Writing Research Across Borders II Session D
Friday, February 18 4:30-6:00pm

D1
Honoring substantial and sustained contributions of three writing researchers in the cognitive tradition and one in the social cultural tradition all of whom facilitated communication among writing research across borders

Honorees:
Charles Bazerman, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.
Pietro Boscolo, University of Padova, Italy
Michel Fayol, Université Blaise Pascal, Clermont-Ferrand, France
J.R. (Dick) Hayes, Carnegie Mellon University, U.S.
Honoring Team:
Denis Alamargot, Université de Poitiers, France
Barbara Arfé, Verona University, Italy
Virginia W. Berninger, Verona University, Italy
Deborah McCutchen, University of Washington, U.S.
Gert Rijlaarsdam, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands

Festschrift Cognitive Writing Presentations by each of the three cognitive writing pioneers in alphabetic order, **Pietro Boscolo, Michel Fayol, J.R. (Dick) Hayes,** each of whom will address these questions**:**

1. What was the most surprising, unexpected finding in my writing research career?
2. How has my programmatic writing research veered in directions I had not anticipated
   when I began investigating the writing process?
3. What do I think are the cutting edge issues in writing research that the new generation
   of writing researchers should pursue?

Honoring Global Writing Researcher across Traditions: Charles Bazerman
This pioneering global leader will be asked to tell the story of how he conceived and implemented the idea of global writing conferences. This personal narrative will cover both the challenges and joys of planning, translating into reality, and revising as needed these ground breaking conferences in which writing researchers from around the world participate. He will also comment on whether or to what degree he has accomplished the goals he had in mind, such as crossing the borders between research traditions and countries, since the first of the four international conferences was held and what his vision for future conferences is.
Introduction to Symposium:
Humans first produced symbols about 30,000 years ago, simultaneously through both the mouth and hand (Marshack,1971), probably resulting from mutations in the FOXP2 gene, which enables the brain's motor system to sequence elements (Vargha-Khadem et al., 2005) through speech, drawing, music, or written language. Not until the latter part of the 20th century A.D. did humans examine how the written language symbols produced by hand are the portals of mind through which we gain conscious access to our thoughts and thinking. The purpose of this symposium is two-fold.

First, we honor three pioneers who established cognitive writing research, inspired numerous graduate students to devote careers to the field, and were international leaders in organizing professional organizations dedicated to writing research in Europe and North America. All

embraced cognitive psychology to answer questions originating from their experiences in teaching writing or working with teachers of writing. In the process they changed writing research from a focus on only its educational applications to its contributions to mainstream cognitive psychology. Gratitude will be expressed for how they (a) brought about change from the standard reaction time experiment paradigm in cognitive psychology when they started (Hayes and Fayol), and (b) organized the EARLI special interest group on writing in Europe (Fayol and Boscolo), participated regularly in the American AERA (Boscolo), and supported COST to keep the cross-country collaborations alive (all). Special acknowledgements will be made for (a) Boscolo's research contributions spanning writing motivation to flexibility as an executive function in self-regulating writing to innovative reconceptualization of writing as play and not only work; (b) Fayol's programmatic, influential research on translation of cognitive processes into written language through on-line experiments and demonstrations that neither spelling nor capitalization and punctuation are mechanical skills but rather, respectively, silent portals of mind expressed through sequenced written symbols produced by hand and markers of idea units; and (c) Hayes' influential model of the cognitive processes of writing—planning, translating, reviewing, and revising—and its revisions, introduction of the Think Aloud method for research on how the writing process externalizes cognition, and research on language bursts during the translation. Hayes's conceptual models, coupled with the on-line experiments introduced by Fayol and instructional studies introduced by Boscolo, continue to have enormous potential for advancing knowledge of the cognitive processes of writing.

Second, we also honor another pioneer for breaking down the borders within the writing research community across traditions and about 40 countries. This conference is possible only because of his vision and hard work behind the scenes. He deserves recognition and gratitude for (a) his advanced planning and sustained time on task, and (b) his vision of how the field of writing benefits from crossing the borders among our traditions, research paradigms, countries, languages, and cultures. In the process of hearing his narrative about this monumental contribution we are reminded that it is the written language that allows us to translate and communicate ideas across the borders of culture and language and politics, which all too often divide us. It is a tribute to Bazerman that he is able to get us to cross those borders in productive and informative ways that benefit the field of writing research and writing researchers.

D2
Text types, student choice, and writing quality

Kevin Hooge, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.
Leonard Alvarez, University of Washington, U.S.

This panel will present three case studies of student encounters with new text types and their endeavors to appropriate purposeful ways to engage writing challenges: The first examines 6 upper grade elementary students as they learn to write for different subject areas; the second discusses the pedagogical implications of 14 high school students' selection of and maintained enrollment in a challenging writing class when their peers of relative equal ability did not, and the third examines 3 students transitioning from general education coursework to major-required upper division classes.

Writing Across Curriculum Contexts: A Case Study of 6 Upper Grade Elementary Students Writing in Different Subject Areas

Marilyn Chapman's (2006) review of preschool through elementary writing research published over the last two decades highlights the dearth of empirical research related to student writing development in the upper elementary grades, which is of particular concern as this is when students are expected to compose a variety of text types, including narrative, informative, and persuasive, while writing across curricular areas. As several scholars of genre have argued (Tardy, 2009; Devitt, 2008; Bawarshi, 2003), in order for transfer to be possible, students need to develop awareness not only of discursive patterns and textual features, but more significantly, sensitivity to subject-specific writing demands, and the sanctioned textual ways of responding to them. The body of extant research on children's genre knowledge and acquisition has demonstrated that children recognize differences in genres even before being able to independently transcribe them and that children's knowledge of genres is developmental (Chapman, 1994, 1995; Donovan, 2001; Langer, 1985).
http://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0Aedjhk9y8p5vZGY2ZGI4Y18wM2JmcHJnd2I&hl=en - _msocom_2
This research has also indicated that students' writing achievements vary depending on tasks and the types and amounts of scaffolding provided (Kamberelis & Bovino, 1999; Donovan & Smolkin, 2002). It has also helped to indicate the ways in which students demonstrate sensitivity to different uses of different textual forms (Kamberelis, 1999). However, as this research has been focused largely on primary grade students and concentrated almost exclusively on story and informational texts, it has not afforded much insight into the ways in which upper grade elementary students understand and recognize genres, the connection between genres and the rhetorical situations that animate them, or the ways students negotiate the various rhetorical writing demands placed on them as they write a variety of text types across different subject areas.
Drawing from Devitt's (2008) hypothesis that antecedent genres are a significant variable in the acquisition of future genres, this study sought to understand how upper grade elementary students of varying writing abilities develop their conceptions of genre through recognition of textual features, how they intentionally reconstitute, adapt and reject textual features from initial text types they have encountered as they write across

curricular areas. To investigate these questions, this six-month study, grounded in case study traditions of qualitative inquiry, involving six students and one teacher within a 6th grade classroom, focuses on six-week long units in social studies and science with ongoing language arts instruction. Data sources include semi-structured interviews with the six students and the teacher; artifact collection of teacher lesson plans, assignments and handouts, student notes, and written drafts; researcher observations with corresponding field notes; audio recordings of lessons presented as well as student interaction during composing; video recording, selected to use primarily with stimulated response protocols, in which students comment on their recorded interaction (Prior, 2003). Data analysis includes an iterative coding process using the constant-comparison method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) which allows for identification of disconfirming evidence (Erickson, 1986). A better developed understanding of the ways in which upper grade elementary students are able to draw on extant knowledge in flexible ways to meet new writing demands can aid educators in better formulating pedagogical approaches to writing instruction that allows students to go beyond proficient yet limiting replication of textual types.

Why Us and Not Them? Motivation, Interest, and Student Selection of Challenging Writing Classes

The last thirty years has seen a re-emergence of research on interest, with much of this developing out of sociocognitive approaches to learning and motivation, Self-Efficacy (e.g. Bandura, 1997; Pajares, Johnson, & Usher, 2007), Self-Regulated Learning (Zimmerman, 2000; Schunk & Ertmer 2000), Task Value (Wigfield & Eccles, 1992, 2002), Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), mastery-oriented/helplessness response to challenges (Deiner & Dweck, 1978, 1980), Achievement Goal Theory (Leggett & Dweck, 1986; Ames, 1992), and incremental and entity theories of intelligence (Dweck, 1999; Blackwell, Trzesniewski, & Dweck, 2007). Some researchers (e.g., Dai & Sternberg, 2004; Damaio, 1994, 2003; Panksepp, 1998, 2003) have recently questioned these approaches for overemphasizing cognitive variables while underplaying affect and emotions or relegating them as effects. Others, including Monique Boekaerts (Boekaerts, 1999, 2003; Boekaerts & Boscolo, 2002) and Reinhard Pekrun (Pekrun, 1992; Pekrun, Goetz, Titz & Perry, 2002) have stressed the need for the inclusion of affective components into learning and motivation frameworks while Suzanne Hidi (Hidi & Harackiewicz, 2000; Hidi & Renninger, 2006) has put forward that interest is a motivational variable that connects affective and cognitive components of motivation and possibly serves as an antecedent to self-efficacy and other cognitive components attributed to learning and motivation. Interest theory has being appropriated in current writing research, such as the impact writing topics have on student interest (e.g. Boscolo et al., 2007), but such efforts only induce temporary states of interest and do not explain how sustained interest can be maintained when students do not have a predispositional interest in writing nor does it explain why those students would select challenging writing classes.

To understand the antecedent motivation and continued persistence that might inform student selection of and continued enrollment in challenging writing classes, this presentation will share findings from a two-year writing development study of fourteen

former Honors students' who selected and maintained enrollment in AP English classes their junior and senior years, while over fifty of their peers from Honors English selected College Bound English instead. This study employed sociocognitive theories of learning and motivation and Hidi & Renninger's (2006) distinction between individual and situational interest to interpret the participants selection continued enrollment. While high self-efficacy beliefs, successful self-regulated learning strategies, mastery-oriented response to challenges, incremental theory of intelligence orientation as well as supportive and preparatory forms of sponsorship are characteristics of most participants, as might be expected, the learning goals orientation had the strongest correlation to their initial selection of AP English as this was characteristic of all participants. Their learning was mediated by their experiences within the AP English class's particular learning environment. Hidi and Renninger (2006) would interpret that environment as the source of situational interest. While two of the fourteen students had a personal or predispositional interest in writing prior to taking AP English, the other twelve students' situational interest was initiated and maintained by the perceived privileged content of the courses and the shared activities which mediated the apprehension of that content. The presenter will then discuss the environmental elements these students attributed to their situational interest.

Negotiating Initial Discursive Encounters: A Case Study of 3 Undergraduate Students Transitioning from General Education to Upper Division Classes in their Major

From the pioneering work of McCarthy (1987), to the most recent account from Tardy (2009), longitudinal research has given us multilayered vistas into the varied, complex ways student writers develop in the university. Indeed, as Rogers (2009) observes in his comprehensive review of longitudinal studies of writing development, "longitudinal studies of college writers…vividly show that college students develop in many ways, including becoming enculturated into communities of practice, gaining critical-thinking skills, establishing stronger identities both as individuals and writers, and distinguishing more detailed aspects of their writing situations." However, given their prolonged focus and penchant to account for multiple variables at once, longitudinal studies of writing development have under-theorized the richly textured moments of contact—the *into moments*—when students entering new academic contexts draw on previous literacy experiences to help them "adjust their old situations to new locations" (Devitt, 222). To be sure, some of the studies assessed in Roger's review (Herrington and Curtis, 2000; Carroll, 2002, Beaufort, 2007) do contend, at least implicitly, with how students transition both socially and personally from their first to final year of undergraduate education; however, in these studies, insufficient analytical consideration is given to actual temporal moments of transition—to the *"into moments and locations"* (Dias and Pare, 2000) where students struggle to accommodate past "textual experiences" (Johns, 1997) to unfamiliar academic settings. These *into moments*—how students frame them, how students orient themselves to them, how students inhabit them, and most importantly, how students understand themselves in relation to them—have much to teach us about students' initial efforts to locate a place for themselves within their disciplines.

This study, which examines three undergraduate university students' transitions through two academic quarters as they move from general education classes into their fields of study, contributes to the emerging body of empirical research (Rounsaville et al., 2008, Reiff et al., *in process*) dedicated to examining moments of discursive encounters. Specifically, this study responds to two recent calls: First, it takes up a research agenda outlined independently by Graham Smart (2000) and Amy Devitt (2007) to develop research projects that analyze "the experience of individuals moving from one domain of writing into another" (Smart, 286); Second, at the theoretical level, this study purposefully combines, as David Russell (2009) has exhorted, socio-cultural activity theory and Schutzian phenomenology to account for the social and individual dimensions of human action, elucidating the potential tensions, struggles and moments of resistance participants in the study experience as they attempt to negotiate their personal and nascent disciplinary identities. To complement, and complicate, Russell's suggested synthesis, this study's design also draws on Min-Zhan Lu's (2004) analytical heuristic for highlighting the cultural and discursive "repertoire" students call on when encountering new writing domains. Data was gathered through open-ended interviews, undergraduate writing samples, upper division writing samples from within students' majors, in-class observations of instruction, and interviews of upper division instructors; the applied data analysis and data reduction protocols proffered by Miles and Huberman (1984), and Grounded Theory data coding approaches developed by Charmaz (2006) were used to highlight the ways student participants transfer and accommodate their writing practices to meet the academic demands of their chosen discipline. By better understanding the complex literacy challenges university students experience as they initially encounter discipline-specific coursework, FYC teachers can develop pedagogies that promote purposeful discursive flexibility, while content teachers can better address the often implicit demands of their assignments and make explicit what are often tacit strategies for approaching new writing situations.

D2 (continued)
Syntax and vocabulary in primary years

The Relationship between Vocabulary and Writing Quality across Genres

Natalie G. Olinghouse, University of Connecticut, U.S.
Joshua Wilson, University of Connecticut, U.S.
Ryan Colwell, University of Connecticut, U.S.

Research literature: Vocabulary is one of the five principle components that emerge from every major theory of written language (Isaacson, 1988); the development of a rich and varied vocabulary is considered an essential step in becoming an effective writer (Baker, Gersten, & Graham, 2003; Roth, 2000). However, the selection of vocabulary in writing has received little research attention. In addition, each writing genre (e.g., personal narrative, biography, folktales, persuasive) is differentiated by purpose and structure. It is not clear what kind of vocabulary is most related to quality for different writing genres. Accordingly, there is no one all-encompassing measure of vocabulary; it is believed that different measures exist depending on the vocabulary most salient to a specific writing situation.

Research Question: Which vocabulary measures predict narrative, informational, and persuasive writing quality? To answer this question, a series of three research studies will be presented.

Methods: In Study 1, 100 second-grade and 100 fourth-grade students wrote a fictional story. Study 2 involved 90 struggling readers in grades 2-6, who wrote informational reports on two different topics from their reading instruction. Study 3 included 100 fifth-grade students who wrote three compositions: fictional story, persuasive, and informational. In each study, participants had 15 minutes to complete a written composition in response to a picture or sentence prompt. In study 3, all three writing prompts incorporated an outer space theme to control for background knowledge. Measures: Across the three studies, a variety of vocabulary measures were included: diversity, sophistication, word length, content-specific vocabulary, subject-relevant vocabulary, academic vocabulary, and high frequency words. All written compositions were scored using a holistic quality rubric.

Findings: Commonality analysis was used to determine which vocabulary measure(s) predicted unique and shared variance in writing quality within and across genres. Vocabulary diversity predicted both shared and unique variance in writing quality in Studies 1 and 2. In Study 2, subject-relevant vocabulary rather than content-specific vocabulary contributed to informational writing quality; students who included a diverse vocabulary broadly related to the subject had higher quality scores. Vocabulary sophistication and word length did not predict writing quality in either study. Preliminary results for Study 3 suggest that different vocabulary characteristics predict writing quality depending on the genre. The results also suggest that students generally use a core corpus of high frequency words across all three genres, with persuasive compositions containing the highest percentage of high frequency words. Inclusion of academic vocabulary was low across all three genres, suggesting that academic vocabulary in writing is just beginning to emerge at fifth grade.

Scope and duration: The first two studies have been completed, and the data has been analyzed. Currently, we are finishing the scoring for Study 3, and anticipate full completion by the fall of 2010.

D3
Disciplinary writing in high school

Figured Worlds and the Access to Written Artifacts in the Disciplines

Guadalupe López-Bonilla, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Mexico

In this paper I will discuss the notion of "figured worlds" as an analytical tool that can help to understand the literacy demands placed on students in the specialized domains of school subjects. I will show how reading and writing in the disciplines requires particular ways of perceiving the world which can only be learned when students have access to the figured worlds that render these specialized discourses meaningful. I argue that teachers can help students learn these particular figured worlds when the authoritative discourse of the discipline becomes internally persuasive for the students. The paper reports partial findings of a research project conducted over a three year period in five public high schools in Northern Mexico. The research design included class observations in selected school subjects, interviews with high achieving and low achieving students, collection of written artifacts and teacher interviews. The conceptual framework draws from three areas of scholarship: A sociocultural perspective based on the New Literacy Studies (Barton, Hamilton & Ivanič, 2000), a theory from psychological anthropology exemplified in the work of Holland, Lachiotte, Skinner & Cain (1998), and a Bakhtinian perspective on discourse (Bakhtin, 1981). From the New Literacy Studies I use Hamilton's conceptualization of literacy events and practices. Hamilton (2000) cites four basic observable elements in every literacy event: participants, settings, artifacts and activities. Literacy practices allude to non observable elements such as the social groups which produce and regulate texts, the domain in which the event takes place; the beliefs, values and knowledge of the participants, and the routines that facilitate the activity. I contend that the notion of "figured world" introduced by Holland et al. (1998) is one of those non observable elements that constitute literacy practices, and provides a conceptual tool that can help to understand the literacy practices in the disciplines. Figured worlds are historical phenomena which recruit, distribute, divide and relate participants. They are cultural storylines that tell participants what is considered normal in a given situtation, and provide a particular standpoint from which to look and perceived the world.

In the analysis, I provide textual evidence from students' interviews and classroom observations of teachers efforts to engage students with the written artifacts of school curriculum trough the specialized gaze of the figured worlds of the disciplines.

References

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin.* M. E. Holquist (Ed.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barton, D., Hamilton, M. & Ivanič, R. (Eds.) (2000). *Situated literacies. Reading and writing in context* (pp. 7-15). London: Routledge.

Holland, D., Lachicotte, W., Skinner, D. and Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

D3 (continued)
Disciplinary writing in high school

Using Writing Tasks to Elicit Adolescents' Historical Reasoning
Chauncey Monte-Sano, University of Maryland, U.S.
Susan De La Paz, University of Maryland, U.S.

Today, the history curriculum, with its emphasis on reading and writing from primary source documents, places high demands on struggling writers. Embedding adolescent writing instruction in history courses requires connecting disciplinary reasoning with writing. Particular aspects of historical reasoning are evident in students' writing and indicate some level of disciplinary understanding, including attention to historical context, perspective, author point of view, accuracy, and comparison of sources (Lee & Ashby, 2000; Monte-Sano, in press; VanSledright, 2002; Wineburg, 1991). To date, much of the research on history writing has focused on how students read and cite evidence from multiple documents (De La Paz, 2005; De La Paz & Felton, in press; Monte-Sano, in press; Young & Leinhardt, 1998). Some attention has been granted to how students represent and construct historical arguments (Britt, Rouet, Georgi, & Perfetti, 1994; Stahl, Hynd, Britton, McNish, & Bosquet, 1996; Wiley & Voss, 1999). However, writing argumentative essays, in themselves, do not always promote disciplinary thinking (Grant, Gradwell, & Cimbricz, 2004). Historical reasoning can theoretically be expressed in different forms of writing, but we do not know whether certain kinds of writing tasks are more likely to promote such disciplinary reasoning.

With this framework in mind, we asked: Does the type of writing prompt affect the quality of students' historical reasoning? We constructed four reading and writing tasks that focused on different types of writing for two conditions (9th grade and 10th-12th grades). Within each condition, the documents and topic were the same for each prompt, but the wording and framing of the prompt differed. Historical documents included the school's textbook and primary sources. For each condition we randomly assigned students within each teacher's classes to complete one of the four prompts. After students completed the work, we examined available records for children for whom parents had permitted access to school files. We also administered a standardized writing test that indicated students' initial writing abilities. The study was conducted over three months with 200 students (82 ninth graders and 102 tenth-twelfth graders).

Despite a statistically significant difference in writing skills and social studies grades across the two conditions (older students were more capable writers with better grades), the same pattern of writing in response to our tasks is evident across grades. The writing prompt that elicited the lowest levels of disciplinary thinking in student writing asked students to imagine a specific perspective and write a letter from that point of view. The writing prompt that elicited the highest levels of disciplinary thinking asked students to compare two documents and note the similarities and differences. Two remaining prompts were nearly as effective—one asked students to consider the point of view of the authors of documents and the other asked students to identify cause-effect relationships. Each of the more effective prompts required students to consider primary documents more carefully than the least effective prompt. Implications for assessment and instruction will be shared.

References

Britt, M. A., Rouet, J. F., Georgi, M. C., & Perfetti, C. A. (1994). Learning from history texts: From causal analysis to argument models. In G. Leinhardt, I. L. Beck, & C. Stainton (Eds.), *Teaching and learning in history* (pp. 47-84). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

De La Paz, S. (2005). Effects of historical reasoning instruction and writing strategy mastery in culturally and academically diverse middle school classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*(2), 139–156.

De La Paz, S. & Felton, M. K. (in press). Reading and writing from multiple source documents in history: Effects of strategy instruction with low to average high school writers. Contemporary Educational Psychology.

Grant, S. G., Gradwell, J. M., & Cimbricz, S. K. (2004). A question of authenticity: The document-based question as an assessment of students' knowledge of history. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 19,* 309-337.

Lee, P., & Ashby, R. (2000). Progression in historical understanding among students ages 7–14. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching and learning history* (pp. 199–222). New York: New York University Press.

Monte-Sano, C. (in press). Disciplinary literacy in history: An exploration of the historical nature of adolescents' writing. *The Journal of Learning Sciences.*

Stahl, S., Hynd, C., Britton, B., McNish, M., and Bosquet, D. (1996). What happens when students read multiple source documents in history? *Reading Research Quarterly*, *31*(4), 430–456.

VanSledright, B. (2002). Confronting history's interpretive paradox while teaching fifth-graders to investigate the past. *American Educational Research Journal, 39*(4), 1089-1115.

Wiley, J., & Voss, J. F. (1999). Constructing arguments from multiple sources: Tasks that promote understanding and not just memory for text. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 301–311.

Wineburg, S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(1), 73–87.

Young, K. M., & Leinhardt, G. (1998). Writing from primary documents: A way of knowing in history. *Written Communication, 15*, 25-68.

D3 (continued)
Disciplinary writing in high school

Conventional and Risktaking Good Writers and Learning Resources in the Mother Tongue and Physics in Upper Secondary School
Norunn Askeland, Vestfold University College, Norway

The question addressed in this paper is what characterizes good writing in the mother tongue and physics in upper secondary school in Norway and the role of learning resources as models for the students' writing. The aim is to shed light on norms of writing in different text cultures in general and in these two disciplines in particular (Snow 1959, Shuell 1991, Bechler & Trowler 2001, Dysthe 2002; van Dijck 2003) and to discuss to what extent models and learning resources might influence the students' writing (Macbeth 2010). By interwieving good student writers, and analyzing their written assignments in the mother tongue and physics, I will discuss the difference between texts written by good conventional writers and writers who are willing to take risks by breaking with subject-oriented norms and conventions (Vickers 2002, Halliday 2004, Casanave 2010, Hertzberg 2006). In order to explore the room for risktaking in writing in the two disciplines I will analys the norms for assessment in teachers'guides, interview teachers about their norms for assessment and also examine what kind of writing that dominates the learning resources used by the students. My hypothesis is that risktaking is more welcomed and more common in the mother tongue than in physics. But at the same time rare and successful risktaking will be given more consideration and higher marks in physics than in the mother tongue as long as the student has the factual knowledge required (Tedick 2002).

Empirically the paper draws on material originated in a project financed by the Norwegian Research Council, *Learning Resources and Writing in Educational Textual Cultures* (2010 – 2013), where we are conducting a research in highschools and in teachers' training in a university in order to find out how students are using learning resources, i.e. textbooks, web sites, encyclopedias etc. in their efforts to write in the mother tongue and physics.

Methodologically we have cooperated closely with teachers who are interested in contributing to the project by inviting us into their classrooms. The same teachers have also given us free access to the digital learning platform used by the school. Consequently, as researchers we are continually allowed to read students' essays and logs. Additionally, we have agreed to make observations and perform focus group interviews with students to explore their thinking about how texts come into beeing and in what ways (Prior 2004).

In Norway the Department of Education has stressed the importance of the so-called basic skills: reading, writing, digitality, numeracy and orality. The new curriculum from 2006 (Kunnskapsløftet) has implemented these skills for every school subject from Kindergarten through all levels in the educational system up to university level. Consequently, writing in any subject should be of interest for the teachers involved, and the aim of the project as a whole is to obtain new knowledge of the scope and possibility for writing in the subjects of mother tongue and physics in both the upper secondary school and in teacher training in higher education.

References

Becher,T. & P.R.Trowler (2001): *Academic Tribes and Territories. Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Second edition. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press

Casanave, C.P. (2010): Taking risks? A case study of three doctoral students writing qualitative dissertations at an American University in Japan. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Vol. 19, Issue 1, 1-16

Dysthe, O. (2002): Professors as Mediators of Academic Text Cultures. An Interview Study with Advisors and Master's Degree Students in Three Disciplines in a Norwegian University.
Written Communication, Vol. 19, No. 4, 493-544

Halliday, M.A.K. (2004): *The Language of Science*. London: Continuum

Hertzberg, F. (2006): Risikoskriverne i KAL-materialet – noen teksteksempler [The risktaking writers in the KAL-project – some cases]. In S. Matre (ed.): *Utfordringer for skriveopplæring og skriveforsking i dag* [Challenges for teaching and researching writing]. Trondheim: Tapir Akademisk Forlag

Macbeth, K.P. (2010): Deliberate false provisions: The use and usefulness of models in learning academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 19, 33-48

Prior, P. (2004): Tracing Process: How texts Come Into being. In Bazerman, C. and P. Prior (ed.): *What Writing Does and How It Does It. An Introduction to Analyzing Texts and Textual Practices*. New York & London: Routledge, 167-200

Shuell, T.J, (2002): The two cultures of teaching and teacher preparation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 8, Issue 1, 83-90

Tedick, D.J. (1990): ESL writing assessment: Subject-matter knowledge and its impact on performance. *English for Specific Purposes*, Vol. 9, Issue 2, 123-143

Van Dijck, J. (2003): After the "Two Cultures". Toward a "Multicultural" Practice of Science Communication. *Science Communication*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 177-190

Vickers, M. (2002): Researchers as Storytellers: Writing on the Edge – and Without a Safety Net. *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 8, No. 5, 608-621

D4
Navigating epistemologies, methodologies, and pedagogies in collaborative, international writing research

Suzanne Blum Malley, Columbia College, U.S.
Evgenia Gulyaeva, Volgograd Academy of Public Administration, Russia
John Ruiters, Stellenbosch University, South Africa

This panel explores the negotiations of three researchers/writers brought together as teachers in a globally-networked learning environment (GLNE) for undergraduate students. Through studies of GNLEs, Starke-Meyerring has convincingly argued for the stunning capacity for "cross-boundary knowledge-making" in such learning environments. She, and others (Starke-Meyerring and Wilson, Maylath, Herrington, Kennon, Dubin, and Melton), have pointed out the many benefits of GNLEs, noting that in global environments, our students need to be able to "inquire into, reflect on, and negotiate locally situated, regularized, and habitual discursive practices…ways of writing, speaking, thinking, and interacting with all the assumptions these entail about what is proper, expected, and common sense" (Starke-Meyerring and Wilson 6). These processes are undeniably the most powerful aspects of the learning experience in GNLEs and they are as important for the teachers as they are for the students.

In this presentation, we explore the promises and pitfalls of "cross-boundary knowledge-making" (Starke-Meyerring) as teachers, writers, and researchers. We begin by sharing our current individual and collaborative research, sparked by or developed during the classroom collaboration in a GLNE. Then, we reflect together on our own local and habituated ways of knowing, teaching, and writing – a reflection that is, we find, absolutely necessary for writing, researching, and publishing across international, institutional, epistemological, methodological, and pedagogical borders. Our collective reflection draws on lingual-cultural type and lingual personality theory (Karaulov, Vorkachev, Karasik), writing and identity theory (Turkle, Faigley, Ivanic, Lanham), research on internet-mediated communication (IMC) teaching environments (Bolter, Lanham, Hawisher, Daisley, Cogdill, Rickly and Crump, Rouzie, Holcomb) and on GLNE's (Starke-Meyerring and Wilson, Maylath, Herrington, Kennon, Dubin, and Melton) as a means of exploring questions surrounding what it means to write and collaborate in a digital and global context.

We hope to share our negotiations and reflections as a means of deepening international dialogues for writers and researchers, as well as to highlight implications for guiding students as they navigate these same processes as collaborators in cross-boundary knowledge making in GNLEs.

Panelist 1 - *Lingual-Cultural Types and Intercultural Communication*
Current trends in Russian sociolinguistics include consideration of personality as part of intercultural and linguistic communication (Bogin, Karasik, Krusin). Lingual-cultural type modeling belongs to a number of promising areas of modern Anthropocentric Linguistics, which focuses its attention on the problems of correlation between language and a person on the one hand, and between language and culture on the other hand. In dealing with the phenomenon of a person in language, researchers have recently investigated the importance of investigations connected with a lingual personality (Karaulov, Vorkachev, Karasik). This study

introduces the theory of a lingual-cultural personality and of lingual-cultural types in particular. Researchers distinguish ethnic lingual-cultural types (an American cowboy or a Russian Decembrist, for instance), historical lingual-cultural types (an English knight), social professional lingual-cultural types (an American lawyer or a German banker) (Dmitrieva, Yarmakhova, Korovina). Some lingual-cultural types can be representatives of several groups. A British colonial official, for example, is a professional historical lingual-cultural type. Lingual-cultural types can and should inform our teaching of language and intercultural communication because understanding of the specifics of lifestyle and communicative behavior shared by a particular group of people is essential for comprehending the mental platform of their culture and will lead to a successful intercultural communication.

In this presentation, I examine the type analysis of American lawyer. In the United States of America, unlike any other country, the role of a lawyer has a pervasive shared understanding. I investigate how lawyers are represented in US popular culture, specifically exploring presentations in legal and crime fiction. I then analyze results from a survey of 200 Russian students, exploring their perceptions of the lingual-cultural type of US lawyers based on TV shows, movies, fiction literature, and discusses the ways in which this analysis informs our understanding of linguistically and culturally diverse language and communication teaching. Lingual-cultural types, however, are not confined to one profession or one type of person, so examining them provides a perspective from which we can all inform our teaching, linguistically and culturally, leading to more successful intercultural communication in global contexts and in GLNEs.

Panelist 2 - *Ludic is the New Phatic – Laying the Groundwork for Sharing in a Globally-networked Learning Environment*

How do the underpinnings of discourse shift in globally-networked learning environments (GNLEs) and what rhetorical strategies create successful internet – mediated teaching and learning environments?

Using data gathered from student discussions over seven years of Sharing Cultures, a GNLE based in undergraduate classrooms at Columbia College Chicago, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa, and Volgograd Academy of Public Administration, Volgograd, Russia, I argue that ludic and serio-ludic (Rouzie) discourses are valuable mechanisms in GNLEs for creating what Malinowski, and then Jakobsen, refer to as "phatic communion," the function of oral discourse that establishes and maintains channels of communication. The idea of the phatic nature of internet-mediated communication is almost always acknowledged in the pejorative sense (Kramsch and Thorne) and is often the basis for critiques of internet social networking as a superficial and useless waste of time. Nevertheless, if we dismiss phatic communion as gossip or idle chatter in internet-mediated contexts, we miss how rich and meaningful this form of discourse is to human connection. When the ludic and the phatic are combined for these social purposes, to gain attention and to establish a channel of communication, they may form one of the *most* important forces for starting communication in GNLEs, particularly in classroom contexts where students are not interacting out of shared interests or goals, but rather because

they have been instructed to use a GNLE to learn. The ludic-as-phatic force, then, is something that writing teachers and scholars need to carefully attend to as they design globally-networked teaching and learning contexts and help their students develop a greater understanding of the rhetorics of networked communication.

Panelist 3 - *Constructing, Sustaining, and Constraining Identity in Globally-networked Learning Environments*

How do students construct online identities as a means of finding community in globally-networked learning environments? Drawing on digital writing and identity theory (Turkle, Faigley, Ivanic, Lanham) and on research from Sharing Cultures, a GNLE based in undergraduate classrooms at Columbia College Chicago, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Port Elizabeth, South Africa, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa, and Volgograd Academy of Public Administration, Volgograd, Russia, I explore how students negotiate the affordances and constraints presented by GNLEs to construct (multiple) identities, to sustain identities across postings, and to navigate the constraints placed on identity in task-focused environments. I argue that successful writers in the GNLE use these constructions of identity to find community and to develop meaningful interaction. I conclude by looking at some of the pedagogic issues educators should be concerned with when constructing writing tasks in globally-networked learning environments.

"Panelist 4" – All three panelists
Navigating Global Epistemologies, Methodologies, and Pedagogies

As a final piece of the session, the three panelists reflect on their own local and habituated ways of knowing, teaching, and writing, drawing from Starke-Meyerring's six suggested means of facilitating cross-boundary knowledge making to highlight how they have worked to navigate the complex processes of writing, researching, and publishing across international, institutional, epistemological, methodological, and pedagogical borders. After exploring what this experience means for international collaboration as teachers and researchers, they suggest pathways for guiding students as they negotiate these same processes as collaborators in cross-boundary knowledge making in GNLEs.

D5
Major findings from a four-year longitudinal study of undergraduate writers

Doug Hesse, The University of Denver, U.S.
Jennifer Campbell, The University of Denver, U.S.
Richard Colby, The University of Denver, U.S.
Kelli Custer, The University of Denver, U.S.
Eliana Schonberg, The University of Denver, U.S.
Rebekah Shultz-Colby, The University of Denver, U.S.
John Tiedemann, The University of Denver, U.S.

Our panel will summarize major findings from a four-year longitudinal study of 73 undergraduate writers at the University of Denver, a private research university. After briefly explaining our methodology, we will spend most of the session addressing key research questions and discussing our findings' implications for writing programs and instruction—in writing courses, across the curriculum, within the disciplines, and in relation to the self-sponsored and internship writing that students produce. Our presentation will be documented with numerous tables and figures provided as handouts, and we will provide significant time for questions and discussion.

Method. By June 2010, we will have collected the last pieces of data from most of the students whose writing we have been following since their first year of college. Four years ago we invited a random sample of 100 students (about 10% of the class of 2010) to participate in this study, for which they were paid, and to which they contributed three main sources of data: 1. Each quarter, all students completed an extensive survey about their writing experiences and attitudes. 2. Each quarter we asked all students to upload all of their writings to an electronic portfolio; participants have averaged over 15 pieces of writing per quarter, resulting in an average of about 150 pieces of writing per student. We coded these writings by length, genre, source materials, apparent purpose, and process (when possible). 3. Each year we conducted an extended interview with each student. The exit interviews based largely on the students reviewing their entire portfolios and identifying their favorite, least favorite, and strongest writings, as well as discussing what they perceived as key aspects of their writing experiences at the university.

Research Questions. The vast amount of data generated allowed us to address several research questions. Among them: What are the amounts and kinds of writing that students do over four years? How do these differ according to year in school and major? What is the relationship, especially over time, between the writing students do in composition or general education courses and the writing they do in their majors? What composing processes do students employ? Do these change over time and, if so, what accounts for the changes? What formal and informal writing instruction and guidance do students receive over time, and what effects might these have on individual student's processes, products, and attitudes? What do students believe about writing and writers? If this changes over four years, what accounts for that change? We address those questions in both a "horizontal" fashion, subjecting data across subjects to statistical analyses, and a "vertical" fashion, compiling rich interpretive case studies of individual participants.

Our study extends the relatively recent longitudinal studies of large groups of undergraduates conducted at Harvard and Stanford, more focused studies of student writers over time like those conducted by Richard Haswell, Anne Beaufort, and Marilyn Sternglass, and

broad studies of writing in the disciplines like the one conducted by Chris Thaiss and Terry Zawacki.

D6

Beyond literate lives in the information age: Digital writing research, transnational contexts, and academic discourse

Gail E. Hawisher, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, U.S.
Cynthia L. Selfe, Ohio State University, U.S.

In this session, we take up the notion of digital literacies in a globalized world and consider how video interviews, sound, images, and writing process videos might inform our understandings of writing in the academy and literate activity (Prior, 1998).

As Carmen Luke and other scholars (Castells, 2000; Canagarajah, 2007; Appadurai, 1996; Lu, 2004) point out, we now live and teach in a world characterized by "accelerating global flows of people and information" (Luke, 2006) which, in turn, have helped form new digital communities and networks that extend across linguistic, cultural, and political borders. The topography of this globalized and digitized "eduscape" (Luke, 2006) differs radically from the environments in which many of us went to school. At the same time, the United States has become simultaneously more aggressive toward other nations and peoples, and more isolationist in many of its political tendencies at home. In this context, literacy instruction, assessment, and sometimes research can become a patriotic national project, a means of molding an English-speaking population. Scholars remind us that within the context of this national effort, U.S. literacy researchers often acknowledge writing research in the rest of the world only in the narrowest of terms (Donahue, 2009). In this session we argue that that we need to move beyond writing research that has been conventionally valued in the field and explore ways in which we might conduct, collaboratively, studies of digital literacy with our students and with those who claim transnational connections.

Speaker 1

Writing Research in a Globalized World: Crafting Digital Literacies and More

Part of a larger study on global digital literacy practices, this presentation explores how writers from here and abroad represent their composing processes when video comes into play. Grounded in the premise that we need to "[pay] particular attention to the methodological challenges we face as we turn toward the global" (Hesford, 2007) within writing studies, the speaker looks to videos that graduate student researchers with transnational connections create when asked to represent their literate activity. Composed by those who hail from places near and afar, the videos reveal intimate connections among cultural practices, writing, and the performance of self through the digital. The literacy narratives (Eldred and Mortensen, 2006) these students relate through writing process videos are passionate about technique, rich in detail, and lend themselves to a methodology that combines digital practices with more established approaches for studying literate activity. Overall, the aim of the presentation is to examine how the study of self-authored video clips can contribute to digital literacy research while at the same time do justice to representations of literate lives across transnational contexts.

Speaker 2

Writing in Vernacular Digital Environments: Expectations for Academic Discourse

This presentation features video interviews with college students who demonstrate how language and literacy instruction, practices, and values have moved beyond national borders and what these changes mean for the literacy instruction now offered in academic writing classes. In particular, the paper examines how students' writing practices in digital environments—for instance, computer games (Alberti, 2009), short messaging systems (Shortis, 2008), and social media sites such as Facebook (Klaebe & Bolland, 2007)—map (or don't map) onto teachers' expectations for academic writing as it is taught in the United States and beyond. Using new literacy studies (Street, 1995; New London Group, 1996) as a theoretical ground, the presenter examines how teachers' epistemological understandings of writing and its privileged position in universities constrain expectations for common genres such as the research paper, the analytical essay, and the descriptive paper—all typical genres assigned in academic writing courses. The presenter will show excerpts from videotaped literacy narratives in which students discuss the writing they bring to college writing classrooms and the expectations for writing that they encounter in university settings. The presenter also explores how universities are responding to changing understandings of communication in digital contexts and modifying curricula to accommodate increasingly multimodal understandings of writing (Yancey, 2004; Selfe & Hawisher, 2004).

D7
Adult writers in science and the professions

How L2 Legal Writers Use Strategies for Scholarly Writing: A Mixed Methods Study

Donna Bain Butler, University of Maryland, College Park and *American University's Washington College of Law, U.S.*

This dissertation research describes how scholarly second language (L2) legal writing is learning and development. The theoretical framework views scholarly (academic) writing in a second language as developmental learning in two domains, language and law, and as socialized cultural practice. The following six fields are involved in and affected by this research: Applied Linguistics, Content-Based (Legal) English Teaching, English Composition, International (Legal) Education, Teaching English for (Academic and Specific) Legal Purposes, and Professional Development. This multidisciplinary study bridges first language and second language writing research, exploring how superior language learners used research-based strategies to build on their existing competences for academic writing at professional levels of proficiency. The international graduate student participants (N=6) in this study needed to show analytical thinking and communicative precision in their research papers and law review articles.

This is mixed methods, longitudinal, descriptive, classroom-based research. Four research questions guided this study. The questions relate to the study's research purpose: that is, to disclose the dynamic, changing nature of factors that influenced strategic competence at the level of professional (or higher) writing proficiency for learners engaged in the process of scholarly legal writing within the context of a semester-long writing intervention. The four research questions are as follows:

For each stage of the scholarly L2 legal writing process,

what are the learners' reported use of writing strategies and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) skills?

which writing strategies and CALP skills do the learners think are the most useful and why?

what are the learners' and teacher quality ratings of the learners' scholarly L2 writing product?

what interrelationships can be seen among (a) learners' writing strategies and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) skills, and (b) learners' and teacher quality ratings of the learners' scholarly L2 writing product?

A mixed methods, concurrent triangulation, multi-stage design was used. This is a type of mixed methods design in which different but complementary data were collected at the same time on the same research topic: that is, strategies and skills actually used and reported helpful by student participants to show competence in scholarly legal writing. This design allowed "triangulation" in which quantitative and qualitative methods were implemented during the same time frame and with equal weight in stages corresponding to recursive processes of writing (that is, pre-writing, drafting, and revising).

Quantitative data analyses disclosed participants' reported use of academic literacy strategies and language skills. Qualitative data analyses provided a comprehensive, detailed view of how participants went about their academic legal writing task using these strategies and skills. The study showed how scholarly legal writing was

both a cognitive and a social-cultural process for participants as they shifted from the writer-centered activity of drafting to the reader-centered activity of revising and constructing knowledge.

D7 (continued)
Adult writers in science and the professions
Writing and Theoretical Physics
Chad Wickman, Auburn University, U.S.

Scholarship in the field of writing studies has often explored the relationship between situated writing activity and the rhetorical dimensions of scientific knowledge production (Bazerman 1988; Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995; Blakeslee 2001; Myers 1990; Rymer 1988). This body of research has shown that writing, and written genres more broadly, helps to organize scientific inquiry and shapes the ways in which scientists communicate their work over time, space, and socio-historical context. Ethnographies of laboratory life have surveyed similar ground through close analyses of scientists' *in situ* representational practices (Knorr-Cetina 1981; Latour and Woolgar 1979; Latour 1987; Lynch 1985; Traweek 1988; see Lynch and Woolgar 1988). These scholars have shown, among other things, that writing is instrumental to the ways in which scientists visualize their work, make it available for inter-subjective deliberation, and ultimately sort through the "mangle of practice" that is laboratory research (see Pickering 1995, p. 23).

Scientists have also taken interest in their own writing practices. David Mermin, for instance, a theoretical physicist, suggests that "writing physics is different from both writing up physics, and the editorial refinement of written-up physics. While there has to be something there before the writing begins, that something only acquires its character and shape through writing" (p. 27). This brief statement makes what I consider to be two key points for the study and teaching of writing in scientific disciplines: first, that the concept of *writing* can be understood in multiple ways, and second, that writing, however understood, is a constructive activity through which scientists make and communicate meaning related to the material world. Building on scholarship in writing, rhetoric, and science studies, I would like to explore Mermin's thinking by investigating two related questions: How is writing understood and enacted in the context of theoretical physics research and communication? How does such an approach help to extend, and perhaps complicate, the ways in which scholars approach writing as a literate practice and situated rhetorical activity?

This presentation, drawing on a yearlong ethnographic study in a chemical physics institute, examines how writing mediates the ways in which theoretical physicists conceptualize, represent, and communicate their work. Data include the following:
1. field observations (laboratories; offices; meetings; lectures; conferences);
2. artifact analysis (computational simulations, multimedia presentations, completed work);
3. interviews with physicists (theoretical, computational, experimental).

Findings show that theoretical physicists deploy multiple media (e.g., computers, software, whiteboards) and semiotic modes (e.g., equations, programming language, linguistic script) in order to construct meaningful representations of objects that may or may not exist in nature. As Ochs, Jacoby, and Gonzalez (1994) suggest, "It is through this multimodal, distributed discursive activity that…physicists narrate their scientific stories and journey through graphic space and other constructed worlds" (pp. 152-153). My aim in this presentation is to theorize this work as a complex literacy practice, and, in

doing so, interrogate what it means to approach writing as an object of study and a teaching subject in a "thinking" science like theoretical physics (see Merz and Knorr-Cetina 1997).

D7 (continued)
Adult writers in science and the professions

The Lifecycle of the Scientific Writer: Investigating How Scientists Become Writers of Science
Lisa Emerson, Massey University, New Zealand

Writing is a critical component of science, yet there is little empirical evidence on how scientists develop as writers. As far back as 1978, Enke noted that the time scientists spend in writing is "out of all proportion to the fraction of our training devoted to developing writing skills" while, more recently, other studies (Atkinson, 1999) noted that post graduate scientists had little formal tuition in writing in their discipline. Larry Yore's work (2002, 2004, 2006) is perhaps the most comprehensive in investigating scientists' attitudes to and experience of writing – yet he and his associates do not consider the development of the writer of science over time.

This study investigates how scientists develop scientific writing skills, and how their attitudes to the role of writing in science change at different stages in their development.

The study takes a "sampling" approach, using as its sample 20-25 individuals at each different stage in their development as writers: senior scientists, emerging scientists (up to 8 years from their PhD), PhD students in science, and undergraduate science students. The sample was taken from 7 research universities and two Crown Research Institutes in New Zealand and Australia over a period of 12 months and included participants from a wide range of scientific disciplines, from the applied sciences (such as plant biology and environmental economics) to the most theoretical (eg theoretical physics).

Once the sample had agreed to take part in the research, data were collected in three forms: participants filled in a short questionnaire, provided written documents to the researcher (eg draft chapters of their dissertation for PhD students, marked assignments for undergraduate students, and draft articles for emerging scientists), and participated in an individual interview. Interviews were transcribed, and the data analysed thematically by hand.

That results suggest that there is, as one participant suggested, a "lifecycle" for a scientific writer, which is characterised by different "life stages". These "life stages" are, in turn, characterised by specific attitudes to, and competencies around, writing, and also by a need to engage with different writing tasks to different audiences. This presentation details the components of the different "life stages" as identified in the data and considers whether the findings are specific to Australasia or whether they can be generalised internationally. It also looks at the implications for the tertiary science curriculum and writing across the curriculum programmes, and considers possible support strategies at the graduate and emerging scientists level.

D8
Adopting a holistic perspective on international students' academic literacy development

Michael-John DePalma, University of New Hampshire, U.S.
Jeff Ringer, Lee University, U.S.
Steve Simpson, New Mexico Tech, U.S.

Recent work in composition's leading journals has challenged the field's exclusive focus on native English speakers and has called for a more international perspective on writing research and pedagogy (Canagarajah, 2006; Horner & Trimbur, 2002; Matsuda, 2006). The role English has assumed as the *lingua franca* of international academic communication has made writing in English a critical skill for international undergraduate and graduate students in US institutions. Not only must these students write high-stakes academic documents in their second language and negotiate a variety of cultural differences between educational contexts in their home countries and in the US, but they must also piece together often implicit writing expertise distributed across a network of teachers and peers in the university and in their fields of study. Writing for this growing population of international undergraduate and graduate students is, thus, a highly complex undertaking that requires an integrated model of academic writing support. In order to address this critical need, studies that explore ways that writing programs can better account for the needs of these student populations are required. In an effort to address this gap, the speakers on this panel offer two frameworks for holistically examining the complex interrelationships between the various factors that influence the academic literacy of international undergraduate and graduate students—namely, adaptation and learning systems.

"Toward a Theory of Adaptation in Multilingual Writing Contexts"
Speaker 1 will outline the key features of his theory of adaptation—a construct for studying the conscious or intuitive process that multilingual writers use to select and reshape learned writing knowledge in order to apply it to new and potentially unfamiliar writing situations. Speaker 1 offers this theoretical framework in an effort to provide theorists with a more suitable terminology for understanding how international students re-shape writing skills they've learned in prior contexts to fit new ones.

"Reshaping Disciplinary Discussions of Transfer in Second-Language Writing"
Speaker 2 explores the potential implications for reframing disciplinary discussions of transfer in second-language writing in terms of adaptation. In his talk, he argues that the term "adaptation" is preferable to the term "transfer" for discussing how international students re-shape writing skills learned in prior contexts to fit new ones because of its assumptions about language, writing, and the approach to composition teaching that it implies. In positing the term "adaptation," speaker 2 aims to offer an alternative basis for making curricular and programmatic decisions in multilingual writing contexts.

"Learning Systems: Equipping the Graduate Multilingual Learner"

Drawing from case studies of five international doctoral students in an interdisciplinary environmental studies program, speaker 3 melds theories of *situated learning* with *systems theory*, a construct commonly used in natural resources management to study interrelationships between ecological, economic, and social factors in environmental phenomena (Laszlo, 1996; von Bertalanffy, 1969) to provide a *learning systems* model for holistically studying advanced academic literacy learning. Building on the discussions of speakers 1 and 2, speaker 3 offers his learning systems paradigm as a sustainable and integrated model of writing support for multilingual graduate writers.

D9
High stakes professional writing
The Complexities of Document Review in Drug Development Environments
Stephen A. Bernhardt, University of Delaware, U.S.
Greg Cuppan, McCulley/Cuppan LLC, U.S.

Our goal is to share findings on "industrial strength" review practices in large pharmaceutical companies. Through extensive workplace observations we find that issues of scale (large documents, large organizations, complex operations) complicate generalizations about how to structure peer or managerial reviews while documents are in development. We have found that current practices as we observe them are frequently costly and inefficient. We believe typical review practices are difficult to justify in terms of improved document quality.

This presentation follows up our earlier work, which detailed general issues with review practices for large documents in pharmaceutical companies ("Improving Document Review Practices in Pharmaceutical Companies." Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 17.4 (October, 2003): 439-473.). That earlier work found that review was frequently a frustrating and time-consuming practice. We suggested that companies would benefit from review practices that were more intentional and better planned, with better articulated purposes, goals, and procedures.

For our current study, we tracked review and commenting practices as iterative versions of documents were circulated, and we monitored review team discussion during F2F or electronically-mediated review meetings. Based on an analysis and categorization of all review comments made during the life history of document development, we report specific, quantified findings on the nature and placement of comments made during review and whether the comments were acted upon during subsequent revision. We also present data on document improvement across drafts. We present our findings as data-driven case studies, organized by company, since our activities were constrained by the particular consulting contracts, our methods were not strictly parallel, and we therefore want to be cautious about combining data across settings.

We developed an approach to classifying and tabulating review comments that has been applied to ten very large documents (clinical research reports) at three different pharmaceutical companies. We interviewed a group of subject experts tasked with review of four of these documents and then compared their descriptions of review effort against our observations of review comments. Additionally, we performed pre- and post-evaluation on four of the reports, using primary trait analysis to judge improvement in quality on seven traits.

The goal of our work is to help bridge the perception/reality chasm and reveal to companies that much of what occurs during the review process has limited impact on the communication quality of a document. We suggest that review practices may actually inhibit business performance and pharmaceutical research. The primary audience for our work are those in industry who coordinate or participate in review processes, industry trainers who work to implement best practices, and those in the teaching profession who prepare professional communicators. We believe our work is of high interest to those who study writing and a good fit for the upcoming conference.

We propose sharing the podium in a single talk. We request something on the order or 45 minutes for our presentation and discussion.

Our work ties into a set of related studies on review practices in industry, most notably:

Dayton, D. (2004) Electronic editing in technical communication: A model of user-centered technology adoption. Technical Communication, 51(2), pp. 207-223.

Hackos, J. (1994). Managing your documentation projects. New York: John Wiley.

Katz, S. (1998). The dynamics of writing review: Opportunities for growth and change in the workplace (Vol. 5 in ATTW Contemporary Studies in Technical Communication). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Kleimann, S. D. (1991). The complexity of workplace review. Technical Communication, 38, 520-526.

Kleimann, S. D. (1993). The reciprocal relationship of workplace culture and review. In R. Spilka (Ed.),Writing in the workplace: New research perspectives (pp. 56-70). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Shwom, B. L., & Hirsch, P. L. (1994). Managing the drafting process: Creating a model for the workplace. The Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication, 17(2), 1- 10.

Swarts,. J. (2005). Journal of Business and Technical Communication 18:328-360. "Technological Mediation of Document Review: The Use of Textual Replay in Two Organizations." Technical Communication 52.1.

van der Geest, T., & van Gemert, L. (1997). Review as a method for improving professional texts. Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 11, 433-450.

D10
Linguistic diversity in higher education

The Linguistic Diversity Project: Connecting Reading, Writing, and Language Background Among First-year College Students

Jonathan Hall, City University of New York, U.S.

The Linguistic Diversity Project seeks to bridge disciplinary divides between "L1" and "L2" research by quantifying and studying higher-order student competencies in first-year composition in general and among multilingual learners in particular. Paul Kei Matsuda has argued that L2 writing has often been conceived as the exclusive domain of TESL specialists, while "mainstream" composition research concentrates on monolingual English-speaking students. Addressing the complex writing issues of today's students will require a new synthesis of these approaches, which will leave neither "L1" nor "L2" researchers secure in their disciplinary niches, but will challenge both to cross borders toward new and more inclusive experimental designs.

In contrast to some studies of multilingual students that have focused narrowly on sentence-level issues, this study employs an expanded, holistic definition of "writing," involving not only the composition of analytical texts, but also academic reading and critical thinking. The goal is to approach these issues as empirically as possible–taking a cue from second language writing research–but at the same time to focus on the issues that professional writing instructors care about in student writing, rather than simply measuring what is easiest to quantify.

Results will be presented from an initial study conducted on a linguistically diverse urban public university campus. The goal is to bring together three types of information collected from 241 first-year students (approximately 40% multilingual):

· Education and Language Background Survey
· Reading and Writing Habits Survey
· Scores on a "middle-stakes" writing assignment involving: reading a text (newspaper article describing new academic research), evaluating a short critical response to it, and developing an argument of the student's own. Scores are submitted by classroom instructors according to a common rubric which addresses 9 dimensions (overall control, reading comprehension, critical reading, relation to assignment, use of sources, structure/organization, style, mechanics & conventions, development of writer's ideas).

Data for all components were collected via Blackboard, which makes the instruments easily exportable and replicable at very little cost, especially since instructors score the essays as part of the regular work of the course.

Research questions to be addressed in the presentation include:

· Who is a multilingual learner today, in U.S. higher education? What languages do they speak, how often, in what contexts, and for what purposes? Can we develop a more detailed description of the spectrum of multilingualism?
· Do such quantifiable profiles correlate with specific issues in first-year composition performance? For example, does a student who has the habit of reading regularly in a non-English language gain an advantage in terms of critical reading in English? Does a student who seldom speaks English outside the

campus context face a disadvantage when writing in English? Are there any patterns in the linguistic profile which have a predictive value of how a student will do on a first-year composition assignment?

· Do student habits of voluntary reading and/or writing (in any language), or their high school experience of being assigned significant amounts of reading and writing (or not) have a quantifiable impact on their performance in first-year composition?

D10 (continued)
Linguistic diversity in higher education
Working the Circle: Language Assumptions in L2 Composition Classrooms
Lance Cummings, Miami University, U.S.

Many writing researchers have been interested in how the discourse of the classroom has shaped the subject positions and identities of students (Brodkey, 1989; Hull, et al., 1991) or instructors (Johnston, 1999), but there has not been as much work on the assumptions about language undergirding students' L2 learning. A few researchers have explored this issue among immigrants and bi-literate students (Sánchez, 2007; Jarrett, et al., 2006), but not so much with International students in the University setting. As the International student population rises throughout the country, an imperative in writing and research must be to examine the assumptions about language shaping students (and instructors) understandings so as to help us see teaching, student writing, and classroom discourse in a new light. "Working the Circle" is an adaptation of current comparative methodologies that opens up the "transnational" classroom to an examination of these assumptions without erasing diverse voices or valorizing binary ways of constructing comparisons.

For this conference, I will present the results of a study I conducted examining language assumptions in the ESL classroom. Using a phenomenological two-tiered interview, I elicited from International students broad, transnational literacy narratives and more focused narratives about writing at a large Mid-western US university. Using Transnational critical frames including adaptations of "racial triangulation" (Shih, 2008) and theories about the tacit "cultural logic" of "unidirectional monolinguism" (Horner and Trimbur, 2002), I juxtapose and analyze these interviews (and my own assumptions about language) to show the "polyphonic" nature of language assumptions in the classroom. Within my own adaption of these comparative methodologies, these triangles become much more like circles, where hierarchies and binaries tend to collapse, showing the shifting and relational nature of language assumptions in today's classroom situation. I focus in particular on two participants—one from Nigeria and one from China to show how assumptions about language interact in multiply diverse ways within the contact sites of student papers and teacher comments. As we become more aware of the diversity of the composition classroom, we must include the assumptions brought to the classroom by teachers and students (and researchers) and how they interact differently within these multiple sites. Instead of "working the hyphen" of researcher-subject or teacher-student (Fine, 1994), I propose that we should "work the circle" in a way that not only triangulates and complicates binaries, but accurately represents the shifting and relational boundaries we encounter in our transnational world.

D10 (continued)
Linguistic diversity in higher education
Uncovering Linguistic Diversity in a US University Writing Program
Angela Dadak, American University, U.S.

The multilingual nature of the student population in US universities and in their writing programs is often hidden under layers of assumptions and lack of information. Initial identification of whether a student is multilingual frequently rest on judgments of accent and race, university information related to visa status, and on students' self designation as "international" or "ESL." (Matsuda, 2006; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008; Roberge, Harklau & Siegal, 2009, Simpson & Dadak, 2009). Language surveys are one way to uncover the linguistic diversity of a particular program and see how national trends are reflected at a local level.

By surveying students regarding the languages they know, how they use them, and how they linguistically identify themselves, the presenter created a profile of an undergraduate college writing program at a private US university showing that less than fifteen percent of the classes had a purely monolingual student population, and the number of US resident multilingual students was double that of international multilingual students. Results also showed that the US multilingual students ranged from highly English-dominant to highly mixed language use. Aligning with research in the field the US students identified themselves as bilingual but not ESL while international students were more comfortable with both terms.

These results have pedagogical, professional developmental, and hiring implications (Friedrich, 2006; Preto-Bay and Hansen, 2006; Shuck, 2006) particularly for a program that mainstreams the majority of its students into "one size fits all" classes taught by instructors from mainly monolingual, English literature or creative writing backgrounds, many with substantial and successful composition instruction experience but little training in second language writing.

The presenter will briefly outline the issue of "hidden" multilingual writer populations in US institutions of higher education, note some of the research about the effect of this population in first-year composition classes, share the survey and results, then discuss uses and limitations of the data.

Friedrich, P. (2006). Assessing the needs of linguistically diverse first-year students: Bringing together and telling apart international ESL, resident ESL, and monolingual basic writers. *Writing Program Administration*, 30.1/2, 15-36.

Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). 'English may be my second language, but I'm not ESL.' *College Composition and Communication, 59*(3), 389-419.

Preto-Bay, A. and Hansen, K. (2006). Preparing for the tipping point: Designing writing programs to meet the needs of the changing population. *Writing Program Administration*, 30.1/2, 37-58.

Matsuda, P.K. (2006). "The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition." *College English*, 68(6), 637-651.

Roberge, M., Siegal, M. & Harklau, L. (2009). *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to US-educated learners of ESL.* New York: Routledge.

Shuck, G. (2006). Combating Monolingualism: A novice administrator's challenge. *Writing Program Administration*, 30.1/2, 83-100.

Simpson, S. & Dadak, A. "Assessing the Diversity of Learners at your Institution" (part of the workshop "Keeping Multilingual Writers in Mind: How Universal Design Can Lead to Inclusive Pedagogies and Practices"). Conference on College Composition and Communication, San Francisco, CA, March 11, 2009.

D11
Development of critical thinking skills in writing-across-the-curriculum

Transfer of a Different Kind: A Study of Developmental Reading, Writing and Academic Success

Alice Horning, Oakland University, U.S.

While educational psychologists have been exploring transfer for quite a while, in books like Teaching for Transfer: Fostering Generalization in Learning (1995) and How People Learn (2000), this research has only lately become a focus in writing studies. The recent work of Wardle, Yancey and others reflects the growing interest in transfer, particularly in first year composition. However, for the most part little attention has been paid to the role and importance of reading in terms of how it transfers to writing courses or coursework across disciplines. Because such transfer potentially makes a difference to student success, examining transfer from developmental reading courses along both of these dimensions provides useful insights.

This presentation reports on a follow-up study with students at a state university in the Midwest who completed a course called "Critical Thinking and Reading" to reveal the ways that the course helped them develop and transfer essential literacy skills. Students are advised (not required) to take this course based on an ACT Reading test subscore of 19 or below. The course makes use of some key approaches known to support transfer: a useful amount and kind of initial learning accompanied by proper motivation and opportunities for using what is learned in a practical way; time on task that is accompanied by helpful and frequent feedback; self-monitoring and self-evaluation of what is working and what is not; application of new information in different contexts; "abstract representations of problems" (How People Learn 78) to see how their features repeat in other situations; building on any and all prior knowledge students bring, including cultural practices and other background information; and a metacognitive approach that replicates experts' ability to "monitor and regulate" (How People Learn 78) their own learning.

A five-year follow-up study with students who took this developmental reading course examines their records of enrollment, success and retention; survey and interview results reveal the elements of positive transfer that the course provides, and show that students carry their reading skills into both their writing courses and other work. Students report that three features of the course are particularly important to transferring what they learned to their work with textbooks and other materials in a variety of different majors. First, the intensive work done in the course on organizational patterns and structures used in typical textbook writing was helpful to them. In textbook reading, recognizing paragraphs of definition, classification, exemplification and so on improved their comprehension. Second, seeing the organizational patterns in formal, nonfiction prose was specifically useful when students were asked to write an assortment of different kinds of papers in various courses. Finally, the course requirement for extensive reading of books over the whole term built their reading "muscles" so that their overall vocabulary and speed increased, along with an awareness of what formal written language should sound like. The more effective and efficient reading skills students developed in the reading class transferred to both their writing and their other coursework, leading to successful course completion and graduation.

Development of critical thinking skills in writing-across-the-curriculum
<div align="center">

Examining Premises: A Campus-Wide Critical Thinking Program
Martha Marinara, University of Central Florida, U.S.
Barry Mauer, University of Central Florida, U.S.

</div>

This presentation presumes that within the university, there is a need for a program that teaches students how to identify, challenge, and, if necessary, change the premises they use to think. To this end, the presenters have begun a three-year project to create flexible, downloadable modules for use in undergraduate courses campus-wide; these modules will teach fundamental skills in critical thinking with a special focus on identifying and chalenging premises in students' thinking. Each module is designed to help students meet International Technology Education Association (ITEA) standards for technical literacy and National Council Teachers English (NCTE) standards for written communication. Modules will be formatted for web courses and will also be available in formats suitable for face-to-face classes. Partnerships with the Interdisciplinary Studies Program and the Writing and Rhetoric Department's Composition Program create the potential to impact five to six thousand students per academic year. Further partnerships with already established campus-wide programs—University Libraries InfoLit modules and the Information Fluency Center—allow these new modules to work with other key points in undergraduate research and writing.

The presenters will first discuss the theories that underpin the project. The primary innovation in this study is that it addresses key questions that normally go unasked. For instance, why do we need critical thinking? How do I identify and test my own premises? Where do our premises come from? By digging into these rarely asked questions, students have a chance to examine not only their own premises, but the premises used by the institution of higher learning of which they are a part. They can come to a common understanding of what they're doing at the university and why. Key to this project is a focus on discourse theory and analysis. Our discourses play a large role in shaping our premises, the general beliefs we have about the world. From these premises flow arguments, which are the judgments we make about specific things in the world. Therefore, these discourses are very important because they shape who we are, what we think about, and even how we behave. Yet linguists point out that we don't notice them because they are all around us, all the time. Perhaps we paid special attention to discourses as we were first learning them—they may have seemed strange and unfamiliar then—but afterwards, most likely, we just used them.

Linguists George Lakoff and Mark Johnson discovered that our discourses are metaphorically structured, with each discourse made out of language borrowed from other discourses. Depending on which discourses we combine and in what ways, we get different pictures of the world. When we have a picture of the world in our heads, we have a set of premises that go along with that picture. Our premises are assumptions about how the world works. And when we don't see that our picture of the world is only one possible picture among many, we lose sight of how other people might see things differently. Our project challenges students to look at the world in different ways so that they might gain the insights that result from these other pictures.

In the second half of the discussion, the presenters preview examples of the modules which use images and texts from popular culture in an interactive, multi-media

format. They will discuss the connections among technical and information literacies and critical thinking as students learn to use, manage, and assess technologies and information while working through the modules. The International Technology Education Association (ITEA) proposes that "technological literacy is far more than the ability to use technological tools. Technologically literate citizens employ systems-oriented thinking as they interact with the technological world, cognizant of how such interaction affects individuals, our society, and the environment." Technological and information literacies because they involve the application of both knowledge and abilities to real-world situations, necessitate using critical thinking in order to develop knowledge from information or data and the technical skills to access information.

D12
From undergraduate to post-graduate writing competence
Metadiscourse and Evaluation in Undergraduate Thesis in Spanish

Millaray Salas Valdebenito, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

This corpus-based study, my dissertation project, focuses on one aspect of metadiscourse, self-mentions, taking the non-integrative approach to the study of this phenomenon (Ädel, 2006, in press). There is some evidence in favor of the assumption of interdisciplinary variation of the genre research article (RA) in terms of explicit references to the RA author (Myers, 1989; Hyland, 1998, 2001, 2002; Fløttum, Dahl & Kinn, 2006; Mur Dueñas, 2007; Afros & Schryer, 2009; Bruce, 2009). The aim of this research project is to compare the employment of personal metadiscourse oriented towards the writer (Ädel, 2006) in research articles from three disciplines (Medicine, Economics and Linguistics) published in Spanish-language journals, by looking at the occurrence of certain lexico-grammatical features that signal it. Although there are a number of studies that have analyzed metadiscourse in academic and scientific prose in Spanish (Beke, 2005; Cubo de Severino, 2005; Müller, 2007; Mur Dueñas, 2007; Aguirre, 2010; Bolívar, Beke & Shiro, 2010), none of these studies has employed quantitative methods, with the exception of Pérez-Llantada (in press). My research question is: are there statistically significant differences between the three corpora of RAs in terms of the rate of occurrence of some linguistic features that signal personal metadiscourse? In this quantitative study, I will employ computational techniques to analyze a corpus of 280 RAs written in Spanish and published in journals from Spain and Latin America that are indexed in Web of Science (Thomson Reuters). Regrettably, at this stage of my research, I am unable to report any findings. However, the defence of my dissertation project is scheduled for December 2010, so by September 2010 I should have results.

D12 (continued)
From undergraduate to post-graduate writing competence
(Re)presenting the Self in Graduate Admissions Essays: Research in the Process Behind High Stakes Writing

Christina Rose Dubb, University of Pennsylvania, U.S.

The genre of statements of purpose (SOP) for graduate school entrance has been scantily researched. While there are a few studies on the rhetoric of the genre and investigations into what makes certain essays successful, no studies consider the process of writing these statements and how students are socially situated inside and outside of academia. Since graduate school admissions are a method of academic gate keeping, this study looks at how students are able to situate themselves so they are deemed worthy of entrance. In particular for groups that are traditionally underrepresented in the academy, how do students gain the cultural capital necessary to rationalize their placement in the world of graduate studies that have traditionally shunned them?

Rather than focus solely on the completed product, as the existing studies do, this study follows students through the process of writing statements of purpose for graduate school admissions, investigating aspects of the practice from the student's point of view including: the students understandings and assumptions about the genre, the discoursal and rhetorical choices they make, the negotiation of their multiple identities, and their visions of their past, present, and future selves. Given the traditionally independent nature of statement of purpose writing, this research is unique in that it studies the process a group of senior undergraduate students go through when composing graduate school essays. The findings focus on two case studies of college seniors (who come from backgrounds traditionally underrepresented in graduate education) and how they negotiate their discoursal and social identities while (and for the purpose of) writing their SOPs for graduate school admission. Using transcripts of an SOP writing workshop and personal interviews and the drafts and final statements of purpose written by the students, the researcher uses discourse analysis, theories of academic literacies, and Ivanic's work on writing and identity to investigate the ways students balance and represent their multiple identities in the high-stakes genre of admissions essays.

D12 (continued)
From undergraduate to post-graduate writing competence
Moving from Graduation to Post-Graduation in Portuguese Universities –
Changing Literacy Practices, Facing New Difficulties
José António Brandão Carvalho, University of Minho, Portugal

The aim of this presentation is the description of a study that focuses on the way students, enrolled in a post-graduation programme (MA) in the domain of Education, perform a literature review task. This study was carried out after it was found that many students have difficulties when performing some literacy tasks they are supposed to develop in the context of the course. When asked about the reasons for those problems, students often refer the difference between the literacy tasks they used to perform in their graduation studies and those that are requested at the post-graduation level.

Data emerging from the study of Portuguese contexts (Carvalho, 2008; Carvalho & Dourado, 2010) show that literacy practices at graduation levels differ from those that are common at higher levels.

These differences seem particularly relevant as far as tasks involved in assessment practices are concerned. At graduation level assessment is often based on examinations while at post-graduation it is more dependent on the production of other genres such as literature reviews or essays.

However, the comparison of literacy practices developed at graduation and post-graduation levels should not be confined to the textual genres students are used to read and write at each level, it must also consider other aspects, such as the reading and writing processes implied in such tasks and involving knowledge acquisition, elaboration and expression procedures.

In what concerns reading, we must consider that there are differences in the number and in the nature of the texts students have to read as well as in the way information is processed, taking into account the context in which knowledge has to be expressed. When assessment is made by exam, knowledge sources are not usually accessible at the moment students have to express contents and therefore it is important to acquire and elaborate them in a way that enables an easy retrieval from the memory; this reading process is, obviously, very different from the reading process developed when the objective is to write an essay or a literature review.

Writing processes also differ completely whether we are writing in an exam or preparing an essay or a literature review. Differences affect all the components of the writing process: planning, transcription and revision. As far as planning is concerned, content retrieval and organisation are performed differently; the same happens with word and sentence formulation as well as with speed and the rhythm in transcription; and finally, we could say the same about revision and text improvement, more feasible when time is available than under the pressure of time limits in exams.

Besides these procedural aspects, others must be taken into consideration, especially those related to the conventions of the academic discourse students must know and apply. Such conventions, fixed by the academic community and characteristic of the texts it makes use of, are more relevant at the post-graduation level due to the genres involved. They have mainly to do with the sources on which a text is based and the recognition of the authorship of the knowledge it displays. Concerning quotation and

reference processes, these conventions imply an appropriate use of language which demands the knowledge of those fixed forms that are adopted adopted and recognised by the whole community.

Taking into account these change of literacy practices and the difficulties many students face when they attend to post-graduation programmes, a study was developed aiming at describing the way post-graduation (MA) students perform a literature review task. Students involved in the study were mainly teachers of different school subjects who were doing a master programme on Education. In order to describe the whole literature review process, involving reading or writing tasks, this study focussed not only on the texts students wrote but also on other kind of documents they produced, such as reading notes and text plans. The study includes, besides this document analysis, a questionnaire in which students were asked about the way they developed the assigned task and the difficulties they felt when performing it.

CARVALHO José A. Brandão (2008). "Acquiring, elaborating and expressing knowledge – a study with Portuguese university students". *Zeitschrift Schreiben*, 1.07.2008 (http://www.zeitschrift-schreiben.eu).

Carvalho, José A. Brandão & Dourado Luís (2010). Processos de Aquisição, Elaboração e Expressão do Conhecimento em Alunos da Universidade do Minho. In J.L. Silva *et al* (eds.), *Ensino Superior em Mudança: Tensões e Possibilidades - Actas do Congresso Ibérico*. Braga: UM - CIEd , pp. 301-308 (CD-ROM ISBN:978-972-8746-80-3).