Can they be taught? Can they be assessed? *Journal of Engineering Education*.41-55.

C3 (continued)

Engineering writing in higher education

Specificity in Resources for EAP: Laboratory Reports from 11 Specific Engineering Disciplines

CK Jung, University of Warwick, UK

Recently, researchers have shown an increased interest in text specificity in the context of English for Academic Purposes (EAP). So far, however, there has been little discussion about undergraduate engineering laboratory reports (UELRs) which are part of compulsory assessed coursework within the UK undergraduate engineering curriculum. They take the form of a report written by an undergraduate engineering student completed after undertaking one of a series of 'laboratories' involving a range of practical work such as measurements, tests, simulations and computer aided designs. Nevertheless, these reports have undergone significant changes in recent years since students now use more state-of-the-art technologies. Consequently we may need to reconsider what can be conventionally described as a 'prototypical' (Swales 1990: 58) engineering laboratory report at undergraduate level. UELR II (UK) is a corpus of authentic UELR examples presenting twenty-first century written academic English in the field of Engineering within UK HE. Although UELR II (UK) was originally extracted from BAWE (ESRC RES-000-23-0800), the author has eliminated some errors which occurred during the project; hence it has been partly recategorised. It consists of 99 UELR examples from 11 specific engineering disciplines which include both single and multidisciplinary degree programmes, totalling 208,019 words. The talk addresses issues in specificity and potential transferability in the use of genre analysis in EAP. In this talk, I will propose a definition of the UELR, a set of criteria that I have used to produce UELR II (UK) and an overview of analytical procedures and considerations which may be useful to researchers who want to identify and use a specific genre from BAWE. I will also discuss specific textual situatednesses and linguistic features using authentic laboratory report samples from UELR II (UK).

Reference: Swales, J. (1990) *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

C3 (continued)

Engineering writing in higher education

Academic Writing Projects as a Way into Environmental Issues: How Does Writing Mediate Disciplinary Genre in Educational Setting?

Ann-Marie Eriksson, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Åsa Mäkitalo, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

There is a growing body of research which combines writing, genres, disciplinarity and notions of learning by turning to a social, historical and situated perspective (Prior, 2006; Bazerman & Russell, 2003; Casanave, 2002). One such well-established approach takes an interest in the conditions for appropriating genres in educational settings through the activity systems where writing is employed (Russell & Yanëz, 2003; Bazerman, 2004). Another comprehensive and frequently adopted view positions academic writing as identity projects, trajectories and a question of literacy (Ivanic, 1998; Lillis, 2003). What is more, there are also a number of studies that situates learning in sociocultural contexts and as part of activities - thereby conceptualizing it as a communicative process. Such studies turn to how texts come into being and explore writing as a situated practice (Dysthe et al 2006; Leander and Prior, 2004). What is less common though, are studies of how disciplinarity, academic norms and genre conventions are mediated in the institutional encounter between disciplinary experts, in the role of university teachers, and students as novice writers who are to learn the genre of their academic field.

This presentation explores the communication in such encounters between representatives of a disciplinary field and university students who are set to learn its genre. The setting is an individual writing project in Environmental engineering at Master's level, in an international Scandinavian university of technology. In focus, there is a research driven writing assignment on the engineering of sustainability issues launched as an academic writing project. The study, which is part of a PhD project in Educational Sciences, investigated how writing within such a socio-scientific and interdisciplinary field was made comprehensible by analyzing 14 cases of initial tutorials around the outline documents for the academic papers-to-be: how did the participants establish a productive starting point for an open-ended and dynamic writing assignment? Through a detailed exploration of the interaction (Jordan & Henderson, 1995) around the outline documents, the study paid attention to participants' sense making practices (Linell, 1998) and in particular to what semiotic-material resources they drew on in their communication (Rommetsveit, 1992). The outline document was used as an explicit mediating tool (Wertsch, 2007) to orient to normative conventions of working and writing in the field. But, and perhaps more interestingly, the communication between the teachers and students brought in particular language use and ways of reasoning which relied on disciplinarity and the specific genre norms and conventions relevant for this particular field.

The results expose how the students' writing is shaped from within an institutional practice. The work of finding a starting point for open-ended, academic writing projects of this kind involves appropriating ways of reasoning and arguing just as well as the ways in which text elements like 'the comparison', 'the trend' or 'the analysis' are part of the organization of an argument.

References

- Bazerman, C. (2004) *Speech acts, Genres, and Activity Systems*. In eds Bazerman, C., Prior, P. *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc: New Jersey
- Bazerman, C., Russell, D. (2003) *Writing Selves/Writing Societies: Research from Activity Perspectives*. Perspectives on Writing. Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Mind, Culture, and Activity. Online [http://wac.colostate.edu/books/selves_societies/]
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. (1993) "Rethinking genre from a sociocognitive perspective". *Written communication* 10(4), 475-509.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. (1995) *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: cognition/culture/power*. Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Inc: New Jersey.
- Casanave, C P. (2002) *Writing Games: Multicultural Case Studies of Academic Literacy Practices in Higher Education*. Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, Publishers: New Jersey.
- Devitt, A. (2004) *Writing Genres*. Southern Illinois University Press: Carbondale
- Dysthe, O., Samara, A., Westrheim, K. (2006) "Multi-voiced supervision of Master's students: a case study of alternative supervision practices in higher education". *Studies in Higher Education*. vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 299–318
- Jordan, B., Henderson, A. (1995) "Interaction Analysis: Foundations and Practice". *The Journal of the Learning Sciences* 4(1), pp 39-103.
- Ivanic, R. (1998) *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. John Benjamins Publishing
- Ivanic, R. (2004) "Discourses of Writing and Learning to Write". *Language and Education* vol 18, no 3, pp220-245.
- Leander, K., Prior, P. (2004) *Speaking and Writing: How Talk and Text Interact in Situated Practices*. In eds Bazerman, C., Prior, P. *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.: New Jersey
- Lillis, T (2003) "Student Writing as 'Academic Literacies': Drawing on Bakhtin to Move from Critique to Design". *Language and Education*. Online: [http://www.multilingual-matters.net/le/017/0192/le0170192.pdf]
- Lillis, T (2008) "Ethnography as Method, Methodology, and 'Deep Theorizing': Closing the Gap Between Text and Context in Academig Writing Research". *Written Communication* vol 2, no 3, pp353-388.
- Linell, P (1998) *Approaching Dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Series: IMPACT Studies in Language and Society. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia
- Miller, C A (1984) "Genre as Social Action". *Quarterly Journal of Speech* vol 70(1984), pp151-167.

- Prior, P. (2006) "A Sociocultural Theory of Writing". In eds MacArthur, CA., Graham, S., Fitzgerald, J. *Handbook of Writing Research*. The Guilford Press: New York
- Prior, P. (1998) *Writing/Disciplinarity: a sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: New Jersey
- Rommetveit, R. (1992). *Outlines of a dialogically based social-cognitive approach to human cognition and communication*. In A. Heen-Wold (Ed.), *The dialogical alternative: Towards a theory of language and mind* (pp. 19-44). Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Russell & Yanéz (2003) *Big picture people rarely become historians: genre systems and the contradictions of general education*. In eds Bazerman & Russell (2003) *Writing Selves/Writing Societies: Research from Activity Perspectives*. Perspectives on Writing. Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Mind, Culture, and Activity. Online [http://wac.colostate.edu/books/selves_societies/]
- Wertsch, J V (1998) *Mind as action*. New York Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (2007). *Mediation*. In eds H. Daniels, M. Cole & J. V. Wertsch. *The Cambridge companion to Vygotsky* (pp. 178-192). Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

C4

Disability and writing: What works

Is “Assistive Technology” Really Assistive? The Impact of Information Technology on Writing Processes

Dianne Samuelson, Harvard University, U.S.

Jenny Thomson, Harvard University, U.S.

One of the most complex skills demanded of post-secondary students is academic writing, a domain where the majority of students with learning disabilities struggle significantly (Lindstrom, 2007). Academic writing involves multiple processes, including the generating, organizing and synthesis of ideas, the production of text, as well as the process of revision (Flower & Hayes, 1981). The process of writing is also heavily mediated by a limited capacity working memory (WM) system (McCutchen, 2000; Vanderberg & Swanson, 2007) and so for students struggling with writing, reduction of cognitive task demands that will be competing for limited WM capacity is an important goal. Educational technology is one medium that has been conspicuously adopted by the learning disability field as a writing tool that may actively reduce certain cognitive task demands related to knowledge access and generation - by reducing task demands on working memory, capacity is freed up for higher level knowledge use. However, the picture may be more complex, with technology having potentially negative effects on the types of higher level processing required for writing in higher education and beyond. Van Waes and Schellens, for example, suggest that the facility of lower level revisions provided by computers may in fact actively, “distract the writer’s attention from the possibility of revision at higher levels” (p.833, Van Waes and Schellens, 2003). Using pause time patterns to quantify depth of processing Van Waes and Schellens (2003) found that the use of a word processor, even by skilled writers, produced more fragmentary pause-time patterns, recursive text and shallower rhetorical structures in the final product.

The current study systematically explores the effect of writing modality – i.e. use of a word processor versus manual writing, within a higher education population (n=40) with and without working memory deficits. Students were asked to write two expository writing samples each. One sample was written using word processing software on a keyboard and the other was written manually, using a stylus and tablet. For each modality data has been collected to quantify cognitive task demands during the text generation process, writing behaviors such as pausing and revision, as well as writing performance. Scriptlog and Eye & Pen software are being used to record the precise timing and nature of key-stroke/stylus activity respectively. Writing efficiency has been captured through variables including words generated per minute and total writing time. Writing quality of the final writing sample is being evaluated using the Lectical Assessment System (LAS; Dawson, 2008). For a small subset of participants, eye gaze is also being collected.

Data analysis for this study, which will continue through summer 2010, is expected to show systematic differences between writing behaviors and products as a function of modality. The possibility of statistical interactions mediated by working memory capacity will also be explored. The results of this study will provide new insights into the strengths and limitations of current technologies in facilitating

acquisition and demonstration of knowledge, as well as how this may vary among different populations of learners.

C4 (continued)

Disability and Writing: What Works

Sentence reformulation and sentence generation in expressive writing difficulties

Barbara Arfé, University of Padova, Italy

Bianca De Bernardi, University of Verona, Italy

Margherita Pasini, University of Verona, Italy

Writing texts is a demanding task, sensitive to a variety of linguistic and communicative developmental problems. The label “expressive writing disorders” identifies a variety of writing problems: the inability to a) form letters (dysgraphia), b) write words spontaneously or under dictation, and c) translate and organize thoughts into words and texts. This latter problem pertains to the linguistic generation of the text and embraces almost all kinds of writing difficulties (Arfé & Perondi, 2008; Arfé et al. 2009; Berninger et al., 2008; Dockrell et al., 2007). Nonetheless, expressive writing problems related to text generation are the most poorly understood learning disability. Developmental models of writing describe text generation as a core process in writing (Berninger et al., 2002). However, this component is often overlooked in the assessment of writing difficulties and explicit identification of language skills relevant to text generation is lacking in developmental models (Dockrell et al., 2009). The majority of studies focusing on developmental writing problems focus on the process of single words spelling and transcription rather than investigating the more complex process of ideas translation. Reasons for this lack of interest may be various. One is that it is usually difficult to measure performance of such an open-ended task (Bishop & Clarkson, 2003).

The present study aimed at identifying text generation measures capable to detect expressive writing difficulties in a population of Italian novice writers. Two tasks for assessing the process of text generation in young writers were developed and evaluated in this study: a Sentence Reformulation and a Sentence Generation Task (Arfé et al., 2009). Their predictive value and sensitivity compared with other standardized language tests (RAN, PPVT-R, a Picture Naming Task and TROG) have been evaluated. Ninety-nine 2nd (N=54) and 3rd graders (N=45), balanced for gender, participated in this study. Italian was their L1 and none of the children presented cognitive, ADHD diagnosis, sensorial disabilities, or developmental syndromes. Children’s receptive vocabulary and syntax, picture naming and rapid naming skills (RAN) were assessed individually. A Sentence Reformulation Task (reformulating a target sentence in three different ways), a Sentence Generation Task (generating written sentences from two concrete words) and a narrative text production task were administered collectively. Text production was coded for orthographic correctness, lexical correctness, grammatical fluency (overall number of sentences) and syntactic complexity (number of correct subordinates). Results show that receptive vocabulary breadth and receptive grammar do not predict children’s expressive writing skills with respect to the dependent measures considered in this study. Measures of lexical access (picture naming) and sentence elaboration (Sentence Reformulation and Generation) are the most predictive of children’s expressive writing skills. Sentence Reformulation and Generation show good sensitivity in identifying children with poor expressive writing skills.

A second study (RESEARCHER NAMES) is currently assessing the efficacy of Sentence Reformulation and Generation tasks in identifying true cases of expressive writing disorder. Results of this second study will be also presented.

C4 (continued)

Disability and Writing: What Works

Orthographic and metagraphic profiles of late primary students, early secondary students, and students with learning difficulties in Québec

Chantal Ouellet, Université du Québec à Montréal, Canada

Nathalie Prévost, France Dubé,* Catherine Turcotte,* Isabelle Gauvin,**

Danièle Cogis, Reine Pinsonneault,* Danielle Bertrand-Poirier,**

Elisabeth Boily, Anne Wagner,* Éliane Houle**

It is recognized that students in Québec have inherent difficulties with syntax, punctuation, and orthographics. Grammatical spelling remains a *bête noire* because of the often intimidating nature of traditional teaching methods. This research project pursues two aims. With regard to students, it aims to establish a state of affairs concerning their knowledge of grammatical spelling and to have a better understanding of their metagraphic abilities in order to determine whether students with learning difficulties use the same learning paths as other students but with delay or whether they use different learning paths. It also aims to document common grammatical spelling teaching practices in connection with student learning. The following objectives are pursued: 1) create orthographic and metagraphic profiles of sixth-grade primary, special education secondary, and first-year secondary students, both male and female, in various regions of Québec; 2) document the common grammatical spelling teaching practices of their teachers; 3) establish links between the practices of their teachers and the orthographic and metagraphic profiles of the students; 4) identify courses of action, training, and collaboration between members of school staff teams in order to improve teaching practices for students with learning difficulties in regular and special education classes. This paper will present the preliminary results obtained during dictation pre-tests and metagraphical interviews used to create orthographic and metagraphic profiles of sixth-grade primary students, students with learning difficulties or at risk, and first-year secondary students, both male and female. Students, numbering 300, and their teachers from four school boards representing various regions of Québec participated in the research project (2010-2013). In addition to contributing to enhancing scientific knowledge in the field, the project's impact will, among other things, directly relate to Québec's Action Plan for Improving French in Primary and Secondary Education and Québec's Policy on Special Education. Its impact will concern the measures for improving student follow-up in terms of stricter requirements for passing writing and spelling tests, and will apply to the measures for increasing teacher preparedness.

C5

Research into multi-modal writing across global teams: Composition, collaboration, and cross-cultural rhetoric

Alyssa O'Brien, Stanford University, U.S.

Christine Alfano, Stanford University, U.S.

Helle Rytönen, Stanford University, U.S.

Led by three Stanford University researcher-instructors who have developed a program in global learning through video-conference, blog, chat, wiki, gaming, Second Life, and storyboarding technologies with universities across five continents, this panel presentation will convey research on innovative strategies for technologically-mediated collaboration among students working in globally-distributed teams. Specifically, building on four years of work connecting university students across Asia, Europe, and the Middle East, these three Stanford teacher-researchers will share research on writing in multi-modal formats through virtual connections – not only blogging and video-conferences, but also gaming and Second Life sessions engaging Swedish, Egyptian and American students, Skype-facilitated peer review exchanges between Stanford and Singapore, and class-to-class collaborative activities between Russia and the US. The presenters will share the research protocol and methods, the observer data and exit survey quantitative data, as well as best practices for cross-cultural learning despite translation and technology obstacles. A particular focus of this panel will be on strategies for incorporating cutting-edge digital pedagogy into traditional institutional settings and methods for collaborative learning in multimodal classrooms. Case studies, resources, and research will be shared in order to help the audience move towards implementation of this exciting work at home institutions, and the panel will end with a general discussion about the challenges and solutions of such research-driven pedagogy in the audience's own educational contexts.

Why is this research important? Today, more than ever, in the current climate of intensified globalization, students need the opportunity to learn concrete strategies for communicating and collaborating with others around the globe. Universities have increased mandates for internationalization and the development of global citizens. Students need to learn the newest technologies necessary for such global conversations and collaborative projects. Yet too often students lack access to technologically-mediated learning environments, and they do not have the chance to work regularly with transnational audiences. Thus, they do not learn how to work collaboratively on new media texts with others from diverse cultures. These, however, are the very skills and core competencies that students will need in their future professions and in their futures as global citizens. As a case study in global learning made possible through innovative teaching with technology, the Stanford Cross-Cultural Rhetoric Project offers one answer to the challenge facing educators today. Specifically, the Cross-Cultural Rhetoric project methodology of real-time e-Learning across diverse cultures offers a new opportunity for global learning that was not possible with previous iterations of e-Learning. The project operates through communication technologies that can be harnessed by students to maximize their own involvement and learning, including real-time video-conferences involving collaborative gaming or multimedia text authoring, asynchronous blog and wiki composition, and Second Life sessions with real-time user interactions. Specially

researched and designed technologies allow students to select modes, frequency, style, and duration of communication across audio, video, chat or text writing, drawing, uploading of text, collaborative authorship, and bodily movement. Such interactions foster cognitive and socio-cultural negotiations that are essential to learning cross-cultural communication, collaboration, and composition strategies. In this way, the Cross-Cultural Rhetoric project aims to foster global citizenship through real-time, high stakes e-Learning in which students are accountable to each other as team members. Our ultimate goal is to share our findings from our research and to look ahead to the future – since the major video-conference technology we have used in the past is no longer available to the public, and since we have been migrating into alternative forms of writing and communication (gaming, Second Life, storyboarding), we hope to use this opportunity to also learn from others and plan our new research agenda for the coming years.

Speaker 1: Simulation and Connection: Gameplay, Open Worlds, and Cross-Cultural Collaborations

In “Simulation and Connection,” Dr. Christine Alfano will provide a detailed overview of the creative, collaborative global encounters she has facilitated between students through activities located in gaming and virtual world environments. Alfano’s work in this area derives from Ian Bogost’s theories of Procedural Rhetoric, namely “a technique for making arguments with computational systems and for unpacking computational arguments others have created.” Alfano will present two case studies: first, a video-conference activity between Swedish and American students in which the students both analyzed and then produced storyboards for “serious games” (games designed to persuade) on topics such as global conflict, world hunger, and climate change; and, secondly, a cross-cultural encounter between Egyptian and American students in Second Life, designed to take students to a virtual third place to engage with questions of identity formation and intercultural communication. For each of the case studies, she will share strategies and pedagogical materials, as well as a frank assessment of the possibilities and limitations of such encounters so as to initiate a larger discussion about using virtual spaces as a way to move beyond international borders and forge new connections.

Speaker 2: What’s So Funny? The Rhetoric of Cross-Cultural Humor

Carnival festivities and comic spectacles, Bakhtin argues, is a deviation from polite social norms. Mary Douglas seems to agree when she posits that humor allows sentiments, which are repressed or blocked in the official culture to surface and be rethought. Bergson, an early writer on humor and rhetoric argues that transpositions – the bringing together of different systems of meaning – expose the assumptions of the world we normally take for granted. Humor then, has the ability to invite us into a “cognitive playground” where the usual roles and norms are questioned, limits of ordinary discourse are exposed, and where, as Boskin argues, we can discuss contentious issues like race, class, gender; issues which can be too volatile or dangerous to address “without the mediation of humor.” It is from the spirit of the carnival and the site of the “cognitive playground” Helle Rytönen presents her experiences connecting students from Stanford, Sweden and Egypt in global teams in virtual classrooms. In these connections, students

have discussed Daily Show clips, political cartoons, stand up comedy routines, and created illustrated David Letterman style “Top Ten” lists together. The students therefore both discuss and make humor together. Her research examines the way humor often relies on incongruity juxtaposition between unexpected elements – the creation of a playful atmosphere in which conventions are recognized and left open for scrutiny. These skills are arguably important for any writing. Furthermore, the negotiations involved in the making of humor create a rich space for the exploration of cross cultural differences and similarities. It does so by bringing popular culture into a fruitful relationship with academic forms. Rytkonen will present her research, teaching methods, and evaluation of the “cognitive playground” as a productive place of play.

Speaker 3: Visual Rhetoric for the Intercultural Encounter

Alyssa J. O'Brien will share the innovative pedagogical practice of using elements of graphic novel composition for intercultural, cross-university collaboration when connecting students in global teams for collaborative writing projects. Specifically, she will explain how teams of international students working on cultural identity projects through video-conference technology in the writing classroom have used story-boarding and collaborative visual design as writing technologies that can foster intercultural competencies, or what theorists Chen and Starosta call "an individual's ability to develop a positive emotion towards understanding and appreciating cultural differences in order to promote appropriate and effective behavior in intercultural communication." O'Brien's contention is that collaborative production of such visual texts can enable deep learning of writing practices across cultures. But in order for this possibility to become reality, the composition curriculum must include negotiated graphic texts as alternative forms of academic writing. Presenting research from two years of investigation into a pedagogy that connects students between Stanford and Russia, Stanford and Singapore, and Stanford and Australia, O'Brien will argue for the inclusion of multi-modal writing as a means of facilitating global citizenship and collaboration across borders.

C6

Writing and national transitions

Genres at Work: A Newspaper's Coverage of the 2009 Iranian Presidential Election Debates

Ali R Abasi, University of Maryland, U.S.

In my proposed presentation I will discuss the findings of a genre analytical study that investigated the coverage of the historic Iranian presidential debates by a liberal-minded newspaper in the critical five days leading up to the June 2009 elections. Drawing on a composite theoretical lens involving genre theory, activity theory and critical discourse analysis, I will explore the newspaper's deployment of news genres in covering the debates and examine the distribution of coverage across members of a genre set on the basis of their genre-specific affordances. The analysis begins by a description of the broader sociopolitical context situating the watershed debates and the crucial role of the press in the Iranian polity. Next, it details the workings of individual genres in the set, each operating in their unique ways toward accomplishing the social action of discrediting the ideologically *Other* candidate and ultimately disrupting the narratives of the established power.

References

- Anonymous** 2009. 'Journalism in a semi-despotic society', *Naiman Reports*, 7-8.
- Barnhurst, K. G. and J. Nerone.** 2002. *The Form of News: A History*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Bazerman, C.** 1988. *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- Bazerman, C.** 2004. 'Speech acts, genres, and activity systems: How texts organize activity and people' in C. Bazerman and P. Prior (eds.). *What Writing Does and How It Does It: An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 309-40.
- Bell, A.** 1991. *The Language of News Media*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bell, C.** 2009. 'Hard versus soft news' in C. H. Sterling (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Journalism* (Vol. 2). London: Sage, pp. 687-89.
- Bhatia, V. K.** 2002. 'Applied genre analysis: A multi-perspective model'. *IBÉRICA* 4: 3-19.
- Boczkowski, P.** 2009. 'Rethinking hard and soft news production: From common ground to divergent paths,' *Journal of Communication* 59: 98-116.
- Carey, J. W.** 1986. 'Why and how: The dark continent of American journalism' in R. K. Manoff and M. Schudson (eds.). *Reading the News*. New York: Pantheon, pp. 146- 96.
- Clayman, S. E.** 1990. 'From talk to text: Newspaper accounts of reporter-source interactions,' *Media, Culture, and Society* 12: 70-103.
- Dehghan, A. R.** 2009. 'Media and public sphere in Iran,' *Asian Journal of Social Science* 37: 256-73.
- Devitt, A. J.** 1991. 'Intertextuality in tax accounting' in C. Bazerman and J. Paradis (eds.). *Textual Dynamics of the Profession: Historical and Contemporary Studies of Writing in Professional Communities*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 336-57.
- Devitt, A. J.** 2004. *Writing Genres*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dias, P. and A. Paré.** (eds.) 2000. *Transitions: Writing in Academic and Workplace Settings*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Ehteshami, A. and M. Zweiri.** 2007. *Iran and the Rise of Its Neoconservatives: The Politics of Tehran's Silent Revolution*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Emmons, K. K.** 2009. 'Uptake and the biomedical subject' in C. Bazerman, A. Bonini and D. Figueiredo (eds.). *Genre in a Changing World*. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse, pp. 134-57.
- Fairclough, N.** 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Flowerdew, J.** 2002. 'Genre in the classroom: A linguistic approach' in A. M. Johns (ed.). *Genre in the Classroom: Multiple Perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 91-104.
- Foucault, M.** 1981. 'The order of discourse' in R. Young (ed.). *Untying the Text: A Poststructuralist Reader*. Boston: Routledge, pp. 48-78.
- Freadman, A.** 1994. "'Anyone for tennis?' Genre and the New Rhetoric" in A. Freedman and P. Medway (eds.). London: Francis Taylor, pp. 43-66.

- Freedman, A.** 1999. 'Beyond the text: Towards understanding the teaching and learning of genres,' *TESOL Quarterly* 33: 764-67.
- Gans, H.** 1980. *Deciding What's News*. London: Constable and Company.
- Gheissari, A.** (ed.) 2009. *Contemporary Iran*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Gheissari, A. and V. Nasr.** 2006. *Democracy in Iran: History and the Quest for Liberty*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Gieber, W.** 2008. 'News is what newspapermen make it' in H. Tumber (ed.). *Journalism* (Vol. 1). London: Routledge, pp. 234-40.
- Giltrow, J.** 2002. 'Meta-genre' in R. Coe, L. Lingard and T. Teslenko (eds.). *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, pp. 187-205.
- Grey, D. L. and Brown, T. R.** 1970. 'Letters to the editor: Hazy reflections of public opinion,' *Journalism Quarterly* 47: 450-56.
- Hall, S.** 2001. 'The spectacle of the other' in S. Hall (ed.). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage, pp. 223-79.
- Hynds, E. C.** 1992. 'Editorial page editors discuss use of letters,' *Newspaper Research Journal* 1-2: 124-136.
- Hynds, E. C.** 1994. 'Editors at most U.S. dailies see vital roles for editorial page,' *Journalism Quarterly* 71: 573-82.
- Hyon, S.** 1996. 'Genres in three traditions: Implications for ESL,' *TESOL Quarterly* 30: 693-722.
- Iyengar, S.** 1991. *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Keddie, N.** 2006. *Modern Iran: Roots and Results of Revolution* 2nd edn. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Khiabany, G.** 2010. *Iranian Media: The Paradox of Modernity*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Khiabany, G. and Sreberny, A.** 2001. 'The Iranian press and the continuing struggle over civil society 1998-2000,' *International Communication Gazette* 63: 203-23.
- Kress, G.** 1999. 'Genre and the changing contexts for English language arts,' *Language Arts* 76: 461-69.
- Lehman-Wilzig, S. N. and Seletzky, M.** 2010. "Hard news, soft news, 'general' news: The necessity and utility of an intermediate classification," *Journalism* 11: 37-56.
- Martin, J. R. & Rose, D.** 2003. *Working with Discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. London: Continuum.
- Martin, J. R.** 1984. 'Language, register and genre' in F. Christie (ed.) *Children Writing: Reader*. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press, pp. 21- 9.
- McNair, B.** 2003. *An Introduction to Political Communication*. London: Routledge.
- Meltzer, K.** 2009. 'Op-Ed page' in C. H. Sterling (ed.). *Encyclopedia of Journalism*. London: Sage, pp. 1033-36.
- Miller, C. R.** 1994. 'Rhetorical community: The cultural basis of genre' in A. Freedman and P. Medway (eds.). *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. London: Taylor & Francis, pp. 57-66.
- Nilblock, S.** 2008. 'Features' in B. Franklin (ed.). *Pulling Newspapers Apart*. London: Routledge, pp. 46-55.

- Orlikowski, W. J. and Yates, J.** 1994. 'Genre repertoire: The structuring of communicative practices in organizations,' *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39: 541-74.
- Paltridge, B.** 1996. 'Genre, text type, and the language learning classroom,' *ELT Journal* 50: 237-43.
- Paltridge, B.** 2006. *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Continuum.
- Prior, P.** 1997. 'Literate activity and disciplinarity: The heterogeneous (re)production of American Studies around a graduate seminar,' *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 4: 275-97.
- Renfro, P. C.** 1979. 'Bias in selection of letters to editor,' *Journalism Quarterly* 56: 822-26.
- Richardson, J. E.** 2008a. 'Language and journalism: An expanding research agenda,' *Journalism Studies* 9: 152-60.
- Richardson, J. E.** 2008b. 'Readers' letters' in B. Franklin (ed.). *Pulling Newspapers Apart: Analyzing Print Journalism*. London: Routledge, pp. 56-66.
- Richardson, J. E. and Franklin, B.** 2004. 'Letters of intent: Election campaigning and orchestrated public debate in local newspapers' letters to the editor,' *Political Communication* 21: 459-78.
- Russell, D. R.** (1997). Rethinking genre in school and society. *Written Communication* 14: 504-55.
- Schryer, C. F.** 1994. 'The Lab vs. the Clinic: Sites of Competing Genres' in A. Freedman and P. Medway (eds.). *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. London: Taylor & Francis, pp. 105-24.
- Schryer, C. F.** 2002. 'Genre and power: A chronotopic analysis' in R. Coe, L. Lingard and T. Teslenko (eds.). *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, pp. 73-102.
- Schudson, M.** 1989. 'The sociology of news production,' *Media, Culture & Society* 11: 263-82.
- Schudson, M.** 2001. 'The objectivity norm in American journalism,' *Journalism* 2: 149-70.
- Scollen, R. Tsang, W. K. Li, D. Yung, V. and Jones, R.** 1997. 'Voice, appropriation, and discourse representation in a student writing task,' *Linguistics and Education* 9: 227-50.
- Sparks, M. K. and Perez, E.** 1991. 'Women not heard in letters columns,' *The Masthead* 14-5.
- Swales, J. M.** 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swales, J. M.** 2009. 'Worlds of genre—Metaphors of genre' in C. Bazerman, A. Bonini and D. Figueiredo (eds.) *Genre in a Changing World*. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse, pp. 3-16.
- Tarrant, W. D.** 1957. 'Who writes letters to the editor?,' *Journalism Quarterly* 34: 501-02.
- Taylor, J.** 2005. 'What makes a good feature? The different genres' in R. Keeble (ed.) *Print Journalism: A Critical Introduction*. London: Taylor & Francis, pp. 117-28.
- Tuchman, G.** 1978. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: Free Press.

- Tuchman, G.** 1972. 'Objectivity as strategic ritual: An examination of newsmen's notions of objectivity,' *American Journal of Sociology* 77: 660–79.
- Wahl-Jorgensen, K.** 2001. 'Letters to the editor as a forum for public deliberation: Modes of publicity and democratic debate,' *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 18: 303–20.
- Wahl-Jorgensen, K.** 2008. 'Op-ed pages' in B. Franklin (ed.). *Pulling Newspapers Apart: Analyzing Print Journalism*. London: Routledge, pp. 67-74.
- White, P. R. R.** 2006. 'Evaluative semantics and ideological positioning in journalistic discourse' in I. Lassen, J. Strunck and T. Vestergaard (eds.) *Mediating Ideology in Text and Image*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's, pp. 37-67.
- Wodak, R. and Meyer, G.** (eds.). 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wortham, S. and Locher, M.** 1996. 'Voicing on the news: An analytic technique for studying media bias,' *Text* 16: 557-85.

C6 (continued)

Writing and national transitions

Professional Writing Education in Afghanistan

Han Yu, Kansas State University, U.S.

This presentation reports the need for English-based professional writing education in Afghan universities, the early development of such education, and plans for future studies.

Since 2008, I have worked with a group of English teachers from Afghanistan in a professional writing course I teach at Kansas State University. These teachers are faculty members at the English Departments of Kabul University and Balkh University and are in the U.S. through a World Bank project to pursue Master's degrees.

According to interviews with these teachers, their departments lack professional writing courses that can meet students' learning needs and facilitate the rebuilding of Afghanistan. English graduates often work as administrative staff in governmental agencies such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and various non-governmental organizations in Afghanistan. At their workplaces, students need to write professional documents such as letters and reports in English. Proposal writing, in particular, is needed because many Afghanistan rebuilding projects are funded by international institutions such as the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank. To have their projects funded, requesting organizations need to submit convincing proposals in English. As more international business partnership emerges in Afghanistan, demands for business communication will also increase in the private sector.

Current writing education in the departments, however, does not fulfill these demands. Students take several writing classes, but the classes focus on teaching grammar and academic essays. Professional genres such as letters and proposals are covered, but only, in the teachers' words, "theoretically": Students learn that a business letter consists of an introduction, a body, and a conclusion with distinct information, but they do not practice writing these letters and thereby cannot gain relevant skills such as audience analysis and organization.

This situation will change as the need for English-based professional writing courses becomes clearer to the decision makers in Afghanistan's higher education. When these teachers return to Afghanistan (and some already did), they will be the first ones to implement professional writing classes. At Kabul University, one such course has already been added to the English curriculum. Details of this course will be shared during the presentation.

However, additional questions remain: Does the professional writing pedagogy these teachers learned in the U.S. apply in Afghanistan? Will cultural and social factors in Afghanistan render (some of) this U.S.-based pedagogy irrelevant or impractical? What specific contents are better suited for the Afghan students? Since many English graduates also work as translators and translate professional texts between English and Pashto or English and Dari, should translation be taught alongside of professional writing, and if so, how? To examine these and other related questions, I plan to interview these teachers as they return to Afghanistan and start implementing the professional writing courses. I also plan to survey students in those classes and examine their writing samples. Findings from this study can shed more light on the need for English-based professional writing

education in Afghanistan, the outcomes of such education, the issues and challenges involved, and the pedagogies that best suit the context in Afghanistan.

C6 (continued)

Writing and national transitions

Gesture and Cognition in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Re-Thinking the Border between Speech and Writing

Beverly A. Sauer, Georgetown University, U.S.

South Africans assumed that the overthrow of the Nationalist government in the elections of 1994 would also bring economic and societal change for South Africa's disadvantaged majority. Change has been slow, however, because massive problems of illiteracy complicate any attempt to assess what workers know—particularly in respect to the so-called 'lost generation' of workers who have had little formal education in any language following the 1976 Soweto riots.

In this paper, Sauer argues that the complexities of the South African context provide an opportunity for re-examining how we assess technoscientific literacy across sharply drawn institutional and societal borders. Drawing upon psycholinguistic research in multimodal communication (speech and gesture) and cognition, Sauer examines how we reconcile individual accounts of risk despite (apparently) incommensurate language, education and experience.

Using data from a longitudinal study of South African coal mine safety training, Sauer focuses on the question: Why does methane explode? Initial (1997) data suggested that workers did not seem to understand why methane [translated as Imbawula] exploded. In follow-up (2005) interviews, educated Zulu-speaking South Africans affirmed with striking confidence that 'Imbawula [methane] does not explode.' Analysis of subjects' gestures reveals surprising conclusions about what educated (Ph.D.-level) and uneducated (less than fifth form) subjects know, what forms this knowledge takes, and how subjects represent their understandings (and misunderstandings) in speech and gesture.

The methodology developed in this project was designed to provide a reflexive analysis of subjects' gestural responses that did not presume to pre-judge the expertise of any given subject's response—regardless of education or experience. In addition, comparative data across multiple variables was designed to avoid problems of interpretation that privileged the researcher's perspective and/or judgments about subject's intended meanings.

The results reveal critical gaps in semantic understanding across all levels of education and experience. Workers and shift bosses shared functional understandings grounded in the structure of institutional space despite differences in language and education. Highly educated subjects showed surprising errors in interpretation—suggesting that they might 'lack technoscience literacy' despite a high degree of confidence in what were actually 'incorrect' or misplaced semantic interpretations. Finally, all subjects showed difficulty in representing Type 2 Knowledge (abstract concepts) like methane and ventilation.

As this analysis suggests, semantic interpretation reflects a subject's individual location in relation to an immensely complicated network of contingent discourses whose meanings are revealed in finely-grained analysis of speech and gesture. Judgments about technoscientific literacy must therefore take into account complex societal and

institutional structures that influence subjects' responses to questions relating to semantic meaning, manual representation of tool use, and object identifications.

As the present study suggests, complexity is characteristic of technoscience cognition in its fullest form. Individual processes of cognition take place within societal and institutional structures that influence both the interpretation and representation of scientific knowledge and experience. By revealing local understandings not visible in writing, research in multimodal communication can play a significant role in defining more generally what it means to be literate in a technoscientific culture.

C7

Development of writing in the early grades

Reevaluating Knowledge-Telling: Modeling Early Writing Development

John R. Hayes, Carnegie Mellon University, U.S.

In 1987, Bereiter and Scardamalia's *The Psychology of Written Composition* presented perhaps the most systematic empirically based account of writing development. Their knowledge-telling model (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987, p. 8), designed to describe the writing processes of developing writers, has become a commonplace in the developmental writing literature. In this model, Bereiter and Scardamalia specify the sorts of knowledge and the sequence of cognitive processes that knowledge-telling writers use to create texts.

In this presentation, I will describe a study that suggests the need to reevaluate the use of knowledge-telling model for describing children's writing processes. For this study, I analyzed 540 texts written by children in grades 1 through 9 in response to both expository and narrative prompts. These texts were selected by Fuller (1995) from a larger sample of texts collected by Berninger and Swanson (see Berninger and Swanson 1994).

The results of my study indicate that although the knowledge telling-model accounts well for many texts produced by children in the early primary grades, there are many texts for which it cannot account, especially those produced by children in the late primary and early secondary grades. In particular, by fifth grade, many students produce texts that include subtopics. This is of interest because the knowledge-telling model does not include a mechanism for creating subtopics. To account for such texts, I propose a new model that makes use of a sub-goal handling mechanism to allow the production of subtopics. I call this a knowledge-structuring model.

The study further indicates that in grades 6 through 9 children produce an increasing number of texts that have whole-text organization. In the texts I studied, whole-text organization was most often revealed when writers disguise the true meaning of the text in early passages. For example, writers may describe an adventure that, in the last few sentences, turns out to be just a dream or they may make statements that are revealed to be false or ironic by what comes later. Neither the knowledge-telling nor the knowledge-structuring models describes a writing process that can produce such texts. Clearly, an additional model is needed to account for whole text organization. I claim that such a model must include a whole-text planning mechanism not present in the other models.

To conclude, I suggest that developing writing processes are best described not by a single model such as knowledge-telling but rather by a sequence of progressively more complex models that describe students' increasing skill and flexibility as they move toward adult competence.

References

Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The Psychology of Written Communication*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Berninger, V. & Swanson, H. L. (1994). Modifications of Hayes and Flower's model to

explain beginning and developing writing. In E. Butterfield (Ed.) *Children's writing: Toward a process theory of development of skilled writing* (pp, 57-81). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Fuller, D. F. (1995). *Development of topic-comment algorithms and test structures in written compositions of students in grades one through nine*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Washington.

C7 (continued)

Development of writing in the early grades

Copying Ability across Primary School: The Role of Working Memory

Joachim Grabowski, Leibniz University, Germany

Christian Weinzierl, Leibniz University Hannover, Germany

Markus Schmitt, University of Education Heidelberg, Germany

In everyday life at primary school, there are manifold tasks that involve the copying of written materials, e.g. when writing down homework assignments or working on arithmetic problems. Correct and efficient copying is an important key ability on which many other tasks and learning processes at school draw (e.g., producing excerpts or summaries). It remains far from clear, however, which processes and strategies help primary schoolers to basically acquire this ability and to use it efficiently. There is agreement in the field of empirical writing research that the involved processes crucially depend on the available resources of working memory. Therefore, it appears reasonable to assume that working memory also plays an important role for writing tasks as basic and “simple” as copying.

We will report on two experiments from a research project on the cognitive prerequisites of copying in primary school. $N = 70$ second-grade students, and $N = 87$ fourth-grade students, respectively, copied, in individual sessions and under experimental control, short texts in the methodological framework of the dual-task paradigm. Each participant copied four kinds of text patterns composed of four different symbol systems which varied according to their phonological and semantic codability: meaningful text, strings of digits, unpronounceable strings of consonants, and graphical symbols. Each symbol system was copied under four conditions in which the components of working memory according to the work of Baddeley (phonological loop; visuo-spatial sketchpad; central executive; neutral) were selectively loaded by concurrent secondary tasks to be performed during the copying. All $4 \times 4 = 16$ copying conditions were implemented within two time slots of lessons in a within-subjects design. Additionally, relevant covariate measures were collected, mainly memory spans.

Results show that in both grades, symbol systems like meaningful text and digit strings that allow for a phonological representation are faster copied than consonant strings and sequences of graphical objects ($p < .001$ for each grade). Moreover, there is a significant interaction between the types of pattern and the working memory conditions ($p < .001$): phonological copying tasks are stronger impaired by secondary loads of the phonological loop and the central executive.

When comparing second and fourth graders, fourth-graders performed generally faster than second-graders. Moreover, a significant interaction shows that fourth-graders improved more when copying symbols that form pronounceable chunks, namely meaningful text and numerical strings. Conversely, the phonological secondary task showed stronger interference with the more phonological copying tasks (meaningful text and digit strings) in fourth-graders as compared to second-graders.

Results indicate an increasing role of phonological (and probably also semantic) processes involved in copying across primary school. This is a first step towards modeling the cognitive demands of low-level writing tasks and educing potential interventions to teach efficient task-specific strategies.

C7 (continued)

Development of writing in the early grades

Graphomotor Skills, Spelling and Writing in Grade 2: The Effects of Teaching Practices

Marie-France Morin, Université de Sherbrooke, Canada

Natalie Lavoie, Université du Québec à Rimouski, Canada

Isabelle Montésinos-Gelet, Université de Montréal, Canada

In the research area which takes into account the complexity of the learning of writing, an increasing number of researchers sustain the idea that the graphomotor skills could be much more important than they seem (Christensen, 2009; Graham, Harris et Fink, 2000). In fact, Berninger (1994) brought to light the place of these skills in the memorization of spelling information and in their access and, more recently, this researcher (Berninger, 2006; Berninger et al., 2002) shows these handwriting skills have a complex relationship with different aspects of writing activities. More rarely, the link between handwriting and teaching practices was study, even if some studies indicate this importance (Graham, 2010); it's the purpose of this communication.

More precisely, our objective is to explore the relations between different profiles of teaching practices for handwriting and the development of writing skills among 718 seven-eight year old children. These children realized three collective tasks at different moments in grade 2 of elementary school: writing letters of the alphabet, writing words and writing text (adapted by Berninger et al., 1997). Our sample is separate in three groups depending of teaching practices: group 1: children are only learn cursive writing since beginning of primary school; group 2: children are only learn manuscript writing since beginning of primary school; group 3 (the most popular profile in schools in Quebec, Canada): children learn manuscript writing in grade 1 and cursive writing in grade 2. First, in this communication, we will present our results for the effects of teaching practices for the three groups who, globally, show different impact of these practices on performances at the three measures of writing (writing letters, spelling and writing text) during grade 2*. Second, we will also focus this relation with the group of children with difficulties.

**our analyses are actually in progress and they will be complete during fall 2010*

C8

Teaching language teachers

Writing Competence in Bachelors of Latin America: Comparative Analysis of Writing Competence as an Outcome in Language Teaching Bachelor Degree Programs in 5 Latin American Countries

Priscilla Núñez Tapia. Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Mexico

A comparative analysis of the graduate profiles of several bachelor's degrees in language teaching was conducted. For this analysis, five prestigious Latin American countries were chosen based on their graduate profiles defined by competences. This research consisted in making a comparative analysis, based on what the UNESCO states, of the graduate profile's competences, specifically analyzing if the writing competence was included and considered as one of the intellectual abilities teachers in languages have to develop throughout their course of study.

Key words: competences, graduate profiles, UNESCO, SEP

Comparative Analysis of Writing Competence as an Outcome in Language Teaching Bachelor Degree Programs in 5 Latin American Countries

In higher education bachelor degree programs identify the competences that graduates are expected to develop at the end of any course of study (Secretaría de Educación Pública [SEP], 2002). For example, the mission of Mexico's higher education is to form professionals that the government and the job field demand (Alcántara, n.d.). For this reason, the universities create documents that detail the expectations for society, especially for prospective students to develop essential competences throughout their professional learning. (SEP, 2000 & 2001; So, Cheng & Tseng, 1996; Comisión Nacional de Acreditación y Posgrado [CNAP], n.d., Eljadue 2007).

In this research I collected and analyzed documents of 5 countries in Latin America concerning their bachelor degree programs in language teaching. I performed an analysis of the graduate profile's competences and I additionally compared those findings with what the UNESCO [United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization] establishes.

In my study I report the findings mainly on the writing competence across the next 5 Latin American countries: Mexico, Argentina, Panama, Chile and Colombia. Though, a further analysis was conducted focusing specifically in Mexico's bachelors in language teaching.

In my research I found that there are different definitions of the competences in the programs revised. In Mexico, the Secretary of Education (SEP) considers the UNESCO documents to define the educational competences; and after, all of the universities in Mexico have to consider primordially the SEP competences to develop their bachelor's programs. However, at the end of my research I found that the graduate profiles in Mexico's bachelors in language teaching are not uniform between them, nor with the UNESCO or SEP. (SEP, n.d.).

In Mexico, the SEP presents the next areas, defined by competences, of professional development in the bachelors of language teaching offered in the universities to form quality teachers (SEP, 2002). These areas are:

1.- Intellectual abilities

- 2.- Knowledge of teaching content
- 3.- Didactic
- 4.- Professional ethics and identity
- 5.- Capacity to interact with the context of the school.

For this research the first area, of the above enlisted, is the most relevant, because is where the competence of writing is presented as one the priorities to be developed in the future teachers (SEP, 2002).

Finally, in my results of the comparative analysis of the bachelor degree programs in language teaching of Latin America, I found that the competence of writing in some programs is included and in others is not raised as a professional development for the teachers. Implications of this research means, that there are particular changes which have to be done in the programs of the bachelors in language teaching to develop quality and efficient teachers.

References

- Alcántara, A. (n.d.) Perfiles Educativos. Los retos de la Educación Superior en América Latina frente al ajuste estructural: Por Una Universidad Reflexiva. *Redalyc*. 1-10. Retrieved May 27th, 2008, from:
<http://redalyc.uaemex.mx/pdf/132/13206901.pdf>
- Comisión Nacional de Acreditación [CNAP] (s.f). Criterios de Evaluación para Carreras y Programas de Formación. 4-6. Retrieved February 12th, 2008, from:
http://www.uss.cl/acreditacion/Manuales/criterios_carr_tec.pdf
- Elijadue, P. (2007). Seminario Práctica Educativa. 1-5. Retrieved March 27th, 2008, from:
<http://practicaeducativa.wordpress.com/category/paola-eljadue/>
- Secretaría de Educación Pública (2000) Acuerdo Número 269 por el que se establece El Plan de Estudios para la Formación Inicial de Profesores de Educación Secundaria. 1-21. Retrieved May 28th, 2008, from:
<http://www.reformasecundaria.sep.gob.mx/doc/sustento/a269.pdf>
- Secretaría de Educación Pública (2001). Programa Nacional de Educación 2001-2006. Por una educación de buena calidad para todos: un enfoque educativo para el siglo XXI. 83-219. Retrieved November 24th, 2007, from:
<http://www.sep.gob.mx/work/appsite/programa/plan.zip>
- Secretaría de Educación Pública (2002). Licenciatura en Educación Secundaria. Plan de estudios 1999 Documentos básicos. México.
- Secretaria de Educación Pública (s.f). Formación docente. Retrieved March 2nd, 2009 from:
http://pronabes.sep.gob.mx/dg/dgespe/cuader/cuad1/4_vis.htm
- So, W., Cheng, M. y Tsang C. (1996). Un Impacto en la Práctica de la Enseñanza: Percepciones de las competencias del maestro entre estudiantes-maestros. Universidad de Hong Kong. 1-12. Artículo 1 y 6. Retrieved April 1st, 2008, from:
<http://sunzi1.lib.hku.hk/hkjo/view/48/4800041.pdf>

C8 (continued)

Teaching language teachers

Rhetorical Features of Education Bachelor Student Writing in Didactics Disciplines.

Isabel García Parejo, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

The work presented here has to do with writing different types of genres that students must know for each of the teaching areas that are included in the new Spanish Degrees in Early Childhood Education and Primary Education (Language(s), Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Music, Plastic, Physical Education). In these areas, among other skills, students should be enabled to design teaching strategies appropriate to the nature of the particular scientific field, based on the Early Childhood and Primary Education curriculum. The study, part of a larger research project still at an early stage conducted by Didactext Group¹, is aimed at analyzing the characteristics of the writing work done by students in the language teaching classroom. The movements called WAC, writing across the curriculum (Bazerman et al. 2005; McLeod y Soven 1992; Russel 1990) and WID, writing in the disciplines (Monroe 2003, Carlino 2005), provides a conceptual and pedagogical framework for studying and designing educational intervention for improving academic writing. The data collection was carried out in 2 classrooms of the Degree in Early Childhood Education and Primary Education at the Faculty of Education of the Complutense University of Madrid during the academic course 2009-2010: Development of Language Skills and Didactis of Language. These data include the description of a teaching unit for the development of language skills from a set outline, the different drafts, and diaries made by participants which describe the process of elaborating the written text. The results of this initial pilot phase showed that students in these degree courses are faced with three major difficulties: (i) difficulties relating to the overall organization of the text, despite having received an outline and having discussed it in the classroom (index, introduction, aims, contents, activities, conclusions, references). It seems that there is less transfer of information from other teaching areas and subjects than would be expected. (ii) Constraints on the ability to relate theoretical knowledge of other teaching areas with a practical piece of work (level of argumentation; adjustment to the communicative purpose), and (iii) difficulties relating to the use of the conventions of written language (use of paratextual cues, agreement mistakes, punctuation signs, references to sources of documentation). The implications of these results for the final design of our broader project are discussed as a conclusion.

References

- Bazerman, C. ; Little, J ; Bethel, L. ; ChavKin, T. ; Fouquette, D. y Garufis, J. (2005) : Reference guide to writing across the curriculum. West Lafayette, IN. Parlor Press.
http://wac.colostate.edu/books/bazerman_wac
- Carlino, P. (2005): Escribir, leer y aprender en la Universidad. Una introducción a la alfabetización académica. FCE, 2006.
- McLeod, S. y S. Soven (eds.) (1992): Writing across the currículum, a guide to developing programs. Sage. Publications, Newbury Park.

Monroe, J. (2003): « Writing and the disciplines ». Peer Review, Autumn, 4-7.
Russel, D. (1990): «Writing across the curriculum in historical perspective : Toward a social interpretation ». College English, 52: 52-73.

C8 (continued)

Teaching language teachers

Academic Writing and Knowledge Transformation in Teacher Education at
University

Teodoro Alvarez Angulo, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

This paper reflects on the sociocognitive approach to academic texts as well as analyzing the linguistic regularities found in expository writing, which is the genre par excellence in academic and professional domains. From a pedagogic approach, this consists of making the writing context, process, and text characteristics explicit with the aim of promoting reflection. This study contends that this methodology will enable the internalization and automatization of what is demanded by the text in terms of writing.

Among the most relevant references the following are of particular importance: Vygotsky, 1932; Bakhtine, 1979; Hayes & Flower, 1980; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Gregg & Steinberg, 1980; Candlin & Hyland, 1999; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Halliday, 1965; De Beaugrande & Dressler, 1972; Van Dijk, 1997; Bazerman et al. 2010; McLeod & Soven, 1992; Adam, 1992; Barton & Ivanic, 1991; Didactext, 2005; Álvarez, 2010).

The main research questions formulated in this paper are connected with the explanation: (i) of the text production context (the previous ideas on the topic, the purpose, the addressee or audience); (ii) of the process and the intervening phases in the text production (planning, writing, revising, re-writing, editing, public delivery and, if relevant, public debate); and (iii) of the text itself (the discursive genre and its linguistic and textual peculiarities.)

This implies considering text writing from a procedural perspective, so that in each phase the tasks carried out by the pupils and the tasks provided by the teachers (helping, mediating, scaffolding) (Vygotsky, 1932; Bruner, 1984) are appropriately differentiated. Each phase will provide a draft until reaching a definitive product, the final text.

The chosen procedure entails working thoroughly on the draft, to clarify it and to re-write the text, which involves evaluating and improving the writing, and also the transformation of knowledge and the construction of thought.

Since the ultimate purpose of this research is a pedagogic project, we are concerned with observing and describing the text production phases and establishing the teaching sequences that facilitate the teaching and learning of the texts in academic domains (qualitative method.) A quantitative analysis will be carried out in order to gather statistic data about mental mechanisms and the most frequent linguistic and textual units (Paratext, text, idea, paragraph, sentence, word, syllable, letter) in the revision of the text. An example: add clarifying or explanatory phrases on technical concepts, such as “cinturón desértico” or include “Ver gráfico” to establish the relationship between data-text and graphics as an intratextual reference. For this reason, a writing experience performed by primary student teachers is included.

With the above mentioned analysis we intend to clarify the influence that reflexion, through the explanation of the context, process, and text, has on future primary school teachers when writing texts. This experience should work as a model for their later teaching activities.

La escritura académica y la transformación del conocimiento en la Formación del Profesorado en la Universidad

Teodoro Álvarez Angulo

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Este trabajo se fundamenta en una concepción sociocognitiva de la escritura, principalmente de textos académicos, así como de las regularidades lingüísticas de la exposición escrita de información, género por excelencia de los ámbitos académicos universitarios y profesionales. Desde un enfoque didáctico, esto consiste en explicitar el **contexto** y el **proceso** de escritura, así como las características del **texto**, con el fin de favorecer la reflexión, y así poder interiorizar y automatizar las demandas de escritura en tales contextos.

Entre las referencias destacables merecen citarse las siguientes: Vygotsky, 1932; Bakhtine, 1979; Hayes & Flower, 1980; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Gregg & Steinberg, 1980; Candlin & Hyland, 1999; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Halliday, 1965; De Beaugrande & Dressler, 1972; Van Dijk, 1997; Bazerman et al. 2010; McLeod & Soven, 1992; Adam, 1992; Barton & Ivanic, 1991; Didactext, 2005; Álvarez, 2010).

Las principales preguntas de investigación que se formulan en este trabajo con textos académicos tienen que ver con la explicitación: (i) del contexto de producción del texto (las ideas previas sobre el tema, la intención, el destinatario o audiencia); (ii) del proceso y las fases que intervienen en la producción del texto (planificación, redacción, revisión y reescritura, edición, exposición en público y, en su caso, la defensa); y (iii) del texto en sí (el género discursivo y sus peculiaridades lingüísticas y textuales).

Ello implica considerar la composición de textos desde una **perspectiva procesual**, de modo que en cada fase del proceso se diferencien las actividades que llevan a cabo los alumnos y las tareas de ayuda, mediación y andamiaje necesarios, que proporciona el profesor (Vygotsky, 1932; Bruner, 1984), hasta llegar al **producto** de cada fase, y al producto definitivo, que es el texto final.

Este procedimiento supone volver a trabajar, desde el borrador, el pensamiento, para clarificarlo y reescribir el texto, lo que implica evaluar y mejorar la redacción, y también transformar el conocimiento y construir pensamiento.

Habida cuenta de que el propósito final de este trabajo es su proyección didáctica, nos preocupa observar y describir las fases de producción del texto y establecer la secuencia didáctica que facilite el aprendizaje y la enseñanza de estos textos, en ámbitos académicos (método cualitativo). La recogida de datos estadísticos sobre los mecanismos mentales y las unidades lingüísticas y textuales predominantes (Paratexto, texto, idea, frase, palabra, sílaba y letra) en la revisión del texto trabajado será objeto de análisis cuantitativo. Un ejemplo de ello: añadir frases aclaratorias o explicativas sobre conceptos técnicos, como “cinturón desértico”, o incluir “Ver gráfico” para establecer la relación entre los datos del texto y el gráfico, como referencia intratextual. Para ello se incluye una experiencia de escritura llevada a cabo con estudiantes que se forman para ser Maestros de Educación Primaria.

Con todo ello se pretende descubrir la influencia de las oportunidades de reflexión que proporciona la explicitación del contexto, del proceso y del texto, en la composición de textos escritos que llevan a cabo estudiantes universitarios, que se forman para ser

Maestros de Educación Primaria, de modo que les sirva de modelo para su posterior práctica docente.

C9

Journalism and young writers

New Journalism Sites: How Do Young Adults See the Future?

Cissy Ross, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.

The profession of journalism has changed profoundly in the last decade with the decline of traditional newspapers and the ascent of Internet-based media. This has also meant that the public is developing dramatically different expectations about professional journalism genres. Indeed, as the number of traditional journalists dwindles, other kinds of readers and writers are emerging—blog contributors, so-called “citizen journalists,” and commentators on social media sites. As Leonard Downey Jr., former executive editor of the Washington Post and Michael Shudson, a professor at the Columbia University school of journalism, point out in their report, “The Reconstruction of American Journalism,” writers for these new media genres will spring from changing social needs of the 21st century, just as the reporting in the last century was driven by the needs of those who wanted a newspaper in the driveway and television antenna on every roof.

At this point, however, no one is sure exactly which or how many of the emerging habits of journalistic reading and writing will take root. One group that will help define them, however, is young adults. The Millennial Generation, people ages 18 to 29 years old, uses online media more than any previous generation, according to surveys conducted by the Pew Research Center. Millennials are more connected to the Internet and more tethered via wireless devices, such as portable laptops and cell phones. In addition, three-quarters of young adults have a profile on a social networking site, such as Facebook. This desire to interact with their peers via the Internet is also shaping the news landscape as Millennials are big contributors to social media news sites such as Digg.com and Reddit.com, where readers—rather than traditions editors—select the top news stories of the day. Where Walter Cronkite was once trusted as a reliable source of news, young adults are likely to get their news from the satiric “The Daily Show with Jon Stewart,” or quick clips of the major headlines sent to their cell phones via Twitter. Indeed the center observes that Millennials are, according to the title of one of its reports, “Confident. Connected. Open to Change.”

What exactly are these changes, and how do they shape the ways young adults read and write for various journalistic media? In tandem with research conducted by Professor Madeleine Sorapure, I plan to present information from a survey of 60 university students at the University of California, Santa Barbara that will probe aspects of this question. Using quantitative measures, the survey will include such questions as: How often do you use the various news media sources: Newspapers? Television? Online websites? Other, such as Twitter? In addition to quantitative ratings about the types of media used, the survey also includes qualitative data, such as open-ended questions for respondents to reflect briefly in their own words on their practices. Based on these responses, some students will be selected for in-depth interviews to probe ideas about the online journalism sites highlighted in Sorapure’s presentation. This research should shed current information on how some young adults are helping to shape new journalism genres for both readers and writers.

C9 (continued)

Journalism and young writers

New Journalism Visualizations: How Do We See the News?

Madeleine Sorapure, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.

From decades of experience, we're familiar with the conventions for reading, watching, and listening to the news. Newspapers, television, and radio present news stories within the familiar constraints of their own medium and to an identifiable audience that knows more or less what to expect. As an increasing number of people get their news from online sources, however, new reading and writing practices are emerging. For instance, the rise of blogging and the increasing popularity of social media news sites (e.g., Digg, Reddit, even Twitter) call into question the traditional roles and relations of media organizations, professionals, and readers ultimately call on us to redefine professional journalistic writing.

Interactive visualizations of news present another new dimension of journalistic reading and writing. In my presentation, I consider what it means to "see the news" by examining seven Web-based news visualizations: Newsmap, 10 x 10, Universe, MappedUp, DoodleBuzz, MSNBC's Spectra, and the visualizations at Digg Labs. These applications visually present the entire news landscape, condensing a massive amount of information onto the small space of a screen. In addition to providing a visual overview of the news, they offer interactive options that allow readers to configure views and mine for details along certain paths. Thus interactive news visualizations offer us opportunities to read, write, and organize news differently—and therefore to see ourselves and our world differently.

In "A See-Through Society" (*Columbia Journalism Review*, 2009), Micah Sifry identifies news visualization as a major trend that is creating a kind of "3-D journalism: dynamic and data-driven." Sifry notes that news visualization has the potential to increase political transparency and strengthen democratic processes. But because news visualization is a relatively recent phenomenon whose conventions are still being defined across several disciplines (computer science, graphic design, journalism), it presents challenges to us as we read, interact, and respond. What strategies can we deploy in order to develop a strong critical understanding of news visualizations? What kinds of technological and information literacies are necessary for us to "see the news" clearly? As I explain in my presentation, in order to use news visualization sites effectively and respond to them critically, we need to apply some familiar literacy skills in new ways. We must assess the sources from which these sites draw via news aggregators or user selection and ranking algorithms; understand the methods and metaphors employed by these sites as ultimately shaping the content of the news; and examine the implications of the interactivity provided by these sites, as readers zoom and filter the news in addition to simply reading it. Drawing on research done with Cissy Ross, I will observe and interview students as they interact with news visualizations with the goal of understanding how young adults of the Millennial Generation deploy critical skills and strategies in these new contexts. Our students have significantly different experiences and expectations as readers and writers of news, and their responses can help us understand the opportunities and challenges of interactive news visualizations and better discern at least one path in the future direction of journalistic writing.

C9 (continued)

Journalism and young writers

Transcending the Border between Classroom and Newsroom: A Comparison of Revision Practices

Yvonne Teems, Kent State University, U.S.

Researchers have discovered much about the revision process by studying teacher-student written interactions in the classroom. In an effort to learn more about the revision process, I transcend the border between the classroom and the newsroom, hopefully lending insight into both classroom and newsroom processes. Considering the work that has been done in composition regarding the linguistic structure of teachers' comments on student work and students' revisions in light of comments (Bardine et al., 2000; Ferris, 1997 & 2009; Sommers, 1982; Straub, 2000; Treglia, 2006), I ask, How do editors comment on reporters' work? How do reporters respond to editors' comments of different syntactical types? What can writers, editors, and teachers learn from the ways editors and reporters create texts in a newsroom?

At my site of study, a Midwestern weekly newspaper with a circulation of 6,000, I collected nine drafts of reporters' stories, editors' comments, and reporters' revised stories. Using grounded theory, I coded the data to determine to what extent reporters made the changes editors called for, identifying six levels of compliance. I then coded the data to determine the linguistic types of comments editors made, identifying six, including directives, rewrites, and observations.

Results showed that the most commonly made edits were questions and directives: The editors asked 30 questions and made 21 directives, which made up 51 of the 99 total edits made, or slightly more than 50 percent. Reporters' responses to questions versus directives show that questions were less effective than directives in achieving the editors' desired outcomes. Reporters complied with directives 17 out of 21 times, indicating a 20 percent noncompliance rate, and they complied with questions 18 out of 30 times, indicating a 40 percent noncompliance rate.

The data support the conclusion that the comments writing teachers advocate – those that allow the writer to maintain authorial control (Straub, 2000) – are also the ones that novice writers are less likely to consider in revision. On the other hand, the comments that allow the editor to appropriate control over the work – directives (Bardine et al., 2000) – are more effective in getting the writer to complete a desired revision. The paradox becomes problematic because suggestive feedback “over the long haul” is helpful to students as compared with corrections because it forces students to think (Ferris, 2009), but these comments prompt less compliance in reporter revisions. This paradox also is wrapped up in differing university and workplace goals: While learning is primary in the university, task completion is primary in the workplace, and learning is a secondary goal (Dias et al., 1997). These tentative findings, which I propose to present in an individual presentation, may inform practices in both the classroom and the newsroom.

References

- Bardine, B. A., Schmitz Bardine, M., Deegan, E. F. (2000, September). Beyond the red pen: Clarifying our role in the response process. *English Journal*, 90(1), 94-101. Retrieved December 6, 2009, from MLA International Bibliography database.
- Dias, P., Freedman, A., Medway, P., & Pare, A. (1999). Students and workers learning. *In Worlds apart: Acting and writing in academic and workplace contexts* (pp. 185-200). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ferris, D. R. (1997, Summer). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339. Retrieved December 6, 2009, from CSA Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts database.
- . (2009). Theory, research, & practice in written corrective feedback: Bridging the gap, or crossing the chasm? *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 15(1), 1-12. Retrieved December 6, 2009, from CSA Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts database.
- Sommers, N. (1982, May). Responding to student writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33(2), 148-156.
- Straub, R. (2000). The student, the text, and the classroom context: A case study of teacher response. *Assessing Writing*, 7, 23-55. Retrieved December 6, 2009, from MLA International Bibliography database.
- Treglia, M. (2006). A study of teacher-written commentary in relation to student revisions and perceptions in college writing classes. Diss. Abstract. New York University. Retrieved December 13, 2009, from CSA Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts database.

C10 Teaching English writing and its research in China: Historical, experimental, and cross-cultural perspectives

The Paradigms and the Shifts: A Review of the Teaching and Research of English Writing in China

Wu Dan, Xi'an International Studies University, China

Report on the course reform: From English Reading (ER), English Writing (EW) to English Reading-&-Writing (ERW)

Xiaohua Hu, Xi'an International Studies University, China

A Study of the Cross-Cultural Differences between the UC/RWC Students and the XISU/SES English Majors: Reflections and Implications

Dafu Yang, Xi'an International Studies University, China

The teaching and research of English writing has experienced all the turbulences and flourishing moments in recent Chinese history. It has been transformed from being taken as “writing in the devil’s tongue” (You, 2010, p.xi) since its entering China in the late 1860s to a rising focus of research by English professors and researchers in China (Yang, 2005; Chang, 2006). The recent changes in this field have reflected the changes in the unique Chinese political culture, economic development, and also technologies. This panel is composed of three presentations: a historical review of the teaching and research of English writing in China, a report of a Chinese National-Award winning curricular reform project for teaching writing to English majors, and a cross-cultural comparison between US college students’ writing and that of Chinese English major students’. The data collected in this project is analyzed by using a corpus-base linguistic protocol (Chambers, 2009).

Speaker 1

Dan Wu

PhD Candidate, Clemson University

Assistant Professor of English, XISU, China

Presentation Title

The Paradigms and the Shifts: A Review of the Teaching and Research of English Writing in China

English has had its pervasive influences in China in the past one and a half centuries. It has been the first official foreign language taught in the educational system from primary schools, which has made China a nation with the largest English-speaking population (Walker, 2009). The teaching and research of this language has been studied by researchers in China and also those in the US through different lenses. Xiaoye You gives an inspiring historical review of the teaching of English writing in China in his book *Writing in the Devil’s Tongue* (2010). This presentation includes an introduction to the history of English writing teaching in China based on You’s research and focuses on the current status represented by different approaches such as the cognitive linguistics

approach (Feng, 2001; Wu & Liu, 2004), the genre analysis approach (Han & Qin, 2000; Li & Zhe, 2003), and the American process theory approach (Wang, 1986; Deng, Liu, & Chen, etc, 2003), etc.

This review situates English writing teaching and research in the context of the unique Chinese political culture (Pye, 1998; Hua, 2001) to explain how the current trends in research have been established and spread from higher education to grade levels, from the English discipline to other disciplines such as science and engineering, in this society with its indigenous Confucian teaching of writing, which is still influential in both Chinese and English writing (Li, 2003), and the imported higher education system (Kirby, 2008) and the teaching of writing that came with it. The important functions of English majors in China as teachers at different levels of the educational system, as translators, interpreters, and writers in the workplaces, and as bridges to connect China with the world, have placed the teaching of English writing to English majors at the focus of curricular reforms in the discipline of English studies.

The budding writing research through American rhetoric and composition perspectives has been made possible by the scholar exchange programs and recent visits by scholars from both sides. Xi'an International Studies University, one of the major foreign languages universities in China, is used as an example to show how its exchanges with Bowling Green State University and Raymond Walters College of Cincinnati University have resulted in the program design and curricular reforms, the first Writing Center in mainland China, and the top National-Award winning writing curricular reform project. Two major studies in this reform project are introduced in detail in the following two presentations.

Speaker 2

Xiaohua Hu

Associate Professor and Ph.D. Candidate of Literature and Rhetoric, XISU, China

Presentation Title

Report on the course reform: From *English Reading (ER)*, *English Writing (EW)* to *English Reading-&Writing (ERW)*

This project has won the Chinese National Award for Higher Education Courses in 2009, and the presentation is a report of this curricular reform. This study aims at discovering the strengths (and weaknesses) of integrating the traditionally separated two courses – ER and EW – in the English major curriculum at XISU.

The first phase, a pilot study, was from September 2008 to January 2009. During this three-semester experimental period, 4 classes out of 18 (each with 30 students) were offered ERW (4 hours per week, 20 weeks per semester) with 2 instructors sharing the teaching workload, while the rest 14 classes were following the traditional curriculum of separate ER and EW (2 hours per course

per week). The rationale for the ERW classes was trying to relate the tasks of reading with those for writing, and to follow a task-focused, sample-guided, and process-based approach to writing. Towards the end of the three-semester experiment, the responses were positive of an intuition and word-of-mouth nature. We expect their achievements of TEM 4 (the national proficiency test for English majors Band 4, conducted on April 19, 2010 with a writing section) would give some reliable evidence of the effect of this first phase experiment.

The second phase of the ERW experiment will be performed during the 2010-2011 academic year, with the scale being expanded to 6-10 classes of English majors from 4 universities with the focus on strategies for effective information processing, substantial writing competence improvement, ERW coursebook compilation, and accurate objective assessment of the course outcomes. At the same time, the comparison of the writing competence development will be made between the two groups of the SES English majors (freshmen and sophomores), with the experimental group (60-120 students) taking the ERW course and the contrast group (60-120 students) taking the traditional courses of ER and EW.

This study aims to test the following hypotheses: (1) The experimental group of students will be more aware of the writing strategies used in their reading process and such awareness will exert positive effect on their reading proficiency and understanding ability; (2) The process-based approach to the assignment evaluation will arouse more sensitive self-reflection on the strengths and weakness of students' own writing competence; and (3) The integrated ERW is more effective than the separated ER and EW in developing the Chinese English majors' competence of reading and writing (Openshaw, 2007; Haswell, 2001).

Speaker 3

Dafu Yang, Ph.D.

Professor of Applied Linguistics, XISU, China

Presentation Title

A Study of the Cross-Cultural Differences between the UC/RWC Students and the XISU/SES English Majors: Reflections and Implications

The intercollegiate exchange between XISU/SES and UC/RWC started in 2006. Ever since then, SES has been sending one faculty member each year to teach English composition (and some other courses in literature or culture) at RWC, which provides us with a valuable opportunity to follow different composition syllabi used in an American university and to communicate with the RWC colleagues so as to update our knowledge of the latest development in the teaching of writing in the American context.

The exchange also provides us with an opportunity to collect American students' writing assignments for comparative studies. In the 2009-2010 academic year, Dafu Yang, one of the panelists of this presentation, has been collecting the RWC freshmen's assignments for such a purpose, and by the end of the spring quarter, he will have collected about 200 students' assignments for English 101 on such writing tasks as "posing a good subject-matter problem", "positive/negative descriptions and self-reflection", "advertisement analysis", "summary and strong response", and "synthesis essay". For a comparative/quantitative analysis, an equal size of the writing assignments produced by Chinese students will be collected by using the same coursebook, following the same syllabus and rationale for composition teaching, and assigning the same writing tasks to XISU English majors (freshmen) in the fall semester of 2010.

This is a corpus-based, quantitative approach to the writing production by the American students from various majors and the Chinese English majors. For corpus building, we follow the common practice of corpus annotation, making possible the computer retrieval of such linguistic information as types of writing, word frequency (type/token), parts of speech, collocates, sentence structure and length, discourse features in terms of assignment structure, transition, thesis statements, topic sentences, particulars, and genre variation (Biber, 2006; Aedel, 2008).

For data analysis, we will focus our attention on the discovery of the linguistic similarities and substantial differences with the intention of finding out the essential problems existing in the Chinese learners' written production and possible reasons behind them. Working out some effective measures for improving the Chinese learners' competence in writing production would also be the aim of this corpus-based comparative study.

References

- Aedel, A. (2008). *Corpora and discourse: The challenges of different settings*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Pub Co.
- Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Pub Co.
- Chang, J. (2006). Globalization and English in Chinese higher education. *World Englishes*, 25 (3), 513-525.
- Chambers, J.K. (2009). *Corpus analysis and variation in linguistics*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Pub Co.
- Deng, L., Liu, H., Chen, F., Chen, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2003). Systematic study of process approach and its implications for the teaching reforms of college English writing. *Foreign Language Education*, 24 (6).

- Du, R. (1992). *Chinese higher education: A decade of reform and development (1978-1988)*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Haswell, R. (2001). *Beyond outcomes: Assessment and instruction within a university writing program*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger
- Hua, S. (Ed.). (2001). *Chinese political culture, 1989-2000*. London: M. E. Sharpe.
- Li, Q., & Zhe, H. (2003). Genre-based teaching approach-theoretical foundations, its application and inspiration. *Foreign Language Education*, 24 (3).
- Openshaw, R., & Soler, J. (2007). *Reading across international boundaries: History, policy and politics*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing
- Pye, L. (1998). *The Mandarin and the cadre: China's political cultures*. Ann Arbor: Center for Chinese Studies The University of Michigan.
- Walker, J. (2009). *The world's English mania*. Ted Talks. Retrieved from: http://www.ted.com/talks/jay_walker_on_the_world_s_english_mania.html
- Wang, S. (2001). Genre, genre analysis and genre-based teaching approaches. *Foreign Language Education*, 22(4).
- Wang, Z. (1986). The new development of English composition theories. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 1986 (2).
- Wu, H., & Liu, R. (2004). A metacognitive framework for L2 writing: A factor analysis approach. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 36(3).
- Yang, Y. (2005). Paradigm shifts in English writing research and theories. *Foreign Languages Teaching and Research*, 2005(01).
- You, X. (2010). *Writing in the devil's tongue: A history of English composition in China*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

C11

Writing-across-the-curriculum in the arts and humanities college

Putting the Body, Gesture, and Interaction into Accounts of Writing Processes:
Theoretical Frameworks and the Case of IO

Paul Prior, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.

Cory Holding, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.

If the body was bound to invention at the birth of classical rhetoric, as Hawhee has documented in tracing rhetoric's close relation to Greek athletics, then it was clearly expelled as current-traditional rhetoric emerged in the long 18th century. When invention returned to the rhetorical scene in the mid-20th century and psychological accounts of writing processes emerged in the 1970s, the body remained firmly off stage. Cognitive process models were solely models of solo writing. They still are. Think-aloud protocols, for example, document a writer on her own in an institutional space structured to limit time and resources. The material, embodied, and interactive dimensions of writing were largely written out of these accounts (except for a small amount of attention paid to the inscribed text). This cognitive perspective continues to be the dominant view in many international and certain disciplinary circles, but even for more social and ethnographic approaches, it lives on in the shared legacy of writing process theory, research and pedagogy.

We begin this presentation by re-examining what has been left out in the representation of writing processes, consider ways that the body and material practice have (rarely) been figured into research (e.g., Haas, Prior, Shipka), and explore how alternative historical and contemporary traditions (particularly gesture studies) might inform a seriously embodied notion of writing. To illustrate the value of, indeed need to, attend to the body, gesture, and interaction in writing, we next present analyses from an 11-month study (videotaped and transcribed observations, collection of documents, and interviews) of the semiotic activity of a group of art and design professors and students engaged in the process of re-designing and revising a web-based art object, called *IO*. We trace inscriptional gestures as the group members gesture over, around, and on inscriptions (paper, board, screen), but also attend to the gestural quality of writing itself. Critically, much of the inscriptional activity was done in the context of face-to-face interaction. We conclude by discussing how figuring the body and gesture into accounts of writing processes can contribute to writing studies (theory, research, and pedagogy) but more generally can also inform gesture studies and studies of situated interaction, which have tended to ignore the place of writing and inscriptional activity.

C11 (continued)

Writing-across-the-curriculum in the arts and humanities college

Writing and Ethos: Assertive Students against Cautious Experts?

*Silvia Ramírez Gelbes, Universidad Nacional de Tres de Febrero,
Argentina*

As it is well known, people construct their own identities through discourse – they send messages to each other telling each other how they repeat or reject the socially ratified ways of being (Ivanič 1997). For, in Goffman’s terms, “a status, a position, a social place is not a material thing to be possessed and then displayed; it is a pattern of appropriate conduct, coherent, embellished and well articulated. Performed with ease or clumsiness, awareness or not, guile or good faith, it is nonetheless something that must be enacted and portrayed, something that must be realized” (Goffman 1969: 64-65). This something is what we call ethos (Amossy 1999).

Meaning an advance within a one-year project, in this paper we analyze the discursive traces of argumentation manifested in documentary scripts of students who attend a postgraduate program in journal documentaries and compare them to the ones in professional scripts. To do that, we consider the persuasive devices that occur in fifteen documentary scripts written by these students and five documentary scripts written by professionals. The analysis shows that the students’ writings tend to construct intensified argumentations in terms of the strategies they use while professionals’ writings do not.

Given the small number of cases in study, it could be inferred only tentatively that students’ discourse tends to compose a more intensive ethos than the one composed by professionals’.

C11 (continued)

Writing-across-the-curriculum in the arts and humanities college

Writing and Learning History – Use of Portfolios in Higher Education:
A Norwegian Case Study

Svein Kåre Sture, University of Bergen, Norway

Cecilie Boge, University of Bergen, Norway

Writing is the historian's most important skill and teaching history is very much about training students to become good writers, able readers of other students' work and competent peer reviewers. Writing is also the most efficient way of learning history. In addition, writing history essays is a good way of learning to write academic texts in general, as our genre is more or less identical to the universal academic essay.

Why is this kind of writing such an efficient way of learning history? The writing process forces the students to think, select and structure their arguments. In order to establish an argument, students have to reflect on the given hypothesis or problem, discuss causality and explanations and present established views on the matter as well as their own arguments. While doing this, knowledge is constituted and reinforced. Active use of lexical knowledge certainly helps to memorize historical facts and trivia, but more important; constructing an argument creates an historical understanding and at the same time facilitates a change from superfluous detail knowledge to deeper methodological knowledge.

In our experience, peer reviewing is another way to reach the same goals. Peer reviewing is an important part of the ongoing learning activity in our classes. Students comment each others essays extensively. This is a vital part of the learning process as it helps developing reading skills and critical sense, as well as social skills. Thus, commenting is far more important then receiving comments, although good advice can be helpful when revising an essay.

In this paper we would like to show how writing is an essential element in portfolio assessed history courses for undergraduate students at the Department of Archaeology, History, Cultural Studies and Religion at the University of Bergen, Norway. These 15 ECTS courses normally attract approximately 100 students. Each student writes three individual essays, peer reviews four essays and are allowed to rewrite two out of the three essays. The essays are published on the Internet and automatically prepared for easy on-line reviewing. All students have access to all essays, and they all write on the same three topics. Thus, the students are familiar with the essay topic they are reviewing and they have the opportunity to see how all their fellow students have discussed the same matter. Peer reviewing also means that the students have to work through the subject an extra time, further reinforcing long time learning and understanding. When the students are finished peer reviewing, the teacher reviews both essays and comments. The teacher gives advice on composition as well as the history content of the essay and encourages the author to revise the text.

We believe that by making our students work actively with history problems through writing and reviewing essays, we give them the opportunity to learn universal academic skills and to become able academic writers.

C12

L1 and L2 error in higher education

What Happens after We Circle All the Errors?: Investigating Student Responses to Grammatical Errors

Michelle Niestepski, Lasell College, U.S.

While much has been said over the past four decades about the dangers of responding strongly to errors in student writing (Bradock & Lloyd-Jones & Schoer, Perl, Elbow), this advice has been unrhetorical in an important sense: it has not taken into account the responses of the recipients of advice, red markings, or injunctions to consult a handbook: student writers themselves.

As careful teachers and scholars, however, most who address questions of error in student writing take into account students' responses or, more properly, what they consider likely student responses, an amalgam of their recollection of students' sour looks as they peruse a corrected paper, randomly collected student comments, and their own memories of their experiences as students. In short, many researchers and writing instructors construct the responses of students rather than gathering them. As Glynda Hull and Mike Rose, Doug Hunt, and Robert Brooke have shown through their interviews and time spent with students, the assumptions instructors make about why students perform certain actions are often incorrect. It makes sense to assume that the assumptions instructors have been making about students' response to grammar may also be incorrect or, at the minimum, not fully understood.

This presentation will discuss the findings of two studies focused on students and grammatical errors. The first study, conducted at the University of Rhode Island, involved 200 students from randomly selected first-year writing courses. Students filled out a survey consisting of 14 open-ended questions designed to gather information on students' practices and attitudes concerning grammatical errors. Questions included "When do you look at the grammatical corrections/markings on your paper?" and "For items that are marked, do you usually know how to correct them?" Results from this study found that the majority of students reported looking at the grammatical corrections/markings on their papers right after receiving them back and often again before writing their next paper in that class. Students also reported usually knowing how to correct the errors. In order to actually gauge students' abilities to correct grammatical errors once they have been pointed out, a follow-up study is being conducted in the fall of 2010 at Lasell College.

Instructors participating in this study are employing two different approaches. One group of instructors is marking errors in students' essays by circling them. The other group of instructors is using Richard Haswell's technique of minimal marking, placing a check mark at the end of each line of text in which an error occurs. Both groups of instructors are passing the essays back to the students and giving them time in class to try to correct the errors.

Results from this study will begin to address the following questions: can students correct specific grammatical errors when an instructor indicates the exact point in the text where the error occurs? Are there certain types of errors students are consistently able to correct? When instructors only indicate the line of text in which an error occurs, are students able to identify what the error is and correct it?

C12 (continued)

L1 and L2 error in higher education

“Graduate Papers Should Not Contain Language Errors!”: Rethinking Response to International Students’ Writing in Higher Education

Nahal Akbari, University of Maryland, U.S.

As part of their academic activities, English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) graduate students in North American universities are expected to engage in a range of literacy practices of which writing is a major component. This qualitative inquiry investigates the attitudes, perceptions and practices of five Iranian ESL students and the expectations of their professors in the context of disciplinary writing in higher education. Some of the key questions addressed in this presentation are what happens when divergent understandings of the act of writing meet in a contact zone where the power relations are not equal, where students are expected to meet the requirements of the academic institution, and where a monologic rather than a dialogic approach dominates the interactions between faculty and students with regards to writing assignments and term papers. The research is informed by a social theory of language (Bakhtin, 1986), a semiotic theory of culture (Lotman, 1990, 2001), a situated literacies perspective of academic writing (Barton, Hamilton, & Ivanič, 2000), and a view of reasoning and argumentation as a socio-historic construct (Toulmin, 2001, 2003). Data sources include text-based interviews with students, interviews with their professors, observation of tutoring sessions, and the analysis of textual artifacts as well as the written feedback provided on student writing. The study further highlights some of the initial encounter experiences of the participating students in academic contact zones (Pratt, 1991), questioning the effectiveness of certain univocal approaches that readers/evaluators adopt in responding to student writing. I will use the results to argue for an understanding of feedback on student writing as a “semiotic space” for dialogic interaction, challenge the assumed homogeneity of academic literacy practices in higher education, and promote a view that is responsive to the textual practices of an increasingly diverse student population in North American academic settings.

C12 (continued)

L1 and L2 error in higher education

A Template for Self-Analysis of Common Errors in English that Occur with Speakers of Polish Adaptable for other Languages

Diane Boehm, Saginaw Valley State University, U.S.

Lilianna Aniola-Jedrzejek, Poznan University of Technology, Poland

Our presentation reports on the results of a two-phase study with faculty and professional staff at Poznan University of Technology, Poland, all of whom use English for professional purposes. Our goal has been to develop a template for self-analysis of common errors in English that occur with speakers of Polish. (The template could be adapted for speakers of other languages as well.)

Since English has become the world's *lingua franca*, the problem of errors in writing made by non-native writers of English is an important field of research, as different patterns are likely to emerge, depending on the individual and the first language. The problem is especially critical for international faculty, who must develop competence in their use of English grammar to be published in their field. This presentation will discuss the results of a two-phase study on L2 error patterns conducted with 20+ faculty and professional staff at Poznan University of Technology (PUT), Poland, which has recently begun offering curricula in English.

The study was conducted with two groups of PUT faculty and teaching staff that had participated in Professional Writing in English seminars conducted by Boehm at PUT: faculty from technical departments (technical physics, computer science and management, electrical engineering), and teachers of English engaged in a European Union project to develop online courses in English. The seminars, followed by subsequent online feedback and editing on faculty articles and course modules, gave rise to a search for a template for self-analysis of common errors in English, tailored for speakers of Polish.

For the first phase of our study, we used *Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems* (M. Swan & B. Smith, eds.) to identify aspects of Polish that would most likely cause interference for writers in English. Comparing these with common error categories identified by scholars such as Dana Ferris (*Journal of Second Language Writing*) and others, we developed an online anonymous survey, given to both the technical faculty and the teachers of English. The categories included both rhetorical and language issues, with questions about prior experience reading and writing in English, which aspects of English grammar are most difficult, and ways in which their first language (Polish) causes interference when writing in English. The English language teachers responded to additional questions about specific aspects of writing in English: sentence structure, verbs, noun endings, trouble spots, and vocabulary. Survey results are currently under study.

In the second phase of this study, we will conduct error analyses of selected PUT faculty and staff articles and course modules and compare these with survey results, to examine the consistency between both sets of data and to determine to what degree the writers were able to identify their error patterns. Based on our research, we will develop a template to be used for self-analysis by Polish speakers of English. Such a template

could also be adapted for speakers of other languages who wish to develop greater proficiency in written English.

C13

Writing in business and organizations

The Link between Business Discourse and Writing Research Methods – An Important Step for Management and Workplace Training

Dana Skopal, Macquarie University, Australia

Writing in the workplace requires many skills. How do we define these skills and how can we teach them? What is the role of managers in writing skills, business writing training and writing research? I will discuss these questions both from my experience working with management in Australia and from my research findings at Macquarie University, Sydney.

I will first present a synopsis of the research in the dissertation ‘Making a complex message accessible: Communicative expertise and its role in designing an information guide for the general public’ (Department of Linguistics, Macquarie University: unpublished Masters Thesis, supervisor Dr Alan Jones). Genre analysis was the fundamental framework adopted for the research completed in 2009, as I examined the recontextualisation process through which a complex subject matter was reformulated into a plain English brochure.

Secondly, I outline several constraints that I encountered during this research and I suggest how these issues can be addressed in future research. Finally, based on my dealings with managers when working on projects, I will discuss what approaches can be made to managers in business organizations so they are made aware of the value of providing access to researchers. The relationship between business discourse, writing research and workplace training cannot be overlooked.

References

- Beaufort, A. (2000). Learning the trade: A social apprenticeship model for gaining writing expertise. **Written Communication**. 17(2) April, 185-223.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View*. London: Continuum.
- Bhatia, V K. (2008). Genre analysis, ESP and professional practice. *English for Specific Purposes*. 27, 161-174.
- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

C13 (continued)

Writing in business and organizations

Writing Competences of University Graduates at Work

Ursula Doleschal, University of Klagenfurt, Austria

Carmen Mertlitsch, University of Klagenfurt, Austria

Anja Waldhauser, University of Klagenfurt, Austria

Knowledge about the specifics of different writing cultures is essential when preparing students for writing tasks in their professional life. Above all, it serves to develop suitable concepts for supporting improvement of student writing skills (see e.g. Beaufort 1999, Jakobs, Lehnen & Schindler 2005).

Aiming for a deeper understanding of writing requirements at different workplaces, the Austrian writing centre of the Alps-Adriatic-University of Klagenfurt, Carinthia, conducted a broad study. Data from 56 different corporations and from a variety of public institutions was gathered (5455 employees with a university degree were interviewed). The survey was carried out in Carinthia, the southernmost region of Austria.

For the study persons in executive positions and members of management were interviewed about their views on writing competences (Ossner 2006, Becker-Mrotzek & Schindler 2007). They were asked whether or not their employees' skills were satisfactory on a professional level. The results of the subsequent discussions provided enough information to enhance some concepts for dealing with students' shortcomings. Their problems regarding all written forms of communication should be approached either during the course of the studies or after the graduation in a professional and supportive environment.

To collect enough data from the interviews, the survey was widespread. The participants came from various professional fields, such as industry, tourism, the media, finance or insurance companies. They summarised the most common and frequently used text types of their occupations (texts which serve internal and external communication at work, see e.g. Weder 2010).

When working with students, it is crucial to be aware of the actual writing requirements (Schindler 2005) they will be asked to fulfil in their future lives. Thus, we were interested in the significance of different text types. We also inquired about the general relevance of writing for the office culture of each corporation. Members of human resource management revealed their expectations and their experience regarding writing skills of university graduates. Other points of interest were the development and alteration of the general culture of writing at work (van Gemert & Woudstra 1997) and the importance of having advanced second or third language skills (Pogner 1999). Furthermore, it was asked whether or not the different companies offered programs (obligatory or voluntary) to further enhance their employees' writing competences. We finally encouraged the members of management to describe the companies' quality criteria and the implemented measures to improve competences in the area of writing.

Apart from the collection of data, the study served the purpose to promote the writing centre and its educational mission within the region. Participants proved to be very interested in the various services. It can be said that the study therefore also created a new awareness regarding the overall topic of writing at the workplace.

The results now are considered a base for shaping modules for different types of studies which are relevant for the students' careers in the future (see e.g. Lehnert 2005). A step further, concerning suggestions of the participants of the study, would be to develop customised courses for postgraduate professional education for the different corporate branches (in accordance with the concept of Rothkegel 2005).

C13 (continued)

Writing in business and organizations

Orchestrating Modalities and Voices to Make Sense of Institutional Practices:
Examples from Academia and Industry

Christine Räisänen, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Sven Gunnarson, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Learning in academia or industry does not only mean acquiring knowledge content, i.e. knowing that, but also understanding the contexts in which that knowledge applies e.g. knowing how, why and when. The answers to the “how, why and when” are usually embedded in institutional practices, norms and ideologies, and are the main causes of institutional inertia. Institutions lack structured methods to enable the collective capture of the dynamic professional know-(how-why-when) created through ongoing discursive interplay between people involved in situated action in local contexts (e.g. Lave & Wenger 1991, Scollon 1996).

Using several illustrative examples from intervention research in industry (construction and telecommunication) and academia (a PhD Leadership course), this paper discusses the theoretical and practical implications of implementing a collective knowledge-sharing method involving active use of several modalities – reading, reflecting, associating, writing, listening and speaking – in these institutional settings. The dialogue seminar (Göranzon et al. 2006), as the method is called, draws on Wittgenstein’s (1983) notion of language games and Bakhtin’s (1986) view of the dynamic and dialogic plasticity of meanings. The different modalities used facilitate externalisation as well as internalisation of the tacit knowledge shared in a group: e.g. *readings* (individually and out loud) lead to *reflections* and *associations* to personal experiences; *writing* allows the *visualisation* and the *travel of ideas*; *listening* enables *situated sharing* of the individual texts being read aloud by their author.

We argue that the dialogue seminar facilitates sense making of institutional discourses and practices by creating legitimate time and space for personalising and sharing complex concepts, by allowing the voicing of alternative accounts, by generating novel images and metaphors. It is a means of “thinking together” (Isaacs 1999) and of collectively understanding established institutional norms, beliefs and epistemologies. The sharing of individual accounts by the group generates innovative ways of dealing with common problems. On the social plane, this sharing creates coherence in the group as well as solidarity. Together, the various groups, in academia and industry, develop a common language in tune with the interests and affinities of the particular group. The dialogue seminar thus provides a time and space for the orchestration of modalities and voices within a collective in an institution, and more importantly, empowers individuals to use both their voices and to inscribe their meanings.

References

Bakhtin, M (1986) *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press

Göranzon, B., Hammarén, M. and Ennals, R. (2006) *Dialogue, skill and tacit knowledge*. London: John Wiley & Sons

Isaacs, W (1999) *Dialogue and the art of thinking together*. New York: Currency.

Lave, J and Wenger, E 1991. *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R. (1998) *Mediated discourse as social interaction*. Longman: London.

Wittgenstein, L (1989/1953) *Philosophical investigations*. London: Blackwell.

C14

Assessment, Audit Culture, and First-Year Writing: Origins, Implications, and Alternatives (A Roundtable Discussion)

Dolsy Smith, The George Washington University, U.S.

Randi Kristensen, The George Washington University, U.S.

Programmatic assessment casts a long shadow across undergraduate writing programs, representing at once a form of pedagogical inquiry and an inexorable bureaucratic demand. Writing occupies a privileged place in university assessments because it is the material medium of bureaucratic labor and control. That is to say, writing is both the vehicle of assessment itself, and the common element in the work for which the university prepares its graduates. But as a trace that does not capitulate entirely to the uses that are made of it, writing remains to offer itself to other meanings, other purposes. The purpose of this roundtable is to invite members to reflect on the degree to which dominant methodologies of assessment do or do not allow these alternatives to emerge? What are the origins, assumptions, and implications of these dominant methodologies? How can we situate this practice within the political, economic, and cultural context of writing in the university at large? How might other approaches to research on writing inform the work of such assessment?

In the American university, programmatic assessments (beyond the individual assessment recorded in each student's grade) seek to demonstrate the "progress" made by students as writers over the course of their university careers. Such assessments are used by administrators to certify the quality of the university's primary product - i.e., the human capital it graduates - and to justify interventions in the curriculum and classroom alike. Faculty, whose labor is being assessed, often provide the labor behind the assessment as well- designing the instruments and the criteria, collecting the data, etc. - and they may use the results for ends that differ, subtly or dramatically, from the aims of the administration.

Kristensen will analyze the historical origins of "audit culture" in higher education in Thatcher-era England, and its relationship to neo-liberal reconfigurations in U.S. higher education over the last two decades. She will describe the levels of expectation and performance of such assessments in university writing, and the ways such expectations and performances reinforce each other at micro levels (syllabus, assignment, and student assessment) as well as on a macro scale (university accreditation, program performance, and faculty evaluation).

Smith will discuss methodologies of assessment in the context of the familiar Foucauldian paradigm, where knowledge and power describe a closed circuit, and the production of the one enables the smooth operation of the other. Such a circuit, it is said, drives the social organization of modernity and its constituent institutions. A prime example of a practice giving rise to this coupling, assessment actually presents a more complex picture. Institutions, and the people within them, in order to justify their exercise of power, perform the production of certain kinds of knowledge. In two senses, such performances are rhetorical: they are intended to persuade particular audiences, and they remain open to multiple, possibly conflicting, interpretations. In any event, the knowledge produced is not exhausted by the power that it serves, because (as Foucault himself observes) knowledge remains irreducibly, intractably material.