

Writing Research Across Borders Session H
Saturday, February 19 2:45-4:15pm

H1

Cognition and context: Are there grounds for reconciliation? (Part I)

Steve Graham, Vanderbilt University, U.S.

Anthony Paré, McGill University, Canada

David Galbraith, Staffordshire University, U.K.

Deborah Brandt, University of Wisconsin, U.S.

Charles Bazerman, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.

Karen Harris, Vanderbilt University, U.S.

Nancy Nelson, University of North Texas, U.S.

J.R. (Dick) Hayes, Carnegie Mellon University, U.S.

In 1989, Linda Flower wrote that “English studies are caught up in a debate over whether we should see individual cognition or social and cultural context as the motive force in literate acts” (282). She was responding to a growing divide in writing theory and research between what Berlin had called “cognitive rhetoric” and “social-epistemic rhetoric,” and to a series of critiques aimed at the basic premises and research methodologies of those who were seeking to develop a cognitive theory of writing (e.g., Berlin, Bizzell, Rose). Flower warned that “theoretical positions that try to polarize (or moralize) cognitive and contextual perspectives... may leave us with an impoverished account of the writing process as people experience it and a reductive vision of what we might teach” (282). Her solution was to work toward “a far more integrated theoretical vision which can explain how context cues cognition, which in its turn mediates and interprets the particular world that context provides” (282).

So now, over two decades later, have we developed that theoretical vision? Do we have accounts of writing that seek to explain the relationship between cognition and context? Is there some common ground between those inner-directed researchers who attempt to learn more about what happens in the head while writers produce texts and those whose outer-directed perspective looks for the social and historical forces that shape the activity of writing? Or are these “theoretical camps,” as Bizzell called them, still divided, still insular, and still hostile?

This panel offers 8 reflections on the cognition-culture schism in Writing Studies. The panellists will comment on their view of the divide and locate themselves in the debate, but each will also comment on the potential for common ground and the possibility of the “integrated theoretical vision” that Flower called for in 1989. Those coming from a primarily sociocultural perspective will talk about how cognition and affect fit into their view of writing and what kinds of psychology seem to provide an account of those phenomena that might be imaginable or useful from their perspective. Similarly, those studying writing and cognition will give a view of what they see as the role of society, culture, and history in writing, and what models seem to articulate well with their understanding of writing. A brief summary of each speaker’s position follows:

Speaker 1: A sociohistoric view of the thoughtful writer

The reconciliation of social and psychological approaches to writing hangs on understanding writing as motivated situated social action. Few would deny that writing engages deeply internal processes from the earliest communicative impulses to the choices made in the course of text production to the advanced conception of complex meanings. Without thought, texts would be without meaning. However, that thought occurs in relation to specific tasks and situations, moved by motivating affects and addressing the social particulars that create the rhetorical situation, including the complex and differentiated genre/activity landscape evolved over millennia of literate history. So the psychological study of writing ought to be grounded in people's responses to situation—which are matters of affect and perception as well as cognition, and which reflect the plasticity and responsiveness of the brain and its development over repeated apprenticed experiences into complex and differentiated expressive communicative practices.

Speaker 2: Cognition and Social/Cultural Lens: Two separate worlds?

Contemporary writing theory, research, and practice have been strongly influenced by two seemingly different approaches to studying writing. One has involved a cognitive lens to studying writing, focusing mostly on the mental operations and motivational aspects in writing development and skilled writing. The other has applied a social-cultural lens, concentrating on the social context in which writing takes place, and how the interaction between writers and context shape each other. Too often scholars from these two traditions ignore each others work instead of working towards synthesis. This is unfortunate, as I would content that an adequate understanding of writing and writing development requires such a synthesis, and that instruction in writing will be enriched as a result. My presentation will primarily focus on the implications of such a synthesis for the teaching of writing.

Speaker 3: Activity, genre, and . . . cognition?

Sociocultural theories of activity and practice have given researchers a powerful framework within which to study writing, and genre theory has allowed for complex accounts of writing within that frame. The combined theoretical perspective views texts and textual practices as socio-rhetorical strategies designed to stimulate, harness, distribute, direct, and regulate activity in an effort to achieve collective objectives. Theories of activity and genre—either implicitly or explicitly—draw heavily on Vygotsky's ideas about the sociogenesis of mind, and infer or conclude that participation in an activity's textual practices involves taking on particular ways of seeing and making sense of the world. The theoretical space created by these claims seems to be an ideal location for research into the relationship between context and cognition, and a rich opportunity for collaboration across research traditions and methodologies, but little such research has occurred. This presentation will offer the outlines of a research agenda that would depend on an interdisciplinary approach to the study of writing.

Speaker 4: Cognition or context: What's the question?

Beliefs about the relation of cognition to the social/cultural context in which it occurs depend importantly on one's beliefs about the relative impact that cognitive and

social/cultural variables have on the research questions that we address. One reasonable view is that cognitive variables generally have small impact compared to social/cultural variables. A corollary of this view is that the outcomes of cognitive studies will vary from one social/cultural setting to another. As a result, the conclusions of such studies will apply only in the circumscribed social/cultural settings in which they were conducted and will have very limited generalizability.

In my presentation, I argue that although there are research questions for which social/ cultural variables do dominate cognitive ones, there are many interesting and practically important research questions for which cognitive variables are sufficiently powerful that they do generalize across contexts. I will provide examples to illustrate each case.

Speaker 5: A Matter of Language

This presenter will argue that differences between cognitive and social perspectives in writing studies have at their root philosophical disagreements over the nature of language itself. Generally cognitivists treat language as symbolic representation of human thought. Writing from this perspective appears to spring from multiple cognitive processes, which then become the central concern of research. Socially oriented researchers on the other hand treat language materially, as a palpable means by which people live and act together in the world. From this perspective, cognition is a residue of writing as writers participate in scenic social processes. Social participation becomes the central concern of materialist research. After briefly demonstrating how these two views of language underlie the two orientations, this presenter will address the substantial difficulties of overcoming these discrepancies.

Speaker 6: Theoretical integration for effective instruction

Many have argued that the integration of writing instruction approaches that involve explicit and scaffolded instruction within constructivist, whole language, or writing process approaches is impossible and misguided. Researchers, however, have shown that explicit, focused, and scaffolded instruction benefits the majority of learners. Explicitness and structure do not necessarily equate with isolated skills training, decontextualized learning of sub-skills, passive learning, or the gradual accruing of basic skills. Explicit, focused instruction must, however, be integrated into the larger literacy context. Ideally, coherent, theoretically integrated instruction is based in learning communities that are educationally purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring, and celebrative. When we treat competing theoretical viewpoints and their associated bodies of research with thoughtfulness and respect, research can result in a powerful repertoire for teaching and learning. My presentation will focus on what we have learned about the integration of self-regulated strategies instruction within the larger writing context.

Speaker 7: Continuity and Discontinuity in Writing Research, or Do “Things Fall Apart”?

Continuity characterizes many disciplinary histories and researchers’ individual biographies, as the narrative form reduces contradictions and complications. The resulting accounts are narratives of progress showing how an edifice of knowledge is built cumulatively by individuals and by an entire research community. This attention to

continuity is one way of telling our story—*my* story. But our histories and biographies can also be told, conversely, as discontinuous accounts with attention given to points at which there have been challenges and revisions as well as “cracks” in the edifice. Considering both, this paper takes a *meta* perspective on the cognitive-social and quantitative-qualitative controversies and suggests how such arguments fit within the larger history of writing research. It also takes a *micro* perspective on the continuity that can be seen in the careers of individual researchers who have not been limited to either a cognitive or social focus or to either a quantitative or qualitative approach.

Speaker 8: Writing and the self

The cognitive/social divide in writing research is, in part, a matter of the different levels of analysis favoured by different disciplines and of how they should be prioritised. I will argue in this paper that these levels of analysis share a common feature. Both focus on an impersonal level of analysis – the sub-personal in the case of the cognitive perspective, and the supra-personal in the case of the social perspective. I will suggest that in order to resolve the tension both approaches need to include the personal level of analysis, and that this involves developing theories about the role of the self in writing. I will also suggest that a move to this personal level of analysis involves a shift away from a focus on the types of processes or moves involved in writing towards a greater emphasis on how knowledge and the social context in which it is constructed are represented to the self.

References

- Berlin, J. (1988). Rhetoric and ideology in the writing class. *College English*, 50.5: 477-494.
- Bizzell, P. (1982). Cognition, convention, and certainty: What we need to know about writing. *Pre/Text* 3: 213-44.
- Flower, L. (1989). Cognition, context, and theory building. *College Composition and Communication*, 40.3: 282-311.
- Rose, M. (1988). Narrowing the mind and page: Remedial writers and cognitive reductionism. *College Composition and Communication*, 39: 367-302.

H2

Developing identities of teachers and writers

A Theory of Writing Development: The Importance of Identity Development to College Writing

Sarah Boggs, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.

The study I would like to present uses qualitative interviewing, case study, ethnographic field notes and textual analysis to trace the writing development of four first generation Latina college students. The study frames writing development in the broad way that Curtis and Harrington (2003) argue for in their CCC's article "Writing development in the college years: By whose definition?". Their view of development, as well as the view of development in this study, relies on theorists who "are interested in the interplay between individual and historical/contextual factors in shaping change; who view development as multidirectional, not unidirectional; who are interested in, as Jack Meacham writes, 'what is distinct and special in individual's lives'" (Curtis & Harrington, 2003 p.72).

The study takes a broad view of development and looks considers how writing opportunities in college are also used by students as opportunities for personal development. The subjects are all first generation, Latina college students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. They took one or more classes from a professor who has been identified in an earlier study study (Singer, 2007) as a "Sponsor of Literacy" (Brandt, 2001).

The corpus of the data collected for each subject includes: transcriptions of two (two hour long) interviews, academic transcript, copies of all papers the student has in her possession written at during the student's four years at the university and any extracurricular writing provided by the student. Additionally I observed a course taught by the professor from whom all case study subjects had taken one or more course and took ethnographic field notes.

The research confirms some of the findings about factors that promote development in non-traditional college student and tries to extend that body of work by proposing a theory of how (one process through which) non-traditional students develop as writers at the university. The study finds that non-traditional college students develop as writers when they: (1) join ideological group that the university recognizes as legitimate (2) appropriate the language provided by academic theories (3) gain a consciousness about how their personal history influences their current perspective. The study points to the importance of courses that help students to move from seeing their experiences as solely personal, to seeing their experiences as transpersonal and as part of a larger group experience. The study suggests that for students with problematic identity issues or personal histories, one way to they become successful writers is to use academic writing assignments as opportunities to conduct a sustained investigation of the identity issues that are problematic for them.

References

Brandt, D. (2001) *Literacy in American lives* .Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curtis, M, & Herrington, A. (2003). Writing development in the college years: By whose definition? *College Composition and Communication*, 55 (1), 69-90.

Singer, J. (2007). *A Retrospective Interview Study of Literacy Sponsorship and First Generation Latino College Writers* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2007).

H2 (continued)

Developing identities of teachers and writers

Writing Reflectively about Teaching in an International Learning Community
Joy Kreeft Peyton, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., U.S.
Carla L. Reichmann, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, João Pessoa,
*Brazil**

Reflecting on instructional practice has long been accepted as an effective way for teachers to examine and seek to improve their own and others' practice and to continue to learn throughout their professional lives. Less known is the importance of writing to support such reflection and learning. Reflective writing is a sustainable, flexible means of professional learning, because it allows individuals to record and re-imagine their teaching, alone and in interaction with others, and it provides lasting texts for ongoing analysis, conversation, and further learning. Reflective writing allows teachers to process current and newly learned practices in a deliberate and focused fashion and to examine, in a safe and supportive setting, instructional practices they might otherwise have ignored and upsetting incidents they might not know how to handle (Burton, Quirke, Reichmann, & Peyton, 2009; Gallup-Rodríguez & McKay, 2010). Finally, it can help to reduce the isolation that often accompanies instruction in instructional programs, large and small (Orem, 2001). For example, Farrell (2007) describes an ESL teacher who reported receiving unsolicited negative comments from a student after class. As a result of reflecting on this incident in writing with a group of peers, the teacher was able to view the comments in the larger context of her teaching practice and to understand the comments as coming from the student's desire to learn rather than a desire to critique.

Reflective writing can take several forms. Journaling independently, interactively, and online allows teachers to reflect on their work and interact with others about it (Lai & Calandra, 2007). Creation of teacher portfolios allows teachers and those they work with to document changes in their writing, classroom practices, and projects over time (Scott, 2005). Writing critical analyses of incidents or case studies helps teachers focus on specific topic areas that can yield change in thought and practice (Nath, 2005). Participating in online discussions (e.g., on discussion boards and in study circles) introduces teachers to a variety of perspectives on topics pertinent to instructional theory, research, and practice (Hawk, 2000).

Since 1999 an international community of teachers and researchers has been implementing reflective writing in their own instruction and writing together about their theoretical understandings, research, and instructional practice (described in Burton, Quirke, Reichmann, & Peyton, 2009). This presentation describes the different forms of reflective writing used by members of this community (personal memoirs and journals, interactive journals between two people, small-group journals, online discussion boards, free writing, and local writing communities) and the development of community over time among this international group of teachers and researchers. The following research methodologies used by the different members of the group to examine growth in reflection, learning, and sense of community will be described: discourse analysis, analysis of patterns of interaction over time, and text analysis. The presentation concludes

by arguing that reflective writing communities have strong potential for promoting professional learning as well as for informing society at large about how teachers understand their work.

References

- Burton, J., Quirke, P., Reichmann, C., & Peyton, J.K. (2010). (Eds.). *Reflective writing: A way to lifelong teacher learning*. TESL-EJ online journal. (<http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/books>)
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2007). *Reflective language teaching: From research to practice*. London: Continuum Press.
- Gallup-Rodríguez, A., & McKay, S. (2010). *Professional development for experienced teachers working with adult English language learners*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. (<http://www.cal.org/caelanetwork/resources/experienced.html>)
- Hawk, W. (2000). *Online professional development for adult ESL educators*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. (http://www.cal.org/caela/esl_resources/digests/pdQA.html)
- Lai, G., & Calandra, B. (2007). Using online scaffolds to enhance preservice teachers' reflective journal writing: A qualitative analysis. *International Journal of Technology in Teaching and Learning*, 3(3), 66-81. (http://ijtl.sicet.org/issue0703/5_Lai_Calandra.pdf)
- Nath, J. (2005). The roles of case studies in the educational field. *International Journal of Case Method Research & Application*, XVII, 396-400. (http://www.wacra.org/IJCRA%20xvii_iii%20Nath.pdf)
- Orem, R. (2001). Journal writing in adult ESL: Improving practice through reflective writing. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 90, 69-78.
- Scott, T. (2005). Creating the subject of portfolios: Reflective writing and the conveyance of institutional prerogatives. *Written Communication*, 22(1), 3-35.

H2 (continued)

Developing identities of teachers and writers

The Jewish Veteran as Ruffian-Intellectual and Model for an Energized Intellectual Discourse

Sheridan Blau, Columbia University, U.S.

My proposed paper, derived from research representing mixed methods, including practices derived from auto-ethnography, narrative inquiry, and discourse analysis, along with a meta-analysis of recent case-study research on successful African-American and Hispanic student writers, will begin with a narrative account of the multiple social and rhetorical anxieties of growing up Jewish and poor in the 1940s and 50s when the identity offered by the language of the public school and school teachers was alienating and emasculating for a young Jewish boy. However, these post-war years were also marked by the emergence of an alternative and counter-cultural discourse forged on the battlefield among Jewish veterans returning from World War II and Korea. These veterans, many of them college graduates or college students whose academic careers had been interrupted by the war, came home speaking and writing a new English language that was vigorously intellectual, yet distinctively male, dramatically raw or crude in its lexicon, shocking to parents with middle-class aspirations for their children, and entirely unacceptable to the genteel and Gentile teachers who typically presided over English classes in public schools.

This male counter-academic rhetoric, most notably exhibited by Norman Mailer who saw himself as a Jewish ruffian-intellectual, offered an identity and a verbal style that was at once oppositional to and even contemptuous of the official language of the school, while commanding the respect and admiration of the larger intellectual and artistic communities whose prestige and cultural influence trumped that of the schools. In a single verbal performance, therefore, one could give the finger to the guardians of the culture of the public school, while saluting the culture of the university and the literary community to which the public school itself regularly and officially paid homage. The aim of my paper, then, will be to explore and reveal the power of a distinctively male and Jewish post-War anti-academic discourse as an avenue to advanced academic success, and to offer a reading of this mid-twentieth century rhetorical rebellion as a version of a similar (but differently gendered and differently inflected) rhetorical rebellion (documented in a number of recent case studies) among African-American and Hispanic students in twenty-first century classrooms and colleges.

H3

Studying dissertations and dissertation writers

Collaborative Revision: Helping Psychology Students Find Their Voice When Writing Their End-of-studies Dissertation

Montserrat Castelló, Ramon Llull University, Spain

Anna Iñesta, Ramon Llull University, Spain

In Spain, formal teaching on academic writing in higher education is not frequent, although it is widely required. Taking into account the socially and culturally situated nature of academic writing, we implemented two intervention studies in the field of psychology with a threefold objective: to help students avoid plagiarism using discursive mechanisms to make their academic voice visible in texts, to reflect on these discursive mechanisms and on the voices in the scientific community of psychology, and to revise their texts collaboratively by means of considering texts as artifacts-in-activity. The interventions focused on establishing reflective dynamics oriented to promote the sharing of students' as well as faculty's conceptualizations about writing, and its potential as an epistemic tool while collaboratively revising successive drafts of the end-of-studies dissertation. Consequently, discursive mechanisms as well as situated conceptions and voices from the academic and scientific community of reference are relevant notions in our approach.

The tutoring interventions (implemented in consecutive academic years 2008-2009 and 2009-2010) show some differences in their design. While the first intervention was more focused on providing students with the information and guidance necessary for them to make the most out of the collaborative revision process, the second intervention aimed at training psychology professors in order for them to provide this kind of insight to their students, without the researchers' intervention.

The variables analyzed were the students' knowledge of discursive mechanisms of academic texts in the field of psychology, the students' satisfaction with the intervention, the traces of text evolution in terms of structure, intertextuality and authorial voice through successive drafts and the quality of the final texts.

The type and the amount of revisions suggested by the classmates and by the tutor were discussed and categorized and then analyzed by three independent judges (Atlas.ti software) distinguishing whether they appear mostly in different environments. The amount and the quality of revisions were also analysed taking into account the relationship between the suggested changes and those finally implemented in texts.

Finally, to assess students' knowledge of the characteristics of specific discursive mechanisms characteristics of scientific and academic texts and the students' satisfaction in the field of psychology, we developed two questionnaires, the first one consisted of 12 items addressing the contents of the course and the second one of 10 items questionnaire and an open-ended survey (5 questions) that they answered at the end of the intervention. Taking into account all this information a new unit of analysis was proposed in order to reduce data in a comprehensive way without losing the overall picture of the composition process: the regulation episode which could be discussed in the presentation. Although the results showed that the quality of the final dissertations increased and better texts were related with higher rates of revisions and more students' satisfaction, students' peer revisions pointed out some problems students had to regulate their writing and some

of the persistent beliefs of the students and faculty about academic writing appeared which will also be discussed in the presentation.

H3 (continued)

Studying dissertations and dissertation writers

Language and Emotion in Academic Writing

Angela Dionisio, UFP, Recife, Brazil

To write academically and scientifically is the textual performance expected of graduate students when they present their theses and dissertations for evaluation. On the other hand, it is also expected that these authors demonstrate their recognition of those who have supported them during the research and writing up periods. Scientific theory and data analysis give way to the expression of gratitude. This paper seeks to investigate how sentiments are demonstrated in academic writing given that emotions are socially constructed. How to express emotion without causing an unhappy first impression for the readers/examiners of the thesis/dissertation? Who are elected as those who most supported the work? To whom is the gratitude directed? Who do the authors consider deserving of the act of dedicating their research and for what reasons? How do the students construct the identity of those they thank and to whom they dedicate their theses and dissertations? To answer these questions, we investigated the manifestations of gratitude and emotion in the genres of *acknowledgements* and *dedications* in master theses (429) and doctoral dissertations (101) produced in the Graduate Program in Letters at the Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil, between 1978 and 2008, observing the construction of the social identity of a variety of social *personae* mentioned from a comparative perspective between the areas of Linguistics and Literary Theory.

H3 (continued)

Studying dissertations and dissertation writers

Critical Discourse Analysis of Dissertation Introductions in Singapore, 1989 – 2009

Cheung Yin Ling, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

Much of research on discourse analysis of master's theses and doctoral dissertations is conducted with students in the Inner Circle (Kachru, 1996), such as United States, Britain, and Australia (e.g., Bunton, 2002, 2005; Dong, 1998; Dudley-Evans, 1986, 1994, 1999; Hewings, 1993; Paltridge, 2002; Ridley, 2000; Swales, 2004; Thompson, 1999, 2001, 2005). There is less published research about how graduate students structure introductions in the dissertation in the Outer Circle (Kachru, 1996), such as Singapore. Specifically little is known about why graduate students write dissertation introductions in the way they do, given the rhetorical salience of this genre component in dissertations (Bunton, 2002; Samraj, 2008). It is crucial to study dissertation introductions because they perform an important function to justify a claim in the reported study (Bunton, 2002; Swales, 1990) and they have not been commonly explored in genre studies (Samraj, 2004, p.65). The present study serves to fill this gap by conducting a critical discourse analysis of dissertation introductions written by the students who completed their master's and doctoral degrees in Applied English Linguistics at a large public university in Singapore from 1986 to 2009, using Swales' (1994, 2004) "Create-a-Research-Space" (CARS) model. This study aims to explore two questions: (1) In what ways are dissertation introductions structured? (2) What sorts of problems do graduate students have with writing dissertation introductions? The data consist of eight theses produced at a large public university in Singapore, all from Applied English Linguistics with a focus on second language writing. The findings highlight four important elements that shed light on dissertation introduction writing practices: the reasons to conduct the studies, the extent to which the studies are related to previous research, the mentioning of authors in the past research studies, and the importance of presenting students' authorial voice in the introductions. The project, which has lasted for a year, has implications for the development of academic writing courses for research students in the discipline of Applied Linguistics. It also provides insights into a better understanding of student-produced genres other than refereed journal articles and student-produced course papers.

H4

Evaluating written expression for developmental and diagnostic purposes: A multiple levels of language approach

"Writing the News": Development of a Standardized Test of Written Language Development

Nickola W. Nelson, Western Michigan University, U.S.

Predictors of Writing Quality in a Cross-Sectional Sample of Children in Grades 4 through 12

Gary A. Troia, Michigan State University, U.S.

Generalizability of Writing Scores: One or Multiple Genres?

Natalie G. Olinghouse, University of Connecticut, U.S.

Tracking Contextual Language Usage among Linguistically Diverse Writers

Kimberly A. Wolbers, The University of Tennessee, U.S.

Presentations for this panel describe research studies that have employed a multi-level language framework (word-, sentence-, and discourse-level indices) for measuring writing performance in children and youth with and without writing difficulties. These studies aim to elucidate developmental patterns, measures that differentiate students with underlying impairments that impact writing, or the validity of commonly used writing assessments within such a framework.

Paper 1 Title: Linguistic Predictors of Writing Quality in a Cross-Sectional Sample of Children in Grades 4 through 12

A number of studies have attempted to characterize the writing performance of poor writers in comparison with their more successful peers (e.g., Anderson, 1982; Bartlett, 1984; Hunt, 1970; Johnson, 1987; Loban, 1976; Morris & Crump, 1982; Morris & Stick, 1985; Scott, 1987). Generally speaking, poor writers exhibit limited productivity and vocabulary diversity, less syntactically complex sentences, more grammatical errors, more spelling errors, and less cohesion in their writing. However, reliable and developmentally sensitive measures that serve as indices for these problems have been difficult to identify. For instance, Scott and Windsor (2000) evaluated the extent to which general language performance measures differentiated school-age children with language learning disabilities from chronological-age and language-age peers. Productivity measures, including total T-units, total words, and words per minute, were significantly lower for children with language impairments than for chronological age-matched peers. However, lexical diversity (number of different words) measures were similar for all children. Grammatical complexity, as measured by words per T-unit, was significantly lower for children with language impairments. The only measure that distinguished children with language learning disabilities from both chronological age- and language age-matched peers was the extent of grammatical error. In contrast, Houck and Billingsley (1989) and Morris and Crump (1982) did not find the average length of T-units to differentiate good and poor writers (i.e., children with language disabilities versus those without). Mixed findings have been reported for other linguistic measures as well. One limitation of the extant research is relatively small sample sizes. Another is an exclusive focus on language-based measures without consideration of orthographic-based measures. This in-progress research study aims to identify reliable and developmentally-

sensitive predictors (language- and orthographic-based) of narrative writing quality. Original story writing samples were collected from 748 students (397 girls, 351 boys) in grades 4 through 12 (no fewer than 40 students at each grade) from multiple schools in the states of WA and MI. Approximately 62% of the participants were European American. About 53% of the students were considered good writers by their teachers (ranked at or above the 70th percentile in their class), whereas 15% were classified as poor writers (ranked at or below the 30th percentile in their class). The writing samples were collected under standardized conditions; each student was given 30 minutes to respond to either one of two title prompts. A score representing overall writing quality was derived from a multiple-trait scoring rubric with a 6-point scale. The writing samples were transcribed and coded using Systematic Analysis of Language Transcripts (SALT; Miller & Chapman, 2008). Codes were established to capture proficiency with written language conventions (e.g., number and type of spelling errors, word-level versus utterance-level omissions, substitutions, and insertions of capitalization or punctuation), language productivity (e.g., total word written, words per minute, number of different words), and linguistic complexity (e.g., number and type of errors in verb tense, subject-verb agreement, and inflectional and derivational morphology, T-units, subordination). Using multiple regression analyses, we will explore which variables serve as the best predictors of narrative writing quality for poor, average, and good writers in elementary, middle, and high school grades.

Paper 2 Title: Tracking Contextual Language Usage among Linguistically Diverse Writers

The purpose of this research is threefold. It first attempts to characterize the written language (in terms of sentence complexity and grammar structures) of two populations of middle school, deaf and hard of hearing students: those who are developing English as a second language and are proficient in ASL as their first language and those who are severely language delayed in their first language. Writing samples were collected from 29 deaf students (grades 6-8) and entered into Systematic Analysis of Language Transcripts (SALT; Miller & Chapman, 2008) for coding and description purposes. There were 26 grammar structure codes (e.g., codes for correct usage, errors and omissions of prepositions, pronouns, and articles as well as verb tense and aspect) and 8 different clause or phrase variables (e.g., #T-units, # of subordinate clauses per T-unit, compound sentences, fragments). Second, this research examines the written language growth that occurs during one academic year of Strategic and Interactive Writing Instruction (SIWI). Prior research has shown that students exposed to SIWI evidence significant gains with contextual language when compared to students receiving sequenced grammar instruction (Wolbers, 2008). SIWI is an approach that combines 20 years of evidence-based research with strategy instruction in writing (Graham, 2006), a substantial foundation of research in interactive writing (Englert & Dunsmore, 2002; Englert, Mariage, and Dunsmore, 2006; Mariage, 1995, 2001) and has specialized instructional components that address the language needs of the deaf (Wolbers, 2007). The purpose of this study is to track the developmental trends in language and provide information on aspects of language growth for two different student populations exposed to SIWI. Three types of writing samples (i.e., personal narrative, narrative, and persuasive) were taken at the beginning of the year, the middle and the end, for a total of

261 samples. While higher-level writing objectives are not a focus of this study, student writing was evaluated using primary trait rubrics and gains were documented. A 5-member research team then coded the samples for contextual language and entered data into SALT (with high overall interrater reliability of .96). Repeated measures ANOVA is applied to the data. Lastly, the research examines if there are patterns or relationships among the variables that can be explained in fewer underlying factors. For this presentation, some focus will be given to the use of SALT software in support of the work in these studies (e.g., entering writing samples, codes developed as well as generating reports on written language).

Paper 3 Title: “Writing the News”: Development of a Standardized Test of Written Language Development

Written composition is a developmental skill that can be influenced positively by formal education and experience and negatively by language impairment and/or learning disability. Writing is a complex skill that requires integration of cognitive-linguistic abilities on at least three levels: (1) on the discourse level, it requires activation and regulation of attention, thought, and memory processes for generating, organizing, and communicating well-formed ideas using a coherent discourse structure; (2) on the sentence level, it requires formulation of sentences with appropriate morphosyntactic structures and cohesion across sentence boundaries; and (3) on the word level, it requires transcription that reflect phonological, morphological, and orthographic knowledge consistent with spelling conventions. Classical studies (Hunt, 1970; Loban, 1976), as well as more recent ones (e.g., Nelson & Van Meter, 2007; Scott & Windsor, 2000), have shown that dimensions of written composition ability can be measured as indices of developmental advances. Such measures also have the potential for diagnosing language impairment affecting written composition. Although some formal tests are available that are dedicated to the assessment of written composition, it is not clear whether they are sensitive and specific enough to detect written language deficits on their own. Regardless, it would be helpful to have a written language subtest as part of a comprehensive battery for detecting patterns of spoken and written language performance relative to a consistent norm-referenced standardization group. “Writing the News” is an assessment task that is currently under development for inclusion in a Test of Integrated Language and Literacy Skills (TILLS; Nelson, Helm-Estabrooks, Hotz, & Plante, 2007). The task uses a sentence-combining format, which involves reading a grade-appropriate set of “facts” (kernel sentences) about pretend school news, after which students are asked to write a pretend news story in a more interesting way that sounds less choppy. Participants in a beta discrimination trial included 112 students (ages 6 to 18 years) who either met criteria as having typical language (TL; n = 58) or language-learning disabilities (LLD; n = 54). Groups were comparable for age, sex, race/ethnicity, and SES. Results highlight scoring criteria at the discourse, sentence, and word levels that show the potential for differentiating students by age group and ability. The best candidate measures (based on tests of mean differences and effect sizes across four grade level groups: 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12) are the discourse-level measure of proportion of content units included, the sentence-level measure of content units per T-unit or “sentence-combining index” (Scott & Nelson, 2009), and the word-level measure of proportion of words with word-form errors

(spelling or inflectional). Results also will be presented for sensitivity and specificity analysis for identifying disability.

Paper 4 Title: Generalizability of Writing Scores: One or Multiple Genres?

Large-scale writing assessment has been fraught with many challenges. In the U.S., large-scale writing assessments at the state level purport to measure the overall writing abilities of students. However, it is not known whether these assessments provide valid data, especially when only one genre of writing is assessed. The purpose of this study was to explore one aspect of a validity argument—whether assessing in one genre represents a universe of generalization for writing (e.g., state-level writing content standards). This study extends previous research by exploring whether various writing measures (derived from levels of language) are dependent upon the written genre or are consistent across genres. For example, one might hypothesize that spelling ability would remain consistent in any genre but that inclusion of essential genre aspects would vary across genres. Past research has indicated low to moderate correlations between different writing tasks (e.g., Brown et al., 1991; Lehmann, 1990; Moss et al., 1982), suggesting that few generalizations can be made from task to task. One important threat to generalization is trait under-representation (Cook & Campbell, 1979; Messick, 1989). Trait under-representation occurs when a test is too narrow, ignoring important elements of a trait. In many states, students complete only one writing assessment, which may under-represent the trait domain and provide inaccurate data about each student's overall writing ability. In this study, 105 fifth-grade students (47% male; 55% Caucasian) completed three writing assessments over the course of 6 weeks: story, persuasive, and informative. Each writing assessment focused on the topic of space to control for the effects of background knowledge. Students responded to a writing prompt similar to state-level writing assessment prompts, and had 15 minutes to plan and write their compositions. Measures represented essential aspects of the state's fifth-grade content standards across three levels of language: word, sentence, and discourse. Word-level variables included spelling accuracy and vocabulary usage. One sentence-level variable represented the ability to construct syntactically correct sentences with appropriate capitalization and punctuation. Three discourse-level variables measured text length, global text quality, and presence of genre-specific elements. Data analysis is currently underway, but preliminary analysis indicates that correlations between the three genres for quality, length, and spelling are small to moderate at best (range: -.16 to .61). These results suggest that assessing in only one genre results in trait under-representation, and that generalizations cannot be made to the broader grade-level standards. Final analyses will present an estimate of variance components across levels of language and genres.

H5

Communicative work in business and school organizations

Interdiscursive Collaboration in Public Relations Contexts

Vijay Bhatia, City University of Hong Kong, China

Interdiscursive collaborative construction of professional genres (Bhatia, 2004, 2010; Bremner, 2006; Smart, 2006) within the framework of ‘communities of practice’ (Lave and Wenger, 1991), can be viewed as a useful instrument for developing writing expertise to initiate novice writers into the conventions of corporate writing. Drawing on evidence from public relations writing contexts, particularly from the analyses of drafts and finished products, interdiscursive collaborative contributions by the participants involved in a specific task, and interviews of professional and novice writers, this paper will identify and discuss some of the important contributors to the construction of specialist genres to draw conclusions about the acquisition of writing expertise in and for collaborative corporate contexts.

Bhatia, V. K., (2004): *Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View*. London and New York: Continuum.

Bhatia, V. K., (2010): ‘Interdiscursivity in Professional Communication’. *Discourse and Communication*, 4, 1.

Bremner, S. (2006): *The construction of workplace writing: Texts, contexts and interaction in an academic administration*, Unpublished PhD dissertation, City University of Hong Kong.

Lave J., and E. Wenger, (1991): *Situated Learning- Legitimate Peripheral participation*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Smart, G., (2006): *Writing the economy: Activity genre and technology in the world of banking*, London: Equinox.

H5 (continued)

Communicative work in business and school organizations

E-mail, as an Agency of Social Actions for Executive Secretaries in the Workplace

Maria Eldelita Franco Holanda, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil

The present work whose theme is the use of email as an agency for social action, which is understood as social facts that consist of significant actions performed through language or speech acts in corporations. Their aim is to identify and analyze social actions carried out by the executive secretaries through the genre email in their businesses, as well as exploring what impact the production of email as a form of electronic communication has. For this investigation, three emails written in Portuguese by executive secretaries of two private and one public companies were collected for a total of nine emails, at the beginning of 2010. A questionnaire about the use of email as social action was applied, in order to verify the regularity in which gender email is produced in corporations and if the statements are intelligible to readers. The analysis of the gender email is grounded on the theoretical support of the New Rhetoric, drawn from the studies of Charles Bazerman (2006a, 2006b, 2007), Amy Devitt (2004) and Miller (2009), among others who define genre as typified recurrent social actions. Our analysis focuses on email as a mediator in society and takes the form of communication in which social typified actions materialize to create social factors affecting actions, rights and duties of people in corporations. Partial results suggest that the social structures that circulate in typed documents create social factors affecting direct actions and duties of individuals.

H5 (continued)

Communicative work in business and school organizations

The Co-Dependence of Structures in Texts and Organizations

Miles Myers, former Executive Director of the National Council of Teachers of English, U.S.

Brian Stock has shown that from the eleventh century on, the development of literacy was accompanied by the organization of "textual communities" (Stock, 1983). One notable example of this co-development of organizational and textual structures is the British Royal Society's decision in 1665 to start publishing Philosophical Transactions on the first Monday of very every month (Kronick, 1976). This action would not have been possible without enough textual production to justify publication regularity, without some understandable pattern for the evolving experimental article (Bazerman, 1988), and without enough organizational stability in the Royal Society to sustain the financing, marketing, distribution, and credibility of the publications. The question is: how do texts and organizations create and sustain each other?

The question is already on the research agenda in studies of writing in the workplace, but there is substantial confusion about what the question means in the teaching practices of college and K-12 classroom. Yes, there is frequent attention in college and K-12 classrooms on writing as social action (Moffett, 1968; Miller, 1984) and as social involvement (Brandt, 1990), but the absence of much research on the co-dependence of writing structures and organizational structures has resulted in almost no attention, at least in K-12 schools, on writing as organizational action.

Where do we turn for a research framework on the co-dependence of textual and organizational structures? For the case study presented here, the research framework is derived from three sources: (1) Alasdair MacIntyre's Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry: Encyclopaedia, Genealogy, and Tradition (1990); (2) John Sealy Brown and John Duguid's The Social Life of Information (2000); and (3) Yrjo Engestrom's cultural-historical-activity-theoretical (CHAT) approach in Learning by Expanding (1987) and in his research on organizational learning. The case study itself examines specific events and rhetorical issues in the NCTE standards project of the 1990s and comments on the re-emergence of these issues in NCTE's involvement in the 2010 Common Core Standards, now underway. The findings from the case study reported here are suggestive about teaching practices in college and K-12 classrooms. These suggestions will be reported within a teaching framework derived from Richard Ohmann's "In Lieu of a New Rhetoric" (1971). Describing this framework, Ohmann says that "the rhetoric, composition, or communication" course should "come finally to an explicit discussion of world views....competing ways of conceptualizing action, mind, the past, cause, space, society" (Ohmann, 1971: 70).

H6

Digital expertise

Expertise Online: Deepening Engagement with Writing Technologies

Derek Van Ittersum, Kent State University, U.S.

It is believed that understanding one's writing process will help one take control of that process, rather than be immobilised by it (Elbow, 1998). A method that has been successful in facilitating this understanding is presenting students with a model of the writing process (Dean, 2009). However, most models are designed by experts on writing, rather than by student-writers themselves. As such, they might not prove as useful as hoped. This presentation will discuss how one international, mixed-gender group of MA TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) writers, finding established models of the writing process unsatisfactory, collaboratively constructed their own model. The presenter will first describe how the group worked together to construct the model, then she will demonstrate how the members used the model in their Writer Development workshops. Data collected were audio-recordings of writers' group meetings, members' reflective journals, questionnaires and interviews. Results indicated that the development and use of the writing process model helped the student writers understand their own writing processes better, and helped them take control of the writing process. Specifically, the awareness of their writing process helped the writers move on with the process when they found themselves "stuck." The model was also used by the students to establish a common language for talking about writing, and to help them understand and articulate their in-process feedback needs. This model is descriptive rather than prescriptive. As such, it has subsequently been used with other groups of writers not as a set formula that is to be taken as-is and imposed, but rather as a starting point from which groups or individual writers can discover, develop and use their own representations of their writing processes.

H6 (continued) Digital expertise

I See What You're Saying: Iconicity and the Evolution of the Rebus Principle
Daniel Kies, College of DuPage, U.S.

“As human beings become increasingly intertwined with the technology and with each other via the technology, old distinctions between what is human and what is specifically technological become more complex. Are we living life *on* the screen or life *in* the screen? Our new technologically enmeshed relationships oblige us to ask to what extent we ourselves have become cyborgs, transgressive mixtures of biology, technology and code.” Sherry Turkle. *Life on the Screen* 1995:21

This presentation discusses the challenge that creating “lives” and “personas” on the screen presents to many of the traditional distinctions in linguistic analysis, such as ‘spoken’ vs. ‘written’ language or the ‘graphic’ vs. the ‘text.’ Electronic forms of communication, hypermedia, and text “chats” allow users to create realities, both literally and figuratively, online as they communicate (Goldberg, et al. 2003, Hewett 2000, Kist 2005). Similarly, literacy researchers (Fleckenstein 2004, Larson) who explore the significance of the image to the text in the development of multimodal literacies often do not discuss the pivotal role the image to our evolving understanding of both literacy and language change.

This presentation proposes an alternative research agenda – focusing on the iconic natures of image and text and how those are evident not only in the development of literacies but also serves as an explanatory principle for the textual features and rhetorics realized through the new media. New media teach us to create those realities, hyper-realities, through a re-emergence of the rebus principle (the representation of language through image) that underlies much of contemporary language change.

Special emphasis is given to systemic-functional concepts of coherence, thematic organization of text, grammatical metaphor, genre, and collaborative writing as the paper offers an analysis of the interplay between speech and writing in the creation of lives online.

References

- Fleckenstein, K. S. (2004). "Words Made Flesh: Fusing Imagery and Language in a Polymorphic Literacy." *College English* 66(6): 612-631
- Goldberg, A., Russell, M., & Cook, A. (2003). “The effect of computers on student writing: A meta-analysis of studies from 1992 to 2002.” *Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment*, 2(1). Available from <http://www.jtla.org>.
- Hewett, B. (2000). “Characteristics of interactive oral and computer-mediated peer group talk and its influence on revision.” *Computers and Composition*, 17(3): 265-288.
- Kist, W. (2005). *New literacies in action: Teaching and learning in multiple media*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Larson, E.L.C. “A case study exploring the ‘new literacies’ during a fifth-grade electronic reading workshop.” Retrieved on April 20, 2009, from <http://krex.ksu.edu/dspace/handle/2097/352>, 2007.

Turkle, Sherry (1995). *Life on the Screen: Identity in the Age of the Internet*, New York: Simon & Schuster.

H6 (continued)

Digital expertise

University Identity as Visual Argumentation

Matthew R. Sharp, Virginia Tech, U.S.

The visual aspect of modern argument is widely regarded as an indispensable tool in the rhetor's repertoire. The ability of the visual element to capture readers' attention and summon their emotions allows communicators across all disciplines access to ever more effective means of persuasion. Furthermore, the visual aspect is increasingly considered a near necessity in all types of persuasive discourse. Few deny this "pictorial turn," of the discipline, as W. J. T. Mitchell termed the study of visual rhetoric in the early 1990's; however, some still question the scope of the visual element's usefulness and capacity to stand alone (without textual assistance) as a true argument.

This individual presentation will explore the question of the visual's argumentative capacity. Through an analysis of graphic and photographic elements of three college viewbooks, I will explore how each viewbook's cover art, depictions of students, and use of student/alumni testimonials present an argument for the university's unique institutional identity. These viewbooks—a standard promotional genre within the field of college admissions and recruitment—were chosen from three competing U.S. universities in the same state to emphasize the competitive nature of the rhetorical situation in question. As competitors, these three institutions are operating in response to similar rhetorical situations. However, they each have different histories, strengths and perceived identities that they must address within the viewbook's argumentative structure. They must each present compelling but slightly different arguments to differentiate themselves from each other and convince prospective students to consider them more seriously.

Based on this analysis, I will demonstrate how visuals can—and in this case must—perform argumentative functions without the assistance of the textual. While textual arguments are obviously a part of a viewbook's rhetorical strategy, both supporting and being supported by the visual, I argue that the unique rhetorical situation here requires the visual element to bear the primary responsibility for convincing the reader to consider the institution more seriously. In fact, I will argue that the textual actually works to support the visual—a complete turnabout from the traditionally assumed rhetorical structure of argument.

H7

The ‘Academic Literacies’ approach and intervention possibilities: Case studies of academic writing development from the UK

Brian Street, King’s College London, U.K.

Ursula Wingate, King’s College London, U.K.

Weronika Gorska, King’s College London, U.K.

This Panel will link the theoretical debates about teaching writing and different historical developments in the UK and the USA, to current practice and policy. The presentations will focus on key tensions in the field between the provision of support by central units, as in the US ‘College Composition’ approach or the role of Writing/Study Skills Centres offering ‘generic’ skills support, on the one hand, and more subject or discipline specific support in which both the students and the staff engage in reflection and new practices around the writing requirements of the particular discipline, on the other; and between public perceptions of ‘falling standards’ and ‘students can’t write’, and research-based evidence of the ‘problems’ students encounter in academic writing.

Writing provision has been part of US academic debate for more than a century, but debates and research exploring diversity of language and literacy practices grew notably in the US from the 1970s onwards, following open access policies which led to the participation of large numbers of students historically excluded from university (Russell et. al., 2009). Whilst the ‘College Composition’ movement and Writing in/ across the Disciplines (WiD/WaC) have been influential in the USA, in the UK the ‘Academic Literacies’ is becoming a significant approach to the thinking and planning about writing support at universities and a number of programmes are being developed that draw upon it. In a recent summary of the approach, Scott and Lillis (2007) argue that Academic Literacies in the UK has emerged from ‘predominantly teacher-researcher recognition of the limitations in much official discourse on language and literacy in a rapidly changing higher education system’. The concept developed from the field of ‘New Literacy Studies’ (Gee, 1996; Street, 1984) as an attempt to draw out the implications of a ‘social practice’ approach to literacy for our understanding of issues of student learning.

The first two contributions present examples of the application of Academic Literacies principles to student support and the teaching of writing. The third contribution reports on research conducted with international students in EAP classes; Academic Literacies was used as a research framework to understand the academic writing requirements these students have to meet. The final paper discusses three examples of how Academic Literacies can contribute to writing pedagogy.

Widening Participation Programme at King’s: Brian Street

An example of the application of an Academic Literacies approach to support programmes for student writing is to be found in the *Widening Education Programme* at King’s College London. This programme was designed to provide a non-credit bearing English language Development course for ‘A’ level (Year 12) students from linguistic minority community backgrounds attending schools in the locality of King’s College London, who would like to further their studies at university. The programme of work was intended to provide additional opportunities for dedicated ‘A’ level students from the local areas who were still in the process of learning English as an additional language; it

was hoped that participation in the Programme would enhance both their 'A' level performance and their chances of entering higher education. The programme consisted of three hour sessions and runs in term time on Saturday mornings, from January to December, with fewer sessions in the summer term according to the students' exam timetable. The course was not an English language course, but rather focused on developing the use of academic English in Higher Educational contexts in the UK. In addition to teaching on the programme, members of the team engaged in ethnographic-style research. The aim of the research was to provide a data base from which future inquiries could be conducted and to make some preliminary interpretations as to how the programme was working. For instance, the researchers were interested in the relationship between the programme objectives and actual experiences and perceptions of the sessions by the students. As one of the teachers in the course observed, the ALD programme: "tries to challenge some of the expectations students may have met at school... about language as narrowly defined...the course involves issues of discourse, genre, writing as social process...within a notion of building on what they already had and bring to the programme rather than treating them as a deficit and just fixing that". Whilst funding for this programme was cut in 2009 – itself an example of the gap between policy rhetoric and practice - members of the team have continued to provide a similar support programme for Sixth Formers in the a local area of London, funded by the Local Authority and we will also report on progress in this programme.

Case studies of 'additional' and 'embedded' approaches to teaching writing: Ursula Wingate

Various methods of discipline-specific writing instruction for undergraduate and postgraduate students have been developed and evaluated at King's College London in recent years (Wingate & Dreiss, 2009; Wingate, 2008). They are based on the principles of the Academic Literacies approach (Lillis, 2003, Lea & Street, 1998) and range from non-compulsory 'additional' provisions such as online materials and writing tutorials to the full integration of writing instruction into subject teaching. The effectiveness of these methods is discussed in this paper. The evaluation findings suggest that the level of integration of writing instruction into the curriculum determines the level of student engagement and progress.

Two case studies are reported in this paper. The first shows two forms of 'additional' writing instruction offered online in Business Management, Pharmacy and Applied Linguistics. The main focus of the paper is on the second case study which represents a writing intervention that was carried out in a first-year undergraduate module. Five instructional methods were fully embedded into the regular subject teaching. The effectiveness of this approach was assessed in various ways: student and teacher perceptions were elicited by questionnaires and interviews, and student progress was identified through the analysis of texts produced throughout the term. The evaluation results were encouraging in most aspects. It is therefore argued that the embedded approach is not only the most successful in terms of student engagement and progress, but can also lead to more effective ways of structuring and presenting subject content.

Finally, the paper will report the findings of a survey among academic teachers from various disciplines and discuss their perceptions of embedded writing instruction.

Learning how to write – perspectives of international pre-master’s students in the UK higher education

Weronika Gorska

What does it take to write an academic paper? Within the UK higher education, institutional answer and faculty advice on this question usually comes in the form of extracurricular English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classes, study skills courses or 1:1 tutorials with a writing instructor (Scott & Lillis, 2007; Wingate, 2006). This approach assumes that a) surface text level, grammatical correctness and familiarity with referencing systems are key elements in academic writing, and that b) genres and disciplinary conventions can be taught separately from the subject content and then applied to any discipline in the academia. Having this in mind, it is interesting to notice that academic assessors are likely to have a different approach, and that in the first place they focus not on whether a paper is grammatically correct and neatly structured, but if it follows the logic and epistemological frameworks of a given discipline.

In the UK higher education, where writing is a major form of assessment, being able to respond to academic writing requirements is a matter of succeeding at university or not (Jones et al, 1999; Lillis, 2001). This research-based paper takes the perspective of international pre-master’s students and challenges both current models of writing support provision and public discourses on students’ low academic standards. The theoretical background of the paper draws on the social views of language and literacy (Barton & Hamilton, 1998; Fairclough, 1993; Gee, 1996; Heath, 1983; Street, 1984), and in particular it employs an Academic Literacies approach as a heuristic for understanding academic writing requirements (Lea & Street, 1998). The discussion uses data from class observations, interviews with international students, faculty members and writing tutors as well as the analysis of students’ texts. The examination of these data yields evidence that international students, who on the institutional level are offered generic writing support, actively seek their own ways to cross institutional, disciplinary and cultural boundaries in order to write academically approved papers. It will be argued that rather than focusing on discourses of ‘falling standards’, it would be more appropriate to focus on how international students negotiate academic literacy practices and what can be learnt from their *ways with writing*. It is hoped that this paper will provide insight for teaching practice, and that it may inform the development of academic writing pedagogy.

Selected References

- Barton, D. & Hamilton, M., (1998), *Local Literacies*, London: Routledge.
Clark, R. and Ivanič, R. (1997) *The Politics of Writing*. London: Routledge.
Fairclough, N., (1993), *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Gee, J. P. (1996) *Social Linguistics and Literacies. Ideologies in Discourses*. (Second edition.)
Basingstoke: Falmer Press.

- Ivanic, R. (1998) *Writing and Identity. The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Jones, C., Turner, J., Street, B.V. (eds) (1999), *Students Writing in the University: cultural and epistemological issues*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Heath S. B., (1983) *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lea, M & Street, B (1998) Student writing and faculty feedback in Higher Education: an Academic Literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23, 2, pp. 157 – 172.
- Leung, C. (2005) Convivial communication: recontextualizing communicative competence. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15, 2, pp. 119–143.
- Lillis, T. (1997) New voices in academia? The regulative nature of academic writing conventions. *Language and Education* 11, 3, pp. 182–199.
- Lillis, T. (2001) *Student Writing: Access, Regulation, Desire*. London: Routledge.
- Lillis, T. (2003) An ‘academic literacies’ approach to student writing in higher education: drawing on Bakhtin to move from ‘critique’ to ‘design’. *Language and Education* 17, 3, pp. 192–207.
- Lillis, T. (2006) Moving towards an academic literacies pedagogy: ‘dialogues of participation’.
- In L. Ganobesik-Williams (ed.) *Academic Writing in Britain: theories and practices of an emerging field*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave.
- Lillis, T. & Scott, M. (2008) ‘Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy’. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4, pp. 5-32
- Lillis, T. & Scott, M. (2007) ‘Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy’. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4, pp. 5-32
- Russell, D., Lea, M., Parker, J., Street, B., and Donahue, T. (2009) ‘Exploring notions of genre in ‘academic literacies’ and ‘writing in the disciplines’: approaches across countries and contexts’ in *Genre in a Changing World* edited by [Charles Bazerman](#), [Adair Bonini](#), and [Débora Figueiredo](#). Perspectives on Writing. Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/genre/>
- Curry, M.J. and Lillis, T. (2010) ‘Making academic publishing practices visible’ in N. Harwooso (ed.) *ELT Materials Development*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, pp 321-345
- Scalone, P., & Street, B. (2006). An Academic Language Development Programme (Widening Participation). In C. Leung & J. Jenkins (eds.), *Reconfiguring Europe: the contribution of applied linguistics*. London: Equinox, pp. 123-137.
- Street, B 2009 “‘Hidden’ features of academic paper writing. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, UPenn
- Street, B. (1999) Academic literacies. In C. Jones, J. Turner and B. Street (eds) *Students Writing in the University: Cultural and Epistemological Issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Street, B. (1984) *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. London: Cambridge University Press
- Wingate, U. (2006). Doing away with study skills. *Teaching in Higher Education* 11, 4,

pp. 457 – 465.

Wingate, U. (2008) Enhancing students' transition to university through online pre-induction courses. In: R. Donnelly & F. McSweeney (eds.) *Applied eLearning and eTeaching in Higher Education*. Information Science Reference, IGI Global: Hershey, PA; London, pp. 178 – 200.

Wingate, U. & Dreiss, C. (2009) Developing students' academic literacy: an online approach, *Journal of Academic Language & Learning*, 3,1, pp. 14 – 25.

H8

Map, territory, chronotope: Reshaping representations of writing, discourse, and disciplinarity

Kevin Roozen, Auburn University, U.S.

Rebecca Bilbro, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.

Samantha Looker, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.

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

In his 1983 essay on blurred genres, Geertz speculated that the felt sense of change in the structure of academic life, disciplines, and genres amounted to more than a re-drawing of the boundaries on a map, seeing it instead as indicative of a deeper change, "an alteration of the principles of mapping." The question of mapping the social onto writing (or vice versa) has been at the center of writing theory for decades, especially in debates about discourse communities, social networks, and activity systems. And yet, as Bateson (1972) suggested, not only is the map not the territory, but the territory itself is uncertain, a flow of complexly laminated intersecting systems. Accordingly, each paper in this session considers how writing, discourse, and disciplinarity map uneasily to human activity. The panel suggests that an increasingly grounded convergence of theoretical notions and empirical evidence offers the possibility of other—flat, fractal, fractured—ways of mapping such chronotopic complexity.

Speaker #1

Title: *Learning American Literature, Studying the Word, Doing 2-d Design: Re-situating the Development of Discursive Practice*

The dominant metaphor of development in Writing Studies locates writers within a particular disciplinary territory and maps their movement from periphery toward some more central location. In this view, acquisition of disciplinary practice has tended to be understood as a product of increasingly deeper participation with a discipline's texts and activities. Drawing upon data collected for a case study of one writer's multiple and diverse textual engagements over a fifteen year period, and informed by a body of theoretical work that attends to the restructuring of practice across diverse activities as a prominent factor in the ontogenesis of social practice (Bourdieu, 1977, 1990; Scollon, 2001), this paper argues for accounts of development that address how the acquisition of disciplinary practice is profoundly mediated by persons' reading, writing, making, and doing for other engagements beyond a single focal disciplinary world.

Using a wide variety of sample texts, video and still images, and excerpts from text-based interviews, this presentation elaborates how one writer weaves discursive practices she employed for a broad range of textual engagements into the discursive practices she employs for literary criticism tasks in English Studies. Practices the writer employed for keeping a prayer journal, for example, are incorporated into her reading-to-write practice for engaging with novels and journal articles. Likewise, practices the writer employed in generating and assembling visual designs for an undergraduate graphic design course are repurposed as invention and arrangement practices for literary arguments. These repurposings of practice across seemingly different activities, I argue, suggest that the writer's ability to act with the key discursive practices for literary

criticism is mediated and produced through her engagement with a wide array of other textual engagements.

Speaker #2

Title: *Affective Engagements in Engineering: Canon, Alter-Canon, and Home Discipline*

Following formative scholars (Foucault, Klein, Prior), who suggest that writing and communication are central pathways into, through, and out of disciplines, this talk investigates canonicity and disciplinary affect as literate disciplinary practices. In reporting on interviews, observations, and textual artifacts collected from faculty, students, staff, administrators, and alumni during an 18-month study of the College of Engineering at a large Midwestern university, I explore several case studies of engineers' affective relationships to disciplinary texts and knowledge production practices.

During interviews, participants routinely indexed emotionally-charged issues—race, gender, class, faith, and sexuality—in connection to their enculturation into and continued participation in engineering. Thus, while Biglan (1973) and Becher's (1989) taxonomies propose that members of “hard-applied” sciences are “purposive and pragmatic,” my findings suggest engineers are frequently just as “reiterative; holistic; personal; value-laden” as Becher supposes humanists to be (35-37). Moreover, these cases suggest that some of the most consequential texts are off the disciplinary map. In addition to the canonical disciplinary texts, like lab and research reports, typically captured in studies of disciplinary genres (e.g., Berkenkotter and Huckin, 1995), participants in this study referenced and provided samples of numerous other kinds of texts critical to their practice of engineering. Through this alter-canon—mission statements, resumes, application forms, novels, religious texts, and poetry—we see how poorly our maps of engineering represent literate life.

As my ethnographic evidence has increasingly called into question traditional classification schemes, I have begun to formulate a new framework to complicate the mapping of disciplinarity. This framework, which I call “home discipline,” traces literate disciplinary practices beyond traditional academic sites as well as manifestations of idiosyncratic “nondisciplinary” practices within such institutional spaces. “Home discipline” thus encourages researchers to attend both to external forces of enculturation and what Leont'ev (1981) calls the “self-assertive motives” of participants in order to fully capture the practice of discipline (21-22). In taking individual talk and text as key levels of analysis, such research reveals the extent to which seemingly distinct disciplines have always been laminated networks of activity populated with many unruly texts, spaces, and human beings.

Speaker #3

Title: *Re-mapping Academic Writing and Language: Pedagogical Representations versus Lived Realities*

In the lived practice of academics, we find an enormous range of languages, dialects, registers, tones, and genres. Academic literate practices are complexly layered and overlapping, requiring constant negotiation and renegotiation of shifting territories. In mappings of the territory of academic writing, however, much of this lived complexity

is lost. Much like the “standard” language ideologies to which they are closely tied, ideologies of “academic” writing and language place boundaries around a category that does not exist in a pure form outside of abstractions and cannot be so easily contained. This disconnect between representative mappings and lived realities occurs because, as Irvine and Gal (2000) describe it, a language ideology is “a totalizing vision” in which language forms are imagined to be homogenous and any element that does not fit with a particular homogenous image is rendered invisible—it will “either go unnoticed or get explained away.”

The false homogeneity of academic writing representations becomes especially striking when we consider how academic writing is represented to student writers. These representations create rigid borders between academic and nonacademic writing and often contain tidy instructions for what to do and avoid in order to write academically. Bakhtin (1981,1986) tells us that language is always dispersed across sites and times and exists in reality only in concrete, situated utterances. Yet he also reminds us that “the real and the represented” are “indissolubly tied up with each other.” Oversimplified as they are, then, these representations of academic language practices have very real effects, in that certain practices—like inclusion of nonstandardized dialect features or an informal, personal tone—can very quickly be labeled insufficiently academic. As a result, students who attempt these practices can be denied permission to call themselves academic writers.

Drawing on a set of longitudinal ethnographic case studies of “basic” writers’ experiences across the curriculum, I will illustrate how the messages sent to student writers—including how-to lists in textbooks, directives in assignment prompts, and judgments in response to writing—reflect mappings of the territory of academic writing that contrast sharply with how professional academics conduct themselves in the world and create for students a clear sense that they are in a less privileged category. In conclusion, I will suggest ways that we might use our pedagogy, theory, and research to bring these realities and representations more in line with each other.

Speaker #4

Title: *Re-Writing/Disciplinarity: A Flat CHAT Account of Semiotic Remediation and Academic Ways of Being in the World*

In 1998, I published a book, *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistoric Account of Literate Activity in the Academy*, that presented a series of analyses of how writing (understood as situated, mediated, and dispersed activity) accomplished disciplinary enculturation (with enculturation figured not as a one-way street, but as both the learning of relative newcomers and the on-going (re)production of disciplinarity). To theorize such complex activity, I took up and reworked the foundational ideas of key sociohistoric theorists (Vygotsky, Luria, Leont'ev, Bakhtin, Voloshinov) and also drew on and integrated work from current sociohistoric psychology (e.g., Wertsch, del Rio & Alvarez, Hutchins, Engeström, Scribner), Actor-Network Theory (e.g., Latour), and practice theories (e.g., Lave, de Certeau). Over the past 12 years, I have continued to do and consult in research that has spun off of, extended, and revised that theoretical framework. In this talk, I consider how I might revise my 1998 book title today as a way to consider the somewhat different set of theoretical terms I have arrived at, what those terms signify, and the research and lines of work that have led to the shift.

The talk will briefly detail the theoretical terms that I settled on in the late 1990s and how those terms grew out of a series of research studies on writing in graduate seminars as well as in response to the research literature and my own biographic experience (living and working outside the US, teaching ESL, and embracing a very interdisciplinary identity as an academic). I then consider how my theoretical frames have since shifted, a shift partly signaled by a movement from sociohistoric theory to what I have termed Flat CHAT, an increasingly semiotic orientation (captured in my recent work with colleagues on *semiotic remediation*), and a sharper critique of encapsulated, territorial notions of community (reflected in a deep reluctance now to *locate* disciplinarity, writing, or semiotic activity "in" the academy). The second half of the talk will focus on ethnographic research on writing, activity, and disciplinarity that I and colleagues have undertaken (including the work of my co-presenters in this session) and examine how that research illustrates the way flat, mediated, dispersed forms of semiotic remediation animate and articulate academic ways of being in a chronotopically laminated world. The paper will conclude by projecting future directions of research from this perspective.

H9

Narratives in middle and high school

Examining Identifying Narrative Performances across Space and Time in a
Midwestern United States Middle School

Mary M. Juzwik, Michigan State University, U.S.

Denise Ives, University of Massachusetts, U.S.

This paper examines how oral narratives are mobilized to perform identities across social spaces and across time scales in an urban middle school in the Midwestern United States. Focal data for the study include video recordings, transcripts, interviews and student writing generated during a four-month integrated language arts unit in a sixth grade classroom. Data were generated through ethnographically oriented participant observation. The focal teacher in the study, Rhonda Wagner, is a white woman who took an integrated approach to language arts teaching, with a particular focus on narrative writing because of the significance of the genre on state tests. Students in the focal classroom include predominantly African American youth and two white girls. Most students attending the school live below the poverty line.

Our multi-layered dialogic discourse analysis takes identifying narrative performances (INPs) as the unit of analysis: we define INPs as oral narrative practices (including talk and other relevant semiotic systems) that function to perform, enact, contest, or affirm some aspect of identification – either the speaker’s or someone else’s. Conceptually, the work is informed by sociocultural theorizations of talk and texts as situated practices that are locally emergent, performative, and semiotically complex. Methodologically, the study is grounded in the research tradition of interactional sociolinguistics.

Our analysis probes how – through INPs enacted across time and space – teacher identification, student identification, and the curricular focus on writing braid together to become significant resources for participants “doing writing” in school. In studying INPs, we consider for example how a) how INPs are structured as “texts”, b) how INPs emerge as turns in longer utterance chains, such as literacy events or lunchtime conversations; c) how emerging narrative storylines develop into “solidified roles” for individuals over time; and d) how emerging storylines respond to, and anticipate, writing practices and other literacy events. We consider the implications of the circulating INPs for students’ ongoing identity performances, for students’ ongoing school-based writing practices, and for Ms. Wagner’s ongoing identity performance as “language arts teacher.”

H9 (continued)

Narratives in middle and high school

Young People's Uses of Fiction-writing in Contexts of Political Violence

Colette Daiute, City University of New York, U.S.

When the nation itself struggles for stability after periods of political violence, those in power exert pressure on citizens to express certain ideas and not others. Pressure to speak in ways that justify a war or demonstrate progress beyond a violent past affects children as they figure out what is going on around them and how they fit. Consistent with political instability is the fact that institutions, like public schools, the church, families, and non-governmental organizations try to socialize young people to their ideologies, as youth struggle to integrate their experiences. This paper discusses young people's uses of diverse written genres in that sense-making process. Since most prior research about effects of violence focuses on psychopathology (like PTSD) (Barker; 2009; Bonanno, 2004) or social reproduction of hatreds, we know little about how children understand such environments. Drawing on socio-historical discourse theory (Bakhtin, 1986; Vygotsky, 1978), this paper presents a developmental approach to studying the effects of growing up during and after political violence that employs literacy as a means of understanding (Daiute, 2010). With a case study in the aftermath of the 1990's Balkan wars, this research engaged 137 adolescents in Bosnia, Croatia, Serbia, and a U.S. refugee community to narrate history from their perspectives during a workshop in local community centers. Based on the premise that each discursive act involves communication with explicit and implicit audiences (Bakhtin, 1986), the workshop asked participants to narrate conflict in three narrative genres systematically varied for author-audience relationship: narrating conflict with a peer (1st person autobiography), narrating conflict among adults (3rd person autobiography), and narrating from a story-starter about a hypothetical community event (open person fiction). Analyses address questions about participants' uses of those narrative contexts to enact diverse knowledge of and orientations to conflict. Hypotheses include that, given extreme political control about issues of conflict in the aftermath of war, young people would use autobiographical narratives to express more socially-accepted scripts (given author exposure as a character or observer) and fictional narratives to express more silenced perspectives in their context (given the option for author anonymity). Plot analyses (conflict issue, resolution strategy, etc) of the each narrative genre across countries reveal context-sensitive uses. Plot analyses of peer conflict narratives indicate youth reflections about interpersonal issues resolved via communication, while conflicts among adults express unresolved societally-specific conflict; in contrast, fictional stories express a range of different psycho-social orientations countering the broader societal expectations. An example of this finding is that, in the 1st-person narratives, youth in Croatia highlight values (like inter-ethnic group friendship) consistent with the national goal to enter the European Union, in the 3rd-person narratives, they critique the adult generation who waged the war, while, in the fictional narratives, they express perspectives considered unacceptable or taboo to share in public (such as the view that Serbia started the wars). Discussion will consider the relevance of these findings to ongoing research with youth using written genres for learning and development.

H9 (continued)

Narratives in middle and high school

The Process of Story Writing

Kees de Glopper, University of Groningen, Netherlands

Jordy Keupink, University of Groningen, Netherlands

Story telling is a remarkable human feat. Nearly every language user can create stories when asked as we use this genre on a daily basis to give meaning to our lives. No wonder the production of oral narratives has been studied extensively (Labov & Waletzky, 1997; Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Heesters, 2000). Story writing has attracted less attention, especially when it comes to the processes of composing. In this study we tried to shed light on the cognitive processes that play a role during story writing. To this end we compared the written production of a fictional story with the process of writing an argumentative text. We conducted an experiment where high school students wrote both a story and an argument on a specially prepared computer that registered their input (Leijten & Van Waes, 2006). After each writing session the students were subjected to a stimulated recall interview (Gass & Mackey, 2000). All gathered data (the created texts, video recordings of their writing sessions, keystroke logs and interview data) were used for comparisons between the two genres. In our presentation we focus on the distribution of types of writing processes, writing fluency, pausing behaviour, and revision. With respect to process types, we expect more generating of content during story writing and more attention to rhetorical aspects during argumentative writing. Fluency, as measured by the average size of production bursts (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2000), is expected to be higher during story writing. Pausing behaviour is expected to correlate with transitions in narrative and argumentative structures and thus reflect genre differences. In argumentative writing we expect more revision at higher textual levels.

References

- Chenoweth, N.A. & Hayes, J.R. (2000). Fluency in writing: generating text in L1 and L2. *Written Communication*, 18, 1, 80-98.
- Gass, S.M. & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Heesters, K. (2000). *Een wereld vol verhalen. Ontwikkeling van verhaalstructuur bij 9- tot 13-jarige eerste- en tweedetaalsprekers van het Nederlands*. Proefschrift Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. Enschede: Print Partners Ipskamp.
- Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. (1997). Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7, 1-4, 3-38. (Reprint from original publication)
- Leijten, M. & Van Waes, L. (2006). Inputlog: New Perspectives on the Logging of On-Line Writing. In K.P.H. Sullivan & E. Lindgren (Eds.), *Studies in Writing: Vol. 18. Computer Key-Stroke Logging and Writing: Methods and Applications* (pp.73-94). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Peterson, C. & McCabe, A. (1983). *Developmental psycholinguistics. Three ways of looking at a child's narrative*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

H10

Writing centres/centers and English language learners: Research on institutional pressures, programmatic challenges, student expectations, and culturally sensitive strategies (Part I)

Lawrence Cleary, University of Limerick, Ireland

Wu Dan, Xi'an International Studies University, China

Ann-Marie Ericksson, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Magnus Gustafsson, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Joan Turner, Goldsmiths, University of London, U.K.

Carol Peterson Haviland, University of California, San Bernardino, U.S.

Amy Zenger, American University, Beirut, Lebanon

Paula Gillespie, Florida International University, U.S.

Michelle Eodice, University of Oklahoma, U.S.

Terry Myers Zawacki George Mason University, U.S.

Chair and panel convener: Terry Myers Zawacki, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA

Creating a Trend: Writing Center in XISU, China

WU Dan

Xi'an International Studies University, Shaanxi Province, China

wudanwang@gmail.com

This presentation introduces the establishment and operation of the Writing Center in Xi'an International Studies University in Shaanxi Province, China. It traces back to the factors that played important roles in creating this center in XISU, such as the exchange program with Bowling Green State University in the US, the recognized importance of student writing by the administration, and the faculty participation and contribution, which have made this center possible and continue to benefit the students. This introduction of the history and operation provides a review of how an American writing center model can be adopted and adapted to a Chinese higher education institution, which might help those interested in building writing centers in other countries or higher education models concentrate more on specific local contexts to find out the opportunities and challenges.

This presentation also points out the pioneering function of this first English writing center in Chinese higher education institutions, which has contributed to a new trend of building writing centers with different components or choice of languages in Chinese universities. This new trend shows that although English departments are foreign languages departments in China that focuses on linguistics and literature but without much rhetoric and composition influences, it is still possible to introduce this American writing center idea into China to promote better writing and learning among students, and it is very important that English professors in China realize and make good use of this “gatekeeper” function of introducing higher educational reforms and movements into

China to cope with the current tension between access and quality in higher education institutions.

Getting the writing right: what does this mean and whose responsibility is it?

Joan Turner, Centre for English Language and Academic Writing, Goldsmiths,
University of London, UK
j.turner@gold.ac.uk

This presentation will focus on some of the strategies adopted by the Centre for English Language and Academic Writing at Goldsmiths, to help L2 students improve their academic writing, both in subject-specific classes, and in one-to-one 'drop-in' sessions, as well as support for students writing their doctoral theses. Despite this institutional role of 'support' and learning development, however, there is increasing (covert) recourse by students to external proofreaders. The results of a study on student attitudes to this will be briefly discussed, with a view to opening up discussion on how/whether writing centres should respond, and what this suggests for changing institutional expectations.

Science and Technology students' second language writing: student profiles, writing activities and research avenues at Chalmers University of Technology

Magnus Gustafsson and Ann-Marie Eriksson
Chalmers University of Technology, Centre for Language and Communication
(magusta@chalmers.se) (ann-marie.eriksson@chalmers.se)

This panel contribution aims to present the current situation for second language writing in science and engineering at our institution. It will identify some of the challenges that Swedish as well as international students face as they write in their fields of study, and provide an overview of some of the research with relevance for L2 writing that the centre is establishing.

Chalmers University of Technology is a research university in Sweden with a focus on engineering education. The language of instruction is predominantly Swedish at the BSc-level and exclusively English at the MSc-level. The general language of instruction at the BSc level is Swedish even though some schools provide compulsory technology modules in English. The expected student would have encountered English for up to 9 years in the Swedish school system but there are increasing numbers of students with other language backgrounds who enter higher education. From the perspective of facilitating technical communication, many of the students come well prepared for university studies but there is also a large group of BSc students who are less fortunate and have graduated from upper secondary school with insufficient language proficiency for a successful university career.

Approximately 30% of the students at the MSc-level are international students with very different and varying language backgrounds. In many cases, this category of students are highly motivated to develop their ability to work in English and willingly take on the challenge of writing and speaking in English. However, from a teaching perspective we see how many of those students struggle to participate in the course work and find productive ways of using it for their thesis writing. The Swedish students in the MSc-programs are usually more experienced in both academic and technical writing and therefore come better prepared for the two years of technical communication in English.

Almost all the BSc-level programmes have well-designed and programme specific sequences of language and communication components. Although many of them focus on Swedish for specific purposes there are also programmes that include compulsory courses in English for specific purposes. The main components in terms of support for English for Specific Purposes and academic writing at the MSc-level consist of a set of elective, sequential courses. In addition to these electives, the recently opened Chalmers Open Communication Studio (CHOCS), the writing centre, also meets an increasing number of students and some course managers use the writing centre in their assignments. For the MSc-level, we also provide courses for faculty all of whom are required to teach in English. The next institutional step at this level is structured support for the technical communication component of the master's degree project beyond the elective writing course currently on offer. In all our interventions we strive towards integrating learning outcomes for technical communication as far as possible with technical learning outcomes.

The Centre for Language and Communication is part of the university key milieu *Learning* and the research areas include for example writing and technology, writing to learn and writing in the disciplines. The overarching aim is to broaden and strengthen the subject base for the knowledge area of technical communication and our recurring basic objective is to investigate and better understand how technical communication interventions prepare students for effective disciplinary communication during and after their university career. One important aspect of this work is to understand the main challenges for students and teachers who are set to work in such interdisciplinary settings.

The student profile at the MSc-level, in combination with the educational setup in programmes with considerable room to maneuver in terms of technical communication focus and support, provide rewarding research and development contexts for such work. In order to investigate these, the Centre is exploring a few different research avenues and actively builds collaboration with other universities and centres of expertise. Some of the questions we have isolated and begun work on include:

- What discipline specific language do students encounter at Chalmers and how should that inform our understanding of how disciplinary discourse informs learning?

- What are the constraints and rewards for students and faculty as disciplinary discourse is emphasized in the learning environments of engineering programmes?
- How do students and teachers address and engage with collaborative forms of disciplinary writing?
- How do we develop our understanding and effective use of disciplinary discourse in engineering education based on our experiences and observations?

Falling Through the Cracks: The Effectiveness of a Regional Writing Centre Policy on Proficiency for Second Language Writers

Lawrence Cleary

Shannon Consortium Regional Writing Centre at UL/The Centre for Teaching and Learning, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland
Lawrence.Cleary@staffmail.ul.ie

Abstract:

Currently, the Regional Writing Centre (RWC) at University Limerick works with non-native speakers of English on any writing issue they present, but will refer these same students to the Language Support Unit (LSU) if a lack of proficiency in the language is preventing the student from producing a text that is appropriate to the context into which they write. This arrangement is the result of an agreement between the RWC and the LSU to respect each the other's remit. Too, as the Writing Centre does not employ tutors with extensive English language teaching backgrounds, most of its tutors lack confidence, knowledge and the metalanguage to facilitate writing development for non-native speakers of English, especially those with language problems. More importantly, the RWC and the LSU have an interest in promoting autonomous learning, the role of the advisor in the LSU and of the tutor in the Writing Centre as one of facilitator of self-direction, but also one of scaffolder, helping students to address the issues that will have the greatest effect, to help students to set goals that are manageable and to direct their attention to strategic options that they may not have previously considered. Additionally, the RWC assures that it does not compromise the authenticity of a students' writing, the integrity of student academic work premised on the idea that the work that is assessed is their own. The consequences of privileging inductive methodologies, self-realisation and non-invasiveness could be devastating for students whose actual English proficiency is below what appears on their IELTS, Cambridge or TEOFL certifications. Students become good test-takers, but not necessarily proficient in the language of instruction at UL, and many of those availing of the two services, the Writing Centre and the Language Support Unit, present much too close to due dates for either of the services to be of much help. This study will inquire into what happens to these students with inadequate proficiencies and little time when, after a few visits, they disappear from our radar. Do they abandon their programmes, returning home, do they hand in their research paper, incoherent English usage and all, do they employ an editor/proofreader, or do they

opt to plagiarise? This study seeks to find out what happens to these people after they leave us and whether our procedures and the policies that guide them allow us to ignore options that could improve the situation of such students.

Multilingualism: Deficit or Asset? Interrogating the Roles and Practices of Literacy Brokers with Multilingual Writers.

Carol Haviland and Amy Zenger

University of California, San Bernadino and American University, Beirut

(cph@csusb.edu) (az07@aub.edu.lb)

To the American University of Beirut, students typically bring a rich multilingual background to their study of writing in English. Most students have written Arabic and a home dialect of Arabic, although for some a home language is Armenian, Ukrainian, French, English, or one of a number of other possibilities. In addition, they will have had K-13 schooling in Arabic, French, and/or English. Because a school's curriculum and pedagogical approaches tend to follow traditions associated with the primary language of instruction, students often identify themselves as "French-educated," "English-educated," and so on—a short-hand way of indicating not only a strong background in that language but also particular experiences of authority and authorship, understandings of how to use and document sources, and habits of composing, among other things. This complex language learning situation makes students adept at language acquisition, and gives them considerable meta-knowledge about language practices.

Because we believed that our students' multilingualism was an asset rather than an impediment as sometimes it is viewed by faculty and even students themselves, we wanted to better understand and build on their knowledge of languages and language acquisition. To do this, we studied two sections of MA students enrolled in a course on disciplinary discourses. Following Elizabeth Wardle's lead, we wanted to teach *about* writing rather than just *teach* writing, so we needed to know about our students, about them as writers, about what they brought to our writing classes as well as to their Writing Center conferences.

This session, a discussion of our data and their implications, reports our challenges us to examine practices of understanding writing as collaborative but teaching it as an individual, competitive enterprise as well to take our responsibilities as literacy brokers seriously. In classrooms and in writing centers this involves recognizing that Pennycook's "transcultural flow of knowledge making" means that as we help students create and publish their ideas we also learn and can create knowledge in forums such as this one.

L2 Writing Tutors On A Diverse Campus: Theoretical Grounding
Paula Gillespie, Florida International pgillesp@fiu.edu

Castellanos and Gloria (2007), Gloria and Rodriguez (2000) have identified as necessary for the success of Hispanic university students a sense of community created by one-to-one attention; culturally sensitive, empathetic, and interested mentorship; and mini-successes, that is, earned self-esteem through praise for small accomplishments. Bilingual and ESL tutors can serve as mentors and role models as well as writing consultants to L2 students writing in English. Their empathy – and their writing strategies – motivate not only Hispanic students but other nonnative speakers and L1 students.

Updates and Research on Writing Centers Internationally
Michele Eodice

Learning, Teaching, and Writing Center, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma

Former president of the International Writing Center Association provides updates on various international projects and thematic interests she learned about in her travels. She also describes research she is doing with a colleague on the research interests of writing center directors.

H11

Understanding disciplinary differences from student, teacher, and assignment perspectives

Writing, Disciplinary, and Meta-Awareness: An Empirical Investigation

Kerry Dirk, Virginia Tech, U.S.

Brian Gogan, Virginia Tech, U.S.

Our co-authored paper shares the results of an IRB-approved empirical study of sixty-five student writers enrolled in “Writing from Research,” the second of two sequenced writing courses at Virginia Tech.

Drawing upon recent work on compulsory academic writing courses, meta-awareness, and transfer (Downs and Wardle 2007; Smit 2004; Wardle 2004; 2007; 2009), we designed a version of the “Writing from Research” course which asked students to investigate the rhetoric and writing that occurs in their own major discipline. Our version of this course was piloted during the Academic Year 2009-2010.

We further designed an empirical study, the goal of which was not only to compare the student learning outcomes to this course’s goals, but also to add to the growing knowledge on academic writing, meta-awareness, and transfer. In an effort to contribute a contextualized piece of knowledge to larger conversations within writing studies, we modeled our own study after the pilot study described by Wardle (2007). Our study employs a survey, a questionnaire, an analysis of course writing, and artifact-based interviews in order to gauge student meta-awareness in the three major areas identified by Wardle: writing, language, and rhetoric (2007, p. 82). The following five questions guided our research:

- How do students view disciplinary writing, after having taken this course?
- How do students approach reading texts, after having taken this course?
- To what degree do genres transfer across disciplines?
- How do students view the role of rhetoric in disciplinary writing?
- What are the programmatic implications (in terms of collaborative course design and teaching students to “Write from Research”) that might be gleaned from this study?

Although our study is vulnerable to the critiques of any case study, particularly those enumerated by Wardle (2007, p. 71-2), our data should be conceived as rejoinders that gesture to a greater generalizability of Wardle’s data. Wardle suggests that writing studies scholars “should attempt to account for the ways in which knowledge and skills are *transformed* across contexts” (2007, p. 69). Thus, it is reasonable to consider each institution, each discipline, each course, and each professor as different contexts—borders, if you will—across which knowledge and skills might be transferred or transformed. The data that we will report moves Wardle’s study across borders: We study sixty-five students (as opposed to seven honors students) from a public, land-grant, technological institution of 23,000 students (as opposed to “a private, Catholic, liberal arts school of 10,000 students”).

H11 (continued)

Understanding disciplinary differences from student, teacher, and assignment perspectives

Writing Assignments in Disciplinary Contexts

Richard Graves, University of Alberta, Canada

Susan Chaudoir, University of Alberta, Canada

We will present a comparative analysis of over 1000 assignments from a variety of disciplines to identify how writing assignments change from one discipline to another. This topic has interested researchers at all levels of schooling since the 1980s (Applebee, Langer and Mullis 1986), (Bridgeman and Carlson 1984), McCarthy (1987). More recent work sometimes touches on writing assignments as a side issue (Kelly & Bazerman, 2003), (Dias, Freedman, Medway & Paré, 1999; Dias & Paré, 2000). Recent work describing writing assignments across the disciplines (Light 2001, 2003), (Paltridge 2002), (Cooper & Bikowski 2007), (Melzer 2003, 2009), (Graves, Hyland, Samuels 2010) identifies the kinds of writing assignments undergraduates at universities write across the academic disciplines. Melzer's work focuses on writing across the curriculum approaches, identifying courses that have a writing across the curriculum focus and using Britton's (1975) taxonomy of purposes for writing (expressive, poetic, functional). Melzer's assignments draw from syllabi available at 100 different institutions in the US. Graves, Hyland, Samuels collected a complete sample of syllabi from one college and 17 different departments. This approach shows how writing assignments change within a specific program at one college and provides us with a complete picture of student writing tasks within each of these programs.

This presentation will build on this work by comparing genres of writing assignments in various disciplines. The research questions focused on one main question: what assignments are undergraduate students given? Do these assignments differ by discipline? Do assignments differ from first year to fourth year, and if so, what aspects change? To answer these questions we conducted a series of studies in a variety of disciplinary contexts: liberal arts departments; nursing, service learning, political science, and geography departments; and first year English lit (writing components). These studies yielded a database of over 1,000 assignments from over 20 disciplines. this presentation will compare the assignments given to students by discipline on a number of variables such as genre, academic year, evaluation criteria, and audience.

At this point we have completed three of these studies and collected the data for all but one of the other disciplines. These research projects are ongoing and part of an effort to create a broad dataset that describes the range of writing asked of students across the undergraduate curriculum. Preliminary findings include some surprising results: the length of writing assignments generally does not increase as students move through the undergraduate curriculum; Nursing students write as much or more than students in many liberal arts disciplines; audiences for student texts are almost always instructors; few opportunities for revision or process are incorporated into syllabi descriptions of assignments.

H11 (continued)

Understanding disciplinary differences from student, teacher, and assignment perspectives

Writing Research within Borders: Faculty Perceptions of Discipline-specific Writing Instruction Transformed

Pamela Flash, University of Minnesota, U.S.

Audrey Appelsies, University of Minnesota, U.S.

Kathleen Blake Yancey (respondent), The Florida State University, U.S.

Until faculty members within the disciplines are engaged in an ongoing process of questioning and shaping their own writing-related assumptions and values, meaningful writing instruction will be, at best, unevenly integrated into undergraduate curricula. In this presentation, we describe a method and the results of an ongoing grant-supported pilot project aimed at supporting attitudinal, curricular, and practice-oriented change at a large public research university.

We will discuss how a sequence of facilitated faculty discussions, held within their disciplinary homes, can provide a means of breaking through barriers typically triggered by unilateral writing initiatives and can result in relevant writing instruction, embedded assessment, and, ultimately, student writing that succeeds in meeting faculty expectations. We argue that the recursive process with which we engaged departmental faculties transformed the meanings and values that faculty members had about writing instruction and about the purposes and values of the undergraduate curriculum. Furthermore, we found that faculty members have been willing to stay engaged in this process, in spite of institutional demands that pulled their time and attention elsewhere. As a result, they have reported feeling that their expertise about content, teaching, and writing are valued and respected. At the same time, they have reported feeling that their expertise was shifting and expanding, and that this growth was dependent upon individual and collective refinement of disciplinary understandings and knowledge of themselves as scholars and teachers.

To provide a context for our work, we first sketch the goals of the pilot project. The project's goals were to (1) provide a means by which faculty members could identify writing values and intentionally integrate writing instruction into their curricula (see, for example, Carter 2002); (2) support relevant writing instruction; (3) provide a means by which faculty members could more accurately and explicitly match assessments to assignment expectations (Yancey & Huot 1997; Thaiss & Zawacki 2006); and (4) have student writing respond successfully to faculty expectations.

In our presentation, we trace the local evolution of discipline-specific writing values across six departments. In addition we share the results of a case study of the Department of History, which examines the shifting understandings, meanings, and values articulated in a series of meetings over the course of three years. Meeting transcripts, analytic memos, student group interviews, observational records, and official "Writing Plan" documents were analyzed using inductive analytic methods (Ericson, 1986; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Hammersly & Atkinson, 1983). We close with a series of implications for ongoing writing research and suggest several institution-wide policy implications.

References

- Carter, M. (2002). "A Process for Establishing Outcomes-Based Assessment Plans for Writing and Speaking in the Disciplines." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*. 4-29.
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook on research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). New York: MacMillan.
- Hammersly, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. London: Tavistock.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Thaiss, C. & Zawacki, T.M. (2006). *Engaged Writers and Dynamic Disciplines: Research on the Academic Writing Life*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Yancey, K. & Huot, B. (Eds.). (1997). *Assessing writing across the curriculum: Diverse approaches and practices*. Stamford, CT: Ablex Publishing/JAI Press Inc.

H12

Collaborative methods in ESL college writing

Rethinking Collaborative Writing in an ESL Context: A Case Study of a Writing Workshop and Its Implication on Teaching

Jijia He, Utica College, U.S.

This study explores the application of contemporary Western composition pedagogical approaches in university-level advanced EFL (English as a foreign language) writing classes at a Chinese university. The researcher conducted a series of writing workshops outside the regular English curriculum and observed what happened in the workshop through a semester, where the focus was on students' attitudes toward the writing workshop experience and EFL teachers' perceptions of Western style writing pedagogy.

Research Questions

What would happen if certain Western composition pedagogical approaches were applied to Chinese university EFL writing classes?

What would be the students' attitudes and teachers' perceptions toward incorporating some aspects of Western composition approaches in college-level EFL writing classes?

How could such an approach, if found to benefit students, best be integrated into the context of the Chinese educational scene?

ESL Writing Research Framework

Silva's (1990) ESL Writing Framework: L2 writing should be seen as "purposeful and contextualized communicative interaction" which necessarily involves: L2 writer, L1 reader, L2 text, contexts for L2 writing, and the interaction of these elements in a variety of authentic ESL settings.

Research Methodology

Research design: Qualitative method, naturalistic classroom inquiry.

Participants: 16 Chinese Junior year English majors, four EFL writing teachers & an American writing instructor.

Setting: English Department, Beijing International Studies University, P. R. China.

Duration: 10-week period of writing workshops, and 2-week term for follow-up interviews.

Time: Spring semester 2006 (February – June)

Data Collection

Data collection techniques: surveys, interviews, and classroom observation. These three sources of data have been collected and triangulated to answer the research questions regarding the teaching of second language writing with the application of contemporary Western composition pedagogical approaches.

Product data: students' pre- and post-revision texts collected during the study.

Process data: students' in-class writing log, researcher's observational field notes & retrospective logs.

Perception data: students' evaluation sheets, surveys and interviews, teachers' interviews.

Conclusions

Students' attitudes show that their likes and dislikes for workshop writing activities and strategies have some similarities with those of L1 students. The EFL

students in the workshop welcomed activities which prompt original thinking, develop ideas, and provide constructive feedback through interactions.

Students' attitudes also show a trend of increasing acceptance of peer reviewing and collaborative writing. Moreover, students especially welcomed learning practical writing strategies to facilitate their own writing processes.

The results of this study suggest that some aspects of the Western writing pedagogy are beneficial for EFL writing instruction in China, which can be useful for better understanding the teaching of writing to ESL students in the U.S.

Limitations of the Study

The study is tightly embedded in the research setting and its unique cultural and educational contexts, and the interpretations and findings are drawn from this particular setting, which may not be generalized to other research contexts.

The study is a collective case study, which involved 16 students in the whole course. Therefore, the results might be influenced by some factors, such as the individual differences in students' personalities, learning styles, and their writing abilities. Cultural influence and learning environment might be two factors to be considered in the study.

H12 (continued)

Collaborative methods in ESL college writing

Using Web-based Collaborative Writing Tools to Foster Peer Feedback and Cooperation in the ESL Writing Classroom

Clara Bauler, University of California, Santa Barbara, U.S.

Over the years, teachers and researchers have developed varied strategies and alternative practices to address feedback in second language writing classes. Peer review is one of the most popular ways of trying to make feedback more cooperative and responsive, encouraging students to also work and participate in the editing and revising processes of their writings (Hyland, 1996; Peñafiorida, 2002; Nunan, 2004). Nevertheless, a number of teachers complain that some students do not seem prepared to give effective feedback to other students (Hyland, 1996; Peñafiorida, 2002). Moreover, a number of students also complain that they do not feel that their peers help them the way they expect (Hyland, 1996). How can we then have peer feedback that is at the same time effective and cooperative? How can teachers and students work together to make not only the teachers, but also the students, responsible for their writing practices and outcomes?

Driven by questions on how to foster cooperative learning environments while encouraging learner autonomy and collaboration in giving and receiving feedback in my Community College English as a Second Language (ESL) writing classes, I have recurred to alternative ways of using Web-based collaborative writing tools in my classroom practices with my students. In this context, Moodle has surfaced as an option due to its socio-constructivist view of learning. Social constructivist perspectives on learning and teaching are mainly based on the idea that the activities of learning and teaching entail construction and negotiation of knowledge through participation in socially mediated and situated contexts (Hall, 1997; Lave, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vygotsky, 1962; Dewey, 1916). Therefore, by adopting a socio-constructivist approach to learning, Moodle seeks to offer many collaborative writing tools, such as online forums, wikis, and chats, which facilitate the social process of constructing and acquiring knowledge through collaboration with others (Warschauer & Grimes, 2007).

In cooperative classes, teachers and students form a community, in which every member is responsible for helping each other, fostering a shared and affective learning environment in the classroom (Freire, 1996; Dewey, 1916; Oxford, 1997; Richards and Rodgers, 2001). In addition, in cooperative classes, the concept of “successful participant” is not only relied on the “teacher’s model”, but also on “the students’ model”; that is, by cooperating and writing together not only the teacher, but also students can be models of successful second language writers to each other (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Cook, 1999; Cook, 2008; Block, 2003). Bearing these principles in mind, this presentation aims to demonstrate and share ideas on how to implement Web-based collaborative writing tools, such as online forums, wikis, blogs, and chats, to develop more guided and structured ways to maximize peer reviews, while fostering a cooperative and affective learning environment in English as a Second Language Writing classes.

H12 (continued)

Collaborative methods in ESL college writing

Promoting Multilingual Writers' Self-Efficacy Using Web 2.0 Participatory Platforms

Maria Jerskey, LaGuardia Community College/City University of New York, U.S.

This presentation comes out of the ongoing dilemma faced by many college writing teachers who teach culturally and linguistically diverse students: How can we reconcile a writing instruction culture that asks us to prepare these students to pass standardized, college, and/or departmental writing assessments with a writing instruction culture that seeks to cultivate an environment in which these students can develop as writers? Traditionally labeled ESL (English as a second language) and more recently ELL (English language learners), these students have been placed (and often misplaced) in stigmatizing, remedial, non-credit bearing courses. The imperative to pass assessments often supersedes the imperative to develop as writers triggering mechanisms that lead to low-achievement and apathy (e.g., Harklau 2000, Harklau, et al. 1999, Nero 2005).

Recent scholarship has called attention to the role that “Web 2.0” participatory platforms (i.e., blogs, wikis, e-mail, e-portfolios, twitter, social media networks, etc.) can play in providing environments and opportunities for promoting writing success beyond a pass/fail paradigm. Could it also impact students’ identities as writers—their writing self-efficacy? It would make sense: Web 2.0 allows student writers to experience writing for and to an audience of real readers within and beyond the classroom (Yancey 2009). Indeed, Web 2.0 has catalyzed a global, textual treasure trove of code-switching, multilingual writing, and a shuttling back and forth between discourse and linguistic communities advancing multilingual, multimodal writing (e.g., Bezemer & Kress 2008; Bloch 2007; Canagarajah 2006; Hawisher, et al. 2006; Lam 2006; You 2008).

The concept of self-efficacy, a component of a larger social cognitive theoretical framework (Bandura 1986, 1997), has been adapted to promote and measure K-12 writing success (Pajares 2003). While some research has focused on college writers, virtually none has focused specifically on groups of college writers who are culturally and linguistically diverse. Social cognitive theory “analyzes human functioning as socially interdependent, richly contextualized, and conditionally orchestrated within the dynamics of various societal subsystems and their complex interplay” (Bandura 2001). As such a “societal subsystem,” Web 2.0 provides a compelling “laboratory” to both promote and study writers’ self-efficacy.

This classroom-based study sought to examine the relationship between students’ writing self-efficacy and their participation on a network of class blogs (one form of a Web 2.0 participatory platform). Data were collected from (a) a network of class blogs from 2 college classes; (b) a writing self-efficacy beliefs survey administered at the beginning and end of a semester; and (c) the final assessments of participating students’ formal class writing. The preliminary findings from the correlation and comparison of these data offer insights and caveats into how employing Web 2.0 participatory platforms to promote the writing self-efficacy of student writers in heterogeneously diverse classrooms might offer a useful bridge to transport a writing instruction culture as it is to a writing instruction culture as it might be.

H13

International writing research across the curriculum: The WAC/WID mapping project

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

Paul Carlino, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina

Patricia Iglesia, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina

Magnus Gustaffson, Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Since 2006, the International WAC/WID Mapping Project has been collecting data from institutions of higher education around the world to show where and how writing by undergraduates and graduate students is taught and learned, assigned and supported. From 2006 to 2009, almost 400 respondents from more than 50 countries completed the Mapping Project survey about writing in their institutions. (A separate survey studied writing in U.S. and Canadian colleges and universities.) The questions the international respondents answered were as follows:

1. Where are students writing in the institution, in either a first language of instruction or in English? In what genres and circumstances?
2. Who cares in your institution about the improvement of student writing or student learning through writing?
3. Is improvement in student writing an objective of certain courses in a discipline or of the overall curriculum? How and why?
4. Have any teachers in/across disciplines met to talk about these issues or made an effort to plan curricula in relation to student writing?
5. What is the source of their interest and what models of student writing/learning development (e.g., articles, books, other documents), if any, help guide these discussions?

The picture that has emerged from the data shows that, by and large, students at the tertiary and post-graduate levels around the world are being required to write in their academic programs in disciplines across institutions, often in a variety of genres. For graduate students, there is consistent pressure to write publishable material in their fields, often in English. However, there is tremendous disparity across institutions and regions in the degree to which writing is regarded as a subject of study in itself—and the degree to which the teaching of writing is regarded as a suitable use of institutional funds. Whereas in some universities, as the survey data show, there has been growing support for writing centers, required or optional writing courses and modules, and/or efforts to train teachers across disciplines to be effective assigners of and responders to student writing, in most of our informants' institutions there is just beginning to be awareness that student writing development may be in some sense an institutional responsibility.

This panel will (1) summarize and generalize from the Mapping Project data and (2) describe regional and local examples of how writing in and across disciplines is conceptualized and supported. A separate panel at the conference will describe the next

phase of the Mapping Project's work, the forthcoming book *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*.

Chris Thaiss, who directs the University Writing Program at the University of California, Davis (US), and who is lead researcher of the Mapping Project, will outline the objectives and background of the project, describe its methods, summarize its brief history, and analyze the demographic data and the diverse responses to the five core questions (listed above). In outlining the objectives and background, he will place this research in the context of changes in writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC) theory and practice since prior programmatic research in the 1980s, which was focused on U.S. institutions, and in comparison with the companion survey of U.S. and Canadian institutions.

Paula Carlino is a researcher with the CONICET at the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina, and a primary contributor to the Mapping Project. In this presentation, she will describe her work with researchers and writing program builders at a range of universities in Latin America and Spain. She will describe the variety of program structures she has observed: writing courses, linked courses, writing centers, team teaching (a writing teacher and a disciplinary teacher working together), teacher development, "sewed" writing in the disciplines, "interwoven" writing in the disciplines, academic meetings and networks. Carlino will highlight the regional controversies between learning to write and writing to learn: what students write about, who gives them feedback, what feedback includes, and the purposes for which they write in higher education.

Patricia Iglesia is a member of the faculty of biological sciences at the University of Buenos Aires. For more than a decade, she has incorporated writing as resources for student learning about cellular biology. In this talk she will present the difficulties that students face when writing about biology, the advances that she and colleagues have made in implementing these strategies, and the challenges they continue to face as professors committed to their students' learning. She writes, "The results that we are obtaining in terms of the number of students who pass the class, in the quality of texts they write, and in the students' commitment to their own learning are evidence that it is a worthwhile endeavor." With her colleague Ana de Michaeli, she has co-authored a chapter on this research for the forthcoming *Writing Programs Worldwide: Profiles of Academic Writing in Many Places*.

Magnus Gustafsson directs the Center for Language and Communication at Chalmers University of Technology, Göthenburg, Sweden. He will describe the history and growth of the Center into a "writing in the disciplines" (WID) program, which delivers courses and modules for many degree programs in engineering, thus allowing students multiple encounters with language and communication, as well as gradual and challenging progression through sequencing interventions, assignments, and entire courses. Given this integration and progression, the Center's language and communication activities are never isolated from the disciplines and communication becomes a dimension of disciplinary knowledge.