

Writing Research Across Borders II Session F
Saturday, February 19 10:30am-12:00pm

F1

Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places

Chris Thaiss, University of California, Davis, U.S.

Paula Carlino, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina

Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams, Coventry University, U.K.

Aparna Sinha, University of California, Davis, U.S.

This panel will be presented by members of the international editorial team for *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*, an anthology of essays that describe and analyze the teaching of academic writing as it occurs across disciplines in higher education settings in more than twenty countries on six continents. Scheduled to appear in 2011, the book, which will be published both in an English print version (Parlor Press) and as a multi-media website on the WAC Clearinghouse, will include essays by forty university teachers/scholars who have been instrumental in designing and leading the initiatives to be described and analyzed.

The purposes of this anthology include (1) to reveal current trends in the teaching of writing across the disciplines in different countries and cultures, (2) provide structural and procedural models for other institutions, (3) demonstrate how specific initiatives derive from local and regional traditions, needs, and challenges—yet also draw on international influences in theory and research. In addition to the forty or more individual essays, the anthology will contain four to six “section essays” to be written by the editors. These essays will examine trends and traditions that influence teaching, learning, and literacy in a region. These essays will draw examples from the individual pieces of different countries to illustrate focal issues. Thus, these essays will attempt to do responsibly the synthesizing of the individual cases into generalizations about countries and cultures. Another feature of the publication will be a glossary of terms either specific to a few of the essays or that bear different meanings depending on cultural contexts.

The research categories and questions guiding the individual essays are as follows:

1. The size, brief history, and mission of the institution
2. Most salient geographic, economic, and cultural features of its location
3. What “literacy” and especially “writing” mean to students and teachers in this institution: why they write, in what languages and dialects, in relation to what goals?
4. Where and what students write in the institution: disciplines, genres, assignments
5. Who “cares” in the institution about student growth in and through writing? How is this concern--or lack of concern--shown in funding, requirements, attitudes, actions?
6. When and how have groups of teachers met to discuss and perhaps plan ways to help students grow as writers? What has resulted?
7. On what models, theories, authors, principles have courses or methods been based?

8. What have been your and the institution's successes in teaching writing?
9. What have been your unfulfilled ambitions in regard to student literacy/writing?
10. Can you describe individual students or events that embody or illustrate these successes and frustrations?

The anthology represents a further stage in the International WAC/WID Mapping Project (mappingproject.ucdavis.edu), which began in 2006 collecting entries to an online survey that asks several of the guiding questions. Most of the contributors to the current book are drawn from the list of 300-400 survey respondents.

In addition to describing details of the project, the panelists will cautiously generalize from the essays received in terms of (1) useful models of program development and (2) common challenges faced by initiators and methods of response.

Speaker One will describe the overall purposes and structure of the book, its origins in the WAC/WID Mapping Project, the projected timeline and future plans, and the projected contents in both the print and online versions. He will identify challenges presented by a publishing project that attempts both to find practical commonalities in programmatic development across cultures and languages and to honor the situatedness of development in local and regional contexts. Given that an international multi-media portal, the WAC Clearinghouse, is one of the publishing venues, he will explore the ways that the project wants to use the varied affordances of the portal in order to (1) realize the diversity and uniqueness of each profiled initiative and (2) facilitate ongoing connections and co-operation among contributors and site users. Based on his own and others' experience in similar program-oriented networking in a national, cross-institutional context, he will describe the useful lessons and the limits of such precedents.

Speaker Two will describe briefly the writing initiatives from Latin American countries and Spain that will be represented in the project. She will describe her objectives for this portion of the book, including the diversity of programs, program histories, and institutions, as well as the ways in which she hopes readers will use the information in both the book and the project website on the WAC Clearinghouse. She will also describe future plans for the information beyond this publication project.

Speaker Three will describe briefly the writing initiatives from the UK, Ireland, Australia, New Zealand and France that will be represented in the project. She will describe her objectives for this portion of the book, including the diversity of programs, program histories, and institutions, as well as the ways in which she hopes readers will use the information in both the book and the project website on the WAC Clearinghouse. She will also describe how she sees this project fitting within her prior and current research on writing centres in the UK.

Speaker Four has been involved in this project as a graduate research assistant for one year. Her task has been to help to manage correspondence with authors, editors, and translators, and maintain a database of all the essays by the contributors. She also helped the editors decide who to invite as contributors to the book. She has also been involved in copy editing the essays from various contributors. Given the international scope of our audience, we wanted to avoid Americanizing the syntax, idioms, and context of each essay. Instead, one of our main goals has been to appreciate the diversity of meanings,

methods, and characters of “the teaching of writing” happening in each locale. We came across terms and concepts in the essays that are new and challenging for many writing programs across the world. We are hoping that after reading what is happening in the teaching of writing across the disciplines in these countries, other teachers and writing directors will also attempt to experiment with structures and procedures at their universities. Thus, assembling something so culturally diverse in context required us to build a detailed glossary of information that will facilitate the readers’ understanding each essay better. As a reader and a copy editor of these essays, she has found it challenging to make sure that she does not influence the intended meaning originally captured in the essay. At the conference, she will be talking about: 1) the problems in putting together essays culturally and contextually diverse; 2) the need of a glossary in an anthology like this; 3) copy editing and understanding the needs of an internationally diverse audience

F2

Psychology Research Reports: An Analysis of Multiple Drafts

J. Craig Clarke, Salisbury University, U.S.

George Whitehead, Salisbury University, U.S.

Elizabeth H. Curtin, Salisbury University, U.S.

Laurence Becker, Salisbury University, U.S.

Overview. It may be an overstatement, but after trying to educate our students about the content of psychology, the activity we probably engage in most often is trying to help them communicate that knowledge effectively. And that usually means in writing. And that usually entails multiple rewrites and detailed feedback. With that as our foundation, the purpose of our panel is to describe procedures for using multiple drafts of reports in psychology research methods courses and to illustrate ways to evaluate those procedures.

Anyone who has ever written knows the importance of rewriting, although the writer may not be able to state clearly exactly what happens during rewriting. Scott, Koch, Scott and Garrison (1999) note that, "As you draft the paper, you may organize your next sentence while revising the one you have just written. Different parts of the writing process overlap, and much of the difficulty of writing occurs because so many things happen at once." (p. 13) Rosnow and Rosnow (2009, p. 97) observe that the problem has been exacerbated by modern technology, "... first draft, revision, and final draft are telescoped" ... and ... "the reason these stages lose their formal definition is that the word-processing system allows you, with the stroke of a key or the click of a mouse, to shift or change words, sentences, paragraphs, and even entire sections as you compose and revise." Nevertheless, books on writing psychology papers provide tips on rewriting with Parrott (1994), Rosnow and Rosnow (2009) and Scott, Koch, Scott and Garrison (1999) each offering six or more tips. Smyth (1996, p. 28) describes rewriting as involving discrete steps, while acknowledging that "research indicates that we are actually revising all the time, in every phase of the writing process, as we reread phrases, rethink the placement of an item in an outline, or test a new topic sentence for a paragraph." Composition theorists support this assertion, encouraging students to think of revision as perhaps the most essential aspect of the writing process (Murray, 1991; Willis, 1993).

Multiple Drafts of Psychology Research Reports: The Assignments

Dr. X and Dr. Y begin the panel by describing the research report procedures that each used in their sections of an undergraduate Psychology Research Methods II course during Fall Semester 2008, a methodology course required of all psychology majors. Both instructors required students to submit first and final drafts of experimental research reports.

Multiple Drafts of Psychology Research Reports: Does Readability Improve?

Dr. C describes how we collected the data about the nature of changes that students made from first to finals drafts. He then presents the results of the readability analyses of the introductory sections of the students' drafts. Our hypothesis was based on the work of Hartley, Soto and Pennebaker (2002), who had studied the readability of 19 influential psychology journal articles from a list of the 100 most influential works in cognitive science selected in January 2000 as part of the Cognitive Science Millennium

Project. Although limiting their analyses to the introductions or part of introductions in the texts, the results showed that the influential articles had higher Flesch Reading Ease scores than the control articles, and tended to be easier to read and have shorter sentences, more sentences per paragraph, and more passive sentences. Roberts, Fletcher, and Fletcher (1994) studied articles submitted and published in the *Annals of Internal Medicine* and found that peer review and editing improved the readability of both the abstracts and the manuscripts, although the improvements were small and the articles were still considered very difficult to read. We had hypothesized that the students' final research reports would be more readable than the first drafts following instructor grading and feedback.

Although the students' reports were edited and changed in several ways from first to final drafts, the readability indices do not reflect these changes. None of the readability indices (the Flesch Reading Score (M = 37.30 and M = 37.29) and associated Flesch-Kincaid grade level (M = 13.40 and M = 13.25), the Gunning Fog Index, (M = 15.14 and M = 15.02), The Coleman Liau Index (M = 13.32 and M = 13.41), the ARI (M = 13.774 and M = 13.55), and the SMOG index (M = 14.42 and M = 14.41) showed any change from first to final drafts. Overall, the readability indices suggest that the students were writing at a level appropriate for college students and at a level consistent with the studies cited earlier.

Multiple Drafts of Psychology Research Reports: Are They Worth the Effort?

Dr. A, former head of the Writing Across the Curriculum Program at our university, describes what research about the composing process suggests the students might do as they revise their first drafts of research papers and compares first and final drafts. If the readability did not change, should we expect to see other types of changes in their work? Summers (1982), and later Glenn and Goldwaite (2008), described the differences between the revisions novice writers would make and the revisions expert writers would make. Specifically novice writers tend to focus on surface features and rarely move beyond changing words or punctuation. In contrast expert writers tend to rethink purpose organization and audience, adding new information and reordering large sections of text. Based on this research we predicted these students mainly sophomores and juniors would be closer to the novices than the experts in the changes they made in revision.

The Microsoft Word Compare feature proved useful in identifying whether they were additions, deletions, or moves (moving a paragraph or part of a paragraph from one part of the paper to another), and a close examination of the revisions proved even more revealing than the categorization of type of and number of revisions. Of the 25 final drafts, nine reflected major revisions of substantive additions and occasionally a move; eleven demonstrated at least some substantive additions, sometimes in only one part of the paper; five suggested only minor changes. The revisions made by students in both course sections indicated that they had in fact made substantive changes, particularly in clarifying hypotheses and developing links between their studies and relevant research literature. Because she had first draft comments from one of the professors, Dr. Curtin was able to see direct links between the professor's comments and student revisions. Even without the first draft comments of the second professor, however, it was clear that students had revised the content of their papers substantially as they moved to final

drafts. Although readability levels did not vary from the first to final draft, the final drafts reflected more complete fulfillment of the assignments.

Multiple Drafts of Psychology Research Reports: Additional Thoughts

Finally, Drs. X & Y discuss aspects of the multiple draft procedure that do not relate to either the readability or comparison analyses. We found the benefit to be in the skill of doing a particular kind of writing. For example, edits usually involve a change in the structure and/or content, such as placing a hypothesis at the end of the introduction or removing a conclusion from the introduction.

Students need to be reminded of the purpose of the introduction. There are a number of errors that students make even after instruction about introductions. Students review studies but might not show how their hypotheses are derived from these studies. Specifically, they make no connection between the literature review and the generation of the hypothesis. As a result students state hypotheses without any rationale for them. In part, this reflects a failure to indicate what the previous research had found. A somewhat related issue is a student's reluctance to generate hypothesis without knowing the results of the research.

References

- Glenn, C., and Goldwaite, M. A. (2008). *The St. Martin's guide to teaching writing* (6th ed.). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Hartley, J., Soto, E., & Pennebaker, J. (2002). Style and substance in psychology: Are influential articles more readable than less influential ones? *Social Studies of Science*, 32(2), 321-334.
- Murray, D. (1991). *The craft of revision*. Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Roberts, J.C., Fletcher, R.H., & Fletcher, S.W. (1994). Effect of peer review and editing on readability of articles published in *Annals of Internal Medicine*. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 272, 119-121.
- Parrott III, L. (1994). *How to write psychology papers*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Rosnow, R.L., & Rosnow, M. (2009). *Writing papers in psychology* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Scott, J.M., Koch, R.E., Scott, G.M., & Garrison, S.M. (1999). *The psychology students writer's manual*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Sommers, N. (1982). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication*, 3(4), 378-388.
- Smyth, T.R. (1996). *Writing in psychology: A student guide* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Willis, M. S. (1993). *Deep revision*. New York: Teachers and Writers Collaborative.

F3

Technology and Writing

Second-Language Writing Pedagogy and the \$100 Laptop

John P. Madden, St. Cloud State University, U.S.

The One Laptop Per Child Association (OLPC) intends to improve education for children in developing countries by providing them a tough, child-friendly, inexpensive computer (the XO, or “\$100 laptop”). This presentation argues that the XO allows second language learners to improve their writing but that teachers will need support.

In terms of methodology, this paper reports on an examination of an XO from the point of view of a second-language writing teacher. In terms of data collection, the XO was tested on writing activities an L2 writing teacher and her students might undertake, including drafting, collaborative revision, and sharing among XOs and via the Internet, all activities suggested in de Szendeffy (2005). Detailed field notes were taken and analyzed for comparison to de Szendeffy's (2005) recommendations (see details see Madden, 2009).

In terms of results, like any laptop, the XO supports word processing and Web access, allowing the use of email, blogs, and wikis. However, in contrast to other laptops, groups of XOs can create local-area wireless networks, allowing L2 writers without Internet access to still collaborate on multimedia texts. Thus, the XO would support activities recommended in the literature on second language writing pedagogy (see de Szendeffy, 2005; Hyland, 2003; Bloch, 2007). The XO has been welcomed into communities and so the computer could change how learners acquire first and second language literacy. Still, successful technology initiatives support teachers (Cuban, 2001; Madden 2010).

In terms of significance, if second language writers have access to tools like the XO at younger ages, they have more opportunities to write what interests them and to reach much wider audiences (see, for example, Ito et al., 2008). Teachers will need to develop strategies to negotiate between second language writers and established academic genres (see for example, Bloch, 2007). Teachers will need to further develop their own skills of writing and collaborating, a challenge, given the relative isolation of the profession.

References

Bloch, J. (2007). Abdullah's blogging: A generation 1.5 student enters the blogosphere. *Language Learning & Technology*, 11, 2, 128-141. Retrieved August 27, 2010, from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol11num2/bloch/default.html>

Cuban, L. (2001). *Oversold and underused: Computers in the classroom*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

de Szendeffy, J. (2005). *A practical guide to using computers in language teaching*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. New York: Cambridge.

Ito, M., Horst, H. A., Bittanti, M., boyd, d., Herr-Stephenson, B., Lange, P. G, et al. (2008, November). *Living and learning with digital media: Summary of findings from the Digital Youth Project*. Retrieved August 27, 2010, <http://digitalyouth.ischool.berkeley.edu/files/report/digitalyouth-WhitePaper.pdf>

Madden, J. P. (2009). CALL and the "\$100 laptop." *CALL-EJ Online*, 11, 1, July 2009. Retrieved August 27, 2010, from <http://www.tell.is.ritsumei.ac.jp/callejonline/journal/11-1/madden.html>.

Madden, J. P. (2010). Limited environment: CALL and the XO. In J. Egbert (Ed.), *CALL in limited technology contexts: Problems and solutions* (pp. 19-30). San Marcos, TX: Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium (CALICO)

F3 (continued)

Technology and Writing

The XO Laptop as the Object of Learning in a Technical Communication Classroom: Documentation and Awareness

Lee S. Tesdell, Minnesota State University, U.S.

The XO laptop as the object of learning in a technical communication classroom: documentation and awareness Lee Tesdell, Minnesota State University, Mankato, Mankato, Minnesota Contact: lee.tesdell@mnsu.edu I have been using XO laptops for several years in my ongoing research into these computers as a teaching tool in my technical communication courses. At the same time the humanitarian and pedagogical philosophy behind the XO and the One Laptop Per Child (OLPC) program interests me. While on my sabbatical last year in Jerusalem I collected some initial reactions about the XO laptop from children of several friends. In addition, I have assigned my students in Minnesota to write documentation for the XO software over the past two years. I continue to be interested in both the effectiveness of the XO as an education tool for children (here I am influenced by the work of David Russell and others on activity systems in the composition classroom) and as an object of study for my technical communication students.

Research question My research question is the following: is the XO effective for teaching both (1) technical documentation and (2) the humanitarian and pedagogical message of the XO and OLPC project, in a U.S. university classroom? OLPC describes the XO in this way: "The XO is a potent learning tool designed and built especially for children in developing countries, living in some of the most remote environments. It's about the size of a small textbook. It has built-in wireless and a unique screen that is readable under direct sunlight for children who go to school outdoors. It's extremely durable, brilliantly functional, energy-efficient, and fun." Source: <http://laptop.org/en/laptop/index.shtml>. At the same time, a debate has been raging in the technology pedagogy literature about the effectiveness of the OLPC philosophy. Some educational leaders in developing countries have questioned its usefulness. In addition XO computer software development has met a number of hurdles.

Data collection and analysis I have collected anecdotal data over the last several years. This semester I am systematically collecting data as my student teams work with the XO laptops. This data will take two forms: (1) survey data that I will collect from my students with a questionnaire. I will ask my students to respond to my research question above. (2) I will conduct interviews with my students in order to get comprehensive responses from them about the research question.

In my analysis I will look for areas of interest within my two data sets. Since the data set will be rather small my goal is to find areas for further study.

References

Haertel, Hermann, Low-cost devices in educational systems: The use of the "XO-Laptop" in the Ethiopian Educational System Source: www.gg.rhul.ac.uk/ict4d/GTZlaptop.pdf
One Laptop Per Child (OLPC) website Source: <http://laptop.org/en/>
Rowell, Laurie, Can the "\$100 Laptop" Change the World? Source: <http://www.elearnmag.org/subpage.cfm?section=articles&article=43-1>

Russell, David, Activity Theory and Composition

Source: <http://www.mhhe.com/socscience/english/tc/russell/RussellModule2.htm>

Vota, Wayan, What Have We Learned From One Laptop Per Child?

Source: <http://edutechdebate.org/one-laptop-per-child-impact/what-have-we-learned/>

F3 (continued)

Technology and Writing

Early Social Networking: Uses of Email in a Professional Writing Group

Lee-Ann Kastman Breuch

This presentation shares results from a qualitative case study of a group of professional writers and their uses of email to support regular review sessions of their work. The case study addressed the research question: What forms of peer review seem most useful to professional writers and why? Another question addressed was: What motivates nonacademic writers to use technology for peer review?

Most scholarship on peer review has focused on academic or instructional contexts. In alignment with the process movement in writing pedagogy, many scholars focused on the benefits of peer review in the classroom and also in writing centers (Bruffee; Harris; Clark). As computers became more common in writing classrooms, so did online forms of peer review, as evidenced by scholarship on uses of email, software programs, chats and other synchronous technologies (Hewett; Hewett and Ehmann; Breuch; Harrington et al.).

This case study continues a discussion of peer review, but it explores peer review in the context of a professional writing group. This case study occurred over a six-month period, during which time I observed one writing group with eight participants. All participants in the writing group were working on manuscripts for publication—some fiction and some non-fiction. I surveyed the writers, observed three writing workshops, and collected email discussions during the six-month period.

A content analysis of email messages demonstrated that half of the total email messages were task-oriented and addressed issues of procedure/meeting coordination (P), submission of manuscript (S), or constructive critique of manuscripts (C). Within these task-oriented messages, the majority of messages were procedural in nature (P) while less than 10% of the messages actually included constructive critique (C). The remaining half of messages were interpersonal in nature. These messages included personal stories and insights, messages of support for other members, and off-task talk on topics of mutual interest to the group, much like a listserv. An example is a cluster of messages addressing the *Million Little Pieces* memoir scandal. Members discussed the relevance of the scandal to their own work.

Surveys confirmed that there is a definite preference for a hybrid (electronic and face-to-face) review process in this group that involved three steps: (1) delivery of manuscript via email; (2) written commentary on manuscript; (3) face-to-face discussion of manuscript. Survey results confirm that members prefer email for delivery due to convenience, but for written commentary, most members said they prefer handwritten comments because it provides a better sense of reader response. All members preferred face-to-face discussion of manuscripts for a variety of reasons: better brainstorming, improved tracking of comments, more fun, and most complete discussion. Members clearly valued email for staying connected to one another between meetings; in fact, many members commented how their group had led to deep and strong interpersonal friendships.

This study left some questions unanswered, such as why members did not often provide electronic critique on drafts. As well, it is interesting that the use of email for interpersonal connections played such an important role in this group's interactions. This study occurred before the advent of social networking technologies; however, the uses of email for this writing group strongly resembled characteristics of social networks that we see today. The presentation will explore these similarities and the interpersonal nature of this professional writing group.

F4

Understanding Linguistically Diverse Students in Higher Education

Hidden in Plain Sight: Recognizing and Serving Heritage Language Speakers in College Composition Classes

Patricia C. Hironymous, Glendale Community College, U.S.

Piper Rooney, Glendale Community College, U.S.

Our recent study at Glendale Community College reveals that 74% of students enrolled in 36 sections of developmental English are Heritage Language (HL) speakers. Although placed in English courses as native speakers, many of these students show evidence of non-native speaker errors in their writing. We are piloting a developmental English course in the fall 2010 designed for this population and will include curricular and statistical information from that course in this presentation.

The term “heritage language” is defined as a language acquired at an early age in the home that is different from the dominant language of the community. A “heritage language speaker” is someone who may still speak that early language or who may only understand but no longer speak it at some point later in his or her life. A heritage language is the language acquired first by the child, but usually around school age, the child has switched to the dominant language of the culture he or she is living in. Thus, the language that was acquired second becomes the dominant language for the speaker.

When students enter college, most college assessment centers ask students what their first language is in order to determine whether an English test or an ESL test should be given. A native speaker of English would answer that his or her first language is English. An ESL student would say his or her first language is a language other than English, since that is the language spoken in his or her home country. This seemingly direct question is not as easy for the HL speaker to answer. For example, some students’ first language might have been Spanish, but their dominant language became English. The students might end up in either an ESL course or a developmental English or freshman composition course, depending on how they answer that question and how they are tested. HL speakers are born in the United States or come here at an early age. They will often be given an English placement test based on the fact that they are citizens and/or have no discernable accent. College assessment centers do not typically consider HL speakers as a group with its own specific language needs.

Although HL speakers have always been a part of American culture, it is only recently that colleges and universities in the U.S. have begun to address the needs of this population by establishing formal centers and programs such as the Center for World Languages at the University of California, Los Angeles. These institutions and others have offered foreign language courses designed for HL speakers for many years, such as “Spanish for Native Speakers,” but only a few such as Georgetown University have begun to provide English instruction for HL speakers.

In an effort to help programs more effectively promote academic success among HL speakers, this presentation will report quantitative data collected at Glendale Community College about its HL population. Further, it will provide information about the characteristics of HL speakers, their prevalence within institutions, challenges they face as they pursue post-secondary education, and ways of helping them achieve academic success. Specifically, this presentation will demonstrate the need for

developmental English courses designed especially for HL speakers through discussion of our pilot course for HL speakers in the fall of 2010. The pilot course will include overt teaching of vocabulary and word forms, grammar and usage in context, sentence types, and even some basic linguistics, providing a metalanguage so that the HL speaker can identify and address his or her own language needs. We believe that a writing course designed specifically for HL speakers can be a first and crucial step toward academic success for this previously unidentified and underserved population.

F4 (continued)

Understanding Linguistically Diverse Students in Higher Education

Generation 1.5 Students Transitioning to College: A Longitudinal View

Amanda Kibler, University of Virginia, U.S.

As the fastest-growing segment of the K-12 school population in the United States, language minority students have also become increasingly visible in higher education, where their experiences in U.S. elementary and secondary schools clearly differentiate them from international students who arrive in the country as adults or as university undergraduate or graduate students. Such students arrive to higher education with incredibly diverse backgrounds: while some have achieved impressive academic and linguistic success, others have been marginalized into ESL “ghettos” (Valdés, 2001) or forgotten in mainstream classes (Fu, 1995).

A relative silence in the second language education profession regarding resident ESL writers (Matsuda & Matsuda, 2009) has been replaced with a surge in college composition research into the academic strengths and needs of these students, commonly labeled “Generation 1.5” (e.g., Roberge et al, 2009; Harklau et al, 1999). Such work explores the social, academic, linguistic, and institutional complexities of these students’ backgrounds and post-secondary experiences, but relatively fewer studies (Allison, 2009; Harklau, 2000) attempt to document students’ writing experiences as they move from secondary to tertiary settings.

This paper presents findings from portions of the fourth and fifth years of an eight-year longitudinal qualitative study of five Generation 1.5 students, a period of time covering students’ senior year of high school and their first months of post-secondary training, which for these students includes university, community college, cosmetology school, and the novitiate. Data collection includes interviews, observations, writing assignments, and writing samples that document students’ academic, social, cultural, and linguistic experiences related to writing in these diverse settings.

This study addresses the following research questions:

- How do the genres in which these Generation 1.5 students write differ from secondary to post-secondary settings?
- How do participants describe the literacy demands presented by post-secondary writing tasks? How do participants compare them to their secondary experiences?

This study takes the perspective that when Generation 1.5 students write, they are not simply learning “academic writing”: they are developing *contextualized communicative competence* (Cazden, 2010) that is responsive to new sets of demands, expectations, and ideologies. These strikingly different settings at the post-secondary level offer students opportunities to expand their linguistic repertoires (Hoyle & Adger, 1998) but also present new academic and linguistic demands for writing.

Drawing upon both a socioliterate analysis (Johns, 1999) of students’ writing assignments and a grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) approach to analysis of observations and interviews, findings from data currently being collected and analyzed indicate that while significant differences exist between the written genres assigned at secondary and post-secondary levels, there is greater variation *among* the various post-

secondary settings in which students find themselves. Challenges with writing faced by many of these students suggest several ways in which secondary writing instruction can better facilitate Generation 1.5 students' transitions to academic and vocational post-secondary environments.

References

- Allison, H. (2009). High school academic literacy instruction and the transition to college writing. In M. Roberge, M. Siegal, M., & Harkalu, L. (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 75-90). New York: Routledge.
- Cazden, C. (2010). *Approaches to research in language classrooms*. Paper presented at the TESOL Annual Conference, Boston, MA.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New Brunswick: AldineTransaction.
- Fu, D. (1995). *My trouble is my English: Asian students and the American dream*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the "good kids" to the "worst": Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 35-67.
- Harklau, L., Losey, K. M., & Siegal, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Generation 1.5 meets college composition*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hoyle, S., & Adger, C. (1998). Introduction. In S. Hoyle & C. Adger (Eds.), *Kids talk: Strategic language use in later childhood* (pp. 3-22). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Johns, A. (1999). Opening our doors: Applying socioliterate approaches to language minority classrooms. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition* (pp. 159-171). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Matsuda, A. (2009). The erasure of resident ESL writers. In M. Roberge, M. Siegal, M., & L. Harkalu (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 50-64). New York: Routledge.
- Roberge, M., Siegal, M., & Harkalu, L. (Eds.) (2009). *Generation 1.5 in college composition: Teaching academic writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL*. New York: Routledge.
- Valdés, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

F4 (continued)

Understanding Linguistically Diverse Students in Higher Education

Learner Characteristics and Writing Performance in a Community College ESL Course: Some Unexpected Findings

Olga D. Lambert, Benedictine University, U.S.

Today's community colleges offer English as a second language (ESL) instruction to ever-increasing numbers of students. The unique role of community college ESL courses is their focus on academic literacy, providing a "bridge" between basic ESL and mainstream academic content courses (Blumenthal, 2002; Song, 2006). Some of the factors that contribute to adult ESL students' success or failure in acquiring academic literacy include opportunities to interact with speakers of standard English, immigration status and integration issues, work and family obligations, and affective variables such as needs, motivations, and emotional states (Scarcella, 2002; Song, 2006).

This study investigates the relationships between the above factors and gain in writing performance as measured by a standardized writing assessment in a sample of community college academic ESL students. ESL students often struggle with writing not only because of their difficulties with English, but also because academic discourse conventions, expectations, and methods of evaluating writing differ from country to country.

The research was conducted at an urban community college in the Northeast, as part of a larger study of adult ESL students' experiences with learning and using English. The ethnically and linguistically diverse convenience sample included 76 students (43 women, 32 men, 1 who did not indicate gender) enrolled in academic ESL courses. I used multiple regression to investigate whether learner characteristics, as measured by the questionnaire I designed (Lambert, 2008), predicted students' progress in their ESL courses as measured by a standardized writing assessment (REEP Writing Assessment, 2005) in February and May 2008.

I found that on average, employed students showed less improvement in their writing than students who did not work. Moreover, among employed students, those who cared for children under 18 and used more English at work tended to show smaller gains in their writing scores over the course of the semester, while those who used more English at home showed larger gains. While the negative effects of working and caring for children on writing score gain are not surprising, the finding that using more English (as opposed to one's native language) at work was associated with less improvement is unexpected. In my presentation, I will address possible reasons for this finding and its implications.

Among unemployed students, more years of English study in the home country and planning to return home were associated with greater gains. Moreover, those who planned to return to the home country were less likely to be anxious about using English and to believe that they were too old to learn English well. Immigrant students may feel that they need to master English to native-like levels, which they perceive as a very difficult, if not impossible, task, while those who plan to return to their home countries may consider any knowledge of English to be an advantage and are not under pressure to learn it "perfectly." Again, the implications of this finding for practice will be addressed.

References

- Blumenthal, A. (2002). English as a second language at the community college: An exploration of context and concerns. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 117*, 45-53.
- Lambert, O.D. (2008). Who are our students? Measuring learner characteristics in adult immigrants studying English. *Adult Basic Education and Literacy Journal, 2(3)*, 162-173.
- REEP Writing Assessment (2005). Retrieved from <http://www.arlington.k12.va.us/15401081182015517/lib/15401081182015517/RWA/index.html> on April 25, 2008.
- Scarcella, R. (2002). Some key factors affecting English learners' development of advanced literacy. In M. J. Schleppegrell & M.C. Colombi (Eds.), *Developing advanced literacy in first and second languages*, (pp. 209-226). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Song, B. (2006). Failure in a college ESL course: Perspectives of instructors and students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30*, 417-431.

F5**College Writing, Studying Academic Genres of Social Participation in Comparable Cultures**

The Conception of the Role of Writing in University Studies in Brazil

Judith C. Hoffnagel, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil

This paper reports part of the results of research in progress on the role of writing in university studies in Brazil. Starting from the idea that each new social situation in today's post-modern world requires the acquisition of new literacy practices, the larger research project investigates writing as a social activity and, more specifically, its role in the realization of social actions, identity construction and the exercise of agency. The study is based on theories of genre, identity, social literacy and agency. Through ethnographic observations of situations of use and production of writing, in the university context, interviews with social actors (professors and graduate students), and linguistic analyses of written texts, the investigation seeks to discover the processes of acquisition of written genres characteristic of different disciplinary areas and the contribution this acquisition makes towards the construction of professional identities and the exercise of agency. The results to be presented here refer to the conception of writing held by professors and students and their perception of the role it plays in graduate studies. With rare exceptions writing is not a part of the university curriculum (undergraduate or graduate) in Brazil such that there is little formal attention given to writing. There is, however, an official manual for the writing of different genres published by the ABNT (Associação Brasileira de Normas Técnicas) which establishes the "rules" for appropriate forms of writing, with a section on academic genres. There are also a fairly large number of unofficial manuals available commercially that purport to make writing of different academic genres "simple" and/or "easy". The existence of these manuals suggests that there is at some level the recognition of a need for writing instruction. Professors complain that students do not know how to write ("express their ideas well") and students believe the writing problems often pointed out by their professors are due to lack of specialized disciplinary knowledge (content) rather than to problems of linguistic expression (coherence, reference, topic progression, etc.). In general, students seem less aware of the role of writing in the graduate school context and while professors are slightly more cognizant of its importance, they too have difficulty in specifying aspects or consequences of not writing well.

F5 (continued)

College Writing, Studying Academic Genres of Social Participation in Comparable Cultures

Educational Genres and Genre Practices in European Higher Education

Otto Kruse, Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

The educational genres used in European higher education have distinct histories. Some of them are rooted in rhetorical practices going back as far as the Middle Ages. Others are derived from seminar teaching, thus connecting writing with research and critical thinking. A third kind of genre may be related to professional writing or may be an outcome of the new electronic communication media. The study of genres in different European writing cultures embraces a great number of old and new genres which vary from discipline to discipline and which are in constant transition.

I will report on a European research project carried out within the COST Action “The European Research Network on Learning to Write Effectively” which attempts to get access to the variety of genres and their uses in Europe’s higher education systems. The methodological problems of comparing genres in different languages and of assessing genres and genre practices in their various contexts constitute the main part of the presentation. To understand genres in context, it is necessary to outline basic features of writing cultures and to explain the functions and forms of those genres within such national and disciplinary cultures. I will report on results obtained and show how quantitative and qualitative data have to be linked to understand writing cultures.

F5 (continued)

College Writing, Studying Academic Genres of Social Participation in Comparable Cultures

Undergraduate Writing, Disciplines, and the Liberal Arts: Analytic Insights and Cross-cultural Dialogue

Christiane Donahue, Dartmouth College, U.S.

In U.S. liberal arts higher education institutions, students participate in diffuse and diverse modes of “disciplinarity” during most of their undergraduate years. Reporting on selected results from a longitudinal study of twenty students’ written work in a U.S. university, in both general education courses and courses in a variety of disciplines, I will focus on the evolution of students’ writing and related disciplinary awareness as they develop in this educational model. Using two types of text (the more generic “analysis” and the more discipline-oriented “research” essays), written by three students in Psychology, Biology, and Philosophy, I will cross-reference their spoken words (interview) with two features in the students’ written texts (subject positioning and intertextual moves). Their texts and interviews provide material for studying their movement towards “full participation” or mature participation (Prior 1998) in communities of practice. The study of the interviews uses content analysis; the study of the written texts uses analytic methods grounded in a synthesis of French and U.S. linguistics scholarship (François, Maingeneau, Prior, Bazerman, all as inspired by bakhtinian thinking): coding for a range of intertextual moves, from direct quote to allusion or commonplaces, and for a range of subject positions, from pronoun-based to syntactic or referential. The cross-referenced analyses serve to highlight aspects of students’ negotiations with knowledge-making and discourse in both general education and discipline-specific work. These negotiations offer insight into variations, heterogeneity, non-linearity, and the possibility of parallel stages of expertise and non-expertise in student writers’ status. The study results suggest that students become fairly aware, as seen in interviews over time, of convention-driven differences in different discursive contexts, but far less aware of the epistemological nature of disciplinary writing and of understandings of the disciplinary knowledge-making that occurs in composing. And yet their writing shows clear evolution into mature practices, with respect to, for example, source use, and they acquire a set of ways of articulating writing experiences. This contrasts with students’ construction of “disciplinary consciousness” in a very different higher education context, in France, as defined by Reuter 2007 and further pursued by Lahanier-Reuter and Delcambre 2009. The U.S. context differs sharply from the French model of early disciplinary focus, providing a particularly useful window into writing, disciplinary knowledge, and discursive expertise. The liberal arts model appears, in the cases studied, to sharpen disciplinary questions at the conventional level for students because it asks them to engage across communities of practice, but not necessarily at the epistemological level (see as well Sommers in press). We currently hypothesize that some mature practices might develop for a time without an accompanying meta-awareness, in the U.S. context of liberal arts undergraduate education. These observations lead to the broader questions about intercultural dialogue that I hope this presentation will pose, questions regarding international exchanges about writing research and writing instruction: how does or can our work account for deep,

naturalized differences in educational and disciplinary framing? How can we pursue research that fosters these explorations in ways that turn us to reflecting on ourselves?

F6

Peer Review in Undergraduate Writing

The Impact of Peer Review Workshops on Disciplinary Identity: Student Writing in Psychology

Janine M. Utell, Widener University, U.S.

Naureen Bhullar, Widener University, U.S.

Peer review has become a widely employed component of teaching student writing across the disciplines. Teachers who implement peer review strategies into their pedagogy value the process for the ways it improves critical thinking, increases understanding of the revision process, and exposes students to a variety of voices and perspectives. By highlighting student intentionality as authors and fostering conversation about communication, student writers develop an awareness of audience and of the value of collaboration. Despite the wealth of information about effective creation of peer critique opportunities, little research has been done on its value, especially in the improvement of the quality of the writing as well as the construction of student writer confidence and disciplinary identity in specific fields of study.

The role of peer review in student work emerges from a process-oriented approach to teaching writing. Process-oriented pedagogy has been a dominant force in composition studies since the 1970s (Perl, 1980; Sommers, 1992; Elbow, 2000; Hauptle, 2006). It is characterized by an awareness of the multiple stages a writer must go through in order to make meaning; a priority placed on facilitating the steps of drafting and revising; and an openness to dialogue and conversation as part of the process. In the Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines movement, this understanding of the development of the student writer is coupled with a model of the student writer as participant in a discipline; writing thus becomes a way to foster disciplinary identity, learn the vocabulary of a particular discipline, and enter into the ongoing conversations of a field (Russell, 2002). Student writers are cast as apprentices, writing to learn their discipline and learning to write as members of that discipline.

Peer critique has been a crucial component of the process-oriented writing classroom since the pedagogy's early days (DiPardo & Freedman, 1988). In peer critique, student writers respond to each other's work in terms of authorship: focus is on the choices made, clarifying and validating the intent of the author (Brufee, 1999; Graham, 1999). Teachers have developed generally consistent methodologies for facilitating such workshop experiences both in and out of the classroom; it is widely accepted that such clear and consistent guidelines are necessary for student success while also allowing room for conversation and collaboration (Paton, 2002; Hauptle, 2006). Just as students must learn how to think of themselves as authors, they must learn to see themselves as collaborators and to recognize the value of the input and feedback of their fellow students (Rutz, 2002).

Concomitant with this process, returning to WAC/WID pedagogy, is the development of disciplinary and professional identity. Peer critique can play a vital role in this process as well. As students come to see themselves as authors and their classmates as collaborators, they come to see the work they do as writers as embedded in a particular field of knowledge (Fulwiler, 1984; Walvoord and Robison, 1990). Furthermore, in effective peer critique, student writing becomes a means by which

authors can participate in an ongoing conversation, about their own development and about their engagement with their discipline (Hauptle, 2006).

We (an interdisciplinary team consisting of three faculty from psychology and one from English) are in the second semester of a study employing both qualitative and quantitative approaches which aims to discern the impact of peer review workshops in lower-level psychology courses on student writing. We are particularly interested in the role peer review plays in fostering student writer confidence and a sense of disciplinary identity. Our co-presented paper will focus on our findings from the first two years of this (non-longitudinal) study. After describing our methodology, procedure, and modes of analysis, we will present our findings from student surveys and from the analysis of student writing, both formal essays and post-workshop reflections.

Six sections of Human Growth and Development over two semesters were studied (three control, three experimental). In the control group, essays were assigned with no peer review workshop experience. In the experimental, a faculty member from the English department and Writing Center (Utell) led a peer review workshop, including reflective writing; students then conducted peer review workshops on two assignments. Both groups were given surveys to assess their attitudes towards their writing, particularly their confidence in their writing in psychology and their sense of dialogue and collaboration around disciplinary concerns and questions; these surveys were administered pre and post grading. Finally, papers from all sections were rated according to a rubric to determine shifts in students' competence related to writing in the discipline. Our findings thus far are preliminary, and we hope to be able to present further data at future conferences. In February, we would be able to present our data from the current Spring 2010 semester, which we are currently analyzing. Speaker One (Utell) would provide the research background emerging from composition studies and WID; Speaker Two (Bhullar) would detail the methodology and analysis; both speakers would address conclusions drawn, both from the writing perspective (Utell) and the discipline-specific perspective (Bhullar).

References

- Bruffee, K. *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- DiPardo, A. & S. Freedman. (1988). Peer response groups in the writing classroom: Theoretic foundations and new directions. *Review of Educational Research*, 58, 119-149.
- Elbow, P. (2000). *Everyone can write: Essays towards a hopeful theory of writing and teaching writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fulwiler, T. (1984). How well does writing across the curriculum work? *College English*, 46, 113-125.

- Graham, R. (1999). The self as writer: Assumptions and identities in the writing workshop. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 43, 358-364.
- Hauptle, C. (2006). Liberating dialogue in peer review: Applying Liz Lerman's critical response process to the writing classroom. *Issues in Writing*, 16, 162-183.
- Paton, F. (2002). Approaches to productive peer review. In D. Roen (Ed.), *Strategies for teaching first-year composition* (pp. 290-301). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Perl, S. (1980). Understanding composing. *College Composition and Communication*, 31, 363-369.
- Russell, D. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history* (2nd ed.). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rutz, C. (2002). One dimension of response to student writing: How students construct their critics. In D. Roen (Ed.), *Strategies for teaching first-year composition* (pp. 329-338). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Sommers, N. (1992). Between the drafts. *College Composition and Communication*, 43, 23-31.
- Walvoord, B. & Robison, S. (1990). Using social science to help oneself and others: Robison's human sexuality course. In B. Walvoord and L. McCarthy (Ed.), *Thinking and writing in college: A naturalistic study of students in four disciplines* (pp. 144-176). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

F6 (continued)

Peer Review in Undergraduate Writing

Learning Writing by Reviewing

*Kwangsue Cho, University of Missouri, Columbia & Sungkyunkwan
University, South Korea*

Charles MacArthur, University of Delaware

Writing well is one of the key competencies most students in the U.S. as well as other countries lack across all ages. A fundamental reason for this unfortunate situation is that students do not have opportunities to practice writing (National Commission on Writing, 2003). To address this *writing proficiency crisis* (Graham & Perin, 2007), institutions of higher education in the U.S. invest considerable financial and pedagogical resources to endow students with opportunities to practice writing with feedback by making instructor/expert feedback available for students.

A very different approach is to use peer assistance or collaboration in the form of peer reviewing such as collaborative writing, peer commenting, peer conference, peer editing, peer revision, and peer reviewing. Over the past 25 years, scholars of rhetoric and composition have continually emphasized the importance of participation in peer review. In peer reviews, individual students read and critically analyze peer drafts to detect problems and generate solutions to improve the problems. As Haswell (2005) noted, peer review seems to be “the least studied of practices now very common in college writing classrooms” (Haswell, 2005, p. 211).

In this research, a *Learning Writing by Reviewing* hypothesis was tested. The hypothesis emphasizes that learners can improve their own writing skills by engaging in peer review of writing. The goal of this study was to examine how engaging in peer reviewing can help the reviewer’s own writing skill development. In spite of rich and diverse literature on feedback, past studies focused on the impact of feedback on feedback receivers’ learning and performance (e.g. Kulik & Kulik, 1988) or receivers’ reaction to given feedback (e.g. Coleman, Jussim, & Issac, 1991; Zellermayer, 1989). Also recent comprehensive reviews on feedback in general (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996) in education (Hattie & Timmerley, 2007) and in writing research (Beach, & Friedrich, 2006; Graham & Perin, 2007) did not include the learning by reviewing hypothesis. This is not surprising because most feedback studies assume feedback from a person in a higher status such as an instructor rather than students.

Although little empirical research exists on the role of reviewing on reviewers’ learning to write, a handful of writing studies have investigated the role of observing or reading others’ writing in learning to write: how observing models’ writing improves the observer’s writing skills (e.g. Braaksma, Rijlaarsdam, van den Bergh, & van Hout-Wolters, 2004; Couzijn, 1999; Graham, Harris, & Troia, 1998; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2002). These observational learning studies provide student writers with opportunities of observing (peer or expert) models drafting papers.

To test the hypothesis that students would learn to write by reviewing peer writing, an experimental study was carried out. The participants were randomly assigned to one of the three conditions: Reviewing, Reading, and No Reviewing-or-Reading conditions. The students in the reviewing condition significantly outperformed those in the reading

condition and in the no-reading-or-reviewing condition. Therefore, this research provides support for the use and adoption of peer reviewing of writing as a learning activity.

Peer Review in Undergraduate Writing (continued)

Informal Peer Response and Learning to Write in Higher Education

Paul M. Rogers, George Mason University

In higher education, studies of response have focused mainly on the written comments of teachers, and their impact on the revision of student texts. Other main lines of response research include the influence of peer-to-peer conferencing on text revision (Nystrand & Brandt, 1989; Patchan, Charney & Schunn, 2009), and the impact of teacher response on second language learners. In recent years, however, a number of researchers have sought to give more attention to student's perspectives on response. These studies have expanded the scope of response research by making more visible the many "institutional, interpersonal, and personal" (e.g. Prior, 1995) contexts in which response occurs.

This presentation extends the inquiry into the complexities of response by investigating student's perspectives on response given by peers in informal settings. Data for this study are drawn from a five-year longitudinal study of 39 writers at the same institution of higher education. Transcripts of interviews were coded using a matrix of variables demonstrated to impact learning to write in higher education (Rogers, 2010), which did not include peer responses in informal contexts. However, the student responses related to informal peer response indicated that this is a vibrant area of student interaction with readers. Furthermore, student descriptions of these interactions suggest key attributes in responders and responses, which greatly fostered student's sense of their own writing development.

Nystrand, M. & D. Brandt. (1989) Response to writing as a context for learning to write. In C. Anson (Ed.). *Writing and Response: Theory, Practice, and Research*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Patchan, M. M., Charney, D., & Schunn, C. D. (2009). A validation study of students' end comments: Comparing comments by students, a writing instructor, and a content instructor. *Journal of Writing Research*, 1(2), 124-152.

Prior, P. (1995). Tracing authoritative and internally persuasive discourses: A case study of response, revision, and disciplinary enculturation. *Research in the Teaching of English* (29)3, 288-325.

Rogers, P.M. (2010). The contributions of North American longitudinal studies of writing in higher education to our understanding of writing development. In C. Bazerman, R. Krut, K. Lunsford, .S. McLeod, S. Null, P.M. Rogers and A. Stansell (Eds.). *Traditions of Writing Research*. Oxford, UK: Routledge.

F7

Teachers' Collaborative Writing in Three Metaphors

Michael Sherry, Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania, U.S.

Christine Dawson, Michigan State University, U.S.

Ann Lawrence, Michigan State University, U.S.

“...Collaboration is hardly a monolith. Instead it comes in a dizzying variety of modes about which we know almost nothing.”

—Andrea Lunsford

This panel seeks to complicate notions of collaborative writing, particularly of teachers' collaborative writing. Much has been written about collaborative writing in the workplace (Bellifore, Defoe, Follinsbee, Hunter, & Jackson, 2004; Bernhardt & Garay, 1998; Brandt, 1998, 2001; Cross, 2000; Gee, Hull, & Lankshear, 1996; Hull, 1997), as well as in the classroom (Bruffee, 1984, 1993; Ede & Lunsford, 1992; Fontaine & Hunter, 2005). But what about when the classroom *is* the workplace, as is the case for teachers? And how might we account for the liminal spaces of teacher writing groups, which, while composed of colleagues, may focus on non-professional writing genres? Moreover, what happens when collaboration is integral to independent writing projects? This panel will present possibilities for thinking anew notions of collaborative writing, offering three metaphors: collaborative writing as framing, as revoicing, and as mourning. Each presentation will explore illustrations generated in three studies of different moments in a teaching career: the teacher-preparation internship year, the first year of teaching, and the years of education doctoral study following a career of K-12 teaching. This panel will theorize how teachers' collaborative writing might operate in each of these transitional moments.

Teachers' Collaborative Writing as Framing: Student-Teachers' Lesson Planning

Learning to write a lesson plan is often an important focus of teacher preparation (Smagorinsky & Whiting, 1995). Indeed, Wertsch (1991) has suggested that "the lesson" is a genre which "arises in and struggles to play a dominant role in a specific sociocultural setting, that of formal schooling" (110). While composing a lesson plan has often been conceived of as an individual task informed by a teacher's beliefs about students and curriculum (AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education, Cochran-Smith, & Zeichner, 2005), the first presentation explores the lesson plan as a heterogeneous site of collaboration and struggle.

Drawing on the sociolinguistic concept of the "interactional frame" (Goffman, 1981, 1986) or the collaboratively negotiated roles, relationships, and responses possible in a social situation, I examine how teachers in a teacher preparation course collaboratively planned lessons using an online wiki (a website any class member could edit) in preparation for teaching them to their peers. This online forum allowed tracing of the production history of each lesson as teachers repeatedly framed and reframed the interactions they envisioned in the lessons according to state standards, a sense of audience, and their negotiations with colleagues.

Attention to lesson plans as a dynamic, collaborative genre promises to provide new understanding of an often over-looked and under-valued form of professional writing

which stands at the intersection of school and university teacher preparation, and of students, teachers, and administration.

Teachers' Collaborative Writing as Inventing: First-Year Teachers' Online Writing Group

For decades, writing researchers and instructors have encouraged K-12 teachers to engage in their own writing projects, as a means to enrich and inform their pedagogy and establish authority as writing teachers (Dahl, 1992; Gillespie, 1991; Kittle, 2008). Yet this engagement in writing, beyond teachers' everyday professional work, is sometimes experienced as an added burden, one more demand on teachers' time and energy (Jost, 1990). These concerns may be especially salient for first-year teachers, whose self-sponsored writing (Emig, 1971) can be easily overwhelmed by the day-to-day complexities of learning to teach.

This study examines the collaborative writing experiences of four first-year teachers who, together with the researcher (their former university instructor), formed an online writing group in order to grow as writers and teachers during this transitional time. The group utilized Skype (free online phone program) and a shared wiki to create a virtual meeting space for their bi-monthly meetings. Data collection for this study focuses on the talk and texts associated with the first year of meetings, including audiotapes and transcripts, field notes, participant writing, wiki postings, and email correspondence.

This study seeks to better understand the patterns of social interaction in this collaborative writing setting. To analyze these data, I draw primarily on discourse analytic methods (Gee, 1991) and a dialogic perspective (Bakhtin, 1981), considering the varied data sources (transcripts, draft writing, emails, etc.) as connected, overlapping turns in an ongoing conversation. Findings indicate that as the participants wrote collaboratively, they were involved in multiple and multimodal processes of voicing and revoicing (Herbel-Eisenmann, Drake, & Cirillo, 2009; Hirst, 2003; Michaels & O'Connor, 1993; O'Connor & Michaels, 1993). For example, a participant may voice a conflict she is feeling first through her writing and then revoice this conflict as she talks about her text. Analysis of group members' talk shows them engaged in additional layers of revoicing, as they respond to the writer and text and as they also use these to revoice their own texts and related experiences. In exploring collaborative writing *as* revoicing, this presentation explores the ways revoicing supports participants' invention of both written texts and "ways of being" as teachers and writers.

Teachers' Collaborative Writing as Mourning: Education Doctoral Students' Extracurricular Research-Writing Groups

The third presentation will explore narratives of learning, and not learning, to write drawn from a five-year study of former K-12 teachers' participation, as education doctoral students, in extracurricular research-writing groups. In this talk, I will discuss stories in which writing is compared to delivering a stillborn baby, abandoning an unwanted child, living with a monster, and surviving rape. I will draw on literacy historian Deborah Brandt's (1998, 2001) notion of "literacy sponsorship," and on ethical philosopher Judith Butler's (2006, 2009) notions of "precarity" and "grievability," to argue that in framing literacy as contingent—as vulnerable to change, misrecognition,

and failure—we make it possible to grieve writers’ loss of certain ways of writing in learning others. Moreover, I will show how thinking about former teachers’/future education researchers’ collaborative writing as mourning generates possibilities for reimagining the preparation of education researchers.

References

- AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education, Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. M. (2005). *Studying teacher education : The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bellifore, M. E., Defoe, T. A., Folinsbee, S., Hunter, J., and Jackson, N. (2004). *Reading work: Literacies in the new workplace*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bernhardt, S. A., & Garay, M. S. (Eds.). (1998). *Expanding literacies: English teaching and the new workplace*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Brandt, D. (1998). Sponsors of literacy. *College Composition, and Communication*, 49(2), 165-185.
- Brandt, D. (2001). *Literacy in American lives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brandt, D. (2005). Writing for a living: Literacy and the knowledge economy. *Written Communication*, 22(2), 166-197.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the “conversation of mankind.” *College English*, 46(7), 635-652.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1993). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Butler, J. (2006). *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. London: Verso.
- Butler, J. (2009). *Frames of war: When Is Life Grievable?* London: Verso.
- Cross, G. (2000). *Forming the collective mind: A contextual exploration of large-scale collaborative writing in industry*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Dahl, K. L. (Ed.). (1992). *Teacher as writer: Entering the professional conversation*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (1992). *Single text/plural authors: Perspectives on collaborative writing*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing processes of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Fontaine, S. I., & Hunter, S. M. (Eds.) (2005). *Collaborative writing in composition studies*. London: Wadsworth.
- Gee, J., Hull, G., & Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: Behind the language of the new capitalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge.
- Gillespie, T. (1991). Joining the debate: *Shouldn't writing teachers write?* *The Quarterly of the National Writing Project*, 13(3), 3-6.
- Goffman, E. (1981). Footing. In *Forms of Talk*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Goffman, E. (1986). *Frame analysis : an essay on the organization of experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Herbel-Eisenmann, B., Drake, C., & Cirillo, M. (2009). "Muddying the clear waters": Teachers' take-up of the linguistic idea of revoicing. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(2), 268-277.
- Hirst, E. (2003). Diverse voices in a second language classroom: Burlesque, parody, and mimicry. *Language and Education*, 17(3), 174-191.
- Hull, G. (Ed.) (1997). *Changing work, changing workers: Critical perspectives on language, literacy, and skills*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Jost, K. (1990). Why high-school writing teachers should not write (rebuttal). *English Journal*, 79(3), 65-66.
- Kittle, P. (2008). *Write beside them: Risk, voice, and clarity in high school writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Michaels, S., & O'Connor, M.C. (1993). *Revoicing: A discourse strategy in the orchestration of classroom discourse*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.
- O'Connor, M.C., & Michaels, S. (1993). Aligning academic task and participation status through revoicing. Analysis of a classroom discourse strategy. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 24(4), 318-355.
- Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, M. (1995). *How English Teachers Get Taught: Methods of Teaching the Methods Class*. Urbana: NCTE.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

F8

Research and Science Writing in Process

Science Blogs and the Middle Region of Research

Greg Myers, Lancaster University, United Kingdom

Erving Goffman (1959) argued that any institutional activity has a front region, in which impressions of the self are carefully managed, and a back region, in which those impressions are prepared and rehearsed. The front region of science is found in articles in academic journals and grant proposals, in which claims are made impersonally, generally, and cautiously, usually stripped of first person statements, past tense narratives, and personal stances, except for careful hedging. The back region is found in the sociology and history of science, where researchers often study particular cases in terms of personal ambitions and styles of research, theoretical and methodological commitments, national and institutional preferences, and issues of funding, most of which get left out of the published articles. Science blogs are an important addition to the range of genres representing science – not as constrained in style or audience as academic articles, not driven by the heroic narratives found in many popularisations, not as hungry for the big event as science journalism. They provide a middle region (Meyrowitz 1986) in which specialist and non-specialist readers can see and comment on both the public presentation in academic articles (front region) and the activities leading up to this presentation (back region). This paper is part of a larger study in which I analyse the presentation of self in blogs in three dimensions: 1) a corpus study of stance markers (Biber et al., 1999; Dubois 2007), 2) a study of features in both posts and comments in which writers orient to possible audiences, 3) qualitative coding of boundary-making between front region and back region, and 4) quantitative analysis of links to other texts. These processes are especially important in areas of public controversy about scientific knowledge.

References

- Biber, Douglas (1999). The grammatical marking of stance. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. In Douglas Biber, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan, (ed.). London: Longman: 965-986.
- DuBois, Jack (2007). The stance triangle. Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction. In Robert Englebretson, (ed.). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Goffman, Erving (1959). The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Garden City: Anchor.
- Meyrowitz, Joel (1986) No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior. New York: Oxford University Press.

F8 (continued)

Research and Science Writing in Process

Towards an Integrative Unit of Analysis: Regulation Episodes in Expert Research Article Writing

Anna Iñesta, Ramon Llull University, Spain

Montserrat Castelló, Ramon Llull University, Spain

While most of the studies conducted on academic writing regulation may have allowed us to learn quite a lot about the specificities of this activity along the writing process, they have too frequently ended up with lists of categories which do not seem useful enough to portray the dynamics of regulation, especially if we understand it as a socially and culturally situated activity (Camps & Castelló, 1996; Candlin & Hyland, 1999; Lea & Stierer, 2000; Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001, Johns, 2002; Castelló, Iñesta & Gonzalez, 2008; Iñesta, 2009).

In this paper we will present an attempt to approach writing regulation from an integrative perspective, taking into account its social and cultural nature. In order to do that, we used a new unit of analysis, the Regulation Episode (RE) (Zanotto, 2006; Castelló & Iñesta, 2007; Castelló, Iñesta & Monereo, 2009), which we have as the *sequences of actions that authors strategically implement with the objective of solving a difficulty or challenge identified during the writing process*.

Data come from a study which analyzed the process followed by two experienced researchers in the field of psychology when writing a RA in Spanish as their academic writing L1¹ in co-authorship conditions. For the purpose of research, Writer 1 and Writer 2 accepted to work separately on the whole article to compare their versions and negotiate a joined one for submission. Writer 1 devoted 660 hours distributed in 11 sessions to write the RA while Writer 2 devoted 1016 hours distributed in 12 writing sessions.

Two independent judges participated in the categorization of the data at two different levels of analysis. *Macro-level analysis* involved distinguishing the objectives, challenges, solutions as declared in the writing diaries participants were asked to fill in for every writing session, as well as in the process and retrospective interviews. *Micro-level analysis*, on the other hand, involved analyzing the transcripts of the researchers' video-recorded writing activity (for each of the writing sessions) to identify the actions implemented while working on the RA as well as infer the intentionality underlying these actions.

Results obtained through macro-analysis confirmed the existence of Explicit REs in the writing process of both participants, which were found to be either continuous (challenge and solutions are cited and implemented in one same writing session) or discontinuous (challenge and solutions are cited and implemented in different writing sessions). Finally, micro-level analysis showed evidence of intentional challenge resolution that had not been explicitly identified by the writers. We considered this to be evidence of implicit Regulation Episodes, which we defined as *those sequences of actions of at least 10 bursts, some of which are aimed at reformulating or adjusting various elements of the sentence, showing an intention to address a challenge, despite not*

¹ In the context of the study there are two official languages, Spanish and Catalan, and while the writers considered Catalan to be their first language, they considered Spanish to be their first language for academic writing purposes.

having made any explicit reference to it during the writing process. Examples of these two kinds of Regulation Episodes will be shown in the session.

NOTE: We use the unit of burst in the same way as Chenoweth & Hayes (2001, 2003) or Beare & Bourdages (2007).

F8 (continued)

Research and Science Writing in Process

Professional education for the language professions

Requirements of Linguistics Abstract Proposal

Françoise Boch, University Stendhal, France

Fanny Rinck, Université Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense, France

Our study examines the "Abstract submission" by looking the written feedback comments given by conference advisory panels on recent papers submitted by PhD students for a French Conference in Linguistics.

This study adopts Discourse Analysis approach, especially on the field of recent European work on *scientific discourse in the disciplines* (see for examples Fløttum and al. 2006; Rinck, 2006), and *English for Academic Purposes*.

The aim of the present study is, firstly, to determine the predominant evaluative criteria applied to these abstract submissions and, secondly, to identify the expectations of the scientific community towards current research (in Linguistics). What are the determining factors in the rejection or the acceptance of an abstract for a conference? From a didactic point of view, the analysis will point out shortcomings and strong points of such texts. The pedagogical application of the results should increase PhD students' awareness about the expectations of the genre. From an epistemological point of view, this study will reveal the characteristics which are considered acceptable and productive in current linguistics and its different subdomains (e.g. psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, etc).

The corpus consists of 284 abstract written feedback. The feedback of two panel members is provided for each submission (i.e. 142 abstracts). The quantitative feedback is based on a provided scale and the qualitative feedback is also required. The contrastive analysis measures the relative importance of the various criteria used by panel members when rejecting or accepting submissions.

Fløttum, K., T. Dahl & T. Kinn 2006. *Academic Voices – across languages and disciplines*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishers.

Rinck, F. (2006), *L'article de recherche en Sciences du langage et en lettres. Figure de l'auteur et identité disciplinaire du genre*. Thèse de doctorat de l'Université Grenoble 3.

F9

Multimedia in School and Work

A New Ethos: Multi-Semiotic Documents as Designed, Collaborative, and Political

Anthony Garrison, Kent State University, U.S.

The inclusion of multi-semiotic documents into the larger writing research agenda has permitted scholars to broaden their gaze to what often seems to be an endless supply of private and public research arenas. This extension, however, presents researchers with unique challenges. Notions of image, animation, and even sound have permeated (and re-permeated) our vernacular and problematize our theories of what writing is today. These notions, and specifically for this presentation those regarding visual and verbal relationships, have begun to shift the nature and perception of ethos in the professional writing world.

This paper presents current research into the collaborative writing practices of one advertising team within a large Midwest advertising agency. Drawing from data systematically collected over a five-month time period, this presentation explores the transformative nature of one collaborative document, a creative brief, between employees within the agency during different advertisement design phases and between the agency and the agency's client, a subsidiary of a global top-three tire company. Ultimately, this session will explore the nature of a "new" ethos evidenced in this research site—an ethos politically situated, often unchallenged, and occasionally contradictory to the individual expertise areas of those involved in the design process. The research presented here has implications for workplace literacy, multimodality, document design, and technical communication as well as for academic instruction in advanced business and professional writing, technical communication, multimedia composing, and writing and representation to name a few.

This research is part of a dissertation project and relied on a multiple-method approach for data collection. The project sought to understand generally the advertising design process in relation to visual and verbal combination and later, more specifically, the influence of one document, the creative brief, on the design process. Using a grounded theory approach, data was collected and coded in such a way that the theories derived from this project emerged from the data itself. Research in rhetoric, written communication, document design, and advertising was used to contextualize this project and its findings. The field of Document Design has long set to understand the complex documents mentioned here and is primed to serve as a resource to help scholars understand modal interaction in the multi-semiotic documents now included in the discipline's purview.

F9 (continued)

Multimedia in School and Work

Reading, Writing, and Multimodality: What Does Literacy Curricula Look Like?

Terry Loerts, University of Western Ontario, Canada

The purpose of this research is to investigate the kinds of literacy practices that are taking place within a grade 6 classroom that is located in a mid-size city in Ontario, Canada. Because of a “revolution” (Kress, 2000, p. 182) in language, writing is currently not considered the sole or the dominant mode of communication (Kress, 2000; Jewitt & Kress, 2003). My research focuses on the kinds of literacy practices that take place within the intended and operational curriculum (Eisner, 1985) and what opportunities are created within the various levels of curricula for students to communicate their “interests” (Jewitt & Kress, 2003, p. 11) according to multimodal theory.

Multimodal theory (Jewitt & Kress, 2003) is concerned with communicating using multiple modes. Rooted in a Social Semiotic Theory (Halliday, 1978), multimodality includes traditional resources for making meaning (reading, writing, speech) as well as image, gaze, gesture, movement, music, and sound effect (Jewitt & Kress, 2003, p.11). The New Literacy Studies (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Heath, 1983; Street, 1984) challenges the exclusivity of traditional literacy practices and focuses on the social aspects of making meaning where people are active participants.

I am using a hybrid methodology: a case study that utilizes ethnographic tools (Dyson & Genishi, 2005). Using literacy events as units of analysis, (Dyson & Genishi, 2005), I am completing my data collection within the next month as I continue to be a participant observer, conduct interviews with a focal group of four students and their teacher, and collect artefacts.

Preliminary data analysis has focused on Dyson and Genishi’s (2005) method of using literacy events as units of analysis. Emerging themes have become codes guiding further data collection, a mainstay of a Modified Constant Comparative Method (Handsfield, 2006) of analysis. It has been reflective and on-going.

Preliminary findings

1. The teacher influences the literacy curriculum to a much greater extent than any of the other commonplaces (Schwab, 1978).
2. Students’ opportunities for communicating in multiple modes occur prominently in the operational curriculum as opposed to the intended curriculum.
3. Traditional literacy practices are more recognized, valued, and practiced than other modes of communication.
4. Through interviews and analysis of different levels of curricula, it is evident that students lead a “double life” (Williams, 2005) – where students’ “interests” in communicating multimodally in their out-of-school lives are not expressed within school.

Educational significance/Interest to audience

This research will provide literacy researchers and educators with an understanding of the dynamics of one instance of a literacy curriculum, the possibilities and constraints

therein, and the recognition that students' multimodal literacy opportunities need to be valued and utilized for a full range of communicational options. This study can provide insights into how curricula might benefit from an expanded view of literacy so that students can communicate using a full range of modes which will benefit them for participating in the societies we live in and beyond.

References

- Barton, D, Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. London: Routledge.
- Dyson, A. H., Genishi, C., & National Conference on Research in Language and Literacy. (2005). *On the case*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Eisner, E. (1985). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Handsfield, L. (2006). Being and becoming American: Triangulating habitus, field, and literacy instruction in a multilingual classroom. *Language & Literacy*, 8, 1-26.
- Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Jewitt, C., & Kress, G. R. (2003). *Multimodal literacy*. New York: P. Lang.
- Kress, G. (2000). Multimodality. In B. Cope, & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 182-203). London: Routledge.
- Schwab, J. J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum. *The School Review*, 81(4), 501-522. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy2.lib.uwo.ca:2048/stable/1084423>
- Schwab, J. J., Westbury, I., & Wilkof, N. J. (1978). *Science, curriculum, and liberal education :Selected essays*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, B. T. (2005). Leading double lives: Literacy and technology in and out of school. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(8), 702.

F9 (continued)

Multimedia in School and Work

Impacts of Visual Blogging, Digital Videos, and Interactive Electronic Correspondence on 4th and 5th Graders' Narrative and Analytic Writing

Carl Whithaus, University of California, Davis, U.S.

This paper examines the impact of new technologies on 4th and 5th grade students' learning processes and writing abilities. Drawing on data collected in a two-year study (2008-2009 and 2009-2010) of 562 elementary students and 32 teachers working at 3 school sites, this presentation explores the impacts of integrating visual blogging (i.e., Voicethread), digital videos (i.e., Moviemaker), and interactive electronic correspondence about readings (i.e., In2Books) on students' development in narrative and analytic writing.

To assess students' development, scores and samples from district-, state-level, and study-specific writing tests were gathered. In addition, written and digital compositions were collected from teacher-created assignments. These materials were considered in the context of classroom teacher evaluations and comments, classroom observations by the research and evaluation team, and interviews with the teachers. The data was coded according to grounded theory methods (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

In 2007, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) International Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Literacy Panel suggested that many students do not regularly "access learning materials that allow them to manage, integrate, evaluate and create information." ETS's Digital transformation extended work by Schacter (1994), Kearsley & Shneiderman (1999), and Carr, Saifer, & Novic (2002) that suggested the integration of ICT tools into the curriculum could increase student engagement and opportunities for inquiry-based learning. The current study finds that the impacts of new media technologies are closer to the benefits promoted in ETS's, Schacter's, Kearsley & Schneiderman's, and Carr, Saifer, & Novic's work than the negative consequences envisioned by Postman (1996, 1993). ICT usage corresponded with increasing collaboration and/or interaction in students' learning processes; in addition, when these three ICT tools were integrated into the curriculum, gains were documented in students' analytic and narrative writing abilities.

Using Voicethread as a visual blogging tool promoted collaborative learning processes and the integration of oral, written, and visual modalities into the English Language Arts curriculum. Digital video projects also encouraged collaborative learning activities; while making digital videos, students created storyboards and used writing as a planning tool instead of treating writing as a final product. Using In2Books, the written dialogues about short texts that individual students had read tended to facilitate the development of students' analytic writing skills without incorporating visual or oral elements.

Gains in students' abilities as narrative and analytic writers were noted on the district- and state-level standardized writing assessments. In addition, analyses of study-prompted writing and in situ classroom writing samples revealed correspondences between integrating visual blogging, digital video making, and electronic correspondence about novels and students' increasing abilities to organize content into narrative formats.

While less developed than narrative writing skills, students' analytic writing also showed marked improvements over the two-year course of the study.

These findings suggest that a careful integration of ICTs into 4th and 5th grade classrooms can facilitate the development of narrative and analytic writing skills. The use of digital composing tools such as Voicethread, Moviemaker, and In2Books appears to develop students' abilities to organize material into written narratives and/or analyses.

F10

What Constitutes a Feminist Approach in the Internationalized, Interdisciplinary Twenty-First Century?

Mary P. Sheridan, University of Wyoming, U.S.

Kristine Blair, Bowling Green State University, U.S.

Lee Nickoson, Bowling Green State University, U.S.

Liz Rohan, University of Michigan-Dearborn, U.S.

This panel investigates what writing research from a feminist perspective might mean from various methodological (archival, technorhetorical, interview-based), institutional (researcher, editor), and life-span positions (out-of-school children's games; college-age personal writing; professorial research practices).

Speaker One: "Feminist Frameworks For Researching Writing in Global, Digitally Mediated Spaces"

In a web 2.0 world, where people freely share information across global networks to make meaning collaboratively, what seems apparent is that innovation and creativity call for new "architectures of participation." Despite the fact that many of these architectures align with feminist principles (attention to local and global networks/communities; collaboration), web 2.0 is hardly inherently feminist. Concerns ranging from intellectual property to cyber violence make clear that online spaces often recreate traditional power dynamics in ways many feminists find troubling. What, then, is the role of feminism in web 2.0 discourse and practice?

This presentation pursues that question by drawing on a 2 year interview-based study with 30 innovators of digital media (e.g., CEO of the international online game *Kuma/War*; editor at CNN; award winning South African documentarian; marketing director for international children's site *Club Penguin*; developer of first educational program in media literacy at The Harvard Institute on Media Education; co-author of *Second Life for Dummies*) across 5 countries. The producers of these sites where so much learning is happening for young people today encourage certain dispositions, such as valuing knowledge made in peer-to-peer networks as opposed to only in hierarchical chains and understanding how knowledge is socially constructed as opposed to seen as individually owned. Such dispositions share an obvious overlap with feminist principles, and yet, the innovators we interviewed made no reference feminisms.

This talk analyzes this disconnect, using the above set of digital media innovators to explore how feminisms are being occluded as well as being taken up tacitly in discussions about and in the co-creation of web 2.0 worlds. In the end, this talk argues that as fourth wave feminists meet disembodied apps, feminists need to make strategic choices about how to enact their goals in a post-identity politics world.

Speaker Two: "Technofeminist Research as Border Crossing Activism"

At its core, feminist research has concerned itself not only with method but also with politics, with "explicit attention to the social relations manifest in women's everyday activities" (Naples, 2003, p. 94), and their lived experiences. By extension, technofeminist research has often combined articulation of women's online experiences with an activism that harnesses a range of technologies for women's social and political

agendas. Naturally, such activism eschews any definition of research that presumes neutrality; at the same time, technofeminist researchers are as obligated as any other group of scholars to critically interrogate their assumptions about epistemology, ideology, and ontology, lest they risk the reinscription of the very gendered categories they hope to subvert.

As a researcher, I became personally aware of this ethical obligation when reading an article by Thomas Skeen (2007) responding to a co-authored piece I had written on women's spaces online. Skeen concludes that technofeminist research and its focus on gendered differences among technology users may unintentionally run the risk of essentializing women and girl's uses of technology. In crafting my own response, I noted that rather than viewing the emphasis on women experiences with technology as essentialist, both feminist theory and method call for a materialist approach, one that questions the ways in which political, material, and social conditions impact women as a class of individuals and the extent to which inequities can and should be transformed through feminist action, across whatever border that action must take place. In this way, such research has the potential to create gains not just for women and girls but for any group for whom technological literacy acquisition is mediated through inequitable social and educational frameworks.

To articulate these goals, my portion of this panel will focus on the theoretical connections between feminist method, the politics of materiality, and multimodal literacies. Just as multimodal literacies complicate our understanding of what composition is or can be, feminist scholars must complicate and explicate what it means to conduct feminist action research in technological spaces both inside and outside academic borders. This articulation is vital if feminists are to provide gains for women and girls and ultimately view their research as activist in both theory and practice.

Speaker Three: "Can We Call It Feminist? How to Articulate Feminist Research Methodologies"

In a time when writing research methods collections are coming out at a stunning pace, read and written by scholars who cross disciplinary and national borders, what would an articulation of feminist research approaches mean if it were to serve as an introduction for an entire collection written for a generalist audience? This presenter explores this question by describing the process of co-editing *New Directions in Writing Studies Research*, a forthcoming research methods collection. Whether research on multilingual writers or on interview practices with participants across multiple continents, this collection calls for new ways to share and represent our research, ways, that for our participants at least, invoke (implicit) feminist values. And yet, in general, the contributors do not invoke feminisms. The question of this talk, then, is how should we as editors understand and frame this diverse research?

Although we did not conceive of the collection as limited to feminist theories or practices for knowledge making, the influence of feminist ideals is remarkably present in a good many of the conversations: emphases on inquiry that values collaboration (e.g. collaboration between/among researchers, researchers and participants, researchers and readers), reflection, inclusivity, and an ethics of care in both undertaking and in representing our work as researchers. As an editor, this speaker sees the presence of feminist practices through throughout the collection. Do these traces of feminist values

justify a framing of the collection as a feminist enterprise? While still midstream of this editorial process, this presenter tells the story of this collection in order to argue that an exploration of feminist methodology is less about constructing specific knowledges and more about continually reflecting on and re-articulating an attitude toward knowledge that can respond ethically to the constantly changing specificities of such knowledge, especially in today's expansive, international research contexts.

Speaker Four: "Feminist Historical Methods: A Lens for Everyone"

Contemporary feminist historical methods are currently facing two twinned concerns. First, while scholars of writing using feminist historical methods would likely not argue that feminist methods can apply equally to the study of deceased *men* as to deceased women, "feminist methods" and the study of women have too often been conflated. Second, "feminist" methods by scholars who study the deceased such as "self-reflection," the admittance of "passionate attachments" and the "role of the emotions" can be essentialized as "women's work" in the academy, rather than habits of mind experienced by any scholar of historical work regardless of the gender of the scholar or of the subject. Both of these concerns limit what it means to do feminist historical research in highly problematic ways.

Addressing both of these concerns, this speaker will use her time on this panel to re-value such feminist methods, largely by modeling how she used feminist historical methods as she edited the diary and letters of a male subject, John Price. Price was certainly not a feminist nor a politically correct figure, yet prescribed gender roles obviously shaped his behavior and sense of self. Feminist methods of self-reflection and personal writing helped this speaker situate Price's work into a greater cultural context, leading to a richer scholarly product. This process highlights that scholars of writing need to think more critically about how they can re-inscribe sexist practices, when uncritically using the term "feminist" to describe analysis that admits or relies on scholars' mining their emotions and personal identities to create knowledge and/or is used to study women only. That feminist methods allowed the speaker to cross generational, cultural and chronological borders between herself and her male subject suggests greater possibilities for feminist historical methods for all scholars.

F11

Writing Assessment and Its Impact on Scorers

Sherry Seale Swain, National Writing Project, U.S.

Mary Ann Smith, National Writing Project, U.S.

Sandra Murphy, University of California, Davis, U.S.

Linda Friedrich, National Writing Project, U.S.

Melanie Sperling, University of California, Riverside, U.S.

The purpose of the three-year Scoring Impact Study was to determine whether or not the National Writing Project's assessment system has any value to classroom teachers and other educators who serve as scorers, and if so, what that value is. The study is based on the premise that writing assessment and writing instruction exert an influence on one another. This perspective has roots in sociocultural theories (e.g., Bakhtin, 1981), which see thinking and learning as emerging from complex social dialogues embedded within larger cultural value systems (in the assessment realm, see Delandshire & Petrosky, 1998, and Shepard, 2000, who explore the conceptual tensions between assessment and instruction; see also Sperling, 2004). Murphy (2008), in discussing contemporary research, comments on the ways that tests have been found to distort instruction. In contrast, some research suggests that teachers' experience of writing assessment can improve the teaching of writing by contributing to teachers' knowledge and expertise when they serve as scorers of writing. Storms, Sheingold, Nunez, and Heller (1998) note the power of conversations among the teacher-scorers as they wrestled with scoring decisions and reflected on the insights spawned by the experience. Researchers (e.g., Gearhart & Wolf, 1994; Sheingold, Heller, & Paulukonis, 1995; Storms, et al., 1998) have also found that teachers reported changes in their own teaching and assessment practices as a result of large-scale scoring experiences. Davies and LeMahieu (2003), on the basis of reviewing the development and use of portfolio assessment systems, illuminate key ways that the teachers learned through participating in large-scale writing assessments: examining student work, forming interpretive communities with high and consistently applied standards, and challenging their instructional practice. In these ways, the experience of teacher-scorers in assessment situations has the potential to positively influence the teaching of writing (LeMahieu and Friedrich, 2007).

Data sources for this study included a survey administered online and follow-up interviews with a subset of purposefully-selected survey subjects. Surveys were analyzed for frequencies and percentages across the categorized data and the continuous scales. Additionally, data are currently being disaggregated so that results by groups of teachers (e.g., by position, years of experience) can be analyzed.

Though negative evidence of the consequences of writing assessment abounds, preliminary findings from this study suggest that teachers/scorers not only gained skills and knowledge about writing, writing assessment, writing instruction, and writing development, but that they took what they learned into their professional roles. This presentation will focus on interesting findings and their implications.

References

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *Dialogic imagination*. (M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Davies, A & LeMahieu, P. (2003). Assessment for learning: Reconsidering portfolios and research evidence. In M. Segers, F. Dochy & E. Cascallar (Eds.), *Innovation and change in professional education: Optimizing new modes of assessment in search of qualities standards* (pp. 141–169). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishing.
- Delandshire, G., & Petrosky, A. (1998). Assessment of complex performances: Limitations of key measurement assumptions. *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 14–24.
- Gearhart, M., & Wolf, S. (1994). Engaging teachers in assessment of their students' narrative writing: The role of subject matter knowledge. *Assessing Writing*, 1, 67–90.
- LeMahieu, Paul G., & Friedrich, Linda. (2007). Looking at student work to develop evaluative frameworks: Why. . . and as important, how? In Anne Davies & Kathy Busick (Eds.), *Classroom assessment: What's working in high schools, Book 1* (pp. 103–127). Courtenay, B.C., Canada: Connections Publishing.
- Murphy, S. (2008). Some consequences of writing assessment. In A. Haynes & L. McDowell (Eds.), *Balancing dilemmas in assessment and learning in contemporary education* (pp. 33–50). London: Routledge.
- Sheingold, K., Heller, J., & Paulukonis, S. (1995). *Actively seeking evidence: Teacher change through assessment development*. MS#94-04. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Shepard, L. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), 4–14.
- Storms, B. A, Sheingold, K., Nunez, A., & Heller, J. (1998). *The feasibility, comparability, and value of local scorings of performance assessments* (technical report). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, Center for Performance Assessment.

F12

Reception and the Continuing Life of Texts

Making a Publication Mean Something: Using Longitudinal Citation Data to Qualitatively Study the Role(s) that a Book has Played in the History of a Field

Damian C. Koshnick, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.

Information scientists have been using citations to depict and study patterns in the structure of scientific knowledge production since the late 1950's. From methods such as simple citation counts, co-citation analysis, historiographs, and the calculation of impact factors, etc., many forms of this bibliometric –(or measuring texts)– research are increasingly a part of our academic conversations. Given the exponential growth of published knowledge production, citations and our ability to count and measure them will continue to be an important tool in the difficult work to gain perspectives on the unfolding nature of progress, growth, and change in all scientific knowledge domains. But these kinds of highly symbolized, quantitatively-based research also have their limits. In brief, bibliometricians preference the manifest, readily quantifiable characteristics of a citation (author, year, journal title, etc.) to the exclusion of the qualitative, latent information which make citations such rich socio-textual units. As such the level of analysis that defines traditional practice in citation research does not typically drill down to the content-level at which many people *within* specific disciplines might be interested. As Moravesik and Murugesan (1975) bluntly stated, “[bibliometricians] are not equipped to understand the technical scientific content of the papers they handle.” And they continued that, “this imposes a limitation on the type of conclusions they can draw from citation counts, because many of the subtleties of citations are connected with the *quality* of the paper cited, and the *context* in which the citation is made” (p. 87).

If accepted, I will present a specific methodology through which non-bibliometricians (researchers within particular fields) can aggregate the raw citation data readily available from Google Scholar and the Web of Science in order to enact detailed, qualitative studies on decades of citations to particularly critical publications within their field. Based on my example of an analysis of (n=122) citations to a book from my field of composition studies –specifically James Moffett's (1968) *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*, I will demonstrate the ways in which this method of analyzing the content of a given citation across five rhetorical functions can reveal distinct patterns about how a book has been “used” and rhetorically symbolized (Small, 1978) by citing authors over time.

Although current forms of traditional citation studies offer us useful, though approximate, indications about how we value certain publications through quantitative means, we need more field-specific researchers to take up citation research. Only then will the full interpretive potential of a citation as a rich socio-textual expression –as a site “at which communal memory is sorted out and reproduced” (Bazerman, 1993, p. 20)– be realized. Only then will the Moravesik and Murugesan divide be resolved. Put broadly, I will argue that citations as sources of historical data should be more broadly utilized.

F12 (continued)

Reception and the Continuing Life of Texts

Beyond the Print Moment: Reception Studies of Online Scientific Discourse

Michelle Sidler, Auburn University, U.S.

In their 2001 article, “Moving Beyond the Moment: Reception Studies in the Rhetoric of Science,” Paul, Charney, & Kendall critique rhetoric and science scholarship for its emphasis on “great moments in science,” the moments at which scientific texts are produced. They argue for an expanded examination of science writing which moves “beyond the moment” to follow the reception of texts after the process of writing and publication ends, determining their long-term impact. Since the publication of Paul, Charney, & Kendall’s article, Web 2.0 functionalities have enhanced our ability to analyze scientists’ receptions of published works in dramatic and exciting ways. Blogs and wikis, in particular, enable scientists to share their own and others’ publications, comments, and responses instantaneously and publicly. Researching online discussions through digital ethnographies allows rhetoric of science scholars the opportunity to learn about the how scientists “read” journal articles, noting the importance of issues like the ethos of the journal authors, the impact of different rhetorical strategies within the article, and the importance of the place of publication.

Methodology and Research Questions

This presentation will recount one such reception study (ongoing since September 2009), a digital ethnography of an article in the chemistry journal *JACS* in July 2009, following its online publication and reception on scientists’ blogs. The article claimed success in creating ketone compounds using sodium hydride, which defies conventional chemistry wisdom, so it immediately caused controversy and prompted critique within chemists’ online communities. Employing textual analysis of online blogs and the journal article as well as interview data, the study asks research questions that include:

- What factors influence scientists’ acceptance or rejection of published arguments and experimental data?
- Why do scientists write and read blogs about current research? What does this practice tell us about the reception of scientific journal articles?
- How do blogs impact both the traditional peer review process and the emerging open access peer review model?
- How does this case study challenge the traditional division between text-based research and person-based research in rhetoric of science studies?

Findings

Though ongoing, preliminary findings of this study suggest that when reading a scientific journal article, chemists have a keen awareness of the writer’s ethos, especially the author’s reputation for pursuing quality (or alternately, unreliable) scientific research. These readers rely heavily on visuals and data initially, then the narrative story relayed in the text becomes important as they read the text more closely. More globally, this case study does indeed challenge the traditional division between text-based research and person-based research. Digital ethnographies allow for reception studies that follow the progress of a publication, at least online. However, like digital ethnographies in other

fields of writing studies (McKee & Porter, 2008), such reception studies also blur the line between text-based research, which does not involve human subjects, and person-based research, which requires institutional review board approval. As online scientific discourse increases, the rhetoric of science community must address this methodological dilemma.

F12 (continued)

Varied approaches to rhetorical and linguistic competence

Construing Consumption: An Analysis of How Meaning is Manifested through Text on Wine Bottles

Nicole Caswell, Kent State University, U.S.

According to Fairclough (2003), “one might for instance argue that prolonged experience of advertising and other commercial texts contributes to shaping people’s identities as ‘consumers’” (p. 8). Halliday discusses how texts, “enact social relations between participants in social events and the attitudes, desires and values of participants” (qtd in Fairclough, p. 27). I use wine bottles as a site where social relations get articulated to discuss how the text constructs the participants -- specifically, the consumers. Building off the notion of language as a social practice (Fairclough), this presentation aims to understand how the relationship between socio-economic class and consumers (of wine) is mediated through text, as well as how meaning is manifested through the marketing and placement of wine bottles. This presentation also considers the conscious choices of wine bottle marketers (Barber, Almanza & Donovan (2006); Charters, Lockshin & Unwin (1999)) whether they are marketed toward particular genders, income brackets or age brackets to understand how meaning is portrayed on various wine bottles.

This presentation examines how the text on wine bottles indexes or shapes people’s identities as consumers, specifically asking: (1) What features on wine bottles (labels, text description, bottle design) are used to shape people’s identities as consumers? And, (2) What features on wine bottles are used to construe consumers as members of different social classes?

Wine bottles lend insight to social relations because of their role in culture. Wines are organized at stores by brand and price, physically (materially) constructing a social meaning that individuals are aware of. This presentation suggests that the text on wine bottles draw on socially shared assumptions about wine drinking that indexes groups of people as being from different social classes or social status (novices vs. experts).

My analysis examines the text on 10-14 wine bottles (ranging in price from \$5.99 to \$60.99), using Caballero (2007) and Herdenstam, Hammaren, Ahlstrom and Wiktorsson’s (2009) analysis of winespeak as a “technical language” as a base for understanding wine labels. I argue the each bottle construes a particular consumer, based on Halliday’s notion of interpersonal meaning (mood and modality). The terms used to describe the wine, Sparking Wine (up to \$9.99) and Champagne (\$18.99 and up), is one feature that I argue helps to construe different consumers. This research offers writing studies a site where social meaning is established within the text. The role of writing in this site is to persuade individuals to purchase and consume wine, and thus serves as a site where more research could be conducted to understand how writing influences individuals’ daily lives.

References

- Barber, N., Almanza, B., and Donovan, J. (2006). Motivational factors of gender, income and age on selecting a bottle of wine. *International Journal of Wine Marketing*. 18(3), 218-232.
- Charters, S., Lockshin, L. and Unwin, T. (1999). Consumer responses to wine bottle back labels. *Journal of Wine Research*. 10(3), 183-195.
- Herdenstam, A., Hammaren, M., Ahlstrom, R., and Wiktorsson, P. (2009). The professional language of wine: Perception, training and dialogue. *Journal of Wine Research*. 20(2), 53-84.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis*. (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Caballero, R. (2007). Manner-of-motion verbs in wine description. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 2095-2114.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialects of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23, 193-229.

F13

Cognitive Models of Writing

Executive Functions of Working Memory in Writing

Thierry Olive, Université de Poitiers, France

Since Flower and Hayes (1980) proposals about writers' cognitive overload, a important line of research in the writing field has focused on how working memory limitations constrain writing. Two theoretical perspectives have been adopted to describe such a relationship between working memory and writing. Based on Just and Carpenter's (1992) theory, McCutchen (1996) elaborated a capacity theory of writing development. On the other hand, inspired by Baddeley's (1986) model, Kellogg (1996) proposed a componential model of working memory in writing which describes how the writing processes are supposed to engage the attentional, verbal and visuospatial components of working memory. Whatever the conceptions, working memory is considered limited in its capacity to simultaneously maintain and process information. Accordingly, it strongly influences writing, which is a complex integrative activity that involves several resource-demanding cognitive processes (for reviews, see Olive, 2004, 2010).

In that presentation, I will begin by briefly reviewing findings on how WM resources are shared between writing processes and how excessive demands of the writing processes can affects operations of other processes. I will also describe how verbal WM, visual WM and spatial WM are involved when composing a text in order to show that the verbal, visual and spatial components of working memory are differently involved by writing during writing acquisition, and that skilled writers engage several visuospatial processing when composing a text.

In the second and main part of my presentation, I will explore how the executive functions of WM such as shifting, inhibiting, and updating are engaged in text composition. I will particularly address how shifting is required to alternate between the various writing processes. It will be assumed that shifting between the writing processes may account for a large part of the high cognitive effort of writing. I will also show the role of updating in the representation of the text. For that purpose, I will discuss the multidimensional aspect of the text representation, which is frequently updated on its various dimensions during the time course of a text composition.

F13 (continued)

Cognitive Models of Writing

Writing as Priming: Implicit Processes in Text Production

Teresa Limpo, Universidade do Porto, Portugal

Rui A. Alves, Universidade do Porto, Portugal

The metaphor of writing as problem solving remains a lighthouse to cognitive writing research. Since the seminal paper of Hayes and Flower (1980) writing processes have been greatly detailed from a top-down perspective. Nevertheless, new views of writing have been developed. In particular, Galbraith (2009) proposed an implicit account of text production, in which he proposed two paths for text production: rhetorical planning and dispositional spelling out. In this talk we will explore this later implicit dimension of writing by focusing on priming effects on writing fluency. Social psychologists have demonstrated that constructs activation can unconsciously influence behavior. For instance, Macrae et al. (1998) showed that a list of words was read faster when its title was Schumacher, than when its title was Shimuhuru. It is also known that sadness is associated with motor slowdown. Therefore, in Study 1 we asked participants to write a sad or a happy story. Congruently, we found that writing on the sad condition was less fluent than writing on the happy condition (17.3 vs. 19.7 words per minute, wpm). In study 2, participants wrote a story about an old man, or about a teenager. In agreement with the elderly stereotype, we found that writing on the old condition was less fluent than writing on the teenager condition (19.0 vs. 21.8 wpm). Study 3 detailed these findings while controlling for construct accessibility. All participants wrote about an old man. Half of them took as character a stereotypic old man described as experienced, wise, weak, warmth and ill. The other half wrote about a counter-stereotypic old man, using the opposite traits (viz., immature, stupid, strong, cold and healthy). We found that writing on the stereotypic condition was less fluent than writing on the counter-stereotypic condition (18.5 vs. 19.8 wpm). Moreover, we showed that empathy and self-monitoring moderated this effect. Specifically, both high perspective takers and low self-monitors showed reduced fluency. After writing about the stereotypic old man, low self-monitors were also more likely to describe themselves as being slow. These results can be interpreted within the framework of the active-self account (Wheeler et al., 2007), which argues that priming might impact behavior through biasing the self-concept. Importantly, these results are also in line with Galbraith's model (2009). Thus, we will claim that these three studies bring additional support to a less controlled view of writing.

F13 (continued)

Cognitive Models of Writing

Effect of Temporal Parameters on the Properties of Texts Produced by Young Writers: the Case of the Transposition of Characters' Words

Sylvie Plane, Université Paris-Sorbonne, France

Fabienne Rondelli, Université de Metz, France

The aim of this presentation is to present a part of a larger group of studies devoted to analyzing the different ways writers manage different levels of linguistic and psycholinguistic constraints. Our study focuses on the temporality of writing, as it constitutes a key parameter of writing, influencing the management of constraints by the writers.

First, we shall present the system of linguistic and psycholinguistic constraints we have defined for methodological purposes in order to organize a description of the production output of writing that incorporates idiosyncratic variations and allows US to define styles of writing.

In a second part, we will present the different levels of temporality that affect writing, and the register problems they pose for the analyst.

The third part is devoted to the presentation of an experiment being conducted in classes of primary and secondary school in order to observe the effects of time frames imposed on the writers, on the properties of written language and textual products. This experiment brings together a large number of researchers who examine the entire corpus, each from a specific point of view in order to analyze the effect of different variables. In the experiment we shall present, young writers had to produce texts in conditions with three different sets of parameters: the properties of the text used as the prompt, the relationship between the source text and the text to write, and the temporal patterns of making the task:

- properties of the source texts: the source texts for supporting the experiment came from an African tale. Two versions were developed for the purpose of experimentation that differ in how the words of characters were transcribed : one version uses direct discourse, the other has transpositions in the form of indirect discourse and narrative speech.
- relationship between source text and text to write: some students had to reproduce in writing the story that had been read by the teacher, others had to produce a continuation of the narrative.
- temporal patterns: for some groups of students, the writing task immediately followed listening to the text, for others, this task was done later.

The factors on which we focus in this presentation concern only the discursive modality used to transcribe the characters' manner of speaking. This is to assess whether students are sensitive not only to the content of what was said but also to how language was used in the source text to translate what was said and to measure the effect of time lag on these properties. These elements help us to better understand the diversity of young writers' ways of developing and representing a text, and to better understand how writers, while writing, use different strategies in order to built representation of their own text.

The initial results suggest that the time between hearing the text and writing the second text accentuates the differences between writers, which attests to differences in their memorization strategies.

F14

Teaching Text Coherence and Structure

The Impact of Building Formal Schemata on ESL Writing Performance: A Focus on Second Sentence in Paragraph Coherence

Yuehai (Mike) Xiao, New York University, U.S.

In his article, Xiao (2008) put forth a hypothetical model of second language writing by drawing on such scholarship as schema theory, reading research, contrastive rhetoric, genre analysis, reading-writing connections, current-traditional rhetoric, all within a constructivist framework. This model of ESL writing emphasized the interrelationship among context, cognition, and rhetorical form. Furthermore, a notion of “building formal schemata with ESL student writers” was proposed for research and pedagogy in L2 writing (Xiao, 2008). The current study is an effort along this line of research to apply the notion of “formal schemata construction” to one aspect of L2 writing, that is coherence. An underresearched topic with regard to coherence is “second sentence”, which refers to “the sentence that immediately follows the topic sentence in an American English paragraph” (Reid, 1996).

Building on the pedagogical implications of Xiao (2008) and Reid (1996), as well as the teaching method of Lee (2002), the author developed an alternative method to teach second sentences for paragraph coherence by helping the English as a Second Language (ESL) students construct their formal schemata (organized background knowledge of rhetorical structure and textual features) for second sentences. This quantitative study is intended to investigate the effectiveness of such a teaching method.

Two comparable groups of Asian graduate students will receive two types of teaching methods--one focuses on exercises reinforcing formal schema for second sentences, the other is traditional paragraph writing based on topic sentence. Holistic scoring and primary-trait scoring for the subjects' timed essays will be applied to assess their writing performance and production of second sentences.

If statistical analysis supports the inference of the positive correlation between instruction and practice of building formal schemata for second sentence and paragraph coherence, then these instruction and practice will be of pedagogical significance, and studies alike can be expanded to other aspects (e.g. outline, genre) of building formal schemata with ESL students.

References

- Lee, I. (2002). Teaching coherence to ESL students: A classroom inquiry. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(2), 135-159.
- Reid, J. (1992). The reading-writing connection in the ESL composition classroom. *Journal of Intensive English Studies*, 6, 27-51.
- Reid, J. (1996). U.S. academic readers, ESL writers, and second sentences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5 (2), 129-161.

Xiao, Y. (2008). Building formal schemata with ESL student writers: Linking schema theory to contrastive rhetoric. *Asian EFL Journal*, V.32, Professional Teaching Articles,13-40

F14 (continued)

Teaching Text Coherence and Structure

Coherence Breaks in the Informative Structuring of Texts

Odette Gagnon, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, Canada

A text, unlike a set of dominoes in which pieces are simply juxtaposed, is rather like a puzzle in which pieces are encased with each other and therefore the presence of each piece and the way that it is fastened with the others contribute to work out the global image. Coherence in text thus rests on the relevance of each statement and the way statements are fastened together.

In our presentation, we will discuss how coherence can be broken. As far as relevance (Sperber & Wilson, 1989) is concerned, a piece of information might be considered more or less relevant because 1.) it is not directly related to context information, 2.) it is redundant, 3.) it contradicts the context (Charolles, 1978), 4.) it is not recovered in the posterior context, or 5.) it is badly placed in the textual flow.

As far as fastening is concerned, four different levels (Gagnon et Chamberland, 2010) are involved, which coincide with four levels of text structuring. At the referential level, a coherence break is caused by referential ambiguities, the absence of referent, incompleteness, semantic inadequacies or incompatibilities. At the semantic level, coherence is compromised when information required for interpretation is missing (Charolles, 1995) and connectors are not (well) used. At the enunciation level, a coherence break might occur if, according to the discourse universe chosen, verbal tenses are not used correctly or temporal/spatial expressions and personal marks are inappropriate. At the informative level (Combettes, 1992), coherence is compromised if the salience of a given piece of information (foreground/background // given/new information) does not coincide with its status (principal/secondary information // “theme / rheme” repartition (topic / comment) (Kopple, 1983)).

Our presentation will focus on coherence breaks that occur at the informative level. At that level, the informative structure of text rests on the way pieces of information are distributed and on the way they are hierarchically presented. As far as distribution is involved, two syntactic structures (for example: active / passive), even though they do not imply semantic differences, represent two different ways of how pieces of information are distributed and presented as “known” or “given” and therefore, these sentences cannot interchange in a given piece of text. As far as hierarchy is involved, choosing between juxtaposing or subordinating two pieces of information reflects the way these pieces of information are presented as background or foreground, and therefore this choice depends on context.

In a data of sixty texts written in French by French speaking university students engaged in a composition course, we will locate coherence breaks that occur at the informative level. We will identify which phenomenon is involved (distribution; hierarchy), what exactly the problem is and how it could be resolved.

References

Charolles, M. (1978). « Introduction aux problèmes de la cohérence des textes », *Langue française*, 38, 7-37.

- Charolles, M. (1995). « Cohésion, cohérence et pertinence du discours », *Travaux de linguistique*, 29, 125-151.
- Combettes B. (1992). *L'Organisation du texte*, Metz : France, Pratiques, Centre d'Analyse Syntaxique de l'Université de Metz, 180 p., (coll. «Didactique des textes»).
- Gagnon, O. et A.-É. Chamberland (2010). « Cohérence textuelle : l'arrimage informatif », *Québec français*, 156, 78-81.
- W. Kopple, « Something Old, Something New : Functional Sentence Perspective », *Research in the Teaching of English*, 17, 1, 1983, p. 85-99.
- D. Sperber et D. Wilson, *La pertinence. Communication et cognition*. Traduit par Abel Gerschenfeld et Dan Sperber. Paris, Minuit, 1989.

F14 (continued)

Teaching Text Coherence and Structure

Situational Contexts and Linguistic Resources for Writing Explanation

Per Holmberg, University of Gothenburg, Sweden

The aim of this study is to investigate the kind of meaning making that, in the context of Secondary school and Upper Secondary school, is called explanatory or expository writing. In the project *Textactivities and knowledge development in school* (funded by the Swedish research council 2007-2010) we have followed three teachers and analyzed how writing is taught. The teachers have one thing in common: the priority of scaffolding students in writing explanations. This priority is well in line with the national curricula for Swedish, but not mainstream, since many teachers and students prefer to work with narrative texts.

The empirical data consists of three documented writing projects, one from each class: video recorded classroom activities and copies of student texts. For this study thirteen student texts from each class have been selected for detailed analysis. All three writing projects focus on writing explanation, but in quite different genres. Teacher A and his students in Secondary school (13 years old) work with personal essays on their reading experience of a novel. Teacher B teaches a group of students in Upper secondary school (16 years old) to write journalistic reports on leadership. Finally, teacher C, also in Upper secondary school, works with students (16 years old) who write comparative essays on two texts of their own choice.

Using the model of Systemic Functional Linguistics the teaching in the three classrooms is analyzed as situational contexts of meaning making that differ in three semiotic dimensions: ideationally, interpersonally and textually. The same model is used also for the analysis of the student texts.

In class A the teaching gives priority to *ideational* meaning making by repeated invitations to reflection and interpretation. In class B most activities are actualizing *interpersonal* meaning, for example when preparing publication of their texts. Class C finally focuses on *textual* meaning, working with writing frames etc. The student texts realize their situational context by different choices of linguistic resources. Texts from class A have the most frequent use of cognitive processes (*I think... I wonder... etc*) – an *ideational* resource for explanation. In the texts of class B explanations are built *interpersonally* by formulating open question and their answers. Finally, class C shows the most elaborated use of different means for *textual* organization. These findings make it possible to understand how the teaching and writing of explanatory texts in fact can be many different ways of making meaning.