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What do we do about policy? – not just a rhetorical question

Speaker(s): Rowena Murray, University of the West of Scotland

Session Type: Plenary session

Session: 2A Room: Windsor Auditorium

For this keynote, I was asked to use it as a platform for introducing and contextualising conference themes and opening a conversation about them.

I will start with opening remarks about the changing terrain of HE as the context in which teachers of academic writing should respond, but I am not going to say much about ‘internationalisation’, marketization of HE and emphasis on student experience, since you will have heard so much about them already. Moreover, different institutions define them in different ways. If you review university websites, these topics are all there in strategies, but how these are implemented will surely be different from place to place.

Of the three themes identified for this conference, I feel we can tick the ‘pedagogy’ box – we know what to do – and the ‘practice’ box – we know what to get other people to do – but what about policy – are we influencing this enough?

What discourses do we use? For example, I coined the term peer-formativity in order to address but also interrogate the idea of ‘performativity’, but others may see this as a corruption of both the term and the collective idea. So, we can use that language and these concepts, but how do we get them heard at the policy table?

This conference is an important opportunity to think about these questions, share our answers and, perhaps, develop new ones. What rationales can we develop? How can we speak to policy makers to let them see the value of our interventions? How will leaders and line managers hear terms like, ‘non-surveillance’ writing retreat for staff and ‘freewriting’ for students? Even when we demonstrate increased ‘productivity’, the response may be that it’s quality, not quantity, of writing that matters. We can redefine ‘quality’ all we like – for example, thesis writers find it helpful when quality is defined as a set of layers, so that they can set achievable ‘quality’ targets for specific writing tasks – but there I go again solving the rhetorical problem, using a practical solution. This is not what leaders and managers want to hear. So, I ask you the question: how can we mutually engage leaders and line managers in our conversation about teaching academic writing?
Talking back: the value of narrative in resisting dominant institutional culture

Speaker(s): Kathleen Shine Cain, Merrimack College

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 3A Room: Windsor Auditorium

Woolbright and Briggs (1999) argue that narrative gives ‘voice to that which would otherwise go unheard.’ The value of narrative in writing center research has been demonstrated often (Bouquet 2002, Geller et al 2007, Denny 2010)—notably situating writing centers as inclusive spaces, challenging insitutional authority. As writing centers celebrate multiple voices, so should our research embrace all voices, valuing narrative in our scholarship and practice as a creative alternative to — a talking back against – oppressive institutional policies. Autobiography theory offers a lens through which to view the essential nature of narrative to our profession. Olney (1980) calls autobiography ‘the key to understanding . . . the very shape and essence of culture,’ noting that the term comprises three parts: auto-self; bio-life; and graphy-writing/text. Writing center narratives are central to our identity, our culture. Through narrative, centers construct their own texts, their own selves, and in doing so provide an alternative to dominant success narratives. Narrative also allows marginalized people (e.g., women, people of color) to establish identity in relation to the dominant culture (Mason 1980, Rosenblatt 1980). Similarly, writing centers forge identities in relation to and often in resistance to a dominant academic culture whose neoliberal practices privilege functional literacy over powerful literacy, success over inclusiveness. Our narratives situate, define, and construct us. In the current academic climate, one way to ‘give voice to that which would otherwise go unheard’ is to construct theoretically sound narratives to represent writing center work in our own terms, to successfully challenge prevailing academic narratives, and to present a creative alternative to oppressive institutional policies. This presentation is a theoretical discussion of how writing center scholars and practitioners can create narratives designed to ‘talk back’ and resist a dominant academic culture whose neoliberal practices privilege functional literacy over powerful literacy, success over inclusiveness. (This is not a report on a research study.)
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‘If you don’t write yourself, on what grounds can you offer advice about writing to others?’: perspectives on the importance of publishing by teachers of academic writing

Speaker(s): Mary Davis, Oxford Brookes University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 3B
Room: Windsor 0-04

Publishing is without doubt an extremely challenging activity which puts pressure on academic staff (Murray and Moore, 2006). Nevertheless, it is generally considered to be an essential part of an academic role, even ‘the measurement of an academic’s professional competence’ (Hyland 2015, p.1). Some research has revealed that both the approach and ability of lecturers to teach academic writing could depend on their own experiences of writing for publication (French 2011). Those teaching academic writing within English for Academic Purposes are part of an increasingly professional, research-informed field (Wingate and Tribble 2012), yet with many on ‘teaching-only’ contracts, opportunities for them to publish seem very scarce.

This interview-based study examines the perspectives of nine academic writing teachers working within EAP in the UK regarding the importance of their own writing for publication. They reported being motivated to research and publish, and felt it impacted positively on their teaching. Several respondents asserted the need to be actively writing for publication in order to support and understand the writing process of their students. However, respondents faced significant challenges, of which the most important issues appeared to be time, contractual restrictions, and a lack of support. In order to explore the impact of gatekeepers in this context, the views of 30 heads of departments were collected through a survey. They agreed that it was important for EAP practitioners to publish research, in order to engage with new ideas and develop professionally. However, more support and mentoring are clearly needed to achieve this in practice.
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How the Theory of Transfer of Learning helps tutors of academic writing

Speaker(s): Bonnie Devet, College of Charleston

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 3C Room: Windsor 0-05

A vital goal for tutors of academic writing is being able to help student writers tailor their writing processes to different writing projects. That is, students adapt what they know about one type of writing to another. This ability to write in different contexts can be explained by the theory of Transfer of Learning. Transfer or ‘writing knowledge transformation’ (Donahue 2016, p. 109) is generally defined as the ability to take something learned in one context and adapt, apply, or remix knowledge or skills in new contexts, including educational, civic, personal, or professional. The mind, seeing similarities to what is already known, extends what is similar to another activity (Haskell 2001, p. 11). If you can shift gears on a car, you can learn to do it for a truck. This activity, then, is transfer of learning.

For tutors of academic writing, transfer is vital. It provides understanding into how key factors—content, context, genres, the writers’ prior knowledge, their ability to reflect, and their dispositions—affect student writers. This presentation is a primer on Transfer of Learning, designed to provide insight into the value of transfer for tutors of academic writing who want to enhance students’ acquisition of academic skills.
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When all the curriculum's a stage: designing a meaningful networked writing experience for first-year through doctoral student populations

Speaker(s): Lee Nickoson, Bowling Green State University  
Amy Rybak, Bowling Green State University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 3D  
Room: Windsor 1-02

Faculty, university administrators, and students themselves know that the ability to write well matters to all students regardless of their degree program. However, what gets defined as good writing—expectations, conventions, rhetorical moves—shifts and becomes increasingly nuanced as students move through an undergraduate and graduate writing program. We share a data-driven account of our multi-year curricular revision effort. Currently in the third year of what is likely to be a five-year revision assignment, we will offer a narrative of our methodology and methods for the revision work: the conjoining of five separate groups of writing faculty committed to creating and fostering dynamic, shared first-year, undergraduate, MA, and PhD curricula that integrate faculty research and pedagogical interests. Grounding our presentation in writing program and writing assessment scholarship, we will present our programmatic attempt to build a culture of writing on our public, state university and our newly configured department as the hub for writing, writing research, and writing pedagogy for our campus community. We will discuss how we identified a series of writing courses that would provide students pursuing any major opportunities to develop their writing for academic, professional, or civic audiences through a robust curriculum of undergraduate course offerings; built programs training exceptional students of writing to be placed in our intensive introductory writing courses as peer-to-peer writing consultants and allowed for increased faculty collaboration at the graduate level. We will then share how the realignment, we believe, enhances the experience of our doctoral writing faculty and students as well, bridging the study of rhetoric and writing instruction with its practice in the teaching and administration of first-year writing programs.
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A four-step model: initiating writing development at faculty level using Master’s thesis workshops as a vehicle

Speaker(s): Tine Wirenfeldt Jensen, University of Southern Denmark
Eva Naur, Aarhus University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 3E Room: Windsor 1-03

In recent years, Danish university education has seen a rise of regulation from central government which intends to significantly reduce students' degree completion time (The Study Progress Reform, 2013).

One of the many effects of the reform is a reduction of the time available for students to write a Master’s thesis, as well as less flexibility regarding when the Master’s thesis process begins and ends. The reform has created an immediate need for increased support of academic writing development. This presents a challenge to all faculties, but especially those without writing centers or prior traditions of addressing academic writing development at a central level. This paper presents a four-step model for initiating development of academic writing skills at such faculties. The model was developed, tested and evaluated in the fall of 2015 in collaboration with all seven departments at Aarhus Business and Social Sciences at Aarhus University, Denmark. As one of the four steps, the model uses ad-on courses developed in collaboration with subject-domain teachers as a vehicle for fostering dialogue on the topic of academic writing development among key players (teachers, directors of studies, librarians, student’s teachers) as well as a method to gain insight into students’ experiences and needs across departments (in this case in the form of 354 written student evaluations). The model has, to a slightly surprising degree, shown the potential to motivate departments to continue to focus on developing students’ writing skills on their own after the end of the initiative, resulting in observable changes.
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Designing a writing space: a local and collaborative approach

Speaker(s): Ruth Bonazza, Middlesex University
Peter Thomas, Middlesex University
Francesca Murialdo, Middlesex University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 3F Room: Windsor 1-04

When discussing centres and spaces catering to writer development, researchers have advocated for realisations which reflect both communities’ needs and variation according to place (Ganobcsik-Williams 2011; Thaiss et al 2012). For centre developers, exchange and critical discussions with other writing support professionals can encourage reflexive practice and a better understanding of the local. However, these exchanges can also lead to unintentional homogenisation through reproduction of dominant visual and/or conceptual themes. McKinney (2013) cautions against this trend, arguing that seemingly inoffensive design choices can marginalise the writers that a space intends to attract and that conceptual ‘grand narratives’ about writing centres, although convenient when lobbying for institutional support, can overrey image. This presentation outlines a new approach, collaboratively developed by architectural designers and writing specialists at Middlesex University, London, to facilitate writers and other stakeholders in designing a space to support a diversity of writer needs. Techniques are borrowed from critical design ethnography (Barab et al 2004) and ‘sharing’ design processes (Murialdo et al 2016) in order to: 1) identify stakeholders, 2) clarify and challenge stakeholder desires, and 3) facilitate mixed stakeholder design teams in translating these desires into workable concept sketches. This critical approach gives space for the diverse cultural, linguistic and educational backgrounds at Middlesex University as well as the institution’s focus on integrating student voices into university planning. Although the results are location-specific, it is hoped that the approach could be of use to other groups that are interested in designing unique spaces.
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'On the outside I'm smiling but inside I'm crying': the impact of module-embedded support for first year undergraduate academic writing

Speaker(s):  
Helen Hendry, Bishop Grosseteste University  
Samantha Elliott, Bishop Grosseteste University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 3G  Room: Windsor 1-05

This project investigated the impact of a module-embedded approach to developing academic writing with first year undergraduate Education Studies students from widening participation backgrounds at one university in England. To evaluate this approach, questionnaires were collected at the beginning and end of the students' first year and interviews and student reflections were used at the midpoint of the academic year. 88 percent of participants (n=44) indicated that they felt confident about academic writing by the end of the first year. Some key supportive strategies which they identified were: integrated guidance and opportunities to apply technical elements such as referencing and paraphrasing within module seminars; consistent personalised feedback, targets and tutorial support from their designated first year module tutor; careful design of assignments so that they built on students' prior learning and progressively developed their knowledge, understanding and connection to theory during Semester 1. However, findings also indicated that this highly scaffolded approach to supporting the transition to first year undergraduate writing in Semester 1 may have increased students' anxiety when presented with less scaffolded tasks in Semester 2. Students also highlighted particular concerns with identifying, selecting and applying academic reading independently. The study suggests that a module-embedded approach to developing academic literacies within subject disciplines may be an effective way of supporting students from widening participation backgrounds to make a successful transition to higher education in different contexts. However, consideration must be given to ways in which student independence can be encouraged as part of this process.
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A corpus-driven analysis of the relation of the keywords used in academic article titles to their citation rates in applied linguistics from 1990 to 2016

Speaker(s): Wenhsien Yang, National Kaohsiung University of Hospitality and Tourism

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 3H Room: Moore Annexe 034

Due to the competitiveness in academic publication and the emerging heavy reliance on internet search engines to expand visibility and readership and to promote publications, writing an attractive and appropriate research article title is essential. In addition, titles may be the first aspect of papers evaluated by journal editors in their screening of submissions in order to meet the requirements of the target audience. These demands require the use of various academic writing skills, and thus make writing titles challenging (Soler 2007). Research on structuring journal article titles has been extensively conducted across disciplines, but what keywords are employed to reflect current knowledge and receive high citations is still underrepresented in the literature. To bridge this gap, this corpus-driven research collected and investigated titles written in leading applied linguistics journals over 25 years to identify the keywords. Then, they were compared to different time spans to study the significance and relevance to the domain knowledge. The most frequently cited articles were also selected to study how their titles relate to keyword employment and their impact on the domain knowledge. The results reveal that keywords vary in accordance with the research trends over time. In addition, while titles are becoming longer, more keywords are purposefully employed by authors in order to expand the paper’s visibility and enhance the citations. The pedagogical implications for teaching academic writing, and suggestions for researching this appendant genre are provided.
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**Student self-assessment reassessed**

**Speaker(s):** Katharina Weiss, The American College of Greece - Deree  
**Session Type:** Paper presentation  
**Session:** 3I  
**Room:** Moore Building 016

For students to learn better, they have to be actively involved not only in learning but also in assessment which in itself needs to become a learning tool. The space of assessment that is today almost entirely occupied by instructors needs to be shared with the students. In a student-centered classroom, learners need to understand and be given the opportunity to apply assessment criteria themselves. Through self-assessment of their writing, students will enhance their self-awareness and become autonomous learners capable of self-improvement and meta-cognition (e.g. Liang 2014, Nielsen 2012). Self- and peer assessment are two helpful tools that are used ever more in writing classes and have been discussed in literature, but the reliability and effectiveness of self-assessment is still a matter of discussion (e.g. Birjandi and Hadidi 2012, Poehner 2012, Matsuno 2009). The study I present here adds to the existing research by offering data based on numbers rather than just observation which stem from a comparison of self- and instructor assessment where both parties used the same specific rubrics. The data was collected in four classes of learners for whom English is a second language in a course called ‘Introduction to Academic Writing’ at the American College of Greece. The outcomes of the study, unexpected in various ways, indicate that student self-assessment – while doubtlessly useful in terms hard to measure – is not reliable, but can be used as a formative and diagnostic learning tool, especially for weak students, to foster learner autonomy.
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Prospects and boundaries: productive tensions in the establishing process of a university-wide language and writing center

Speaker(s): Ann-Marie Eriksson, University of Gothenburg

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 4A Room: Windsor Auditorium

The initiation of an academic writing and language center as a university-wide operation undoubtedly signifies an important policy step and institutional action. As the theme of this conference makes clear, such actions take place in response to societal changes and social realities which in turn produce changing conditions for higher education. However, support for students’ academic writing is often not called for until new conditions for teaching have already resulted in increased demands regarding student literacy and writing capacities. The initial stages of a newly established center therefore involves attending to immediate needs while simultaneously prioritizing the development of responsible and durable forms of provision. The process of establishing such provision has repeatedly been found to rely on arduous navigation among multiple stakeholders’ interests. Given that diverse textual practices and writing traditions are carried forward by means of concrete tutoring and teaching, the establishing process also implies significant professional processes on the level of individual staff. This presentation focuses on concrete tensions produced as institutional and individual levels intersect during a writing center establishing process currently taking place at University of Gothenburg. With 37,000 students and eight different Schools, this university exemplifies a large governmental research institution in the Nordic region. By tracing the history of what was initially termed academic language support in this institution and then illustrating initiatives currently being delivered in response to increased internationalisation and diversification, the goal is to discuss: By what types of strategies can writing and language centers respond to and impact university culture?
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Academic writing - whose responsibility and at which stage?

Speaker(s): Linda Weinberg, Braude College of Engineering
Contributor: Miriam Symon, The Interdisciplinary Center
Session Type: Paper presentation
Session: 4B Room: Windsor 0-04

As part of the Israeli Council for Higher Education’s new five-year plan for internationalization, the number of content courses offered in English will increase, in order to maximize the international experience at home while preparing local students for exchange programmes. Consequently, adequate provision must be made to raise proficiency levels of students’ productive skills. A new CEFR-aligned framework for the teaching of English in higher education in Israel proposes that all four language skills be emphasised within English for Academic Purposes (EAP) programmes. This bottom-up initiative represents a major switch in focus from that of reading comprehension only, which has characterized Israeli EAP for over forty years. In this study, we focus on the development of conventions for academic writing through collaboration between EAP and content lecturers based on the collation of data from surveys and interviews conducted in two academic colleges in Israel. This data highlights the content lecturers’ general lack of awareness of language issues within the EMI context, and identifies the challenges faced by students with specific writing conventions. Knowledge gained from the study should contribute to the alignment of institutional policy with the shifting realities of the internationalization of higher education. It should also inform practice (Ferris 2001) in terms of future workshops for EMI lecturers provided by the EFL teachers and lead to greater emphasis on the development of relevant writing conventions in the EFL classroom (Meurs et al 2014).
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Assessing writing gains between the first and third year of university: factors contributing to improvement

Speaker(s): Irene Clark, California State University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 4C  Room: Windsor 0-05

This presentation will discuss an assessment of argumentative, thesis-driven essays written by students in their first and third years, who participated in a project held at a large, public, Hispanic serving American institution. Referencing scholarship concerned with the issue of ‘transfer’ (Clark and Hernandez 2011; Yancey et al 2014), genre (Soliday 2011), and debates concerning the effectiveness of General Writing Skills (Petraglia 1995), this presentation will describe the writing study and the results obtained from the assessment—that is, the extent to which students were able to transfer prior knowledge about writing to General Education courses. The use of paired essays written in a similar genre by the same students at comparable points in their college careers constitutes a significant strength of this study, because it enabled the researchers to control for two factors that are important in writing assessment—the students and the type of essay being assessed. In addition, surveys distributed to students included unsolicited statements that the first year writing course had fostered understanding of academic genres, enabling them to learn process oriented approaches that had strengthened their ability to complete writing tasks in other academic contexts. Moreover, an additional finding is that the quality of the upper level writing assignments had a significant impact on whether students were able to complete writing assignments in upper division courses. This presentation will include examples of both successful and unsuccessful prompts and suggest that faculty development in the creation of writing assignments is necessary to maximize student success.
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Writing in constructive alignment: Making written assignments add up to the thesis

Speaker(s): John Harbord, Maastricht University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 4D Room: Windsor 1-02

An important element of any graduate’s battery of skills is to be able to write clearly and incisively, based on good data soundly interpreted to answer a well-framed, relevant question. Most university degrees provide a capstone research-writing project, most typically a thesis/dissertation, that will test these skills. Many of these skills are complex, relatively abstract, and not possessed by most students on entering higher education. To achieve the desired learning outcome (Biggs 1999), courses and assessment throughout a student’s career need to build progressively towards the skills needed to complete the thesis (or equivalent capstone genre). Given the importance of understanding theories of writing in developing an effective series of both assessed and unassessed written assignments that will take students from entry point to the exit learning outcome, it is crucial that writing specialists play a role in this process of alignment, partnering with subject specialists so that writing is not seen as an add-on to the curriculum but an integral part of learning. Based on the ongoing process of constructive alignment at Maastricht University, I will consider how writing specialists can effectively engage in this role and achieve positive results.
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Unpacking disciplinary conventions and expectations in the redesign of writing assignments at an engineering master's programme

Speaker(s): Andreas Eriksson, Chalmers University of Technology

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 4E  Room: Windsor 1-03

This study investigates development work on an international engineering master’s programme and highlights collaboration between communication and content staff in the development and re-design of writing assignments. The study originates from a course manager’s frustration about the quality of students’ writing despite several attempts at addressing problems and subsequently accounts for the assessment and re-design of two assignments. The study takes a broad approach to the revision of writing assignments, but the main data are interviews with students and comparisons of students’ texts before and after the re-design. The presentation describes changes made to the assignments and theorises the changes from a programme and course perspective. One central aspect of the re-design was the unpacking of the learning outcomes of the course and how these were to be manifested in students’ writing (Anson et al 2012). For instance, the transfer from laboratory work to report text remained tacit as students were uncertain about how to integrate laboratory results into their texts. The context investigated is viewed through an academic literacies lens and the concepts of normative and transformative (Lillis and Scott, 2007). These concepts are relevant here because the study exemplifies challenges when collaborating to find ‘possibilities of transformation’ in writing assignments (Lillis, Harris, Lea and Mitchell 2016, p. 11) and because an English-as-a-medium-of-instruction (EMI) context tends to face tensions between the normative and transformative. The study contributes to the field of integrating content and language (ICL) and to studies of academic literacies in EFL higher education contexts.
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During the last decade higher education institutions find themselves competing over potential students. This ever-growing competition created a dichotomy between being attractive and maintaining a high academic level. This dichotomy may impact the desirability of writing courses within academic institutions, and thus marginalize the need for such courses. Internationalization may offer writing professionals an opportunity to remain relevant within our institutions. A recent study found that the top three internationalization issues in recent years are student mobility, English as a lingua franca and multicultural issues (Yemini and Sagie 2016). These issues are further strengthened by Engwall’s (2016) conclusion that preparing higher education students for a globalized world would require more language and culture courses. In addition to these needs posed by internationalization, institutions also face a number of challenges, namely economic and political issues encroaching where once academic and socio-cultural purposes were the sole values of academia (Knight 2013). For writing professionals to remain responsive to the current challenges and opportunities arising from the internationalization of higher education, we would suggest advancing a proactive, rather than a reactive, strategic course of action within our institutions. In this presentation, we outline our approach to identifying the expanding international language and writing needs of our institution, our self-assessment process for developing services to meet these needs, and our strategy for promoting these services within the institution.
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The role of attribution and perceived self-efficacy in writing development – possibilities of evaluating a novel approach at iba, the largest private University of Cooperative Education in Germany

Speaker(s): Andrea Klein, Internationale Berufsakademie
Contributor: Monika Zimmermann, Internationale Berufsakademie
Session Type: Paper presentation
Session: 4G Room: Windsor 1-05

A University of Cooperative Education combines academic learning at a higher education institution with practical, workplace-based training. Since this hybrid form of study is thriving in Germany, the special context of writing development needs more attention. It takes place in a system with three parties (dual student, professor, and employer) with different sets of expectations. This affects both the pedagogic approach and the nature of the texts and research projects, which tend to be more practice-oriented. We are driven by the desire to make student writing more satisfactory to all parties involved. We decided to use generic and discipline-specific methods simultaneously to develop students’ writing. Thus, students are provided with a range of techniques for improving their academic writing in a general sense, and they are socialized in their future field. Due to their double work load, students need prudent instruction which also considers motivational aspects. The so-called ‘bbb-model’ (Zimmermann 2011) describes the development from novice to expert, ‘bbb’ meaning ‘begeistern, bewusst machen, befähigen’ – ‘enthuse, raise awareness, capacitate’. Research is needed to elucidate this particular context and to investigate our concept’s effectiveness. Evidently, general literature about Teaching Academic Writing cannot address dual students’ learning needs. In our presentation, we will share our concepts, practical experience and outline our research plan. We hope to receive valuable feedback. Even though our approach focuses on dual study programmes, it carries potential for the Teaching of Academic Writing in general. The psychological interventions can be applied in various contexts.
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Strategic use of language repertoire in academic writing in an L2 – case study results of the project PROSIMS

Speaker(s): Sabine Dengscherz, University of Vienna

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 4H  Room: Moore Annexe 034

Academic writing in an L2 provides several challenges. In the project PROSIMS (Strategien und Routinen für professionelles Schreiben in mehreren Sprachen / Strategies and Routines for Professional Writing in Multilingual Contexts, prosims.univie.ac.at) we explore how students and researchers deal with these challenges in practice. We focus on real life writing in academic contexts in the target languages German, English, French and Hungarian. We analyze the macro structure of the writing processes of our participants, looking for certain routines and strategies. A special focus lies on the question how the participants make use of different languages in their repertoire (see also the possibilities described by Lange 2012). We explore how our participants deal with these possibilities: Do they write in the target language entirely or do they also use other languages? If yes – in which situations and for which purposes? The project is work in progress, but we have already analyzed a certain amount of data (ca. 100h screen videos of writing process of 14 participants, and retrospective interviews with 12 of them, 2 more are due in January), and already written several case study reports. In my presentation I draw on these data and provide some insights into strategic language use during L2-writing, which shall be analyzed in the context of heuristic and rhetorical challenges (which vary in different academic genres) as well as individual preferences, experience and attitudes. The insights into strategic language use are meant to be fruitful for the teaching of academic writing in an L2.
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‘Professor please read and tell me what I should be doing?’: how international students’ navigate the requirement to write critically

Speaker(s): Jessica Hancock, Glasgow Caledonian University, London

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 4I Room: Moore Building 016

Critical writing is a crucial part of UK university courses, especially at postgraduate level. But there is often a lack of shared understanding between staff and students about what critical writing means and involves, particularly with postgraduate students with undergraduate degrees from non-UK universities. Fox (1994) has noted the frustrations that come from this kind of absence of clear definitions about the requirements of critical writing. The students in GCU London are almost all international; many find requirements for critical writing problematic and confusing, and desire assistance to enable them to fulfill expectations. Although the continual increase in the number of international students in UK universities (UKCISA 2016) has led to research into how universities can deal with this diversity, international and EU students’ conceptions of and difficulties with critical writing has not been fully explored, although researchers such as Maringe and Jenkins (2015) have addressed issues with academic writing in a more general sense. This presentation explores the findings of semi-structured interviews about critical writing (17 postgraduate students, 4 members of staff). The interviews revealed the ways in which students construct critical writing as involving their own personal reactions to theory and knowledge, and as a struggle that is often, ultimately worthwhile. The paper will suggest how to enhance the teaching of critical writing to international students without making students feel that they are in the wrong kind of academic tribe (Betcher and Trowler 2001), by exploring the contested nature of this term amongst both students and academic staff.
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An alternative approach to writing provisions: a critical pedagogy for community and dialogical education at the London School of Economics

Speaker(s): Sara Felix, London School of Economics and Political Science

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 5A Room: Windsor Auditorium

One of the primary aims of LSE LIFE, opened in September 2016, is to engage London School of Economics and Political Science students with the literacies of academic study. Writing and reading are a priority for students: writing and reading workshops have attracted more than twice the participants than any other type of workshop, and students have asked to focus on these skills in more than half of the 700+ one-to-one tutorials provided in the first three months of operation of this new student centre. This presentation theorises the writing practice at LSE LIFE from a critical pedagogy perspective (Brookfield 2005) whose focus on creating an inclusive, open community informs an analysis of how advisers use a critical pedagogy of community (hooks 2003). By focusing on community, LSE LIFE endeavours to enter into dialogical education (Allman, 2010), where dialogue here is not ‘a matter of each person or several people simply stating what they think’ (Allman 2010, p.162). Instead, it is critical engagement and reflection on why ‘each person thinks as he or she does and where this thinking has come from’ (p. 162). Specific examples of supporting writing through a dialogue of ideas and arguments to engage and empower students, including the use of physical space, are presented to demonstrate how a pedagogy of community and dialogical education are practised. Questions are raised about the limits of these pedagogical perspectives in the context of an elite university, given the focus on high marks and individual performance.
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Supporting doctoral students in the Czech Republic to produce academic texts in English: from policy to practice

Speaker(s): Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolova, The Czech Academy of Sciences
Alena Kasparkova, VSB-Technical University of Ostrava

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 5B Room: Windsor 0-04

Czech universities seem to have raised their expectations for PhD students to publish articles in impact factor journals. Research shows that publication output increases when writing is aided with structured interventions, such as support writing groups, writing courses, and writing coaches (McGrail et al 2006). However, in a country with only one writing centre (serving primarily the researchers of Czech Academy of Sciences), and no tradition of writing courses, we wonder whether and how universities match their requirements with structured interventions. The Czech Republic has been absent from international reviews on teaching academic writing (Bjork et al 2003 and Thaiss et al 2012), likely due to no concentrated efforts to report, but the need for teaching academic writing has been articulated in Czech scholarly literature (Danišková 2014). We aim to contribute with an investigation into the development of writing support in three public universities’ PhD programs. In total, we conducted 20 semi-structured interviews with PhD students, their supervisors, and university administrators to examine how the need to write publishable texts in English is reflected upon and how the institutions’ policies mirror that need. Our preliminary results suggest that policy responses are highly variable, but meaningful changes are beginning to occur. With our pilot project, we aspire to identify best practices and prepare the ground for a larger-scale project to render a more detailed picture of the current situation in teaching academic writing in the Czech Republic, so that policy makers are mutually inspired and writing support for doctoral students continues to improve.
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Academic writing and transferable skills for transition to higher education: an example from Classics

Speaker(s): Richard Hawley, Royal Holloway, University of London

Session Type: Paper presentation

Since approximately 60% of our undergraduate students have not studied Classics before and sometimes struggle with writing at university level, the Department of Classics tasked me to design a compulsory first term module to equip our especially diverse ‘transition’ students with skills that would aid their academic progress and future employability. Here I embedded a workshop, informed by practice from my own experience and e.g. Friedrich 2008 and Fawbert 2008, to teach a range of academic writing formats and use of departmental marking criteria and referencing style, timed for when students would start work on their first assignments. Understanding was evaluated by a two-part summative follow-up exercise, requiring an abstract of an academic article, and an evaluation of its strengths and weaknesses, using our marking criteria, and organised by the headings we use on our coursework feedback sheet, so students can learn and better understand what staff reward. Other workshops in the module explore other communication skills such as: oral presentation, team work, handling material evidence, working with translations and applying critical theory. A final exercise, written over the vacation at the end of the module for summative assessment by me as module leader, requires students to reflect on their learning development over the term, including explicitly their academic writing skills. Students thus evaluate their own improvement and areas of weakness after just their first term, while also providing themselves with the specific, detailed examples of skills development that they need for career applications.
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We writing teachers work to improve academic writing by changing practices of students and teachers. But how thoroughly and quickly do the ordinary disciplinary practices (typically without direct writing instruction) inculcate disciplinary writing conventions? Using new natural language processing tools, we analyzed student papers (n=162) in two macro-disciplines (natural science and engineering), and two micro-disciplines within each (biology and physics, industrial and chemical engineering), across three years (final undergraduate and two post-graduate). We used the Michigan Corpus of Upper-level Student Papers, containing papers graded as excellent (A) by professors. A discriminatory function analysis of over 130 lexical indices and 150 cohesion indices revealed significant differences not only between student writing in the two macro-disciplines (93.2% classification accuracy) but also between the micro-disciplines (84% accuracy). Moreover, there was little difference (<10%) in lexical and cohesion patterns across the three years within either macro-disciplines or micro-disciplines. Thus, even at upper level undergraduate study, the best students have acquired the ability to write texts that have a unique linguistic profile, conforming to their micro-discipline in both lexicon and cohesion. The fact that the differences are so strongly evident as early as the last year of undergraduate study suggests that ordinary disciplinary teaching practices are capable of producing the effects we want. The pedagogical problem, then, is not primarily to teach specific linguistic features, as with EAP. There are too many. The problem is to understand the socio-cognitive and socio-cultural factors that allow some acquire and/or prevent others from acquiring specialized academic writing.
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Dissertation/thesis writing across Europe: exploring student writers’ experiences

Speaker(s): Bojana Petrić, Birkbeck, University of London
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This talk will present an ongoing cross-national project, which aims to explore students’ experiences of writing a Bachelor’s/Master’s dissertation/thesis and to determine to what extent some of these experiences impact on dissertation/thesis writing. The project is a collaboration of researchers from nine countries across Europe (Bosnia, Denmark, Malta, Macedonia, Portugal, Romania, Spain, UK, Ukraine). Although the parameters of the dissertation/thesis genre vary across national university systems, institutions, departments, disciplines, and language/writing cultures, the dissertation/thesis is a high-stakes assessment genre regardless of this variation (Aitchison and Lee 2006; Donahue 2013). It is also the longest and most complex piece of writing students produce in the course of their studies, located half-way between academic and scientific or professional writing (Russell and Cortes 2012). It is therefore of interest to gain an understanding of the student writers’ perspectives on completing a dissertation/thesis, including the challenges, difficulties, coping strategies, the role of the supervisor, and other factors that facilitate or hinder this process (Castelló and Iñesta 2012; Harwood and Petrić 2017). The study uses a multimodal methodological approach, which includes in-depth retrospective interviews with students upon completion of their dissertations/theses and a journey plot tool. Data have been gathered about dissertation/thesis writing in a range of languages (i.e. the languages spoken in the countries above) as well as in English as a foreign language. In this talk, we will present the aims of the project and the research approach, and discuss the preliminary findings of the project regarding tensions and contradictions, but also patterns of activities that appear to be linked to particular writing approaches and associated practices. We will close by discussing the implications of the findings for cross-cultural research on academic literacy as well as for pedagogical approaches supporting dissertation/thesis writers.
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Writing centers, enclaves, and creating spaces of pedagogical and political change within universities
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Scratch a university and you’ll find a long-range plan, often given lofty titles such as the ‘21st Century University Initiative’ or the ‘University 2020 Vision.’ Yet the issues facing universities behind the lofty language are pressing: reduced government funding, rising student fees, growth of contingent labor, increased regimes of standardized assessment and more. Unfortunately, to address these problems, universities increasingly turn to corporate and neo-liberal approaches to planning and administration. Faculty often oppose such approaches, but are uncertain about how to respond. In this presentation I argue that academic writing programs can play a role in the future of the university that resists corporate structures and standardization and emphasizes learning and exploration. Using the example of Writing Centers, I discuss how such programs maintain significantly different visions of pedagogy as well as different political and institutional presences, can offer models and spaces for creating change in the larger university. I begin by charting the ongoing discussions of the social and political space of the Writing Center in the contemporary university. I then draw on Victor Friedman’s (2011) concept of ‘enclaves’ to discuss how Writing Centers, even when small, can draw on their pedagogical and participatory values and practices to begin work as agents of institutional change in universities. I will demonstrate how our approaches to teaching writing, as well as other methods such as social media use, faculty mentoring, and work with campus and community partners, can work toward creating a more activist culture of writing and participation within the university.
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A generic guide for developing writing competences in the disciplines

Speaker(s): Bente Kristiansen, Copenhagen University
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For many students academic writing is ‘a practice of mystery’ (Lillis 2001). This mystery relates to the understanding of how a discipline is working and producing knowledge (Carter 2007). Therefore the teachers of the disciplines have an important role in ‘demystifying’ academic writing. However, this is a difficult task if academic writing conventions are tacit knowledge for the teachers.

I am suggesting a guide for integrating the development of student writing with the developing of student learning in the disciplines. The guide is inspired by Anne Beaufort (2007). She identifies five knowledge domains that the academic writer draws from: subject matter knowledge, genre knowledge, rhetorical knowledge and writing process knowledge – together these domains represent knowledge about how to communicate in a given discourse community. Within each of these knowledge domains I suggest some didactic questions and activities that can serve as keys for investigating the discipline specific ways of developing knowledge and how writing is part of this process. The questions and activities are based on the understanding of academic writing as a way of arguing for and documenting knowledge (Blåsjö 2004). Therefore important activities are related to argumentation and the use of sources (Bizup 2008). Other activities are related to the concept of disciplinary literacy, especially the reading in the disciplines. Generic questions and intensive use of written learning activities might be a key for demystifying the practice of academic knowledge production and writing.
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Responder/Respondee positioning: student stances towards each other and each other’s work in the HE EFL Classroom

Speaker(s): Ingunn Ofte, Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Jennifer Duggan, Norwegian University of Science and Technology.
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Although the benefits of peer response on student learning are well researched, research on responder/respondee positioning is limited. Few studies of peer response texts examine the nexus of language used by responders and their social context. Exceptions include Weiyun He’s (1993) examination of peer review texts and Mangelsdorf and Schlumberger’s (1992) analysis of reviewers’ approaches to revisions. Additionally, Carson and Nelson (1994) showed that the cultural patterns individualism and collectivism strongly influence student reviewers’ stances in feedback. The proposed paper presents the results of our research into responder positioning in Norway. It investigates students’ approaches to revisions, hedging, stance towards the respondee, and power distance within 119 peer response texts produced in a BA-level EFL teacher-training program in Norway. These texts were coded on two planes: stance towards the respondee and approach to revisions. We coded the responders’ stances towards the respondee using six categories: professional, professional friend, friend, underqualified friend, underqualified, and unclear position. These six categories allow us to explore, e.g., perceived power distance between the responder and respondee. The texts were further coded into two categories adapted from prior studies (Mangelsdorf and Schlumberger 1992; Lockhart and Ng 1995): interpretive and collaborative. Interpretive responses aim to rework the focus of the respondee’s paper, while collaborative responses try to meet the goals of the author and his/her intended audience. Preliminary analysis revealed that responders’ positioning is reflected in their employment of strategies such as hedging, impersonalization, and minimizing imposition. The texts reflect a blend of individualist and collectivist ideologies.

References:


Self-regulated learning: a case study with an EFL writer

Speaker(s): Selma Karabinar, Marmara University
Diler Gultekin, Bahçeşehir University
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This presentation is based on a case study with the chief purpose of examining the effects of an intervention program (i.e. self-regulatory strategy instruction in writing) on the participant student’s self-regulation as a writer. Another purpose is to uncover the developmental processes that the student undergoes along the way to become a self-regulated learner in academic writing. SRL strategy intervention was applied to a student studying English at a language school of a university in Istanbul and included explicit goal-setting, self-monitoring and self-evaluation according to the needs of the student during one-on-one tutoring sessions over a period of eight weeks.

The intervention data included 4 untimed writing tasks followed by stimulated recall interviews and weekly goal-setting and self-monitoring forms. Meanwhile, the researcher kept a personal tutoring log. SRL intervention applied in the study consisted of three cycles: forethought, performance and self-reflection (Zimmerman, 2001). The learner was expected to use the information that she gained from self-reflection to feedback her forethought, which would eventually start a new cycle until the goal is achieved. Results of the study revealed that tutoring practices promoted opportunities to encourage the learner to become conscious of her own learning process. Thus, the student showed a considerable improvement in goal-planning and self-evaluation. Curriculum developers and classroom practitioners should make the skills for SRL explicit for the learners and try to facilitate their development through relevant teaching and learning activities.
Electronic writing support in secondary and higher education: approaches, ideas, and examples
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Although, today, electronic approaches to support the teaching/learning of writing are created in many places, discussions are more technology-driven rather than pedagogical. We feel that writing pedagogy needs to know and discuss these new developments and their applications in HE. While previous reviews and meta-analyses (for instance, Allen Jacovina and McNamara 2015; Stenberger-Hu and Cooper 2015) focused mainly on such approaches as Automatic Essay Scoring (AES), Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE), or Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS) in general we will discuss these and additional approaches such as commented templates, real-time corpus search tools and uses of phrase books by explicitly linking them to pedagogical practices in HE. We will also offer an overview, based on a currently conducted systematic review. The final discussion will be devoted to the usefulness and usability of such electronic support measures and their pedagogical applications. It will allow the audience to report from their own experiences or developments.

The following presentations are given:

Part 1:

- **Introduction** (Emilie Ailhau, Ann Devitt, Otto Kruse, Christian Rapp, Carola Strobl): The introduction will report on approaches, technologies, and uses of new electronic features supporting the learning and practice of writing. It will provide an overview preparing a better understanding for the following demonstrations.

- **Academic Writing Assistant – AWA and Schrijfhulp Nederlands** (Lieve De Wachter, Jordi Heeren, Kristin Blanpain, An Laffut): In this presentation, we will discuss the development of two online writing tools (Dutch and English) offering students process- oriented and individualized writing support, thus stimulating their self-learning processes. Exploratory studies show that users experience the tool as relevant and helpful, and that their texts improve in several areas.

- **CorpuScript** (Carola Strobl): This tool was developed at Ghent University to support individual electronic feedback on students’ writing in L2 and, at the same time, to create a database of error-tagged learner production. The error-tagging is based on a predefined matrix that combines James’ (1998) four problem types (overinclusion, omission, selection, and misorder) with the three domains of lexicon, grammar and
discourse. Students are prompted to self-correct their writing based on a combination of an automated and a manual analysis. We will present a case-study in an advanced writing class in German L2, showing the self-regulatory processes of students working with the tool.

Part 2:

- **Research Writing Tutor** (Elena Cotos): Research Writing Tutor (RWT) combines genre writing and disciplinary expertise in a corpus-based platform that provides opportunities for students to learn, practice, and internalize a style of scientific writing that conforms to disciplinary conventions. This presentation will demonstrate the RWT, placing an emphasis on its viability and effectiveness. Select empirical evidence will be drawn from studies that informed the development and implementation of this writing tool: 1) genre analysis results that were derived from a large multi-disciplinary corpus of published research articles, 2) writing analytics exploited to operationalize genre constructs for automated feedback, and 3) impact of data-driven learning and interaction with RWT.

- **Thesis Writer** (Christian Rapp, Otto Kruse): TW is a Swiss-based system in English and German to support the writing of proposals based on a variety of tutorials, linguistic support tools, process instruction and collaborative functions. The system is already open for use at our own university and data of a first evaluation study are available.

- **Discussion**: Conclusions will be drawn to the pedagogical uses such technologies have for academic teaching and writing centre work. Participants are invited to briefly introduce tools they developed at their own universities or use in their work.
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Corpus-assisted editing for doctoral students: do-it-yourself corpora for individualising the student experience

Speaker(s): Maggie Charles, Oxford University
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One way for academic writing courses to respond to the diversified nature of the student body is by individualising the student experience. This paper shows how the use of do-it-yourself, tailor-made corpora provide an individualised resource for graduates who are writing doctoral theses. The thesis is a high-stakes genre, demanding a high level of editing skills; yet relatively little attention has been given to this aspect of the process. This paper reports on a course in corpus-assisted editing for doctoral students who had completed part of their thesis in draft. After introducing corpora and the AntConc software (Anthony 2014), students each built two corpora of 1) discipline-specific research articles in their own field and 2) their own writing. Class sessions provided demonstrations of how to use specific tools for editing, followed by individualised practice on students’ own writing.

While the utility of concordances for improving lexico-grammar has already been demonstrated (Boulton and Cobb 2017; Flowerdew 2015), I show that other corpus tools are also valuable for editing. Thus Keyword Lists and Concordance Plots address issues concerning the development of content, while N-Grams helps students check disciplinary phraseology. Feedback indicated that students valued and made substantial use of this corpus technology. All 66 participants answered positively the question ‘Is it helpful to use your corpus and AntConc for editing?’ (79% yes definitely; 21% yes probably). This paper presents further details on the course and the affordances of corpus tools for individualised learning, illustrating the findings with examples of student work.
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Writing and reading competencies of monolingual and bilingual students in Germany
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At German universities, the drop-off rate of students with an L2 or a bilingual background is distinctly higher than the drop-off rate of L1 students. One reason for this might be difficulties in reading and writing academic texts – be these difficulties really higher than those of L1 students, or be these difficulties simply ‘perceived’ as being higher by the bilingual students (Langelahn, Brandl, and Arslan 2013, Hashemian and Heidari 2013). Since there are studies showing that people who have not learned to read and write in their L1 have problems in acquiring knowledge and literacy on a high level in the L2 (cf. Fürstenau and Gomolla 2011), and since most bilingual children in Germany only learn to read and write in German, we set up a test in which monolingual and bilingual pupils between the age of 9 and 12 wrote short texts and also compassed a reading test of words and non-words.

The first results show that there is a difference in the reading and writing competencies of monolingual and bilingual children. While there was no relevant difference in reading words, for example, there was one in non-words that indicate that L2 pupils have the tendency to still read letter by letter at their age, which is negative for text comprehension (Israel and Duffy 2009). We will present further results of the study, and would like to discuss what this means for our teaching and supporting bilingual students at schools as well as at universities: which teaching methods would fit (e.g. L2-L2 peer tutoring, bilingual classes, online writing forums)? How can we train the trainers in order to cope with the extra demands (e.g. classes on teaching the language)?
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This paper presents an overview of a recently published monograph (Bhatt 2017) which offers a novel approach to the study of writing and digital literacy. Through in-depth accounts of assignment writing in college classrooms, I examine ways of understanding how students engage with digital media in curricular activities and how these give rise to new practices of information management and knowledge creation manifested in digitally mediated writing. I then consider what these new practices portend for a richer theory of writing and literacy in an age of informational abundance and ubiquitous connectivity. Looking also at how institutional policies and strategies on digital media are applied in classroom writing tasks, and how students end up embracing or avoiding imposed technologies, this study offers an in-depth study of learner practices. I argue that it is through the comprehensive study of such practices that we can better understand the efficacy of technological investments in education, and the dynamic nature of the writing carried out by students charged with using those technologies.
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Situating writing development in universities: the directory of academic writing provision, UK Higher Education
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In Autumn 2000, a National Survey of Staff Perspectives on the Teaching of Academic Writing in Higher Education found that writing development programmes and centres were rare in UK universities, although writing provision existed in some academic departments and institutions at that time (Ganobcsik-Williams 2004). Over the past sixteen years, Academic Writing research and writing development practice have grown significantly. However, it is not clear to what extent current writing development provision still exists only in pockets within institutions and to what extent UK universities have established formal channels for student writing development. This presentation will discuss the ‘Directory of Academic Writing Provision, UK Higher Education’ research project, funded by the Royal Literary Fund, which seeks to update the 2000 survey by investigating how UK universities provide structures for teaching and supporting academic and scholarly writing, and the nature of such structures (e.g. centralised, programmatic, strategic or ad-hoc). The project is gathering data via a questionnaire distributed to senior managers responsible for teaching and learning and/or for the student experience at every UK university, and is using this research to set up an open-source Directory database featuring institutional profiles of academic writing provision. The presentation will review key project findings to date, highlighting a variety of institutional policies on writing development and the types of writing support provision that these policies appear to enable or allow. The Directory will be showcased as a resource for discovering where writing development work is situated within UK universities, and as a model for identifying and compiling the types and institutional locations of writing development in other Higher Education contexts.
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Writing-enriched curricula: transformed pedagogies, sustained change
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Does the increasing institutionalization of writing across the curriculum initiatives move colleges and universities closer to their goal of writing-infused curricula in all disciplinary areas? Not necessarily. When cross-curricular writing requirements and policies are built atop unchallenged and ultimately disruptive perceptions of writing and writing pedagogies, unilateral approaches to integrating writing instruction into undergraduate programs can yield uneven and limited results. In this presentation, the Writing Across the Curriculum Director from an American research university will portray a WAC/WID model designed to intentionally provoke and ultimately transform attitudinal roadblocks as a first step to achieving a sustainable infusion of discipline-relevant writing instruction into diverse undergraduate curricula. The model is called the Writing Enriched Curriculum, or WEC, and it is now being implemented in 60 academic departments in the presenter’s home institution and in more than ten other American and European colleges and universities. WEC engages local faculty groups in a recursive process of generating, implementing, and assessing Undergraduate Writing Plans. In generating these plans, faculty respond to samples of student writing, data generated by student and external stakeholder surveys, and curricular maps by identifying relevant writing objectives and re-conceptualizing ways in which these writing abilities can supported within their curricula. The presenter will demonstrate ways in which the WEC model, designed to capitalize on reflection and to divert resistance, has resulted in sustainable changes in the ways that writing and writing instruction are conducted and the degree to which student writing meets differential faculty expectations.
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Peer writing mentoring as a physical and mental space for student writing
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At UGent, a major Belgian university, students of English are expected to attain a high level of academic writing skills. However, due to the constraints of university funding, a single teacher was responsible for teaching more than 175 students how to write, resulting in a situation where students could wait for weeks before getting any feedback on their work. To combat this issue, a peer writing mentoring programme was established during the academic year 2013 - 2014. Employing students as near-peers, this programme aims to aid in students’ development as writers by providing them with additional opportunities for non-directive feedback. As part of an ongoing programme evaluation, students’ reflective writing was analysed for content related to (students’ perceptions of) mentoring, and its impact on their writing process. From this, it became clear that mentoring has taken an important place in students’ writing education. Students noted the importance of a physical space for mentoring - in our case, a dedicated mentoring room – in relieving some of their writing anxiety. In addition, mentoring had a significant impact on students’ mental space for writing - they noted feeling more confident about their writing, having an increased understanding of the writing process and feeling less anxious. Mentors’ approachability and their use of non-directive guidance were important factors in establishing and maintaining this mental space.
Addressing retention through academic writing
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Birkbeck’s teaching and learning policy advocates inclusive learning, teaching and assessment practices that value the diversity of the student body and stipulates that study skills tuition ought to support student retention. The paper discusses how the teaching of academic writing may support Level 4 student retention in the Department of Law at Birkbeck, a widening access institution, which attracts many students without traditional qualifications. The prevailing assessment methods in the Department are essays and exams without opportunities for formative assessment. Institutional data indicate that Birkbeck’s L4 students tend to abandon their studies around the time of submission of their first essay. This shows that the first assignment functions as a self-evaluation mechanism, on the basis of which students determine their potential to succeed as learners, demonstrating a link between academic writing and retention. Based on this and on views of teaching staff, who identified lack of academic writing skills as a major obstacle to student progression, ‘scaffolding assessment’ (Dickson, Chard, and Simmons 1993, p. 12) will be introduced from the next academic year in the Department. Grounded on research demonstrating the effectiveness of scaffolding assessment in student attainment (e.g. Abraham and Jones (2016); Murtagh and Webster (2010)), it will involve a progressively more complex sequence of writing activities with opportunities for formative assessment. The paper discusses consenting and resistant staff responses to this initiative as well as student comments, which indicate that the teaching of academic writing as part of scaffolding assessment can complement efforts to improve retention.
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Affects and writing: how self-efficacy, writing tasks and emotions influence writing. An empirical study
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The current research on writing (e.g. Bremerich-Vos 2016 and Ehlich 2003) focuses on writing tasks and ways to improve the production of written texts by students. Our research tackles specific questions like: How do emotions, self-efficacy and writing tasks influence the writing process? We assume that papers with complex writing tasks, e.g. papers requiring the integration of many intertextual references, are prone to induce a specific writing process and specific emotions. Studies on SLA and FLL are widely concerned with emotion, affect and learning (e.g. Dewaele and MacIntyre 2016), but their focus lies on classroom-activities. Our research, however, concentrates on writing consulting in an academic setting. In our survey (N=150 students) we asked students about their personal experiences with complex writing tasks and their emotions during the writing process. The results show a correlation between failing, self-efficacy, emotions (especially shame) and the individual writing process. We highlight concrete examples of writers and their emotional experiences in the writing process with intertextual references. Such experiences can provoke a Denkbremse (a ‘thinking-brake’ inhibiting intellectual reflection). Large-scale factors include fear of failure, negative experience from previous feedbacks or a mythical belief in the natural writing talent. In consulting situations, there are also incidental variables or affective filters to be considered, such as anger, shame or envy. Finally, we discuss the potential consequences of our findings for professional writing consulting. Based on our results, there are two types of writers, each requiring different coaching methods.
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The student experience: distance doctoral programs, writing centers and innovative technologies, and holistic writing support
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A recent article in University World News (Blessinger 2016) highlights a growing trend in higher education — distance doctoral programs have shifted the landscape for graduate studies from the physical to the virtual space. But, as Blessinger noted, this shifted landscape has not changed the demands for academic rigor and productivity. Obtaining a doctoral degree now means managing full-time employment and personal-life responsibilities with often limited time and access to typical onsite resources, including professors, peers, and support services. To this end, we ask: how can graduate writing centers play a more fundamental role to support student experiences related to writing and research activities? Although many universities are developing centralized writing support programs for doctoral students to help address unmet needs, these programs have tended to be spread out across both undergraduate and graduate writing student populations or have focused exclusively on dissertation writing (Autry and Carter 2011; Jimenez y West and Gokalp 2011; Jimenez y West et al. 2011; Ober Mannon 2016; Simpson 2016). In contrast, our Center offers graduate students comprehensive support with academic writing and research-related tasks that include assignments for coursework, professional presentations, publications in academic journals, human subjects protection proposals, dissertation proposals, and dissertations. We offer online enrichment activities (e.g. writing/data rallies, retreats, workshops, etc.) and innovative technologies (e.g. screencasting and videoconferencing) to supplement one-on-one coaching. Our holistic student-centered model combines multi-leveled support structures to cohesively provide an interconnected whole-support model for academic rigor and production.
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Postgraduate (EAL) ‘writing’ and the overlooked influence of Rhetorical Transfer
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Bourdieu rightly noted that academic language is ‘no-one’s mother tongue’, and this is particularly true when it comes to academic writing. We are all aware that when we are grappling with new ideas that we do not yet fully understand, there is an apparent lack of clarity in our writing. The same is true for students whose first language is not English – but this may be further compounded if they are unsure of the argumentative paradigm that is expected of them, especially if their paradigm in their first language is different. Back in 1966 Kaplan noted that just because you can write an essay in your L1 does not necessarily mean you can write one in an L2 and with it he founded the theory of contrastive rhetoric, which 50 years on, despite significant research in this area, still lacks a pedagogical framework. Yet it is here where transfer effects may appear and be interpreted as linguistic deficiencies rather than culturally, in the broadest sense, defined differences in approach, both in terms of argumentation as well as rhetoric. The aims of this session are therefore, firstly, to raise awareness of the difficulties that in particular students whose first language is not English may face and the potential reasons for these, exploring the commonly-held misconceptions that they are simply ‘language’ problems; and secondly, to reflect on how best to support the development of written academic articulacy for all students.

References:

History of a history student: composition strategies in the digital age
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This talk reports on an on-going longitudinal study of an undergraduate history student. Using a qualitative approach to gain maximum ‘emic’, student’s-eye-view perspectives, the study aims to contribute to our knowledge of student writing processes in the internet era. Seminal qualitative studies into student writing were conducted in the pre-internet, or early-internet era (e.g., Prior 1998; Spack 1997; Lillis 2001), and as such documented student writing in an analogue age. In the intervening period, the development of the internet as a platform for composition has, perhaps, profoundly changed student composition strategies. Although some work on internet-era writing has been done (e.g., Stapleton 2010), the research base is still thin. Thus it may be argued that our knowledge of student composition practices is anachronistic. In addition, history writing is under-represented in writing scholarship. I report on initial findings of an interview-based study of a history student, selected by virtue of having a particularly screen-based, online approach to writing. The study, following the student through their second and third years, is based on interviews and email correspondence with the student about their writing, adapting a ‘talk-around-text’ method (Lillis 2001). By attempting a ‘thick description’ (Geertz 1973) of one student’s textual history, I hope to document some of the strategies, feelings, and aspirations of a student-author in the internet era. Generalizability is of course a moot point in a study of a single student, but participants might like to consider how typical they find this particular student’s story.
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This paper addresses the challenge of creating synergy among the increasingly more specialised and centralised supports for four key higher education activities - research, writing, teaching and learning - which frequently fail to capitalise on their shared territories and common ground. There is a wealth of research about the distinct areas of learning, teaching, researching and writing in higher education (Anson 2015; Geller and Eodice 2013; Sorcinelli et al 2006; Thaiss et al 2014; Trowler et al 2012); however, there is a dearth of scholarship addressing these four areas more holistically (Boyer 1990). In many institutions, central support for these four areas continues to grow, repeatedly in a reactive rather than strategic manner, in the form of sometimes overlapping programmes or activities, centres, institutes and other units (Thaiss et al 2012). This responsive growth, often influenced by external forces, can result in the goals, structures and services of these central supports being less than optimal. Our paper proposes that dialogue and research, across units and institutions, will illuminate intersections and contribute to institutional transformation based on complementary, coherent and integrated provision. Specifically, our paper outlines the goals, and progress to date, of a European COST Action where we aim to address the identified challenge by classifying, as ‘frontier taxonomies’, the common ground in terms of shared purposes, processes, knowledge, values and skills among centralised institutional supports for research, writing, teaching and learning in order to capitalise on their synergies. In addition, it aims to suggest advantageous models and practices for supporting these four areas that are mindful of the availability of new technologies and assessments and that prompt a reworking of current institutional supports. European colleagues facilitating this discussion acknowledge financial support provided by the EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020 through COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology) funding for Action 15221 http://www.cost.eu/COST_Actions/ca/CA15221
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Demystifying the teaching of writing

Speaker(s): Stephanie Dunson, Williams College

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 7F Room: Windsor 1-04

When we ask faculty from across disciplines to teach writing, we’re potentially asking them to perform what may seem a towering task: that is to teach courses that combine content material in which they are expert (e.g., sociology, history, political science, etc.) and content matter beyond their direct scholarly training (i.e., writing, composition, rhetoric, etc.). It should come as no surprise, then, that despite our best efforts at providing opportunities and training, faculty often feel underprepared for (even resistant to) WAC initiatives. But what if we helped faculty see writing not as an additional thing to teach but rather as an additional way to teach? How can thinking about the use of writing in content-areas actually help faculty better articulate their values, goals, and objectives? What work can writing do to help students meet the discipline-specific objectives set for courses?

This workshop opens with a few brief writing activities that offer models for using writing to do intellectual work and to heighten critical thinking. The focus then moves to a discussion of the ideas behind the techniques that are informed by subtle but important shifts in thinking about the broader roles that writing can play in content-specific courses. The workshop concludes with the presentation of guidelines that can be concisely presented to faculty from across disciplines as a portable but powerful mindset—a shift in thinking that they can readily adopt to develop their own applications for writing that are meaningful and manageable extensions of their established style of teaching.
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Creative challenges: an inquiry into the critical intersections between creativity and academic writing in the doctoral thesis

Speaker(s): Steven Thurlow, University of Melbourne

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 7G
Room: Windsor 1-05

All western higher education systems expect doctoral candidates to produce a written thesis that is sufficiently complex, stylistically proficient and, above all, outstandingly original and creative. Despite a growing body of work on the writing practices of doctoral students (for example, Aitchison and Guerin, 2014), creativity and doctoral writing remains an under-researched combination. Current literature on this topic generally neglects to foreground the growth of creativity and creative practices when compared to other aspects of the writer’s academic literacy development. This paper investigates perceptions of the place and affordances of creativity by a small group of L1 and L2 thesis writers at one large Australian university. It explores how students attempt to introduce specific types of creativity into their doctoral writing practice, such as the creative use of writer’s voice and strategies to ensure heightened reader engagement in their work. Data was gathered through observation of a six ‘creative’ academic writing workshops, subsequent interviews about the notion and practice of creativity and textual analysis of selected ‘creative’ thesis extracts. Our findings reveal clear acknowledgement of the crucial role creativity and strategic use of creative practices can play in the production of a suitably original thesis. However, before thesis writers can usefully tap into creativity as a force in their doctoral writing, they face sizable constraints that typically occur in the form of ‘blocking’ disciplinary conventions, possible ambivalence from supervisors and, possibly most detrimental of all, self-censorship of their creative urge.
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Bridging the gaps: embedding academic literacies through a first year writing programme

Speaker(s): Sacha Mason, Bishop Grosseteste University
Sue Cordell, Bishop Grosseteste University

Session Type: Workshop
Session: 7H Room: Moore Annexe 034

This workshop explores the findings from a research project which focused on the experiences of first year undergraduate students from widening participation groups. The project introduced a First Year Writing Programme (FYWP), a tailored approach that supports writing in the discipline. The concept of the FYWP derives from a model adopted in America and aims to embed academic literacies across a range of first year modules. The pedagogical approach used here was to utilise the skills of the learning development tutor with academics in their field. The workshop explores the value and challenges of collaborative working within the context of the introduction of a FYWP. The FYWP and the approaches and resources used in the project will be discussed and the workshop seeks to investigate and share other pedagogical approaches within the sector. Particular focus will be on learners’ confidence and competence as academic writers with recommendations for future research and practice. The project findings suggest that key challenges for learners were on the understanding of university expectations and the likely trajectory of marks. The workshop provides some practice links by examining how students manage the different demands of planning, time management, technical conventions and the emotional demands of undergraduate study.
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Nurturing students’ writing self-efficacy and wellbeing

Speaker(s): Jeremy Schildt, University of East Anglia
            Zoe Jones, University of East Anglia
            Nonia Williams, University of East Anglia

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 7I             Room: Moore Building 016

More young people than ever are undertaking study at university and there has been an increase in the numbers of students arriving at university with declared mental health conditions in recent years (MWBHE 2015). What is more, during their time at university, students may encounter a range of academic, social, cultural and financial pressures that affect their wellbeing. In the area of students’ writing development, research has revealed feelings of anxiety, alienation and isolation (Huerta et al 2016; Bowstead 2009). This workshop provides an opportunity to explore recent responses to this at the University of East Anglia (UEA) that focus on building supportive spaces for writing.

The Learning Enhancement Team at UEA is situated within the Student Support Service which also incorporates the University’s team of Counsellors and Mental Health Advisors. We have developed a range of practices for students at all levels that are designed to help foster writing self-efficacy and nurture a sense of wellbeing. These practices acknowledge that ‘academic writing is a social and cultural act’ (Clughen and Hardy 2012, [p. xii] and provide physical and mental spaces for producing writing that are collaborative, creative and student-led.

In this workshop we will share and invite participants to experiment with these practices, from ‘writing to it’ (Gale and Wyatt, 2016) to walking tutorials, from making use of examples of student work to micro-groups for social writing.
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The paper investigates the effectiveness of implementing blended learning for writing tasks in a required English language enhancement course at a university in Hong Kong. As part of a project incorporating SCORM-based e-learning materials for the university-wide course, the paper describes the instructional design and implementation of shareable learning objects alongside blended learning activities to develop writing. By adopting an action learning approach, feedback about the relevance and usefulness of integrating e-learning modules was collected through questionnaires, interviews and students’ writing samples. The evaluation of the modules focussed on aspects such as a) interactivity; b) learning potential; and c) perception of blended learning for future use. Findings revealed that integrating specifically designed e-learning objects containing interactive activities into the English language course added value to the students’ learning experiences through practice, reinforcement, and scaffolding. Evaluation of students’ writing samples also showed that the specifically designed blended learning activities provided opportunities for analytical skills required for writing at the tertiary level.
Exploring the challenges of academic writing in English among academics in Turkey

Speaker(s): Zuleyha Unlu, Gaziosmanpasa University
            Erkan Kulekci, Kastamonu University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session:  8C                Room:  Windsor 0-05

In Turkey academics are expected to publish their research in English in international journals not only for recognition in their field but also for academic promotion. This presentation will share our preliminary findings on the academics’ experiences with writing in English in Turkey. The study aims to investigate the challenges the academics face (e.g., linguistic and institutional challenges) when they publish in English for the international audience and the ways they cope with these challenges. Linguistic problems cover issues such as being familiar with only the discipline specific terms while not being equipped with the general academic English language skills. The institutional challenges range from balancing the teaching load with researching and writing in English language to meeting the criteria set by Higher Education Council to be promoted. We will also present how the academics cope with these struggles by; for example, working with translation/proofreading services, which further complicates the situation. To this end, we will first present a brief background on academic publishing in English by researchers whose first language is not English. Then, we will particularly talk about academic writing in English in Turkish higher education settings. Following this, the design of the study, the data collection and analysis processes will be detailed. We will also share our initial findings from the interviews with academics in two state universities in Turkey. Finally, the implications will be shared both for the professional and academic development of the researchers and for writing development in English in higher education institutions.
Towards post-digital engagement: a study of international students’ composing practices

Speaker(s): Lavinia Hirsu, University of Glasgow

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 8D Room: Windsor 1-02

In this presentation, I share the findings of a study conducted at a UK institution on international students’ reading and writing engagement (e.g., finding, reading, evaluating, and synthesizing a wide range of materials). Unlike previous studies that have looked at specific uses of certain digital platforms, this project focuses on the processes that students engage with in order to prepare their academic work – processes which involve the seamless integration of physical and digital dimensions. Building on scholarship in digital literacies (Liu; Rose; Tarsa), this study aims to investigate students’ flows of reading and writing, the paths that hinder or facilitate academic production, and the practices of knowledge navigation through the use of digital environments. Data on students’ experiences with academic sources include a dataset of images of students’ online practices captured with lifelogging cameras, interviews with the students about their patterns of reading and writing in academic contexts, and samples of student work along with related artifacts (highlighted readings, keyword searches, reading notes). The goal of the presentation is to articulate a framework of post-digital engagement whereby knowledge-information is constructed fluidly, across platforms, practices, and habits.
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Exploring the pedagogic and practical intersections of academic writing support for students and academic staff in an Irish higher education institution

Speaker(s): Maria-Jose Gonzalez, Dublin Institute of Technology
Contributor: Roisin Donnelly, Dublin Institute of Technology
Session Type: Paper presentation
Session: 8E
Room: Windsor 1-03

This paper discusses the pedagogical approach adopted for the support of academic writing for both students and academic staff at a higher education institution (HEI) in Ireland. It builds on previous research conducted in our professional development context on supporting lecturers in academic writing (Donnelly and Crehan 2012; Donnelly 2014). The study uses a reflexive and data-driven evaluation of two initiatives in existence in the HEI: a Continuous Professional Development Module (CPD) for academic staff and postgraduate students (PGs) entitled ‘Academic Writing and Publishing’, in existence since 2009, and a more recently established Academic Writing Centre (AWC) for supporting undergraduate and postgraduate students. The evaluation reports on students’ and lecturers’ perceptions of the effectiveness and nature of academic writing support provided by the two Centres. The evaluation analyses the results of two online surveys: students (n=140) and lecturers/PGs (n=60) as well a focus group interview with six lecturers.

Three Forms of Data Collection:

1. STUDENT online survey with the most recent recipients of the AWC supports
2. STAFF online survey across all cohorts who completed the AWP module since 2009
3. STAFF focus group resulted in a series of useful vignettes of experiences

Analysis of the data indicates that lecturers and students hold different views about the type and nature of the academic writing support and its effectiveness. Academic staff remain very aware of the importance of writing development and practice both for themselves and their students. Combining skills, socialisation and academic literacies approaches allows academic staff the opportunity to develop their own practice, and consequently improve the learning experience of their students. Analysis of student data, on the other hand, reveals that students have a preference for the use of reflective strategies to address issues such as structure and paper organisation. Thus supporting students’ development as academic writers requires a commitment to providing meaningful feedback to support them in becoming reflective about their writing. These results provide useful insights to inform the development and future provision of academic writing support in the two Centres, and go some way towards consolidating the current and future role of academic writing within this 21st century educational institution.
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**Investigating the effectiveness of written feedback comments within one PhD writing group**

**Speaker(s):** Roger M.A. Yallop, University of Tartu  
Djuddah A.J. Leijen, University of Tartu

**Session Type:** Paper presentation

**Session:** 8G  
**Room:** Windsor 1-05

Peer feedback is a common method employed within Academic writing groups (Leijen and Leontjeva 2012). In this process, the student plays two important, but separate, roles: (1) student as feedback giver, and (2) student as feedback recipient. Ideally, students should be skilled in giving high-quality feedback as well as being proficient in interpreting and, then, implementing ‘useful’ feedback comments in subsequent drafts.

This study investigates the student as feedback recipient using both qualitative and quantitative research methods. It reports on the observations and analysis of a native English speaking PhD writing researcher participating in a small discipline-specific writing group over a three-month period. All the other participants are native Estonian speakers of similar age with a proficient level of written English. Furthermore, they are linguistic PhD students, with the objective of writing a scientific article in L2 (English) for publication. Students submitted their texts online and then gave written feedback to all group members using Microsoft Word. This was followed by a face-to-face group meeting. In total, there were five rounds of feedback. The researcher analysed all his/her written received feedback comments and his/her reaction to them, and subsequent changes to his/her text.

Written feedback comments are categorised using a unique taxonomy based upon studies into hedging principles (Salager-Meyer’s 1994), social presence theory (Yallop 2016), categorisation and effectiveness of feedback comments (Liu and Sadler 2003; Nelson and Schunn 2009). Qualitative data is analysed from the researcher’s introspective diary and through participant interviews. The results suggest the types and quantity of feedback comments good reviewers use to write effective feedback comments.
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Constructing the spaces between: a collaborative approach to academic writing consultations

Speaker(s): Deak Kirkham, University of Leeds
Contributor: Laura Foster, University of Leeds
Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 9B Room: Windsor 0-04

With many EAP writing textbooks (e.g. Bailey 2015; de Chazal 2014) understandably focussing on teacher-led, in-class textual and linguistic issues (paragraph development, topic sentences, editing, referencing and nominalisations), the field of EAP writing can sometimes appear to underplay the ‘spaces’ that exist between acts of writing. ‘Spaces’ here means those extra-textual, more amorphous issues (e.g. motivation, sense of audience, writerly identity) where writing per se does not occur but which remain critical components of an effective writing process. This presentation explores one such issue: the EAP writing consultation. Oftentimes framed as an interaction between a single tutor and a single student, and enacted not infrequently as a unidirectional ‘advice imparting’ event, the presenters outline an alternative – and collaborative - construction of the writing consultation. Drawing on collaborative writing theory (Speck et al 2008; Storch 2013) and praxis (Kirkham 2016), we sketch the background to a non-monadic writing consultation programme deployed in a 6-week EAP pre-sessional at a UK University in 2016. We discuss the programme’s rationale, tutor/student feedback thereon, and sketch possible modifications for the future, touching briefly on controversial issues around shared text creation. Aiming to rebalance the EAP writing equation away from its sometimes undue focus on the classroom teaching of writing and towards the between-class spaces where learning emerges, this presentation seeks to remind the EAP community of the importance of the consultation (properly deployed) in the writing process, and to inspire colleagues as to the rich possibilities, collaborative and other, afforded by the EAP writing consultation.
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Revisiting reflective writing as a teaching and assessing tool in teacher education

Speaker(s): Caroline Rosemary van der Mescht, Rhodes University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 9C Room: Windsor 0-05

This paper reports on an action research investigation into teaching practice in Higher Education. It discusses the first two cycles of an intervention that took the form of eight reflective assignments, in which a programme of reflective writing was introduced experimentally in the academic literacies strand of an in-service Bachelor of Education, Foundation Phase course. The first cycle probed the academic literacy needs of students; the second worked on developing students as reflective practitioners (Schon 1983). The goals of both cycles are key to teacher development in South Africa today, as teacher upgrade programmes engage with the low levels of in-service teacher’s language proficiency (Fleisch 2008) as well as with their slow uptake of the transformative values embedded in the curricula (Morrow 2007). The paper presents the benefits identified by students but also discusses unexpected challenges for lecturers incurred by using reflective writing as an assessment genre. The paper discusses students’ comments on the intervention cycles in terms of literature on reflective writing (Hillocks 1995). It then explores some of the tensions which resulted from assessing reflective writing. Finally, it presents the benefits of including this writing genre in academic literacy support programmes for teacher training (Luckett and Sutherland 2000; Goodwin and Kosnik 2013).
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Measuring writing behaviour changes before and after writing retreats? An innovative, cross-country method to develop and validate a questionnaire

Speaker(s): Sara Mathieu-Chartier, University de Montreal
Contributor: Larissa Elisabeth Kempenaar, University of the West of Scotland
Session Type: Paper presentation
Session: 9D Room: Windsor 1-02

Writing retreats are one of a range of strategies used to support graduate students and researchers to increase research outputs. They provide an ‘immersion experience, writing support and mentoring, focused engagement in the writing experience and a community of practice and reflexivity’ (Moore et al 2010). According to qualitative studies reviewed by Kornhaber et al (2016), there is evidence that writing retreats facilitate increases in outputs. However, there is currently no validated measure to gauge changes in writing behaviours and its maintenance following a writing retreat and similar writing programmes. A structured research retreat was organised January 2017 with experienced retreat facilitators to initiate a research network to develop a range of projects. The present study was the result of this research retreat. It aims to develop and validate a self-reported questionnaire to assess writing behaviour change. A transactional and systems approach to academic writing was used to define writing and its determinants (Kempenaar and Murray 2016). This operationalization of ‘writing’ is based on the integration of a behavioural process model (Van Egeren 2000) and a transactional model of stress (Lazarus and Folkman 1984) situated in a systems model (Bronfenbrenner 1979). English and French versions of the questionnaire were trialled among graduate students attending writing retreats in Canada and Scotland. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to assess its reliability and validity. An overview will be presented which outlines the process of the retreat structure to kick start research projects followed by the preliminary results of this study.
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Doing well at university: academic blogging as an inclusive writing genre

Speaker(s): Lisa Clughen, Nottingham Trent University
David Hindley, Nottingham Trent University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 9E Room: Windsor 1-03

The increasing marketization of UK Higher Education (Molesworth, Scullion and Nixon 2011) and its concomitant rise in quality assurance and enhancement structures have seen a major importance given to the quality of the overall student experience in UK Higher Education. A key part of this is, of course, the student academic experience itself and such is its importance that it is seen as determining the future health of universities: ‘What makes the big difference for the future is the reputation of the university and the reputation of the university is based on how well students do’ (Phoenix 2016, 1.52.32 mins).

Yet literacy scholars have argued powerfully that the writing of the academy is itself exclusionary – it simply does not allow all students to do well. The eminent scholar Peter Elbow recently lambasted the exclusionary nature of literacy cultures in the West arguing powerfully for the use of familiar language in writing genres and of the use of talk for writing support, so that writers are able to use ‘the language that comes most easily to mind and mouth’ (Elbow 2014, 6).

This paper argues that academic blogging offers precisely the type of inclusive writing genre and inclusive environment for writing development of which Elbow speaks. First, blogging allows students to deploy a form of language that ‘comes more easily to mind and mouth’ and, second, they develop their writing for their blog in a collaborative context, so they talk to others about the development of their blogs as part of the writing process. It describes a case study taken from a final year module in Sports Education, Contemporary Issues in Sports Practice, which has trialled the use of a blog as a formative part of the overall assessment. It then discusses a multi-method research project that has sought to gauge student perceptions on whether blogging allows them to engage with and own their writing for assessment (key factors in ‘doing well’) and on how this compares with academic essay writing.
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Integrating academic writing: a model for curricular and institutional change

Speaker(s): William Banks, East Carolina University
Brandon Hardy, East Carolina University
Nicole Caswell, East Carolina University

Session Type: Symposium

Session: 9F Room: Windsor 1-04

Recent research into learning transfer has suggested that faculty assumptions about what students carry with them from one class to the next, or from one educational setting to the next, is highly inaccurate, particularly when the curriculum has not been purposefully constructed to encourage learning transfer (Engström 2001; Haskell 2001; Nowacek 2011; Brent 2011). This issue is particularly relevant in Writing Studies: for nearly a century in the United States, teachers have assigned discreet writing tasks to students across grade levels and across the curriculum only to be frustrated that students seem not to have transferred what they should have learned about writing into new contexts (Clark and Hernandez 2011; Hillocks 1995; Moore 2012). This symposium explores one university’s approach to improving transfer. As part of our reaccreditation efforts, our university undertook a comprehensive plan to restructure both how academic writing is taught, and at which points in the curriculum, in order to provide for greater scaffolding of instruction to students and to make sure that students were part of a transfer-oriented writing curriculum (Adler-Kassner and Wardle 2015).

Speaker One will discuss the campus-wide curricular shifts that were enacted as part of this change. In particular, he will detail the shift in Writing Across the Curriculum to ensure that students engage with purposeful writing assignments in each year of their four-year undergraduate curriculum. Central to this change was the creation of a set of University Writing Outcomes that were approved by faculty from across campus. Speaker Two will discuss the creation of a University Writing Center, which has served as an important hub for support to students and faculty. Specifically, he will detail how the writing center engages students and faculty in transfer-oriented writing practices during writing center sessions, and how consultants are prepared to work with the new writing curriculum. Speaker Three will discuss the creation of the writing mentors program to further support writing on campus and to develop student leadership in the area of academic writing. An extension of the writing center, the writing mentors program embeds writing consultants in specific discipline-based writing courses across campus. Speaker Three will share how writing mentors shift the ways that writing is taught and discussed in writing intensive courses and how the notion of writing expert is negotiated among faculty, students, and mentors. Combined, these speakers share one university’s approach to teaching writing in the disciplines and across the curriculum, and the writing support offered to faculty and students. At the end, participants will be asked how our multifaceted approach might work in other contexts: What are the affordances and constraints of this model in the context of your own institutions? How might elements of this reform model be useful in the context of your home institution(s)?

Participants in this symposium should leave having engaged a practical case study of one university’s efforts at curricular and institutional change. Additionally, they will have a host of resources for how they might engage learning transfer around academic writing through classroom-based and curricular activities.
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What can citation practices tell us about the teaching and study of academic writing now? A symposium on comparative research in the field

Speaker(s): Andrea Scott, Pitzer College
            Pam Bromley, Pomona College
            Jenny Thomas, Pitzer College, Pomona College, and Scripps College

Session Type: Symposium

Session: 9G  Room: Windsor 1-05

Just as the landscape in higher education is changing as more and more diverse students attend university (Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley 2009), scholarly conversations about academic writing and its instruction are also adapting to new challenges. This roundtable examines these scholarly conversations through two lenses: scholarship and teaching. We first introduce an empirical study of citation practices in the German scholarly journal Josch: Journal der Schreibberatung [Josch: Journal of Writing Consultations] from its inaugural to its latest issue to analyze what citation patterns reveal about the emerging discipline of applied writing studies in German. The last presentation will ground these questions in teaching practice and bring into view scholarly conversations on the other side of the Atlantic. Our broader goal is to introduce comparative approaches to analyzing academic writing now--through the meta-lens of the field’s major journals and through daily practice in our classrooms. Speaker 1 will introduce U.S.-based research on citation patterns. Neal Lerner (2014) completed an empirical study of citation patterns for the first thirty years of the U.S.-based Writing Center Journal. Based on the results, he characterized writing center studies as in the midst of an ‘unpromising present.’ Citation patterns revealed a research culture that is largely inward looking, rarely collaborative, and lacking a shared scholarly base. In an effort to take up the field’s recent call for replicable, aggregable, and data-driven research (Driscoll and Perdue 2012; Haswell 2005), Speaker 1 and Speaker 2 collaborated on a project reproducing Lerner’s methodology, adding several questions particular to the Germanic context, to ask: what does the present of writing center studies look like in the Josch, the first journal dedicated explicitly to writing consultations in German-speaking countries? Speaker 2 will introduce the results of the Josch citation analysis project, situating them in reference to Lerner’s Writing Center Journal citation analysis. First, explicit comparisons with Lerner’s study are presented, including collaboration, gender, number of citations per article, and specific authors, texts, and journals cited. Second, findings specific to the Germanic context are presented, including the inclusion of peer tutors as authors and authors’ institutional locations. Recognizing overlapping goals and values in the teaching of academic literacies and language proficiency, Speaker 3 will explore how L2 research on connections between reading and writing (Grabe 2003) can inform our teaching of citation practices. In ‘writing from readings’ assignments, citations are visible manifestations of the interconnectedness of these two skills. By raising these connections to the level of explicit awareness and offering ample opportunity to reflect upon and create source-based arguments, L1 and L2 writing instructors can model growing awareness of moves clarifying the writer’s participation in existing scholarly conversations. Final discussion questions: How do writers, from scholars to students, determine which sources to cite? What impact does this have on academic discourse? What can L2 research on connections between reading and writing skills tell us now about how we might teach students ways of entering scholarly conversations in their writing?
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The value of peer review across different institutional, national, and curricular contexts

Speaker(s): Djuddah A.J. Leijen, University of Tartu  
Joseph Moxley, University of South Florida  
Chris Anson, North Carolina State University  
Christiane Donahue, Dartmouth College

Session Type: Symposium

Session: 9H  Room: Moore Annexe 034

Peer review of student writing is an increasingly common practice in educational contexts. Recently, large-scale empirical research has found that while students exaggerate the quality of their peers’ work when asked, over time students’ evaluations become more highly correlated with instructors’ scores (Moxley and Eubanks 2016). Exploratory research on the longitudinal effects of students ‘peer reviews has found that students who are trained to conduct peer reviews in foundational writing courses provide more thorough reviews later in junior- and senior-level STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) courses and use the critical writing terms introduced in the first-year courses (Ross 2016). However, these preliminary findings need further investigation across different institutional, national, and curricular contexts.

To investigate the value of peer review in such contexts, this symposium reports on several interconnected studies of peer-review using the same digitally-mediated peer review system at different levels of higher education (first-year/foundational courses, upper-level undergraduate STEM courses, and graduate courses) at different institutions (the University of Tartu, Malmö University, the University of South Florida, North Carolina State University, and Dartmouth College).

Speaker #1 and #2 will report on their collaborative efforts to develop MyReviewers. Students at the University of Tartu and the University of South Florida have used MyReviewers to engage in reflective writing about their processes and provide reviews and/or grades on their peers’ written work. As a result, a corpus has emerged of hundreds of student essays and peer reviews, which researchers have analyzed using different methods.

Speaker #1 and speaker #2 will report on the development of campus-based Community Comments as well as Community Comments shared across institutions that address the unique needs of two groups of L2 writers: doctoral students at the University of Tartu, INTO international program undergraduates at USF, and undergraduate students at Malmö University, Sweden. MyReviewers provides a library of comments that reviewers can embed on students’ papers. In addition, the presenters will report on the differences between L2 writers and L1 writers when it comes to peer review commenting styles—the number of comments, categorization of comments, and perceived helpfulness of comments. Finally, the presenters will provide an overview of their efforts to develop Writing Analytics, such as lexical changes across drafts in relation to comments, frequency and originality of comments, and sentiment analysis of comments in relation to progress. Presenters will report on the rationale for the algorithms and explore some preliminary results by campus and across campuses.

Speakers #3 and #4 will co-present the results of a corpus study comparing the conceptually-related terms and threshold concepts used by students during peer review in a foundational writing course and in several upper-level STEM courses. This study applies the results of a non-probability, voluntary survey of writing experts administered to a U.S. listserv (WPA-L) and a European listserv (EATAW@JISCMAIL.AE.UK) populated by scholars and teachers of academic writing, yielding a response rate of nearly 50. In addition to demographic data, the survey asked respondents to provide ten key terms they felt should be present in principled, expert response to student writing, such as ‘audience’ and ‘purpose,’ and ten key terms expected
to be used by novice writers when responding, such as ‘sentence,’ ‘mistake,’ and ‘comma.’ The resulting dual corpus of terms has been applied to nearly 100,000 student peer reviews and teacher comments on the same student texts generated through a digital peer review system in a foundational writing course. Statistical analysis shows that teachers’ responses to student writing reflect at least some of the concepts favored by experts, and that although the concepts employed in student peer reviews are generally different than those of their teachers, the difference is not statistically large, suggesting potential for the parallel improvement of both instructor and peer response (Anson and Anson, under review).

Speakers #2 and 3 will compare the results of this large-scale content analysis with a similar corpus analysis of peer reviews and teacher comments curated from several upper-level STEM courses at two institutions in the U.S. where students are required to complete foundational writing courses in their first year of study. The results of this analysis will reveal the extent to which favored response terms are being ‘transferred’ (Anson and Moore 2016; Donahue 2016; Yancey et al. 2014) from foundational writing curricula into courses in the disciplines, and what implications arise for further instructional development and research.
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Enhancing the development of students’ disciplinary discourse and content learning in science and engineering through a focus on writing: a comparison between approaches at a Swedish and a UK university

Speaker(s): Jim Donohue, Queen Mary, University of London
Andreas Eriksson, Chalmers University of Technology
Julian Ingle, Queen Mary, University of London
Magnus Gustafsson, Chalmers University of Technology

Session Type: Symposium
Session: 9I Room: Moore Building 016

An Erasmus funded collaboration between Chalmers University and Queen Mary University of London in 2016, involving a one-week visit by Queen Mary disciplinary and Learning Development/Thinking Writing staff to Chalmers, enabled us to share practices and approaches in how we support the development of students’ disciplinary discourse in science and engineering.

In Queen Mary, a funded project known as The Whole Programme Approach to Writing Development has been focusing on two degree programmes, Mechanical Engineering and Electronic Engineering and Computer Science. The objective of the project is to investigate writing development across the three years of the programmes and support innovations that build engineering discourse along a more coherent trajectory. At Chalmers, there is a long tradition of developing disciplinary discourse at the level of entire educational programmes. Given that many students start on a BSc-programme and continue onto an associated MSc, the ‘programme’ at Chalmers allows for a five-year sequenced progression for a majority of the students. There are also a number of students (25%) who enter at the level of the MSc and consequently experience less of the sequenced progression. Since the BSc section of the programmes is delivered in Swedish and the MSc is delivered in English, the whole programme approach at Chalmers also needs to negotiate issues of transferring from L1 to ESL or EFL. The different engineering programmes, therefore, exemplify different degrees of EMI and some provide more integrated disciplinary discourse development than others.

The symposium will be organised in the form of a dialogue between the two universities to draw out significant parallels and differences, and how these have been addressed. The dialogue is framed by three interrelated conceptual configurations: disciplinary practices, contexts, and multimodal texts. Our engagement with these configurations is influenced by our educational philosophies or theories; the pedagogical approaches we encounter or use and find to be effective with specialists or students; and the multimodal artefacts and practices of students and specialists we encounter in the various programmes. Drawing on experience in our respective contexts and using joint concept mapping to visualise our activities, we will offer some of the approaches we have adopted (e.g. social semiotics; constructive alignment; research-based learning, genre-based writing instruction; writing-to-learn; and concept mapping) to explore how they are used in strategic mixes within the various programmes. In our practices, we find our focus shifting between the three configurations of practices, contexts and texts, sometimes emphasising artefacts, sometimes practices, sometimes students, sometimes specialists/lecturers, and sometimes the development of educational material and resources.

We hope to be able to present the audience possible ways towards implementing a whole programme approach at their respective institutions. However, we also want to highlight the challenges we face and how we are currently addressing them.
Discussion questions:

How do your experiences of developing students’ disciplinary discourses and content learning compare with the ones you have heard about in the presentations?

Do the three broad perspectives of practices, contexts, and texts and the theories and approaches referred to help in articulating your experience?
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Talking academic writing: a conversation analysis of one-to-one writing tutorials with students from vocational backgrounds

Speaker(s): Elizabeth Caldwell, University of Huddersfield
Amanda Tinker, University of Huddersfield

Contributor: Katharine Stapleford, Leeds Beckett University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 10B Room: Windsor 0-04

Tutor: So, essay writing...

Student: Yeah, how do you do that?

This paper sheds light on what happens behind the closed door of the academic writing tutorial. Whilst there has been some empirical research on classroom interaction and dyadic tutorials, there has been little examination of the talk that occurs between tutor and student in one-to-one academic writing tutorials. The paper will present the findings of a study that used conversation analysis (CA) to examine the talk of individual academic writing tutorials at a small college-based Higher Education (HE) campus, where many students have vocational backgrounds. Undergraduate students with vocational qualifications often have less experience with academic writing than their peers who study A-levels (Parry 2012). However, college-based HE students also share many of the characteristics and challenges of ‘non-traditional’ HE students (Caldwell and Cattermole 2015). The study aimed to understand how tutorials are organised, how identities are established and how learning is developed. Data from 17 tutorials carried out with students from a range of courses and years were analysed using CA (Drew and Heritage 1992). The analysis revealed a number of strategies employed to negotiate goals between tutor and student, and how talk is used to achieve neutrality, correction and repair. Within this context, there is a paucity of research offering guidance for tutors to develop these strategies in the one-to-one tutorial. These findings will therefore fill this gap by providing a resource for practitioners to interrogate and reflect on good practice for conducting academic writing tutorials.
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‘I find that hard to explain to my students’. What do we assess when we assess reflective writing?

Speaker(s): Jacqueline Van Kruiningen, University of Groningen

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 10C Room: Windsor 0-05

Reflection tasks stimulate students to look back on accomplished tasks with the aim to understand their accomplishments and steer future actions. Reflection is considered an essential component of critical learning and problem solving, and as such, as indispensable for their professional development (Wald et al 2012). Students are commonly asked to work out these reflections in a writing task.

What do we assess when we assess reflective writing? Students’ professional development? Their reflections on this development? Or the quality of their writing about this development?

An analysis of first year students’ reflective writing at the University of Groningen (Medicine programme) and of their supervisors’ assessment and feedback reveals the struggle of both students and supervisors’ with this reflective genre. The outcomes of the study (a corpus analysis combined with interviews) point to unclear instructions and criteria, reflections that did not meet supervisors’ expectations, and variation in assessment practices. The supervisors pointed out that they found it difficult to set criteria for (levels of) reflection. With regard to the writing component, the supervisors required an ‘adequate’ and ‘academic’ style but at the same time seemed to appreciate a personal writing style, which suits personal reflection but is in contrast with the demands that university teachers usually set for academic writing tasks (c.f. Nesi and Gardner 2012). In my presentation, I will put forward some questions and discuss possible answers regarding the (explication of) criteria for reflective writing, and the (un)desirability to combine learning outcomes for reflection with outcomes for writing skills.
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Academic vulnerability and work related stress: exploring the potential of writing retreats to enhance wellbeing and promote positive academic identities

Speaker(s): Alison Eardley, University of Westminster
Marie Fletcher, University of the West of Scotland

Contributor: Emma Banister, Manchester University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 10D Room: Windsor 1-02

In this paper we explore the potential for structured writing retreats (Murray and Newton 2009) to improve the resilience and coping mechanisms of academic staff and students in Higher Education institutes. Recent definitions of vulnerability draw on the complexity of interactions between individual characteristics, states and social structures, which inform experiences of powerlessness and the potential for harm (Baker et al 2015). For those who experience vulnerability, the impact can be felt widely; for example consumer vulnerability informs the distribution of social and economic resources (Baker and Mason, 2012). We develop a new concept, which we term ‘academic vulnerability’. Academic vulnerability encapsulates potential threats to academics’ or students’ sense of self and well-being, which emanate from a range of sources. For academics this includes considerations of job (in)security, status, promotion and salary; all of which represent significant challenges to the formation of positive academic identities. We report findings from an exploratory study: longitudinal survey data was collected from a cohort of attendees at a series of structured writing retreats. In this paper we specifically focus on those findings that shed light on attendees’ perceptions of well-being. Our preliminary findings suggest that in providing safe nurturing writing spaces, structured writing retreats function as important support mechanisms allowing attendees to cope with stress and other potentially adverse aspects of academic life, potentially reducing experiences of academic vulnerability. We therefore suggest that writing retreats and other academic-related communities of practice could offer important opportunities for the development of ‘strong’ ‘successful’ academic identities.
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Supporting academic writing for post-graduate Engineering students: a Hong Kong example

Speaker(s): Hebe Wong, City University of Hong Kong
Wing Shing Chan, City University of Hong Kong

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 10E Room: Windsor 1-03

Writing for the discipline in a range of genres which involve linguistic features they are unfamiliar with is often a challenge for many university students. Providing students with explicit knowledge of the structure and linguistic choices of key genres to help them gain access to ways of communicating in their academic communities has been a key concern (Hyland 2003). While much has been discussed about the undergraduate context, little effort has been given to provide support for academic writing in post-graduate programmes in which students are not only required to report on their research studies but also publish as new scholars for the profession. The need for professionalization with respect to publishing support is growing as the number of international students is on the rise in post-graduate programmes (Craig 2013). This paper presents the online language support facilities developed by an inter-university project to support the academic writing of post-graduate Engineering students in three government-funded universities in Hong Kong. It will explain how an FAQ blog investigates the needs of post-graduate students in academic writing, and describes the online materials developed to support the writing of Journal Articles, Letters and Conference papers in Engineering. Insights gained from the provision of online language facilities for academic writing are discussed.
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Collaborative marking across the curriculum

Speaker(s): Vicky Collins, Royal Holloway, University of London

Session Type: Lightning talk

Session: 11 Room: Crosslands

Collaborative marking, where assessors jointly negotiate the feedback and final mark awarded, tends to be applied most to non-written and practical assessment tasks, such as presentations, in the UK HE context. It is a method rarely selected for written tasks where other less intensive forms of first or second marking are employed. This talk describes a method where subject academics and writing specialists collaboratively marked formative essays produced by first year law students. The two tutors-to-one script approach was intended to provide students with balanced feedback on both the effectiveness of their writing skills and their subject knowledge. Each essay was annotated by both markers independently, within defined areas of the marking criteria. Subject lecturers commented on the relevance, understanding and level of argumentation in the response, while writing specialists’ comments focused on organizational and linguistic features. Feedback from the writing specialist aimed to complement academic skills development sessions which 1st Year undergraduates had received. An overall evaluation of the work was provided by the subject lecturer with reference to feedback from the writing specialist. This pedagogical innovation enhances feedback practices in two ways: the early opportunity for students to receive feedback on key areas of practice inducts them into the discipline and the academic culture of the institution with sufficient time to improve (Evans 2016) and secondly, it promotes access to learning by reinforcing the academic skills development support available at the institution. A possible outcome of the collaboration is that both subject and writing specialists consolidated as well as challenged their assumptions of what constitutes successful academic writing by reading each other’s commentary, and most importantly how to communicate this tacit understanding to students.
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A proposal for design-based research drawing on the Learning Sciences to support academic writing pedagogies in art and design

Speaker(s): Emma Shackleton, University of the Arts, London

Session Type: Lightning talk

Session: 11 Room: Crosslands

Considerable research has been undertaken to investigate academic writing in higher education (HE) and develop inclusive writing pedagogies. Despite this, a significant gap remains between examples of effective practice in research studies and actual practice in universities where pedagogies for writing – and the related activity of reading – can be constructed as marginal and deficit-related (Wingate 2015). Writing is a route through which students learn by transforming and articulating their developing knowledge as well as demonstrating their learning for assessment (Bransford, Brown and Cocking 2002). However, where inclusive teaching of writing is not available, students’ learning and attainment can be impeded due to gaps between the requirements of their discipline and their own understanding of epistemology and how to communicate effectively within their discipline. This is particularly the case in art and design environments where students are required to carry out diverse written academic assignments, even though they may have rejected writing in their choice of study, and have followed educational and professional routes that do not involve complex reading and writing (Orr and Blythman 2002).

Drawing on education theories, cognitive and social psychology, anthropology, neuroscience and learning technologies, the interdisciplinary education research of the Learning Sciences has created an evidence-based framework of effective teaching practices and how individuals learn successfully (Bransford et al 2000, Sawyer 2014). Hence, this lightning talk offers a visual insight into my focus of planned research: how evidence-based practices identified by the Learning Sciences can inform pedagogical patterns that HE practitioners collaboratively can adapt with pedagogic traditions of academic writing and practices of disciplines within art and design (Orr and Blythman 2002, Laurillard 2012, Wingate 2015).
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The logistics of writing for logistics professionals: university courses making connections with industry

Speaker(s): Patricia Dooey, Curtin University

Session Type: Lightning talk

Session: 11 Room: Crosslands

In recent years, changes to the higher education policy in Australia have allowed those on international student visas to remain temporarily in the country after graduation in order to gain experience in their chosen field prior to returning home. This situation demands that these graduates be ‘work-ready’, so with increasing competition amongst all graduates for jobs in Australia, universities are responding to employer group demands for graduates who possess excellent oral and written communication skills (Graduate Careers Australia 2008). In response to the need to improve these skills for both local and international students, many universities are now embedding language and professional skills development content and activities into their courses. This presentation describes how Curtin University Business School combined an academic task with a workplace visit for a cohort of 2nd year undergraduate students studying Supply Chain Information Management. In small groups the students were tasked to visit a nominated business in order to observe and investigate a particular function within the supply-chain part of the business, and to compile a report detailing a suggested improvement to this function. The report was their nominated major academic (group) assignment, but it would also be presented to the management of the company. In addition, the students were required to attend two writing-focussed classes during the semester. Specifically, the classes addressed ways to communicate effectively within a professional and an academic setting. The overall aim was to facilitate improvements in the students’ oral and written communication skills through authentic learning experiences.
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Several shades of Strunk and White

Speaker(s): Paul Abbott, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt

Session Type: Lightning talk

Session: 11 Room: Crosslands

Strunk and White’s *The Elements of Style* has been recommended by generations of writing teachers in the USA and beyond. It presents 11 rules, 11 principles, and 21 approaches to guide young authors who are writing in English. While surely their book has helped countless learners, for many of us, exactly how the authors have helped has remained obscure. Strunk and White did little more than haughtily assert that their rules, principles and approaches are the right ones. A satisfying explanation has been long overdue. While academia, grateful perhaps for a unifying though fragile authority in an important and mundane area, looked the other way, I went on a journey and learned why authors should omit needless words (Principle 17), not explain too much (Approach 11), and enclose parenthetic expressions between commas (Rule 3). Here I tell my story.
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Small is Beautiful: the importance of short word count assignments

Speaker(s): Justin O'Brien, Royal Holloway, University of London

Session Type: Lightning talk

Session: 11
Room: Crosslands

It is not a beautiful thing to destroy words? The skill to be able to boil down a message to its essence, with not a single redundant word, is rather over looked. This lightning talk argues that the combined challenges of large class sizes, straightjacket quality control processes and boiling frog inertia corrals educators into a dangerous groupthink that can generate an overly homogeneous assessment regime. A traditional assignment diet that is all too often reliant on a predictable elastic essay formulation that fails to sufficiently challenge student learning and teacher innovativeness, whilst simultaneously failing to adapt to the needs of 21st Century employment. Inspired by Orwell’s ‘2+2=5’ notion the talk puts forward an argument for less (volume) being more (complex and challenging).
Pre sessional students’ perceptions of the value of formative feedback to their competence as academic writers

Speaker(s): David Channon, Royal Holloway, University of London

Session Type: Lightning talk

Session: 11 Room: Crosslands

There is wide agreement on the usefulness of written formative feedback as an aid to improve students’ academic writing (Higgins et al 2002; Weaver 2006). However, Boud and Molloy (2013) argue that the practice of giving feedback is not based on solid research or theory. This small scale study aims to elicit student’ feedback on feedback in order to address this gap. There is a lack of research on the role of emotion in students’ perceptions of written feedback (Dowden et al 2013). How does emotion mediate students’ readiness to act upon feedback, especially when it may be construed as negative? What type of feedback – content or structure focused - do students value the least and the most? The study interviewed four former students who are continuing their studies at RHUL. They were emailed a short set of questions which asked 1. How the feedback they received during the Pre-Sessional made them feel; 2. How useful it was in helping them to improve their writing; and 3. What type of feedback they think tutors should focus on. The findings have implications for practitioners wishing to give more effective feedback to students.
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Ambiguities and embeddedness in academic plagiarism: the case of higher education in Georgia

Speaker(s): Madona Giorgadze, Ilia State University
Contributor: Nino Kereselidze, Ilia State University
Session Type: Lightning talk
Session: 11 Room: Crosslands

The frequency of academic plagiarism is explained by ambiguities in good academic practice. The reason behind this ambiguity is first and foremost unclear definition of plagiarism, inability to identify their signs, differential attitude, varied perceptions, and taking students’ academic skills for granted. The talk draws on scarcity of academic and policy literature on plagiarism, document analysis limited to copyright and syllabi and university regulations, semi-structured research interviews, questionnaires and personal observation as an added research method. More specifically, the research questionnaire enquires the degree of students’ informability before the peer-review method was integrated in systemic course of academic writing.
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Writing your Master's thesis: from A to Zen

Speaker(s): Lynn Nygaard, Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO)

Session Type: Lightning talk

Session: 11 Room: Crosslands

After introducing the idea that writing a Master’s thesis is less about following a prescribed recipe and more about developing a deeper understanding of your purpose, your audience, and your context, the book goes into more detail about both the process of writing a thesis, and the product itself. The section on ‘the process’ covers research design, ethics, reading, the writing process, and supervision and guidance. The main purpose of this section is to demystify the process of thesis writing, to help students understand that revising is not a sign that you didn’t do it properly the first time, but rather a way to develop your ideas. The section on the ‘the product’ looks at structure and argument, the introduction, the theoretical and conceptual framework, method, results and analysis, conclusion and discussion, and the finishing touches. Each of these chapters stress the function of these chapters, rather than the format: for example, the function of the introduction is to position yourself within the conversation you want to take part in, and to show your reader what question you intend to answer. The way you do this will depend very much on the kind of thesis you are writing, your discipline, the methodology you have used, and the kind of argument you want to make. Throughout the book I provide concrete examples, and give students some questions to reflect on for their own work.
Developing policy guidelines for promoting reflective practice in the academic training of teachers

Speaker(s): Gerd Bräuer, University of Education Freiburg

Session Type: Lightning talk

Session: 11 Room: Crosslands

The project, PREPARE, which will be introduced in a Pecha Kucha format, aims for the development of a political agenda to strengthen the requirement of reflective practice through writing in electronic portfolios. Reflective writing in the training of teacher students seems a central means of self-regulation in their future profession. School internships show a special potential for shaping professional competence through reflective practice, carried out mainly through writing. Internships in Austria, Germany, Luxembourg and Italy are being used as areas of research in order to demonstrate the necessary systemic change in the collaboration among interns and between interns, their instructors at the university and their school mentors in order to further develop the depth of reflective writing and the rhetorical quality of portfolios.

In order to make this need for reform visible, the project uses a video- and Web 2.0-based digital learning system for the support of (self-)reflective competence – with reflective writing in the center of attention. The learning system, consisting of a video annotation platform and an electronic portfolio, will be used to document, analyze and evaluate the interns’ activities in professional situations and their effort to communicate their insights with peers, instructors and school mentors alike through reflective writing.

Based on the outcome of the study described above, changes will be made in the overall interactive reflective writing system between interns, instructors, and school mentors. These adjustments toward the needs of the interns as reflective writers will be monitored by an international team of policy makers who will collaboratively develop a political agenda with the aim to strengthen the role of reflective writing as a central part of reflective practice in the training of future teachers.
Academic writing – a thing of beauty, a joy to behold

Speaker(s): Ronald Barnett, Institute of Education, University College London

Session Type: Plenary session

These days, around the world, academics are increasingly being expected to engage in research, the most significant ‘performance indicator’ (in either national or world rankings) being that of academics’ publications. And reward structures reflect this orientation, with titles and promotion very much dependent on publications (and in some countries, academics are paid a personal bonus directly for every publication they produce). In other words, academics are not just expected to write but they are being paid to write. Partly as a result, the sheer quantity of academic publications is rising exponentially.

But some nice questions arise: To what extent do academics reflect on writing as such? Do they ever talk – over lunch, over a coffee – about writing? Does any academic, when asked for her/his occupation, say ‘I am a writer’? To ask these questions is surely to indicate at once that writing as such is rarely part of the discourse of academic life and perhaps even more rarely comes to play a part in the formation of academic identity.

But what is it for an academic to write? What is academic writing in this sense? How can we expect our students to come to care about their writing and to write well if we do not care passionately about our own writing? How can we expect those of our colleague academics – who have focused on their teaching - who are now being expected to write for publication for the very first time to come to take writing seriously (on top of everything else in life) unless writing itself becomes an activity that has its own interest and gives personal satisfaction?

In my talk, I want to share some thoughts – albeit somewhat personal, autobiographical and even polemical – on these matters. I shall suggest that there are new responsibilities coming onto academics to care about writing and that there are considerable satisfactions from doing so. Having such a care towards writing can even change lives.
University literacy as a tonic for 'Post-Truth'

Speaker(s): Kurt Schick, James Madison University
Contributor: Laura Schubert, James Madison University
Session Type: Paper presentation

Universities must now respond to a social and political landscape characterized as ‘post-truth’ (Oxford Dictionary’s 2016 international word of the year), wherein emotion and personal belief often trump objective facts in shaping public opinion. In the US, college writing classes typically address this challenge by employing cultural studies pedagogy (George, Trimbur, and Lockridge 2014), critical pedagogies (George 2014) or by teaching traditional rhetoric and argumentation (Fleming 2014). However, cultural studies and critical pedagogies often focus on reading more than writing, and they fail to provide a set of straightforward, teachable heuristics. Conventional approaches to rhetoric and argumentation can be useful writing pedagogies, but they often focus too much on rhetoric as persuasion or remain too technical and complicated for many undergraduates (e.g., Toulmin 1958).

This presentation describes a practical, vernacular approach to teaching academic writing as a dialectical, truth-seeking activity. Synthesizing elements of classical and modern rhetoric, we will present an adaptive, plain language system for designing and evaluating arguments. Our model adapts Toulmin’s (1958) concepts of argumentative supports (data, backing, warrants), along with Aristotle’s (2006) notions of artistic and inartistic proofs, to develop a sophisticated but non-technical foundation for teaching and learning academic argument. Scholarly discourse, which communicates the results of disinterested investigation, provides a strong counterpoint to post-truth, and is therefore suitable for preparing college graduates to become thoughtful, responsible citizens.
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'I’m not an ESL teacher - I’m not a writing teacher!' Teaching writing across the disciplines in linguistically-diverse classrooms

Speaker(s): Steve Marshall, Simon Fraser University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 13B Room: Windsor 0-04

Simon Fraser University (SFU), Canada, has approximately 20% international students with English as an additional language (EAL), and a larger number of domestic multilingual students. Undergraduate students are required to take at least two writing intensive (W) courses to graduate, courses that follow writing-intensive pedagogy, balancing learning to write and writing to learn. To learn through writing, students require advanced academic literacy skills (especially, reading and writing advanced academic texts) to learn course content. However, many students are not the idealized native speakers who may benefit most readily from learning through writing. Consequently, instructors face challenges meeting the needs of all learners in linguistically-diverse writing classes.

I present data from interviews with 10 instructors from different subject areas in which they describe how they respond to linguistic diversity in their classes. Instructors described adapting their practices to teach writing and to teach through writing, made sense of their classrooms via traditional binaries (ESL-native speaker, international-domestic, first language-second language, proficient-deficient), and expressed conflicting multiple identities that embraced or rejected senses of being a content teacher, writing teacher, and ESL teacher. I argue that these responses, in part, reflect powerful institutional discourses, and policies that are playing catch-up in a changing university.
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The student as ethnographer: interrogating the genre, writing in the disciplines

Speaker(s): David Marquard, Ferris State University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 13C Room: Windsor 0-05

Genre theory has offered the global academy an enriched and diverse approach to the teaching of academic writing. In the United Kingdom, a genre-based pedagogy has shown how texts are linguistically situated where they take shape and achieve various goals through social processes (e.g. Halliday and Hasan 1989; Martin 1993). As well, a genre-based pedagogy allows space for further understanding ‘organisational patterns and salient features’ (Hyland, 545). Similarly, in North America, rhetorical genre studies has examined how disciplinary writing demonstrates routines in the production and use of texts that have shared social goals and characteristics (e.g. Bozeman 1994; Devitt 1991; Orlikowski and Yates 1994). Given these pedagogical methods, this paper offers assessment data from an advanced composition course (in a North American University) that pinpoints how such a pedagogy fails to transfer written competency for students as they learn to write in their given disciplines. To show this failure of transfer, the analyses of this assessment data borrows from Wardle’s (2009) insight into how composition courses (and the design of writing assignments) fail to provide complex rhetorical situations and exigencies that are found in disciplines across the university. And with the analyses of this data, this talk employs Devitt’s (2004) suggestion to offer assignments that position writing students as key investigators situated in the communities/discourses of their academic disciplines. In so doing, students are invited to examine the social situations, exigencies, and disciplinary conventions in which genres function (or fail to function).
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How students experience academic writing at the University of Vienna: feelings, difficulties and implications for teaching practice

Speaker(s): Klara Dreo, University of Vienna
Bernadette Huber, University of Vienna

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 13D Room: Windsor 1-02

As two peer-tutors of academic writing, we felt the urge to communicate the students’ perspective towards academic writing. To be able to give a valid and significant statement, we conducted a survey and evaluated 89 questionnaires from students who took part in Bachelor seminars at the Department of German Philology in Vienna during the 2015/16 academic year. Our research interests were: Which aspects of academic writing are the most difficult for students at the beginning of their studies? Do these aspects change over the course of their studies? What feelings do students connect with academic writing? Which kind of support in academic writing do students make use of and in what way did it help them? Our results provide insight into students’ experience with academic writing as well as the consequences of not mastering a requested writing assignment. They also emphasise the importance of support for students in academic writing at an early stage. We could draw conclusions as to what steps of the writing process are difficult for novices and/or experts and therefore should be addressed by writing support. Our findings will be compared with findings by Sommers and Saltz (2004) and Fishman et al (2005) as well as similar studies conducted in Germany by Dittmann et al (2003) and Sennewald and Mandalka (2012). Finally, we present thoughts on how the reported feelings towards writing at the university might affect the model of writing competence developed by Anne Beaufort (2007).
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Large lectures as a challenge: introducing Writing Fellows in Engineering

Speaker(s): Nadine Stahlberg, Hamburg University of Technology

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 13E Room: Windsor 1-03

Surveys among academic instructors of engineering indicate that writing is seen as an important ability to finish one’s degree in engineering (ZLL 2016). Due to tight curricula and the importance of quantitative reasoning in engineering, however, students rarely get the opportunity to develop or improve their writing abilities, especially not in bachelor programmes (ZLL 2015, ZLL 2016). Hence, it does not come as a surprise that nearly 80% of the students in bachelor programmes at Hamburg University of Technology (TUHH) do not feel well prepared for their thesis (ZLL 2016).

The newly introduced Writing Fellow programme at TUHH aims at both encouraging teachers to engage writing activities in class and providing support for students to develop and improve their writing skills. It builds on the idea of US-American Writing Fellow programmes, which Dreyfürst and Liebetanz (2016) have recently adapted to German higher education by drawing on the University of Wisconsin-Madison variant. This presentation addresses the challenges the introduction of a Writing Fellow programme in engineering is confronted with. Which obstacles have to be surmounted when introducing a Writing Fellow programme in engineering disciplines? What kind of compromises might need to be made? What risks but also what chances can be observed?

Based on initial experiences and the results of evaluations made at TUHH, we discuss approaches to handling challenges such as large lectures, prevalence of multiple-choice exams, submission of writing assignments as group work, rare writing activities within curricula, and little appreciation of writing activities in general.
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Pedagogical beliefs – the stumbling block between policy and practice in feedback

Speaker(s): Maxine Gillway, University of Bristol

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 13F Room: Windsor 1-04

‘One can design systems of accountability and practices for Communities of Practice to live by, but one cannot design the practices that will emerge in response to such institutional systems’ (Wenger 1999, p. 229). This paper reports on a study to evaluate the impact on oral and written feedback practices of teacher development sessions aimed at improving the consistency of formative feedback and its alignment to institutional policy in one summer pre-university English for Academic Purposes programme in the UK. A case study approach yielded data from think aloud protocols, written feedback, tutorials and semi-structured interviews. The findings extend our understanding of teacher beliefs and feedback in higher education by illustrating how different modes of feedback and different types of beliefs behave differently in their relationship with practice and institutional culture. It is proposed that despite institutional attempts to align feedback practices with policy through teacher development sessions, the focus and formulation of feedback may be resilient due to core beliefs on the nature of the subject and the student-teacher relationship. Implications for course design and teacher development are discussed. Although this research is limited to case studies of two teachers, it is hoped that it will be of value to others who aim to standardise teacher feedback in other contexts. It is also hoped that it makes a contribution to our understanding of teacher beliefs and feedback on academic writing by highlighting the impact of teacher beliefs on the focus and formulation of different modes of feedback.
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Increasing attention is being paid to threshold concepts in doctoral education and writing development (Keefer 2015). Liminality, in particular, is of interest because it theorises a transitory learning space that doctoral students occupy as move into ‘knowingness‘(Keefer 2015; Savin-Baden 2008; Trafford and Leshem 2009). This space is characterised by shifts in, and space-making for, thinking. This can result in intense befuddlement, ‘stuckness,’ and uncertainty about identity and purpose in life (Meyer and Land 2006; Savin-Baden 2008). These spaces can simultaneously become transformative spaces, provided that learning bridges are available to help students create links between where they are and the intended path (Savin-Baden 2008). Similar to this notion of ‘learning bridges’ is the notion of wayfinding – a concept often found in architecture that can refer to finding one’s way in an urban setting. Wayfinding may be a useful metaphor to conceptualise movement within the liminal zone, as it involves at least three things: (1) understanding or having some knowledge as to where one is, as a beginning of the journey; (2) reading the environment for information and feedback on next steps to take; and (3) the ability to identify the destination, and of having arrived. This presentation uses ‘wayfinding’ as a tentative framework, highlighting the use of several ‘gamestorming’ workshops that took place at a Canadian university over a term. Gamestorming is an iterative approach to brainstorming that involves the use of games and other visual tools (Gray et al 2010). These workshops supported doctoral students with conceptualising their research. In doing so, I suggest they acted as wayfinders. Successes, techniques, challenges, and lessons are discussed.
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Talent development as part of a writing centre – introducing Writing_Talents

Speaker(s): Angelika Dorawa, Westphalian University of Applied Sciences Gelsenkirchen
Bocholt Recklinghausen
Lena Kreppel, Westphalian University of Applied Sciences

Session Type: Paper presentation
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Writing_Talents has been established as a part of the Central Talent Development Department at the Westphalian University of Applied Sciences (WH), Germany, and is funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research since 2012. It is the first programme nationwide that offers structured language promotion for native speakers at a basic level in combination with written language skills for first-year students. It includes integrated subject-specific courses, workshops and a consultation hour, which are tailored to the needs of the students being a result of the heterogeneous student body showing different written language competences. Moreover, whereas it is typical for the German Higher Education System that writing centers act externally, the distinctive characteristic about the WH’s writing center is, that it is part of a talent development initiative and cooperates closely with the various faculties on an organizational and, in part, content level.

The presentation will show the experience of Writing_Talents operating externally as part of the strategy of the process of talent development but cooperating closely with the WH’s faculties and will discuss where advantages and disadvantages may lie when writing development is regulated externally or linked to a specialist area. Furthermore, it will give the participants the opportunity to exchange ideas and share the experience about a successful cooperation with the faculties and to reflect whether some features are transferable to one's own work environment.
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How do student writers use software tools when paraphrasing on a computer?

Speaker(s): Carol Bailey, University of Wolverhampton
Jodi Withers, University of Wolverhampton

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 13I Room: Moore Building 016

Paraphrasing requires a writer to understand a sometimes difficult text and re-present it in their ‘own words’. This necessitates sound lexical knowledge and grammatical dexterity, making it a challenging task for native speakers and especially for second language writers. Research on paraphrase often takes the written output as its primary data (Keck 2014; Uemlianin 2000). Techniques for investigating the paraphrasing process include post-writing interviews (Pecorari 2003) or questionnaires (Liao and Tseng 2010) and concurrent methods such as think-aloud protocol (Khrismawan and Widiati 2013). Technological approaches such as keystroke logging or eye-tracking software are underutilized, so in our study we pilot the use of screencasting software (Snagit) to capture the paraphrasing process. Our participants (both native and non-native English speakers, ranging from university Foundation to Doctoral study level) were asked to paraphrase two short texts: one by hand and one on a computer. The computer paraphrase task was recorded using Snagit and the resulting videos and texts were coded in order to address the questions: (1) is there a difference in quality between a paraphrase written by hand and one drafted on a computer? (2) what software tools do student writers use when paraphrasing on a computer? In this presentation we use clips from our screencasts to illustrate the range of software tools accessed by participants in our study, and the variable levels of skill in their use. We then explore the correlations between use of digital tools and quality of paraphrase. We argue that our findings have implications for the teaching of writing in a digital age.
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Civically-engaged writing in the academic context: effective rhetorical approaches

Speaker(s): Auli Ek, University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB)

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 14A Room: Windsor Auditorium

The global academic interest into political participation has a long tradition (Ekman and Amnå 2012). In the world ravaged by refugee crises, climate change, and terrorism, it is critical that writing programs and centers more widely recognize the need to teach students to become participating citizens. Writing programs and centers are in a unique position to accomplish this (Adler-Kassner2008, Cella and Restaino 2012). They reach students from various disciplines and can enhance their ability to advance positive change in their communities and globally through a focus on the rhetorical approaches that enable them to become effective communicators in civically-engaged discourse. Rhetorically-savvy writers can convincingly appeal to both the general public and political decision makers. The civically-engaged rhetorical pedagogy can be feasibly based on the students’ prior knowledge on topics requiring urgent attention, which also strengthens the symbiotic connection between other disciplines and writing studies. Although pragmatic in its aim—promoting positive change—writing instruction for civic engagement meets with the ideals of academic writing: It involves research, argumentation, analysis, critical thinking, and the pursuit for new knowledge. The rhetorical approaches I will discuss include Aristotle’s modes of persuasion and George Lakoff’s theory on ‘reframing’ the argument. The civic contexts I will discuss include writing for global social justice, the media, and democratic public policy work. I will provide evidence for my argument by giving examples of writing assignments such as the letter to the editor, grant proposal, public policy proposal, and case analysis (Foran 2002).
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Doing Science Write: technology-enhanced learning of discipline specific scientific writing practices

Speaker(s): Neela Griffiths, University of Technology Sydney
Contributor: Yvonne Davila, University of Technology Sydney
Session Type: Paper presentation
Session: 14B Room: Windsor 0-04

A key practice in science is the use of the scientific literature to communicate research findings and inform further research. To help commencing university Science students attain the level of writing proficiency expected and understand the discipline-specific academic discourses required, it is recommended that explicit teaching of writing skills be introduced early in the curriculum (Coil et al. 2010), and embedded and scaffolded (Amos and McGowan 2012). To address this our project aimed to introduce first year students to the conventions of scientific writing, develop their scientific report writing practices and build their confidence in writing. We achieved this by taking a technology-enhanced student-centred approach, intentionally designing and integrating targeted online interactive tutorials and face-to-face workshops into a first year, first semester Science subject. Using this blended learning approach enables inclusivity, accessibility and flexibility thus supporting our increasingly diverse student cohort (Devlin et al. 2012). A pre and post semester paired-comparison showed that students’ confidence in their scientific report writing increased after completing the online tutorials and workshops. Their academic performance in the assessment task also improved compared to previous cohorts in the subject. Students commented that the well-targeted, in-depth analysis provided on how to write a scientific report helped them to understand the importance of good scientific writing, and how to write according to university and scientific standards. Based on our success in embedding discipline specific, contextualised writing practices resources, we recommend that this approach be used to demystify scientific writing in the first year curriculum.
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From genre knowledge to genre performance: metacognitive scaffolds in the L2 writing for research classroom

Speaker(s): Raffaella Negretti, Chalmers University of Technology
Lisa McGrath, Sheffield Hallam University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 14C Room: Windsor 0-05

Genre analysis has proven to be a powerful catalyzer of students’ understanding of writing as disciplinary communication and a means to knowledge construction (e.g. Hyland, 2007). Nonetheless, voices within genre pedagogy (Johns, 2011, Devitt, 2015) have called for research into activities that scaffold students beyond the acquisition of rhetorical structures, towards an awareness of genre variation, and genre performance. This shift places learning in the spotlight, inviting a trans-disciplinary turn in genre studies beyond applied linguistics. This process has already begun; for example, Clark (2016) combines insights from new rhetoric and neuroscience in the exploration of writer identity. In our case, we combine theories from different genre traditions (ESP and new rhetoric) with theories of metacognition. Our goal is to elicit doctoral students’ genre awareness and to enable them to derive insights applicable to their ongoing writing (genre performance). Data drawn from two tasks (metacognitive scaffolds) were analyzed using Tardy’s (2009) model of genre knowledge. Initially, students were asked to describe their writing context and genres. Later, students submitted a visualization of the research genres in their specific scientific community, accompanied by an account of their genre observations, and how they would apply these insights to their immediate writing context. Our approach highlighted various facets of emerging genre knowledge, enabling students to both develop genre awareness and plan their own choices and strategies for genre performance. Crucially, these tasks helped students become metacognitive writers, as reflected in the students’ expressions of agency and scholarly identity in the data.
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Writing a master dissertation – students’ difficulties and coping strategies

Speaker(s): José Brandão Carvalho, University of Minho
Rómima Laranjeira, Polythecnic Institute of Coimbra

Contributor: Luísa Álvares Pereira, University of Aveiro

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 14D Room: Windsor 1-02

Writing a master dissertation is a particularly complex process, considering both the aspects related to its genomic configuration (structure, language, norms of reference) and the factors that constrain its production (methodological procedures, student/supervisor relationship, time management, institutional constraints, disciplinary writing cultures, the individual nature of the writing process). This complexity may underlie problems and difficulties identified either by supervisors or students and reported in different studies (Castelló and Iñiesta, 2012; Castelló, Iñiesta, and Corcelles, 2012; Barbeiro, Pereira and Carvalho, 2015).

Aiming a deeper understanding of the dissertation writing process, the present study seeks (i) to identify and analyse students’ perspectives and representations of the dissertation writing process, (ii) the problems that arise in the writing process, (iii) finally, the strategies used to overcome them. Taking into account that academic communities have different procedures and conventions, the study also seeks (iv) to verify if such perspectives and representations vary according to the field study of the participants. The study is based on semi-structured interviews with students who recently completed their masters thesis in the areas of Humanities, Education and Engineering. The analysis follows a theoretical-methodological framework guided by the definition of a writing process that, beyond the cognitive, linguistic and social dimensions, involves an emotional dimension that can condition it decisively. As far as they provide information about the dissertation writing process and its inherent difficulties and enable the characterization of different disciplinary perspectives on academic writing, the results of this study may contribute to the knowledge in the field of Academic Literacies, allowing supervisors and students a deeper understanding of the writing process and its inherent difficulties.
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Writing in the disciplines as writing to learn – student disciplinary discourse to enhance learning

Speaker(s): Magnus Gustafsson, Chalmers University of Technology

Contributors: Jonas Bylander, Chalmers University of Technology
Sabine Reinfeldt, Chalmers University of Technology

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 14E Room: Windsor 1-03

Irrespective of educational level or language context, we tend to talk of ‘writing-to-learn’ (WTL) often in general, across discipline ways or we tend to use WTL-techniques in ‘pre-writing’ stages for the respective student writing projects we are involved in or scaffold. In this presentation, we would like to take a look at WTL from the disciplinary angle (MSc-level engineering) and present results on learning (learning outcomes met via assignments and / or the exams) from two different MSc-level courses at a university of technology. Both the courses have gone through course re-design in connection with faculty training courses. The re-design components vary between the two courses but share the focus of scaffolding student writing for lab reporting writing and involve workshops, peer response, criteria design and negotiation. Technically, the examples can also be addressed as ‘writing-in-the-disciplines’ of course and the various discipline-specific details that are different in the expected internalized standards of the two disciplines are represented. However, while the writing assignments in the two courses and many techniques in the courses are recognizable as disciplinary writing, our focus is on the design of writing assignments and their effect on disciplinary learning. In this choice of focus on the WTL-dimension, we follow Carter, Ferzli, Wiebe (2007) in an attempt to help show improved student learning also for writing assignments other than pre-writing activities.
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Evaluating writing and the teaching of writing

Speaker(s): Ursula Canton, Glasgow Caledonian University

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 14F Room: Windsor 1-04

Academic writing benefits from the research insights gained in numerous disciplines, as well as the experience from different pedagogical traditions. This multidisciplinary conceptual richness befits the complexity of writing, but also contributes to making the notion of ‘successful academic writing’ a construct that defies easy measurement. While this means that attempts to find overly simplistic forms of measuring the success of students’ writing and academic writing support should be avoided, radical resistance to any form of evaluation is also an unsatisfactory reaction for different reasons, ranging from pragmatic ones, such as justifying resources spent on teaching and researching academic writing, to the notion that best practice should be evidence-based.

This workshop opens with a brief review of the constructs and methods that underlie the testing of academic writing in relevant disciplines. It then offers activities to examine participants’ practice of evaluating students’ ability to write, and evaluating their own success in teaching writing. Comparing our practice, including two small-scale studies carried out by the presenter at a post-1992 UK university, the workshop aims at

- encouraging reflection on the role of measuring ‘good’ writing in our work as practitioners and researchers in academic writing
- exchanging experience of using different tools for evaluation and
- putting forward ideas for further research to challenge the limitations of these current tools.
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Fitness tracking for writers: an iOS app to help demystify and optimize the process of writing

Speaker(s): Sarah Haas, Ghent University

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 14G  Room: Windsor 1-05

It is by now well-established that PhD writers are under pressure to not only finish their degrees on time, but to also publish their work by the time they graduate. Even though support for postgraduate writers has been increasing, room remains for exploring creative ways to help postgraduate writers across disciplines meet these demands.

This workshop will introduce a fitness tracker for writers, an iOS app whereby writers in any discipline can collect and analyse data on themselves as writers, and use the information to demystify and optimize their writing processes. The app was developed drawing on the knowledge that awareness of processes can help writers become self-regulated (see for example Castelló et al 2013), and on the recent findings that the use of fitness trackers can facilitate changes leading to positive outcomes (Chung et al. 2017). Workshop participants will be introduced to the app before having a chance to try it out. Participants will first use a flexible model of the writing process as a starting point to design their own models within the app. These individual models will then be used to track writing activity in a short writing session. The workshop will end with a general discussion on the perceived usability and usefulness of the app. Issues will be considered from the perspective of individual writers, as well as from the perspectives of writing developers and researchers. Participants are asked to download the (free) app onto their iOS device before the start of the workshop.

References:


Kingston University’s Writing and Oral Skills Project: an interactive and creative response to the changing landscape in HE

Speaker(s): Karen Lipsedge, Kingston University
Egle Butt, Kingston University

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 14H  Room: Moore Annexe 034

The Writing and Oral Skills (WOS) Project is designed to enhance students’ academic writing and speaking skills through extracurricular generic weekly workshops, and discipline-specific workshops. It builds on the approaches and strategies employed in academic skills centres to ensure that all students, regardless of background, can participate fully and benefit from the opportunity to improve their generic academic writing and speaking skills (Lipsedge et al 2015). By using a combination of lecturer-led presentations, small-group exercises and peer-review, students are introduced to academic writing and speaking skills in a collaborative, inclusive and supportive workshop environment with the emphasis placed on active participation and engagement. (Longfellow et al, 2008) Our evaluation of the WOS Project utilises institutional data and demonstrates how enhancing students’ key academic skills helps to facilitate their educational outcomes (Badcock, Pattinson and Harris 2010). We will simulate a WOS workshop to demonstrate the types of teaching and learning strategies and materials used, and their impact on student learning. Our workshop will also involve the audience in activities, discussion and the exchange of good practice to show how academic writing workshops can use a range of pedagogical practices to respond creatively to the changing higher education landscape.

As an institution with strong values around widening access, diversity and inclusion, we are committed to ‘develop[ing] strategies to support all who can benefit from a Kingston University education, regardless of background’ (Kingston University, ‘Led by Learning Strategy’, 1.7). Such strategies of approach also foster a shared learning environment in which students feel empowered and, thus, able to apply the acquired skills to their course assessments (Downing and Herrington 2013). We address the theoretical underpinning, development and evaluation of the WOS Project, and report on qualitative and quantitative findings drawn from student feedback, assessment outcomes and end-of-year progression statistics, to provide evidence for the Learning Gain aspect in the TEF assessment criteria. (McGrath, Guerin et al 2015) Our results show that students attending our WOS workshops are more likely to be eligible to progress at the end of the academic year, including those from disadvantaged backgrounds who are at greater risk of withdrawing (Downing and Herrington 2013).
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Avoiding plagiarism in academic texts: an approach to paraphrasing in 3 steps

Speaker(s): Lisa Nazarenko, University of Applied Sciences Technikum Wien

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 14I Room: Moore Building 016

Writing academic texts such as theses, seminar papers and critiques involves using material from other sources, but if students copy these sources too closely or do not cite them correctly, they can be guilty of plagiarism. In cases of unintentional plagiarism, it can be difficult to determine whether the student does not fully comprehend the original text or is unable to paraphrase and summarize. In some cases the cultural context determines how the concept of plagiarism is viewed; moreover, guidelines can be confusing when not all teachers in a specific teaching situation agree about what constitutes plagiarism or an acceptable paraphrase. How can students be guided to use source material without plagiarizing it? In this workshop I will present a practical 3-step approach to avoiding plagiarism that includes raising students’ awareness of what, exactly, plagiarism involves and developing the students’ ability to paraphrase and summarize what they have read. Participants will engage in activities I have successfully used with ESP/EAP students at an Austrian technical university and will also be encouraged to share their ideas and experiences in this area.
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Writing and risk: gambles, speculations, wagers

Speaker(s): Tom Muir, Oslo and Akershus University College

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 15A Room: Windsor Auditorium

What does it mean to take a risk when I write? Can I? Should I? The idea of risk has preoccupied a number of scholars recently, including those interested in discourse, writing and education (e.g. McWilliam 2009, Zinn 2010 and Thesen and Cooper 2014). This paper draws out the opposition suggested by McWilliam, and developed by Thesen and Cooper, between cold and warm risk, whereby cold risk is merely a cost/benefit calculation of what kind of approach or analysis a particular research community will accept, while warm risk is ‘interested in emergent meaning,’ ‘seek[ing] to open up possibilities and trace meanings’ (2014: 12). In so doing, it asks questions about the creative dimensions of academic writing, and simultaneously figures risk as a demand made by writing at a time of marketization in higher education. Risk, we might suggest, is everywhere in writing and pedagogy, even – or especially – when we begin to talk about creative approaches. There is a risk, for example, in failing to take account of the historicity of ‘creativity’ – our usage is not one Shakespeare would have recognized, because in early modern England, ‘creation’ would have been a word relating strictly to the actions of God. This historical perspective is necessary because the politics of neoliberalization works to freeze us in an ossified, eternal present, an ‘end of history.’ Against this, I develop a concept of warm risk to argue for a kind of academic writing that might, in the words of Jacques Derrida, anticipate the future ‘in the form of absolute danger.’
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Translingual academic writing pedagogy at internationalised universities

Speaker(s): Melanie Brinkschulte, University of Goettingen

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 15B Room: Windsor 0-04

The efforts of universities to offer internationalised study programmes to prepare students for a globalised working context and to be attractive for students from abroad increases constantly. The internationalisation of universities and the globalised scientific communities are accompanied by globalised scientific cultures with their various writing traditions. To meet this situation, an empirically based writing pedagogy, 'Academic Writing in Multilingual Contexts (MultiConText)' is developed at the International Writing Centre at the University of Goettingen/Germany. The concept is theoretically based on Canagarajah’s (2013) Translingual Practice and Busch’s (2013) sociolinguistic insights of multilingual language repertoires. The programme MultiConText offers a wide range of workshops and consulting for students to develop their translingual academic writing competencies. Students learn to use their individual multilingualism as a resource for academic writing, they learn to develop their individual voice in academic texts to express their individual, various cultural backgrounds. During workshops and writing consultations students are engaged to activate their available languages which are helpful for the current writing project. The presentation will introduce the writing pedagogy of MultiConText and provides an insight into how the programme currently is embedded into the curricula at the University of Goettingen and its perspectives within the university’s internationalization strategy, namely the internationalization of study programs of all faculties.
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Puttin’ on the style: is ‘stylish’ writing the way to better academic writing?

Speaker(s): Gerard Clough, Royal Holloway, University of London

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 15C Room: Windsor 0-05

Steven Pinker (The Sense of Style, 2014) and Helen Sword (Stylish Academic Writing, 2012) pillory the kind of academic writing that is unkind to the reader or - as Pinker puts it in his article, ‘Why academics stink at writing’ (2014) - the kind of ‘turgid, soggy, wooden, bloated’ writing that is ‘unpleasant to read, and impossible to understand’. For Pinker, the remedy lies in a writing style that makes the reader feel like a ‘genius’ not a ‘dunce’. Sword also finds little to cheer about in her survey of one thousand peer-reviewed articles from across the disciplines. What she finds is ‘zombie’ nominalisations and other textual habits that obscure meaning and disengage the reader. For ‘stylish’ writing to happen, Sword recommends writer independence and the courage to break away from stifling disciplinary norms. This talk will consider whether such advice is as flawed as the generic prescriptions of earlier style guidance (Orwell, Strunk and White et al) or whether there is a genuine case for ‘stylish’ writing that cuts across the disciplines, enlivens and illuminates scholarship and makes the reading of academic work pleasurable. If there is a case, how does it sit with e.g. genre-based pedagogies that seek to acculturate students to write in the disciplines – the alleged home of so much bad writing? These questions will be discussed along with findings from a recent small-scale survey of student views on writing style.
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Enfleshed writing practices – are you feeling it yet?

Speaker(s): Amanda French, Birmingham City University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 15D Room: Windsor 1-02

Academic writing is a contingent, yet ever present ‘thing’ in the Academy, which academics and students often feel a great deal of anxiety about. This paper draws on New Materialist theories about texts and textual practices (Braidotti 1994; Barad 2007) and the data collected for my PhD that explored lecturers’ perceptions of academic writing. It became very clear that many of my participants experienced the processes of producing academic writing in very physical and emotional ways. This was manifest in the intense language and physical metaphors used to describe their feelings about writing as they transitioned to university, thence from undergraduate to postdoctoral studies and into the world of academic publishing. I will discuss how participants articulated the intensity and emotional nature of their academic writing experiences using words like ‘fear’, ‘frustration’, ‘outrage’ ‘exhaustion’ and ‘yearning’. These splashes of emotion were real ‘hot spots’ (MacLure 2013) in the data which indicated the importance of the affective domain to the development of professional academic and writing identities (Archer 2008). Subsequently, I have incorporated an acknowledgment and exploration of the affective domain into my academic writing development work that I will be sharing with the audience. I hope that the presentation will stimulate debate about how important emotions like frustration and anxiety are to academic writing and how I believe they can be used to effectively promote positive writing identities and challenge the often sterile discourses around skills and performativity that can characterise academic writing development in higher education (French 2017).
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Addressing academic and disciplinary writing skills for graduate Engineering students

Speaker(s): Jennifer Craig, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 15E Room: Windsor 1-03

At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, graduate students learn to write and to present as young professionals by instruction or mentoring from their advisors and often their peers. While most students succeed, this approach often produces stress for students, is inefficient for advisors, and can produce uneven results. The Program in Writing, Rhetoric and Professional Communication in collaboration with the Department of Aeronautic and Astronautic Engineering surveyed graduate students re: their communication skills. Respondents reported divergent needs. Not surprisingly, they claimed that they already knew enough about academic writing but that they wanted to learn more about disciplinary communication. However, data also revealed that a significant number of respondents lacked confidence in succeeding at basic academic writing and rhetorical tasks. This contradiction may indicate that a significant number of respondents focus on success in disciplinary genres while at the same time, they fail to identify and strengthen the rhetorical and academic writing skills necessary to achieving that success. This presentation concludes with a discussion of the role of academic writing in the production of disciplinary genres and the ways in which writing studies and engineering faculty can collaborate on an interdisciplinary approach.
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Cross-national publishing in Business and Economics: a case study

**Speaker(s):** Betsy Bowen, Fairfield University
Elizabeth Boquet, Fairfield University

**Contributor:** Kathryn Nantz, Fairfield University (Economics)

**Session Type:** Poster

**Session:** 16  **Room:** Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

Studies of international scholarly publication reveal the pressure ‘periphery scholars’ (Canagarajah 2002, p. 12), face to publish in ‘international’ journals written in English, sometimes making their research less accessible to the local context (Curry and Lillis, 2014, p.3). One strategy for challenging the status quo in scholarly publishing is the creation of English-medium publications designed for national or regional audiences (Canagarajah 2014, p. 17; 2002, p. 275; Curry and Lillis 2014). This study examines faculty in Business and Economics, disciplines under-represented in the literature on international scholarly publication, who were part of a three-year, cross-national faculty development project which culminated in an edited collection of essays on integrative business education written in English but designed for a regional Central Asian audience. As in other former Soviet bloc nations, Russian, rather than English, had until recently serve as the lingua franca for scholarship, complicating the discussion of the ‘imperialism of English’ (Canagarajah 2002, p 41). Our research raises questions about how we define ‘English,’ about the willingness of publishers of English language texts to accept a variety of Englishes, and about the ability of editors to tailor their expectations to meet the needs of global audiences. Our experience allows us to suggest some best practices for other ‘literacy brokers’ (Lillis and Curry 2006) who want to mentor and guide periphery scholars through the academic writing for publication process.
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Writing_Talents – pioneers in basic level language promotion at German universities

Speaker(s): Angelika Dorawa, Westphalian University of Applied Sciences Gelsenkirchen
Bocholt Recklinghausen
Lena Kreppel, Westphalian University of Applied Sciences

Session Type: Poster
Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

As every university faces the challenge of structural change in higher education, the Westphalian University of Applied Sciences (WH) established the successful writing centre Writing_Talents that combines basic level language promotion for German native speakers and German as second language learners with teaching academic writing. The different entry requirements to the university of applied sciences display the WH’s heterogeneous student body. At the WH, the majority of students come from the northern Ruhr area – a region with a high proportion of university-remote, low-income families or families with a migrant background. Moreover, two-thirds of the students graduated from vocational schools. Hence, there is a great heterogeneity in the field of (written) language skills of German among these students, concerning not only academic writing but also basic level language skills, which is demonstrated by the experience and research of the WH. In reference to that, the WH established the first programme nationwide offering a structured basic level language promotion that addresses its student body – including native speakers of German and German as a second language learners. This structured basic level language promotion is an addition to the offers already existing in writing centres such as teaching academic writing or giving writing advice. The offers of Writing_Talents include concrete support programmes, such as integrated courses, workshops and a consultation hour tailored to the needs of the students. The programme roughs up the regional educational discussion, as we are now consulted as experts in our federal state North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany. Furthermore, we are pioneers for other German Universities such as the Ostfalia University, which adopted our best-practice programme in 2015.

The aim of the poster is to present the offers of Writing_Talents so that other universities might adopt a structured basic level language promotion into their existing offers of a typical writing centre.
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Learning for the workplace? Enhancing professionalization through academic writing assignments in further higher education

Speaker(s): Ann-Marie Eriksson, University of Gothenburg

Contributor: Marie Studahl, University of Gothenburg

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

This poster outlines the design and preliminary findings from a small-scale, interdisciplinary pilot project focusing the role of academic writing in areas of specialized further education. Further education marks a central arena of modern, professionalized knowledge societies. Regarded from a policy perspective, further education often manifests a concrete response to diversity in the workplace and an institutional arrangement that help promote lifelong learning. Even if not explicitly taught, academic writing is often employed as an important means for teaching and learning in disciplinary settings of this kind. While genre-based pedagogies would be given priority as the central means for discipline-specific writing instruction (cf. ESP pedagogy), mundane academic writing instruction in disciplinary settings remains a rich area to be studied. The pilot study seeks to find methodologically promising ways to explore academic writing as a situated, major learning activity intended for increased professionalization. Data has been collected in a diversified, practice-based area where nurses from different fields of expertise work their way into infection care by a problem-based academic essay assignment. By samples taken from the collected video data and text material, the poster will highlight instances where instructors and nurses jointly work with difficulties and problems with the text to approach genre. Attention will be drawn to the analytical work of studying how professional and academically relevant reasoning emerge in the interaction around specific textual formulations.
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Course outcomes: the connection between policy, pedagogy, and practice

Speaker(s): Sarah Faye, University of California, Davis

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

Last year, the course outcomes for the first-year-composition course at University of California, Davis have been rewritten to allow a move away from written products and towards rhetorical awareness and greater student choice in the assignments. What is important here is not so much the course context (first-year-composition course at an American university), but how changing the course outcomes has liberated the students and the instructors from ‘mutt genres’ (Wardle 2009) and allowed them to move toward what Eodice, Geller, and Lerner (2016) call ‘meaningful writing,’ or opportunities for student agency, engagement, and connections with students’ past and future writing tasks (4). Because the new outcomes push for a multimodal pedagogy, students explore all kinds of literacies, not just those that privilege writing, thus responding to the call from Yancey (2004) to consider that ‘the literacies that composers engage in today are multiple’ (p. 302). This invites students to create genres applicable to future composing tasks or genres that help them connect to their passions and prior knowledge. This policy change in the course outcomes has revolutionized our pedagogical practice. While this happened in an American context, the takeaways are applicable to any writing instructor because it is a generalizable example of how deceptively small policy changes can revolutionize our teaching practice, and how course outcomes are central to a course’s core vision. In our case, the change allowed for a new vision for the course: one that asks students to find or create meaning in their college writing.
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When students enjoy writing?

Speaker(s): Marcus Fiebig, TH Nürnberg

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

Most teachers of academic writing would agree that emphasizing the strengths a student shows in his or her writing is essential when e.g. giving text feedback. This view is also backed up by constructivist learning theories that explain the motivating and conducive effects of a strengthening approach (QUELLE). Nevertheless, writing research often focuses on the many problems students experience when writing (e.g. Sennewald/Mandalka (2012), Pohl (2007), Dittmann (2003)). It seems that writing research has yet to look into the joyous side of academic writing for university students. To address this gap, this study attempted to identify, understand and describe sub-processes students experience in their writing that they would label as satisfying or epistemic, i.e. situation in which students learn while writing. Theoretically, this study is informed by Galbraith (2009) who, in his dual-process model of writing, regards text production as a process in which knowledge can be discovered. Combining quantitative and qualitative methods the author asked German first and second year university students for positive sub-processes during their writing process. In addition, the study investigated how this phenomenon is influenced by the relationship between the social and physical task environment, the individual environment (e.g. motivation) and certain techniques (e.g. feedback or freewriting) (Hayes 2012). The results show that most of the interviewed undergraduate students are able to describe punctual successes in their writing that can be translated into motivating and epistemic sub-processes. Some students described for example how they enjoyed achieving a logical micro-structure in a part of their paper. Based on the results the author invites the audience to discuss his recommendations on how to use writing as a tool for discovery in teaching undergraduate students.
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Analysis of students’ abstracts written in English – teaching students based on their own mistakes

Speaker(s): Dragana Gak, University of Novi Sad
             Vesna Bogdanović, University of Novi Sad

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16  Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

The study is based on the analysis of abstracts written by Master’s students in an education system where academic writing is not a preparatory course nor it is a part of any other course in their curriculum. At the Faculty of Technical Sciences, University of Novi Sad, Serbia, students have to write a scientific paper before obtaining their Master’s degree. These papers with abstracts in English are published in the Proceedings of the Faculty of Technical Sciences. Although students have had English courses (as only language courses) in their curriculum, none of them had English for Academic Purposes. Furthermore, none of the courses in English practices their writing skills. The poster will analyse their abstracts and make an effort to present the most typical types of mistakes. The study will address the problems with organization and structure of abstracts (four moves structure), use of vocabulary (specific vocabulary, noun phrases, linking expressions), and grammar issues (tenses and voice), as well as a number of (un)expected errors. The aim is to compare those to the disciplinary practice in academic writing in English in order to authentically present real problems and possible means for their improvement. The aim is also to present the need for improving and developing students’ writing skills, which they will need in the continuation of their scientific and academic development. The conclusion will clearly demonstrate that academic writing courses and academic writing material have to be included within undergraduate or Master courses.
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Ambiguities and embeddedness in academic plagiarism: the case of higher education in Georgia

Speaker(s): Madona Giorgadze, Ilia State University
Contributor: Nino Kereselidze, Ilia State University
Session Type: Poster
Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

The frequency of academic plagiarism is explained by ambiguities in good academic practice. The reason behind this ambiguity is first and foremost unclear definition of plagiarism, inability to identify their signs, differential attitude, varied perceptions, and taking students’ academic skills for granted. By taking critical pedagogy approach, the poster demonstrates that the peer-review alleviates students’ self-confidence that can be a reason for avoiding venturing their own work and enables them to learn more effectively.
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Situating writing where it belongs: writing in the disciplines in the LitKom-project (Bielefeld University, Germany)

Speaker(s): Svenja Kaduk, Bielefeld University

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

Writing specialists working in centrally located Writing Centers almost all share the same limitations to their work: centralized services only reach few students, mostly the ones who are not the most in need of writing support, and the transfer into disciplinary context is not easy. Furthermore, empirical evidence and research show that additional approaches to teaching academic writing, like centralized writing support, are not as effective as embedded approaches: students rate writing instruction higher and more effective when it is presented by disciplinary experts and within disciplinary learning settings (Wingate). The poster presents a WiD-project at Bielefeld University, Germany. The LitKom-project, which started in 2012, and is funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research initiative 'Qualitätspakt Lehre' (Quality Pact for Teaching) is based on the conviction that the place for writing development in universities is in the disciplines. The project presented offers a model on how to effectively equip teachers with different academic backgrounds to teach writing in their disciplinary courses. The project combines this embedded approach to teaching academic writing with a centralized coordination which is located in the Writing Center. The poster presents the main modes of collaboration and ways to embed that have been deployed in the first four years of the projects’ funding phase and that will be continued and further developed in the second phase which runs until 2020.
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Building a global team for teaching and learning writing excellence

Speaker(s): Shoghig Keoshkerian, American University of Armenia

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16  Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

It is widely accepted that combining the teaching of language and content is currently practiced in a wide range of areas and continues to be one of the most applicable approaches to effective language teaching for native and non-native learners. Content based instruction (CBI) gives the learners the opportunity to use the language to communicate, reflect effectively and gain content knowledge through the practice of target language. The presenter will share an original CBI course that was designed to raise awareness about the current global citizenship (GC) issues through English academic writing to meet composition goals. She will also introduce various approaches for structuring content-based writing instruction. It is widely accepted that such instruction develops writing skills and researching, and arises need for academic writing tasks on a wide range of awareness-raising writing activities and outreach. The presenter will discuss the subject matter with integrated topics and learning approaches related to important social issues, education, internationalization, diversification, and sustainable development. The implementation of the course showed that in an English language classroom the integration of content matter fosters not only students’ language writing skills and proficiency, but also changes their overall perception about the dynamic and interdependent world of the 21st century. As such, it provides a useful content base upon which to build a course to target academic and linguistic skills.
A practical approach to scaffolding second language writing in higher education

Speaker(s): Lina Larsson, The University of Gothenburg

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

In the globalized world of today, an important aspect of being employable is to be qualified as regards the level of language skills in the target language (L2) required. Thoughtful scaffolding of writing and language interventions at university level therefore mark an important means to facilitate immigration and employability. This poster presentation discusses an ongoing, small-scale, genre-based pedagogical project designed to help adult immigrant students improve their L2 writing competence. All students in this intervention are educated teachers in their country of origin and studying to be qualified to teach in their new language, Swedish. Yet they typically lack L1 language skills, which not only makes it difficult for them to manage their educational program, but has also resulted in difficulties related to referencing and much frustration. The intervention consists in helping the student group tackle the situation and a workshop sequence based on pedagogical strategies influenced by the ‘teaching learning’ cycle (Gibbons 2002) was developed. Model examples of referencing were shown to the students and problematized as a genre. Students collaboratively wrote a summary of a text which was part of the course literature and contained central concepts. By this way of working, the facilitators noticed how questions, both concerning language and content, could be discussed and answered in the smaller group and that this contributed to improved learning outcomes among the students. As a result, students’ written texts reached an unexpected improved quality regarding linguistics, structure and content. These observations encourage further implementation of the pedagogical design.
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Bridging the gaps: embedding academic literacies through a first year writing programme

Speaker(s): Sacha Mason, Bishop Grosseteste University  
Sue Cordell, Bishop Grosseteste University

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

This poster shares some of the findings from a research project which focused on the experiences of first year undergraduate students from widening participation groups. The project introduced a First Year Writing Programme (FYWP), a tailored approach that supports writing in the discipline. The concept of the FYWP derives from a model adopted in America and aims to embed academic literacies across a range of first year modules. The pedagogical approach used here was to utilise the skills of the learning development tutor with academics in their field. The poster describes the experience of collaborative working within the context of the introduction of a FYWP. The FYWP and the approaches and resources used in the project will be shared and delegates will be invited to share other pedagogical approaches within the sector. Particular focus will be on learners’ confidence and competence as academic writers with recommendations for future research and practice. The project findings suggest that key challenges for learners were on the understanding of university expectations and the likely trajectory of marks. The poster provides some practice links by examining how students manage the different demands of planning, time management, technical conventions and the emotional demands of undergraduate study.
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Thinking words – doctoral students’ use of linking words as a thinking tool in the writing process

Speaker(s): Jenny Mattsson, The University of Gothenburg

Session Type: Poster

As a language advisor, I see writers of academic texts struggle with early drafts in pursuit of the perfect end product. Both writers, their supervisors, teachers, and tutors often tend to focus on the finished product more than on the drafts and what writers can actually gain from them. Early drafts are, however, an important part of the writing process as they make writers think through writing which is a significant part of formulating a communicative text.

In my ongoing research, I am looking at one such way of thinking while writing, i.e. linking words such as in addition, furthermore and however, used sentence-initially in non-native English speaking doctoral students’ research articles. Findings so far show that there is often an overuse of sentence-initial linking words in early stages of writing, but that the amount of words is later reduced. My hypothesis is that sentence-initial linking words are used by writers as an aid in organizing their thinking while writing early drafts and that later in the writing process the need for (an overuse of) these words decreases as the writer’s thoughts are then more organized.
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Writing Commons

Speaker(s): Joseph Moxley, University of South Florida

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

The goal of the poster is to familiarize users with the existence of Writing Commons and to invite professors to submit pedagogical materials. Writing Commons aspires to challenge the limitations of traditional print textbooks or ebooks. In the spirit of the commons movement, we invite our readers, particularly college faculty, to help us develop Writing Commons so that it meets the needs of students in diverse writing courses. By working collaboratively, we hope to create a new kind of writing textbook, a textbook not written by a single author in the old-school way but by us, by a crowd of people who want a new kind of writing text, one that is more interactive, more Web 2.0ish—a text that is readily available via phone, PDA, or netbook, an expansive textbook that meets the needs of any college-level writer. Writing Commons aspires to challenge the limitations of traditional print textbooks or ebooks. In the spirit of the commons movement, we invite our readers, particularly college faculty, to help us develop Writing Commons so that it meets the needs of students in diverse writing courses.
‘Teachers (…) expect things that never have been mentioned’: German university students’ evaluation of support for academic writing in English

Speaker(s): Ute Reimers, Siegen University

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

In the light of the rapid development of the internationalisation of universities, appropriate academic writing in English is demanded of university students worldwide. However, this constitutes a great challenge for them since especially in their foreign language writing process students need to master a complex network of diverse competences (cf. Wrobel 2014, p. 85; Girgensohn and Liebetanz 2010, p. 181). A small-scale questionnaire-based survey at a German university (cf. Dittmann et al 2003), was conducted a) to examine how students of English evaluate the support they receive for writing academic texts in English within their university courses and/or in additional support programs and b) to develop, on the basis of these findings, preliminary proposals how teaching necessary skills could be improved or usefully complemented.

Around 78% of the students would appreciate the establishment of an individual writing consultation that focuses on writing academic texts in English since only 28% were explicitly taught how to do so. The students are distinctly aware that the formal conventions they are presented with do not suffice for the successful mastery of a complex writing process (cf. Ballweg 2011, p. 131). Results indicate that an intense supervision can hardly be sufficiently covered within a seminar or even in office hours. Therefore, it is suggested that ‘committed collaborations between (…) lecturers [and writing consultations]’ (Kruse and Ruhmann 2006, p. 29), especially concerning academic English, should be established for students to become successful and enthusiastic writers in their discipline. Generally speaking, in the writing center foundation movement in Germany, support for a growing number of students who need to conform to the language trends of globalisation needs to be included and promoted.
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The differences in scientific cultures (scientific work) in Georgia and in Germany

Speaker(s): Tinatin Sabauri, Tbilisi Ilia University
            Salome Pataridze, Ilia State University

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

Teaching is a dynamic process requiring continuous adaptation, observation, updating of teaching approaches/methods, analysis and modification in order to better meet students’ individual earning goals. Our research, covering a small part of German and Georgian educational environments can outline interesting problems and needs as well as successful strategies that may be relevant to other educational environments.

Results and analysis of the survey are being processed and they will be covered in the full text of my article. The research will help readers (tertiary teachers and educators) evaluate and use the techniques of effective academic writing, in their teaching process. We hope this experience gained through the comparison of Georgian-German academic spheres will be interesting to the participants of the conference. They will get to know to some challenges that Georgian and German students face, and to our successful teaching strategies.
An investigation of possible barriers to home students’ attainment in academic writing within a British higher education institution specialising in art and design

Speaker(s): Emma Shackleton, University of the Arts, London

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

In art and design in higher education (HE) formal and informal writing is an essential if often secondary activity (QAA 2008), which students can find stressful (for example, Bhagat and O’Neill 2011). In 2016, research was carried out to explore potential barriers to home students’ attainment in writing within a case study of a leading university specialising in the arts with a diverse student intake. The research focused on academic writing as situated practice, within the wider context of the UK government’s education policy in relation to the arts, HE practices for academic communication and research of pedagogies for academic writing (Heller and Morek 2015; Wingate 2015). Interviews with five experienced students (three undergraduates and two postgraduates) and questionnaire responses from five academic support lecturers were examined with thematic analysis.

During their learning journeys, students were empowered by their prior knowledge, their agency, reading and the university’s support services. However, they were disempowered significantly by the lack of comprehensive integrated tuition in academic writing within their disciplines, feedback, and conditions like dyslexia. Self-theories were evident as mediating influences. Furthermore, lecturers held extensive knowledge that was not visible to the students. The barriers identified are amenable to pedagogical solutions. Hence, I conclude with a diagrammatic framework for proposed PhD study that will draw on the findings of situational research, the Learning Sciences and academic writing pedagogies to create continual inclusive integrated teaching and learning spaces across face-to-face and digital-technology environments (Sawyer 2014, Heller and Morek 2015; Wingate 2015).
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Using Criterion in a writing class: benefit or hindrance?

Speaker(s): Olesya Shatunova, Kanagawa University

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

With technological innovations steadily entering education automated writing evaluation (AWE) software has been applied to the evaluation and assessment of English writing performance and support revision. Automated writing evaluation has been a topic of hot debate and has been perceived as both a ‘boon and a bane in the struggle to improve writing instruction’ (Grimes and Warschauer 2010).

Criterion is one of such Web-based learning tools that aims to support writing instruction across many different levels and several genres. Once students submit their essays to it, Criterion provides a performance summary that includes holistic scores and the corresponding feedback on each error. Although Criterion has been used in writing classes for the past decade in Japan, the actual benefits of Criterion have not been fully investigated.

This poster presents a descriptive study on how and whether Criterion feedback can improve academic writing skills of students at a tertiary level by comparing human raters’ feedback with feedback provided by the software in the following areas of feedback: Organization and Development, Grammar, Usage, Mechanics, and Style.

The findings of this study can help the instructors who are interested in using Criterion as a feedback tool in their writing classes to utilize it more effectively.
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The effects of written feedback types on students' academic texts

Speaker(s): Günther Sigott, Alpen-Adria University
Melanie Fleischhacker, Alpen-Adria University
Stephanie Sihler, Alpen-Adria University
Jennifer Steiner, Alpen-Adria University

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

Teachers, lecturers and writing centres are often confronted with the challenges of giving constructive and encouraging text feedback on students' texts. Written text commentary has become an important instrument to help improve writing skills. Generally, two types of text feedback might be distinguished; directive feedback relates to speech acts such as judgements, demands or requests and might also include text invasions, whereas a non-directive approach includes questions, suggestions, subjective statements and non-invasive stimuli. Research is missing with regard to writers' motivation to incorporate feedback in the revision process as well as on the quality and form of supportive text feedback. The effects of text feedback types on students' academic writing as well as their integration in the revision stage are therefore the focus of this pilot study. Nine student essays from undergraduate English students with German as their L1 are analysed. A mixed-method approach is used including a quantitative analysis of directive and non-directive feedback instances. Although feedback is provided on six feedback levels (text, paragraph, sentence, word, punctuation and formal issues such as citation), the focus of this study is on text and paragraph. The other levels will be the subject of a subsequent publication. Qualitative interviews are supposed to give further insight with regard to feedback instances that did not lead to any alterations in the final version of the texts. The results might be used as a basis for an extensive study in order to formulate guidelines and pedagogical suggestions for feedback givers.
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The poster aims to give an overview of the changing landscape of academic writing as affected by internationalisation of tertiary education in Russia. The presentation will show how international postdoctoral researchers can help guiding Russian engineering students in academic writing, while the language students can help giving guidance on language.

The information in the poster will cover the following main topics:

1. challenges that Russian engineering students face, which result from the cultural differences in Anglo-American rhetorical traditions and lack of proper language training;
2. major changes in the area of teaching academic writing caused by the internationalisation of education and need for academic mobility;
3. pedagogical needs to recruit international postdoctoral researchers as tutors for writing centres.

The presentation is based on the authors’ own experience of teaching academic writing and providing consultations in the Writing Centres. The ideas will be supported by ongoing research conducted by the authors as well as by the results of the survey carried out by the British Council, Moscow.

References:

Developing critical thinking through service learning

Speaker(s): Gerald Dampier, Royal Holloway
Marion Engrand-O'Hara, Royal Holloway

Session Type: Poster

Session: 16 Room: Windsor 0-02/0-03 (Networking room)

‘Service learning' occurs when students are engaged in an activity within the community which enables them to meet particular learning objectives on their course of study. Potential benefits can be considerable: Eyler et al (2001) note positive associations in literature with personal growth, interpersonal development, social outcomes, impact on academic learning, ability to apply learning to the real world, ability to understand and analyse complex issues, critical thinking, cognitive development, career development, relationships with faculty and the likelihood of graduating.

In adopting a service learning task as part of an assessment on the Pre-Masters Diploma for International Students (PDIS), the initial motivations were to improve student engagement, transition experiences and intercultural competence. Feedback from academic departments had suggested that PDIS students struggled to collaborate with students of other nationalities once they had progressed to PG study. In an effort to help students in working in this way, the PDIS now requires students to complete 10 hours of volunteering with a local organisation supported by the University's Community Action team, research the organisation and critically analyse their experience, to produce a 12-15 minute presentation.

Feedback from students indicates that this experience is valuable particularly for the opportunities it presents for enhancing their English language and communication skills, personal and practical skills, and their understanding of British society. Analysis of the presentations produced by students also confirms the extent to which such an exercise reinforces and develops critical skills learnt elsewhere on their programme, relevant to academic writing and much more.
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Competing traditions of undergraduate writing: (re-)learning the essay across the channel

Speaker(s): Cornelius Dieckmann, University of Tübingen

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 17A Room: Windsor Auditorium

With the internationalisation of universities, intellectual conventions migrate and become conflated. It is therefore necessary that students – and teachers – be made aware of the genre and tradition of their writing. International students especially are left wondering whether the writing habits of their native academic culture lose validity in the new context (Bräuer, 2004). Approaches to writing pedagogy typically adhere to either the Continental European or Anglo-American tradition (Rienecker and Jørgensen, 2003; 2013). As a study-abroad student of English Literature at the University of Cambridge, I received instruction surprisingly more akin to the Continental tradition, while instructors at Tübingen, my German home university, mostly favoured the Anglo-American model. Neither, however, should be viewed as the other’s evil twin, as an awareness of both can yield more mature, flexible writing. This talk explicates the advantages and risks of the freedoms afforded by the Continental school, and the tuition required to achieve successful results without prescription. Comparing findings from interviews with instructors and fellow international students at Cambridge to my experiences as an ‘Anglo-American’ peer tutor at Tübingen, I offer solutions to contradictions that commonly remain implicit:

- How can the classical essay as a venue for freely formulated thought – historically exemplified by such philosophical and literary essayists as Ralph Waldo Emerson, Walter Benjamin, and David Foster Wallace – be reconciled with the Anglo-American school?

- Without a rulebook, can the Continental essay be felicitously taught and learned?

- How can today’s heterogeneous writing practices deal with the legacy of an essay which aspires to ‘[reflect] a childlike freedom that catches fire, without scruple’ (Adorno, 1984)?
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Writing in design education: the magazine and the studio as vehicles for writing development

Speaker(s): Tine Wirenfeldt Jensen, University of Southern Denmark
Contributor: Kathrina Dankl, Design School Kolding
Session Type: Paper presentation
Session: 17B Room: Windsor 0-04

Design students should be uniquely prepared for research writing as design as a discipline requires the ability to approach the unknown in order to generate new knowledge, and as students are trained in process-oriented methods and to adapt their work continuously. But somehow, these skills do not seem to transfer in practice when it comes to academic writing. This might be due to a lack of familiarity with the academic genre as well as lack of knowledge of how to apply existing skills to the task of writing. Academic writing development is not an established part of the design pedagogy discourse, and the connections between academic writing skills and core parts of the design curriculum such as critical thinking skills and digital literacy are often overlooked. This calls for developing a pedagogic approach that uses existing resources in design education.

We show that by drawing on disciplinary-specific resources already familiar to design students (in these cases ‘the magazine’ and ‘the studio’), such resources can act as a bridge, allowing design students to engage with academic writing in ways that makes it possible for them to see how their disciplinary knowledge and methods can be applied in the context of academic writing.

This strategy offers a way of making generic writing support not only more accessible for design students, but accessible in ways that highlights the relevant disciplinary-specific skills design students already possess. Such strategies might also call for a general renegotiation of the relationship between disciplinary-specific and generic writing development.
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How do L2 master’s TESOL students perceive and develop argumentation in their academic writing? A case study at a UK university.

Speaker(s): Hania Salter-Dvorak, Exeter University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 17C Room: Windsor 0-05

Argumentation in academic writing of both LI and L2 students is an area which is receiving increasing attention in the literature (Mitchell et al 2000; Wingate, 2012; Nesi and Gardner 2012; Salter-Dvorak 2016). However, we still know very little about how individuals build up awareness and performance in argumentation. While some posit that argumentation skills can be taught generically, there is a strong view that these are best built up in the context of the discipline studied (Mitchell et al 2000; Wingate 2012; Nesi and Gardner 2012). This paper discusses preliminary findings from year one of a two-year ethnography on argumentation of L2 master’s TESOL students at Exeter University, who are assessed through written texts which fall into the ‘essay/critique’ category (Nesi and Gardner 2012.) Here, the writer is required to discuss pedagogical issues in her/his context by evaluating and synthesising theoretical perspectives in the literature; the result is a blend of knowledge, experience and opinions in which coherent argument is key. For most of these students, whose previous writing experience in English has been limited to the 250 word IELTS essay, this genre is an unfamiliar one. While pass rates on M.Ed. TESOL degree are generally high, many struggle with the essay requirements to make and evidence claims appropriately. Drawing on the design of recent studies, e.g. Morton, Storch and Thompson (2015), the study employs a naturalistic approach, combining interview data with student texts and course documents in order to explore how these students develop argumentation in their essays over the course of year one. In year two, the findings will be implemented to introduce interventions which will support these students to develop argumentation in their academic writing.

References:


How to supervise a graduation thesis effectively

Speaker(s): Ene Alas, Tallinn University
Session Type: Paper presentation
Session: 17D Room: Windsor 1-02

In many non-Anglophone countries, an increasing amount of research, including university graduation theses, must be completed in English. These theses are often written as well as supervised by non-native writers of English. What are the problems that these writers and supervisors struggle with? Do they share a perception of the standard set for such academic writing? How useful are EAP classes in this context? The presentation will juxtapose the expectations of the graduation paper writers with those of their supervisors in the process of graduation paper writing, to identify if there is a conflict between faculty perceptions of students’ academic writing standard and students’ own assessment of their EAP skills. Relying on a questionnaire and follow-up interviews, the study explored the variability in the non-native students’ and their non-native supervisors’ perception of the quality of student academic writing but also in their feedback expectations, time management, level of independence, student-supervisor relationship, etc., depending on the level (Bachelor’s, Master’s and Doctoral) of writing. The research disclosed a set of 16 supervising challenges in the given (Estonian) context, ranging from providing linguistic support to managing interpersonal relationships. By the same token, a taxonomy of student academic writing challenges emerged as well as types of requests to the supervisor on different levels. The supervisor-identified student writing problems seem to suggest a need for possible academic writing programme adjustments to assist students.
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The mediating influence of a web-based peer review platform on the activity systems of 12 L2 writers in responding to and using feedback on writing

Speaker(s): Tsui Eu Sandra, Nanyang Technological University
Session Type: Paper presentation
Session: 17E
Room: Windsor 1-03

Two key issues in feedback on writing for L2 Chinese learners have been the apparent preference for teacher feedback (Hu and Lam 2010, Tsui and Ng 2000) and reservations about the appropriateness and effectiveness of peer feedback with such learners (Carson and Nelson 1994, 1996; Nelson and Murphy 1993). This study investigated how the use of a web-based peer review platform influenced the activity systems of responding to and using feedback from both teacher and peers on academic writing, of 12 Chinese learners. These case studies drew on data gathered from questionnaires, stimulated recall interviews, semi-structured interviews, focused diary entries, drafts of writing and records of teacher and peer reviews on the web-based peer review platform, SWoRD (now called Peerceptiv). Using the theoretical lens afforded by the key concept of mediation in third-generation Activity Theory (Engestrom 1987, 1999), the data were analysed and the mediating influence of SWoRD on the various components of the activity system was investigated. It was found that SWoRD mediated the relationships between the subject (L2 writer) and the rules (e.g. the issue of ‘face’ among Chinese learners); the community (peer reviewers of lower proficiency); and the division of labour (peer reviewers as experts, as opposed to the traditional division of labour where the teacher is the expert). The findings suggest that the potential of peer feedback in helping L2 writers improve their writing, is unleashed with the mediating influence of SWoRD while the oft-cited preference for teacher feedback in the literature is far from monolithic.
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Is the question the answer? Stimulating cognitive thinking by asking effective questions

Speaker(s): Jenny de Sonnevile, Leiden University Medical Center
Nikki Kromkamp, Leiden University Medical Center

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 17F Room: Windsor 1-04

Being able to ask questions that effectively develop a student’s critical thinking is one of the most important skills for a teacher of academic writing. Research has shown that different questions can function at different cognitive levels. Therefore, teachers need to be aware of the function of the questions they ask to promote the writing process. Benjamin Bloom developed a taxonomy to analyze the different cognitive levels at which questions function. Questions that demand an answer given at a factual, conceptual or applicable level are defined as ‘lower order questions’. Questions that demand an answer given at an analytical, evaluative or creational level are defined as ‘higher order questions’.

A teacher needs to be able to ask questions which stimulate both a lower and higher level of thinking depending on the purpose of the question. However, research has shown that teachers predominately ask questions that work on a lower cognitive level, while thinking at a higher cognitive level is important for promoting deep thinking, requiring students to analyze and evaluate concepts and thereby stimulating critical thinking.

The goal of this workshop is for participants to reflect on what their aim is when they ask a question, what the function of their question is and whether it is likely to achieve their learning aim. Through a variety of activities and discussions, participants will reflect on which specific cognitive processes their questions address. The primary focus will be on exploring how questions can be reformulated to stimulate higher order and critical thinking.
Critical reflections from the field: embracing diversity through Inclusive approaches to teaching and developing academic literacy

Speaker(s): Ursula Wingate, King’s College London
Olga Rodriguez Falcon, University of East London
Tiffany Chiu, University of East London
Melissa Ferro, University of East London

Session Type: Symposium

Session: 17G Room: Windsor 1-05

This symposium addresses different pedagogic approaches adopted to the teaching of academic writing and literacy skills in different academic settings. While acknowledging a variety of instructional approaches, we critically consider the question of how different writing approaches and forms of provision can be more responsive and inclusive in meeting the needs of diverse student populations.

_Ursula Wingate, King’s College London (chair)_
‘Drop-in writing clinics’ - how helpful are they for students?

‘Drop-in clinics’ are a type of academic writing support that has recently proliferated. The instructors usually do not see the student texts before the session, and are often not familiar with the required genres. To evaluate the quality and effect of this support provision, I conducted a study in which I observed 20 clinics and followed the progress of some students until the completion of their assignments. The results suggest that the drop-in clinics have limited effect on the quality and outcome of students’ assignments, but provide confidence and motivation that improve the writing process.

_Olga Rodriguez-Falcon, University of East London_
Embracing diversity for attainment: An inclusive approach to writing

This presentation will discuss the findings from a research project ‘Embracing Diversity for Attainment’, which evaluated the impact of a Writing in the Disciplines approach on Level 3 foundation students. One of the key findings will be students’ self-reported higher levels of motivation and participation around embedded writing provision directly attached to their assessments. The presentation will also discuss students’ comments on identity, authorship and belonging within HE and how they justify the need for new pedagogies that better address their needs and expectations.

_Tiffany Chiu, University of East London_
A redesigned genre-based exercise to the teaching of literature review writing

This presentation will discuss an evaluation of an implementation of a redesigned genre-based task, complemented by the academic literacies perspective to the teaching of literature review writing to Sociology foundation students. This action research critically examines the effectiveness of the blended EAP and Academic Literacies to the teaching of writing, with a particular focus on linguistic resources (i.e. cohesive devices). The findings suggest that this intervention has positive effect on student awareness of language resources and development of autonomy and confidence in writing.

_Melissa S. Ferro, University of East London_
Lessons from an international student pathway programme in the U.S.

Recent growth in the enrolment of international students at U.S. universities has led to the development of pathway programmes where international students can further develop their academic English whilst earning credit towards their degree. This presentation discusses the reflective practices of an undergraduate
pathway programme lecturer who taught a research methods module to undergraduate multilingual learners. The analysis of these practices indicates the use of hybrid methods supported by the literature on EAP, Academic Literacies, and critical pedagogies.

The final discussion questions:

- Which form(s) of academic writing provision do you think the most effective in your teaching context?
- How can we identify a practical way forward to writing pedagogy by combining the approaches of Genre/EAP and Academic Literacies?
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Turnitin: a journey in academic writing

Speaker(s): Gill Rowell, Turnitin
Earle Abrahamson, University of East London
Carol Bailey, University of Wolverhampton
Goa Borrek, Turnitin

Session Type: Symposium

Session: 17H Room: Moore Annexe 034

For almost two decades Turnitin has been viewed as a global leader in technology to prevent student plagiarism, but with countries like the UK taking a more formative approach to using the technology to promote the positive attributes of academic integrity and beyond, the tool has also been used to explore the greater academic writing space. Fortunately, the challenges created due to this emphasis on a negative discourse of plagiarism and academic misconduct have been seen by innovative practitioners as an opportunity to use technology to teach and showcase good practice academic writing conventions.

On a very practical level, just as Turnitin can be used to demonstrate to students visually why referencing and citation is necessary in the digital age, it can be used to show students what good writing looks like and and nurture these fundamental writing skills, therefore equipping students with key competencies for their academic or professional journey beyond the confines of the university.

Through partnerships with academic institutions in the UK and beyond Turnitin will share good practice examples of approaches to using Turnitin to explore the academic writing space. In particular:

- To manage the skills gap from secondary and further to higher education
- To engage the English Language Learning community
- To allow students from vocations which traditionally are not known for their appetite for academic writing to excel

This symposium, facilitated by Turnitin and presented by academics from around Europe, will explore these aspects of the writing process and how technology can be used to assist and engage students.
21st century writing in a time of globalization

Speaker(s): Rachel Riedner, George Washington University
Jennifer Wingard, University of Houston
Rebecca Dingo, University of Massachusetts
Eileen Schell, Syracuse University

Session Type: Symposium
Session: 171 Room: Moore Building 016

We present perspectives on globalization that emphasize different ways in which it impacts writing curriculum. We invite audience to consider what literacies emerge from experiences of globalization? How do social relations, multiple forms of power, and economic forces shape the experiences that students bring to the writing classroom? What does writing tell us about how students negotiate their lives in globalization? How do local conditions change how we teach in the global writing classroom? How does the passage across borders of students and translingualism affect writing? How do dominant social, political, economic forces, both local and global, shape literacy and writing? The first paper discusses a first-year writing curriculum that introduces students to multiple forms, genres, and styles of writing, and provides rhetorical skills to navigate different writing situations. The paper discusses a course that focuses on the veil as it is a deeply contested global practice and symbol. The veil requires multifaceted, distinctive varieties of writing and research as well as understanding visual and representational practices, national belonging, colonial histories, gender norms, economic structures, and religious practices. The paper argues for pedagogy that emphasizes variations in genre, audience, purpose, audience and style as a means of inviting students to participate in a diverse, contested, and fluid globalized world. The second paper focuses on a first-year writing curriculum attuned to changing writing and communication practices. The paper maps challenges of globalizing the curriculum. This curriculum offers a starting point for extending into a reading-writing model where students practice writing in different modes and genres. The paper invites the audience to consider how we teach students about how geopolitics, migration, economics, and increased interconnectivity and how do these areas impact student writing? What writing does twenty-first century globalization privilege and necessitate? How do students develop transnational literacy skills? What are the roles of writing program administrators and teachers in addressing these complex power dynamics? The third paper focuses on a graduate curriculum that responds to shifting migration, multiple literacies, funding and student streams. It addresses the challenge of US composition and rhetoric curriculum that is based in national assumptions of standard written English. This paper argues for a curriculum that asks teacher-scholars to learn current trends in migration, language acquisition, and economics along with best practices of writing instruction. By changing the historical and contextual readings, this shift from a U.S. based national perspective to a global one insures that rhetoric and composition benefits graduate students. The fourth paper examines the role of Writing Centers in responding to the needs and linguistic resources of international graduate students attending U.S institutions. International students represent a global export and source of income and labor. Yet international students struggle with expectations of writing tasks as pedagogies employ a monolingual approach that does not account for translingual resources and global literacies. This paper addresses how a Writing Center developed a course for international students. Affordances and challenges associated with this course, along with models that move beyond monolingual writing pedagogies.
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Writing conventions in an era of multilingual publication practices: the case of changing rhetorical patterns in Norwegian academic discourse

Speaker(s): Kristin Solli, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences
Ingerd Legreid Ødemark, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences
Tom Muir, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences

Session Type: Paper presentation
Session: 18A Room: Windsor Auditorium

This paper presents the results of a study investigating changes in rhetorical patterns in the introduction sections of three Norwegian-language academic journals in the humanities and social sciences. Our study compared the 1994 and 2014 volumes of the journals. During this period, the publication patterns in these fields in Norway have been consistently bilingual, with scholars publishing in Norwegian for a national audience and in English for an international audience (Sivertsen 2016). While considerable scholarly attention has been given to the texts that multilingual scholars write in English, we wanted to look for potential changes in local academic discourse against the backdrop of multilingual publication practices.

Our findings show that in all three fields there has been a move towards a rhetorical structure that conforms more explicitly to the CARS model (Swales 1990), often considered a hallmark of Anglo-American rhetorical patterns in research article introductions. We discuss these findings in light of 1) the introduction of performance-based research funding policies; 2) previous studies of change in academic discourse in languages other than English (Bennett 2014, Lillis and Curry 2010); and 3) changes in disciplinary conventions.

Beyond the case of Norway, this study highlights the need for more research on cross-linguistic writing practices in order to understand the discursive and epistemological implications of multilingual publication practices more fully. Our study also indicates that writing support programs for researchers who work in fields where multilingual publication practices are common might benefit from adopting more explicitly multilingual and contrastive pedagogical approaches.
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Learning from uncertainty: the function of uncertainty in generic and discipline-specific writing in Architectural education

Speaker(s): Roman Banzer, University of Liechtenstein
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Not infrequently, architects claim that the plan, the model and ultimately the built object constitute their language. It is Juhani Pallasmaa who reveals the potential of the human hand in his book 'The Thinking Hand'. He claims that the unity of mind and body allows craftsmanship and artistic work to be fully realized. In Chapter Five he talks about the work of thinking and the value of uncertainty. Therefore, I will discuss the terms (1) uncertainty and (2) critical thinking (Paul and Elder, Bean), and we will examine the value of both in terms of engaging ideas and student engagement in writing. We aim to think about the function that uncertainty can have for generic writing and the function that critical thinking can have for discipline-specific writing in architectural education. Scientific literature is being analyzed personally and then group-discussed by raising topic related questions which lead to more and more precise text fragments written by the students. The process of writing can be seen as an architectural as well as a personal approximation. Confronting yourself of being precise in writing text means evaluating your true statements thoughts and feelings. We present the results of a series of narrative interviews with a sample of 50 first semester students of architecture. We also conducted a survey regarding the competence-based knowledge gained in writing different papers (essay, logbook, poster slogan) during the semester.
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Complex learners; complex disciplines: a genre familiarity approach to teaching pre-sessional writing

Speaker(s): John Wrigglesworth, Sheffield Hallam University
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How can we increase a student’s familiarity with academic genres and how they work? Academic writing practitioners work across a wide variety of teaching contexts (Charles and Pecorari 2016). Academic literacies research show learners as having complex bundles of characteristics (Street and Lefstein 2007). Corpus studies of academic disciplines show differing patterns of language use (Hyland 2004). It’s no surprise that students and teachers can feel disorientated. This paper evaluates several approaches to teaching academic writing and argues for a genre-based approach centred on authenticity of individual student experience. In doing so, it draws on the debates surrounding EGAP and ESAP, product, process and post-process, and CLIL. By supplementing classical notions of rhetoric (Aristotle 1991) with contemporary conceptions of genre and micro genre (Martin and Rose 2008), the approach hopes to make recognizable patterns of language and unfamiliar content. Using interview data drawn from staff and students on a pre-sessional language course in the UK, the presentation looks at student understandings of the language and content of their future discourse communities and the process of writing about unfamiliar genres. The students on the course were preparing for study in different disciplines, but were given opportunities to prepare for specific disciplines rather than for study in general. Students expressed satisfaction with this model, though a significant number of teachers reported anxiety about their own familiarity with genre and content knowledge.
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Academic writing now: the experiences and learning trajectories of international graduate students in two Anglophone countries
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This presentation will explore academic literacy socialisation issues arising from internationalisation, and the choice by many graduate students to study in an Anglophone university (issues discussed, for example, in Wingate 2015). Its focus is the challenges faced by 32 international MA and doctoral students from 20 different countries as they engage with the literacies of their new disciplinary community (Duff 2010). Data were collected using narrative frames (Barkhuizen 2014) and interviews, since these instruments allow for reflection and scaffold the expression of participants’ views. Information was elicited about students’ prior learning and experience on several aspects of academic writing, as well as their coping strategies, self-evaluation of their progress and immediate learning priorities. Study findings revealed that the undergraduate writing experiences and difficulties of this group on entering PG studies had much in common. Students reported having received little instruction about academic writing in their home countries, and therefore feeling poorly prepared to master Anglophone practices. They described the challenges of writing using sources, evaluative and writer-responsible writing, as well as perceived inadequacies in their academic vocabulary, metadiscourse strategies, and the ability to compose concise, logically-structured texts. Writing critically was a new challenge for most of them. However, what was noticeable was that students at the end of their studies were able to describe the writing practices and expectations at PG level in detail, showing a real understanding of what was involved. The presentation will conclude by discussing implications for writing teachers’ pedagogy and the practices of disciplinary supervisors.

References:


The practice of feedback in academic writing: from role play to experience of peer tutoring
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Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 18E Room: Windsor 1-03

The Library and the Faculty of Education at Bergen University College are in the midst of establishing an academic writing centre. Our main activities are workshops, seminars and one-to-one guidance. The latter involves using master students as tutors to advise students on their writing tasks. The tutors receive three days of intensive training in academic writing with a strong emphasis on guidance and feedback. Feedback is an effective strategy to achieve deep learning and is well placed in teaching and assessment pedagogies of academic writing (Hafer 2014; Reitbauer et al 2013). Research on assessment regards feedback on student performance as part of formative assessment approach (Black and Wiliam 1998; Frey and Fisher 2011) whose purpose to integrate feed-up, feedback and feedforward. This presentation aims to report on the type of feedback student tutors provide to their peers and the reflections they provide on their experiences. We use mixed methods. First, the students were exposed to role play where they reflected on the feedback provided in an enacted tutoring situation. Second, they themselves provided feedback on a sample of student writing. Finally, the students submitted a report on their actual experiences as writing tutors. The preliminary analysis of these data shows that student tutors are inclined to give positive feedback and highly concerned with feedforward, i.e. they wish the students leave the session motivated to improve their writing.
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Institutionalizing academic writing now: from margins to center

Speaker(s): Katrin Girgensohn, European University Viadrina
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Over the last decade we could witness an immense growing of institutional writing support in higher education in many European countries. A remarkable number of writing centers and writing programs started, and research, conferences, publications and organizations on academic writing are still increasing. These developments could lead to the impression that academic writing eventually became central to academia in Europe. In other words: academic writing seemingly reached the importance in higher education that those of us, who chose teaching and researching academic writing as profession, hoped it would achieve. For us, the support for gaining writing competences and the use of writing as a tool for academic learning are key for higher education. But do other stakeholders really see this importance, too? How much do, besides our growing profession, professors in other disciplines, administrators and students care for academic writing? Do writing centers or programs get the resources they need? Do writing scholars get the same recognition for their research as scholars in other disciplines do?

From talking with colleagues I often get the impression that within our local university contexts, neither professors nor administration seem to care as much as we do about academic writing. In writing center literature, there is even a debate about feelings of ‘marginalization’ (e. g. Macauley/Mauriello 2007). It seems as if the growing of our professional field, as important and pleasing as it is, might not reflect what happens in our local contexts. There, many of us still struggle with creating sustainable structures, establishing an awareness for the importance of academic writing or gaining respect for our scholarship.

In this keynote I am going to take a closer look at what lies behind this diffuse impression of marginalization or perceived degradation that many writing centers and writing programs tend to face in local university contexts. Based on the theoretical concept of institutional work (Lawrence et al 2009) and on empirical research on the institutionalization of writing centers (Girgensohn 2016), I will introduce a model for institutionalizing academic writing that connects writing studies with organizational research. It offers a way for understanding the complexity of the work we conduct within our local contexts beyond teaching and research. It also provides practical guidance for this work within a European context, where in many countries academic writing support is still far away from being regular practice in higher education.
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From Boone to Budapest: the role of context in determining the policies, pedagogies, and practices of writing programs

Speaker(s): Kimberly Gunter, Appalachian State University
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In determining the location for writing instruction, the pedagogies to be used, the composing tasks to be assigned, the professional development to be offered to faculty, etc., universities must negotiate several dialectics. The frequently perceived divides between course content versus writing instruction, generalized writing literacies versus understandings of writing as an always situated task, writing as purely alphabetic exercise versus multimodal/multimedia venture—universities must contend with these types of questions as they build structures to support students’ composing.

I argue that universities, while remaining cognizant of current rhetoric and composition scholarship, EAP and educational research, and rapidly changing 21st century literacies, should retain local context as a touchstone when crafting systems for delivering writing instruction. I discuss field research completed at two institutions, Appalachian State University (ASU) in Boone, North Carolina, USA, and Central European University (CEU) in Budapest, Hungary. ASU provides a four-year, vertical writing curriculum for undergraduates, including generalized writing instruction, WAC, and WID instruction for undergraduates. (ASU provides nearly no writing instruction for graduate students.) CEU, offering one-year, intensive Masters and some doctoral degrees, provides writing instruction through an independent Center for Academic Writing where faculty (mostly from literary studies) offer WID classes and one-on-one tutorials. While some pedagogical approaches are consistent across both (process approaches to writing and consideration of genre), the structures whereby instruction is provided, faculty’s professional development in writing pedagogy, partnerships with disciplinary faculty, and concepts of student agency vary wildly. Invoking scholarship in genre theory (Soliday 2011; Bawarshi and Reiff 2010), transfer of writing skills (Clark and Hernandez 2011), and materiality, medium, and rhetoric (Kress 2007), I discuss how the strengths of both programs suggest ways that other schools might learn from these universities.
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Experiencing master’s dissertation supervision: findings from a longitudinal case study, lessons for EAP practitioners

Speaker(s): Bojana Petrić, Birkbeck, University of London
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Session: 22B Room: Windsor 0-04

In this talk, we discuss the implications of the findings of a year-long study of master’s dissertation supervision for EAP practitioners. Our project involved charting the experiences of L2 dissertation students and their supervisors at a UK university, using a qualitative case study methodology. The study was located in four different humanities and social sciences departments in a UK university, and, in line with qualitative case study approach, a rich mixture of data sources was drawn upon. Data included repeated interviews with students during the dissertation writing period, from their initial proposals to the completed dissertations, chapter drafts with the supervisor’s feedback, dissertation diaries the students were asked to write while working on their dissertations, supervisee think-aloud sessions recorded while writing their drafts, interviews with the students’ supervisors, and dissertation markers’ reports.

We found that a number of supervisees experienced difficulties with various aspects of academic literacy: literature searching, citation and referencing, and injecting their voice into the text, as well as skills such as time management and communicating effectively with their supervisors. We argue that EAP practitioners can play a vital part in enhancing the supervision experience for both supervisors and supervisees alike, and that excerpts from longitudinal case studies such as ours can be effectively used for awareness-raising activities for this purpose, providing students with vivid insights into authentic supervision experiences. We close by providing some pedagogical proposals and activities that EAP practitioners could introduce into their courses to address these issues.
Why do(n’t) I want to read these essays? Developing an intuitive framework to help student writers understand why their texts might (dis)engage a reader

Speaker(s): Sarah Haas, Ghent University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 22C Room: Windsor 0-05

This paper introduces an intuitive framework for helping student writers understand why readers might find texts (dis)engaging. The development of the framework began when I became the sole teacher of 300+ undergraduate students of EFL—and the sole marker of their texts. Often filled with dread at the thought of marking, I became interested in the question ‘Why do(n’t) I want to read these?’

Taking a grounded theory approach, I systematically noted places in the texts where I wanted to stop reading, and then categorized my reasons for disengagement. Once a preliminary framework was formed, I collected similar data from students (reading each others’ texts), and non-specialist colleagues (reading their students’ texts). Readers were asked to notice and explain in their own words where/why they were disengaged. Written feedback as well as audio-recorded data were collected and analyzed.

These instances of (dis)engagement were categorized, and arranged into a framework divided into Initial Engagement (wanting to start reading) and Continuing Engagement (wanting to keep reading), and further categorized into higher-order and lower-order concerns. In order for the results of the inquiry to be useful for a wider audience, the framework categories are largely comprised of the intuitive language used by students and non-specialists.
What (not) to do with academic posters

Speaker(s): Dimitar Angelov, Coventry University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 22D Room: Windsor 1-02

Despite the multimodal nature of the academic poster, most Academic Writing guide books – of which Finch Hedengren (2004), Powell and Teare (2010) and Day (2013) could be seen as a representative sample – conceive of it as yet another textual template, very much akin to the report, with which the poster seems to share a structural logic and meaning-making devices. Almost invariably, academic writing guidelines seem to focus on the verbal dimensions of the poster, whilst its visual elements – although not ignored - are treated as matters of formatting and aesthetic choice, expected to enhance what is essentially a textual core. Yet, there seems to be a tacit agreement amongst academics and writing developers that posters possess an extra dimension - often described as originality in presentation - which, although taken into account during the poster’s evaluation, is seldom explained or captured in detail as part of assessment briefs or marking criteria. There is thus a dissonance between how posters are taught, on the one hand, and how they are assessed as academic writing assignments, on the other. Furthermore, there seems to be a dissonance between the poster’s signifying potential as a developing, multimodal academic writing genre and the uses to which it is routinely put, both in student assessment and in writing for scholarly publication. Based on semi-structured interviews conducted with researchers and lecturers from the across the disciplines, this study will promote the academic poster as a genuinely multimodal signifying resource and will seek to elicit the pedagogic and research implications of its multimodality.
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Using a multimodal referencing guide as a ‘scaffolding’ strategy in the writing tutorial

Speaker(s): Arina Cirstea, De Montfort University
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Following the intense drive towards internationalisation within UK universities, the writing development needs of the student cohort have grown increasingly diverse. A particularly well-documented problem area refers to culturally determined variations regarding the acknowledgement of sources in academic work (Abasi and Graves 2008, Gu and Brooks 2011 and Abdulkareem 2013). Writing tutors are called upon to support all of these learners develop appropriate levels of understanding and implementation of institutional referencing practices. However, facilitating the development of such complex skills within the limited timeframe of a writing tutorial can be challenging. Consequently, despite the support available, in this tutor’s experience, mastering referencing skills continues to rank high among the concerns of both students and disciplinary lecturers.

Drawing on a conceptual framework derived from Vygotsky’s (1978) Zone of Proximal Development, Wood, Burner and Ross’s (1976) concept of ‘scaffolding’ as a learning strategy and Goodfellow and Lea’s (2013) take on the ‘digital university’, this paper reflects on the effectiveness of a multimodal referencing website as a scaffolding strategy in enhancing students’ referencing practices. It aims to establish whether this digital resource can help writing tutors create learning processes that appeal to students’ existing set of skills and interests, and highlights challenges related to its use.

As the evaluation of this resource will be underpinned by both research and reflections on my own practice as a tutor within a UK Centre for Academic Writing, the individual presentation timeframe will allow me to communicate my own insights before opening the matter up for debate.
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Language policy and writing development in TNEs. Help or hindrance in writing development?

**Speaker(s):** Stuart Perrin, Xi’an Jiaotong-Liverpool University
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The 2000’s have seen the rise of Transnational Education (TNE), which is one element of the internationalization of education. Asia and especially China has been particularly active in the drive of TNE (Huang 2007) with the British Council (2013) identifying China as a country with TNE opportunity. Alongside the rise of TNE, and in many cases driving it, has been the momentum gained by English Medium Instruction (EMI) in places such as China.

The status of English as an Academic Lingua Franca (Mauranen et al 2010) in an increasingly globalised world provides the linguistic background for EMIs within Transnational Education. For many EMI TNE institutions however this creates the paradoxical situation where the majority of students are studying in a language that is not their first language, and where they are being taught and assessed by academics who may also be mostly English additional language speakers.

Located in an EMI joint collaborative university in China, this paper looks at one attempt to recognise the status of Englishes within the institution through the development of a language policy, which tries to establish language use protocols. It then raises the question as to what the impact on the teaching of writing the language policy has had, and whether it has been successful in recognizing the many different forms of English, or whether English native speaker domination (Jenkins 2014) continues to be the benchmark that is being aimed for, especially in connection with writing.
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New horizons: rethinking the role of writing centers in China

Speaker(s): Jessie Cannady, Xi’an Jiaotong-Liverpool University
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Within an EFL context in China, opportunities for integrative motivation tend to be stifled as the necessity to use the target language, written or otherwise, outside of the classroom is limited. Despite best practices and the compulsory requirement to pass English for Academic Purposes (EAP) modules, students rarely find themselves engaging in written L2 communication for anything besides assessments. However, as Writing Centers emerge and their practices become more prevalent in this setting, the development of writer identity and the establishment of integrative communities can be made possible through the use of the e-learning tools. Shifting these writing opportunities to the virtual space invites students to network, share and play with language. Early studies have noted the use of online literacies as a motivating factor in Chinese students to learn English as a means to make connections or establish guanxi. Exploration and understanding of ‘self’ has been identified as essential for students establishing their voice in writing, which is often consider essential in Western conventions for academic writing. However, for joint-venture programs in China where students are awarded a dual degree from a Western and Chinese university, there is little time for additional composition courses or exploratory writing. This presentation will share how the Writing Center at Xi’an Jiaotong-Liverpool University is working to fill this void through the use of an online 30-Day Writing Challenge, which encouraged students to establish a community while at the same time invited individual discovery and exploration of writer identity.

References:


Instructional scaffolding by observing a peer: a strategy for improving students' writing proficiency

Speaker(s): Annemarie Leuridan, Ghent University
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Teaching writing skills to large groups of students simultaneously remains a challenge to universities. Therefore, the concept of ‘flipped classroom’ is gradually winning acceptance. This presentation will focus on how Ghent University implements that concept, based on the theory of observational learning through modeling (Rijlaarsdam et al 2008), by introducing a learning pathway. Additionally, we will explain how we trained content teachers to coach peer feedback sessions as part of this pathway, with the aim of ensuring consistency in assessment of writing skills throughout the entire curriculum. For a specific course, 2nd year students of criminology (n=240) received the task of writing a self-reflection essay on their first-year experience. We introduced a twofold trajectory, consisting of videos and a plenary session. Firstly, students observed a peer in short videos alternating with content- and strategy-related questions, giving insight into her attitude and metacognitive processes. Secondly, students attended a plenary session in which they gave and received peer feedback on their self-reflection essay, coached by content teachers. A qualitative analysis with the aid of a questionnaire has been carried out, indicating that students perceive the learning pathway as a very useful method to improve their writing proficiency. Furthermore, students recognize progress in their coping strategies to deal with writing issues. At the end of the presentation, we will discuss suggestions from the students’ point of view and how to tackle those issues in the future. Additionally, the advantage of involving content teachers will be explained.
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Achieving synergy and coherence between different approaches to the development of academic writing

Speaker(s): Nick Endacott, Middlesex University
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Generic approaches to the teaching of academic writing in HE in The UK have, even if often marginalised, been commonplace for some time now, typically in the form of relatively context-independent 'insessional' offerings and/or 'academic skills' offerings. Although the importance of discipline-specificity and sociocultural context has been long-recognised [e.g. the pioneering work of Tony Dudley-Evans and John Swales; Hyland 2000], it is only more recently, with the emergence of EAP and academic writing as mainstream research-informed academic disciplines in their own rights that the sector has been able to position itself more centrally within HE in The UK. This has resulted in better resourcing and greater recognition, and enabled development of more systematic pan-institution programme-contextualised and curriculum-integrated approaches to the development of academic writing [e.g. Wingate 2015 and 2016]. At Middlesex University, a typical post-92 UK institution, we have developed a long-standing Embedded programme-contextualised approach to the teaching of academic writing to a systematic pan-University level; nevertheless, despite their rather different underlying philosophies, we continue to also offer a range of more generic opt-in offerings. With significant growth in the scale of our operations, one of our key challenges emerging now is achieving strategic and operational coherence between the two broad approaches such that both complement, inform and enrich the other to the benefit of students and programmes. Drawing on attendance data and on feedback from students and colleagues, this talk addresses some of the complexities in achieving this.
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The enhancement of academic literacies in a Portuguese university - discussing a course, its theoretical basis and methodologies
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Despite the recognition of students’ difficulties, the teaching of academic writing has no tradition in higher education in Portugal. There are, however, some successful approaches to this area, carried out in some universities where, at the suggestion of some professors, optional courses are being offered to undergraduate and postgraduate students (Carvalho 2012). The aim of this paper is to present and discuss a course that aims to promote students’ academic literacy skills students in one of the new Portuguese universities. Placing the issue of academic writing in the broader framework of academic literacies (Lea and Street 1998; Russell et al 2009), this course aims at raising students’ awareness of academic language and its role in learning and expressing knowledge. Focussing on both comprehension and writing processes, the course enhances students’ consciousness of the high specificity of academic texts that stems not only from their scientific domain but also from the communities and contexts in which they are produced and read. Furthermore, the course is predominantly practical, since it aims an appropriation of the textual genres by the students through actions of use of the language in a real context of learning (Carlino 2013). In addition to its theoretical ground, this presentation discusses the rationale of the contents, the methodologies and the evaluation processes of the course, which is eminently practical and implies several reading and writing tasks involving different academic text genres. As a conclusion, and based on the analysis of students’ difficulties and achievements, we make some recommendations for the teaching of academic writing, giving examples of activities that prove to be particularly effective.
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What students make of feedback: how they interpret it and what they do with it

Speaker(s): Simon Green, University of Leeds
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Constructivist approaches to written feedback on student writing in Higher Education have highlighted the importance of feedback in supporting the self-regulation of novice writers (Carless 2013; Paul et al 2013; Burke and Pieterick 2010): that is the way it fosters the emergent abilities of writers to understand standards, assess their own writing in relation to standards and plan strategically to close gaps in performance (Sadler 2013). This conception of feedback highlights the central role of student writers in appropriating feedback and problematizes the way student writers interpret the feedback they receive and how they make use of it in their subsequent writing.

This paper addresses this issue: it considers the understandings three participants on an MA TESOL programme at a British university constructed from the written feedback they received on their first (non-assessed) assignment, and how these understandings shaped their writing of their first assessed assignment. The study is a part of a larger, longitudinal project investigating the construction of academic literacies, using text-based semi-structured interviews and textual analysis.

The data (1) show variable patterns of interpretation of feedback and use in subsequent writing; (2) suggest that student interpretations of feedback are limited and shaped by their understanding of key concepts in academic writing, such as ‘criticality’ for example; and (3) suggest the limitations of uni-directional feedback, however detailed and well-intentioned, and a role for the interactive, oral mediation of feedback.

References:
Students’ reflective writing: from policy to pedagogy

Speaker(s): Sarah Horrod, Kingston University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 23D Room: Windsor 1-02

Teachers of writing are aware of increasingly complex assessment types consisting of various modes, stages and types of interaction. Leedham (2009) discusses the expanding range of innovative assessment types and indicates some reasons for this trend. There is also discussion of the challenges of particular assessment genres such as group reports or reflective writing. Regarding the latter, Ross (2014 p.220) notes the ‘audience-focused performances of self’ which leads some to criticise the artificiality of reflection and Creme (2005), for example, argues for it not being summatively assessed. EAP teachers, in the meantime, seek to address the teaching of written reflection and other such newer genres. Overall, however, there is more focus on examining the nature of genres for assessment than analysis of why such types of writing exist. In this study, I aim to explore some of the reasons for particular assessment types. In order to investigate the influences on pedagogic practice (Bernstein 1990), I examine the relationship between certain policy texts and university assessment; in this case, reflective writing. Drawing on elements of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) and using concepts and tools from Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) (Wodak and Meyer 2015), I investigate links between student texts and key policy documents as well as conduct interviews with students and staff to investigate participant perspectives. Findings suggest that articulation of learning is a priority, raising questions about what is valued in higher education and why. I also discuss implications for teachers of academic writing as students strive to meet expectations.
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Redefining academic writing policy in a business school: what do teachers say?
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Over the past decade, the Faculty of Economics and Business (FEB), University of Zagreb, has introduced elements of academic writing in English within a number of ESP courses. These are predominantly delivered to students new to university in large, mixed-ability groups where efforts to teach academic writing basics do not always produce the desired results. Moreover, academic writing in Croatian is not taught either, and students generally demonstrate little interest for this vital skill. As a result, despite considerable English language proficiency, students’ writing often remains fragmented and incoherent, which may affect their performance in discipline courses. On the other hand, Croatian higher education institutions have recently been engaged in the process of internationalization and accreditation, which called attention to the quality of academic writing. We have therefore attempted a policy makeover at the institutional level and embedded our attempts in our school’s broader efforts to satisfy accreditation requirements. We conducted semi-structured interviews with the FEB management and teachers in FEB’s English-taught programme to establish how they assess students’ writing and its place in discipline courses. Next, we constructed a questionnaire targeting teaching staff. We expect that our research will show the need for teaching the basics of academic writing in small groups, after which writing instruction should be embedded into subject teaching (team teaching). Hopefully, our initiative may be beneficial for academic institutions which do not have a strong tradition of teaching academic writing.
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Sound writing: developing a global/local writing handbook for the 21st Century

Speaker(s): Julie Christoph, University of Puget Sound
Kylie Young, University of Puget Sound

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 23F Room: Windsor 1-04

What does it mean to teach writing during a time when language and student demographics are changing rapidly? As a lingua franca, English is undoubtedly changing languages and cultures around the world. But so, too, is English being changed by the many world Englishes. Commercial writing handbooks, which frequently present language standards as a simple matter of ‘correctness,’ haven’t caught up with the pace of change of language change or of student demographics.

This presentation will offer snapshots of the global and local policy, pedagogy, and practice that led to the creation of Sound Writing, the online writing handbook that the University of Puget Sound commissioned students to write in the summer of 2016. As a local text, this handbook has many benefits: unlike commercial handbooks, the cost and revision timeline for Sound Writing meets local needs rather than those of publishers (and their shareholders). The handbook is also targeted specifically at our local audience of liberal arts students and faculty, and it includes advice specific to the disciplines and disciplinary approaches used on our campus. Central to the handbook is a nuanced discussion of Standard American English as one of many evolving linguistic constructs in a global context.

This presentation will introduce Sound Writing and invite audience members to think of ways that they might continue to revise and tailor the handbook when it becomes globally available as an open-source text in fall 2017—both to reflect global language practices and to fit local needs on their own campuses.
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Strategic action for your writing center

Speaker(s): Katrin Girgensohn, European University Viadrina

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 23G Room: Windsor 1-05

Imagine you work in a fabulous writing center: Students of your university love it and spread the word how useful the center supports their academic writing. Maybe your center’s percentage of visiting students in relation to your university’s student body is high above national average. Your writing center might also be well known and a model for many other universities in your country. Your center might even be internationally connected and famous for its innovative work. Within your university, however, you have the impression that neither professors nor administration care very much about the great work you do. Even more strange: You gain the impression that some other divisions, which — from your point of view — work less effective, get more respect and resources. Sounds familiar?

In this workshop we will follow-up the plenary talk on institutionalization and transfer it to your local contexts. Participants will exchange their experiences with different strategic action fields identified through empirical research on writing center leadership. The aim is to enhance awareness and possibilities for the strategic actions that we can undertake within our local contexts and beyond.
Beyond defensive writing: improving style in academic writing

Speaker(s): Trevor Day, Royal Literary Fund
             Katie Grant, Royal Literary Fund

Session Type: Workshop

Making academic writing attractive without losing academic rigour is often perceived as a problem, both for students and staff. For many, there is a tendency to write defensively. However, Helen Sword (2009) in surveying academics’ views about writing concluded that ‘the most effective and engaging academic writers’ have the capacity to write with ‘originality, imagination and creative flair’, conveying ‘enthusiasm, commitment and a strong sense of self’. Stephen Pinker (2014) adds to this, suggesting that good writing style ‘earns trust’ and effective writers ‘spare readers from squandering their precious moments on earth deciphering opaque prose’. Understanding the rhetorical and narrative devices employed in high-quality academic writing, for example how to combine academic rigour with emotional response, is key not just to the writing success of staff, but also to the expertise staff can bring to bear on the writing development of their students. Using two papers from different disciplines, this workshop explores how good writing earns a reader’s trust and respect, whether the reader is the editor of an academic journal or a tutor marking an undergraduate essay. Better style improves students’ grades in assignments and exams, and ultimately, results in academic papers of higher standing.
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Will you ever get on top of your field? A short introduction to literature review as an eye opener to the many ways of using information in academic writing

Speaker(s): Solveig M.L. Kavli, Western Norway University of Applied Sciences  
Pål Steiner, University of Bergen Library.

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 24A Room: Windsor Auditorium

Academic writing education engages with a diversity of academic skills or literacies. Among these, Information Literacy is of major importance; i.e. the ability to search, evaluate and ethically use information. The rapidly increasing quantity of information available inescapably changes student writing, in particular regarding the way information is read and used in text production. For instance, when writing a literature review, students may struggle to identify the number of sources to include, how to approach and discuss interdisciplinary literature, and how to judge the quality of the sources.

In this presentation, we outline how Libraries are stakeholders in writing education, arguing that Academic Writing and Information Literacy no longer can be seen as separate fields. Recognizing that a subject-embedded and scaffolded approach to both writing- and IL-education is promoted in both fields, we explore different ways academic writing and information literacy can be merged in education through the collaborative efforts of academic staff, writing teachers and academic librarians. The presentation draws upon practical experience at Norwegian colleges and universities, where the current trend is to locate writing centers at academic libraries. As an example on best practice we would like to demonstrate how tight collaboration between academic writing centres and libraries can enhance and facilitate PhD and MA students in getting on top of their field when writing their literature review.
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Albert Bandura’s self-efficacy theory argues that students with higher self-efficacy are more motivated and engaged and as a result, they are more successful (Bandura 1986; Bandura and Schunk 1981). According to Timothy Seifert, students who believe in their academic abilities experience a stronger feeling of control and therefore, they can deal with difficult tasks effectively (2004, p. 146). In my academic writing classes, I have observed that students with a positive self-image are not afraid of using their critical thinking skills to improve their writing. However, weaker students may feel confused, discouraged and unmotivated because they believe that they are not capable of writing. This paper will focus on L2 students and argue that by creating the right environment inside and outside academic writing classes, it is possible to increase the degree of students’ self-efficacy and confidence. A positive learning environment can shape and encourage self-efficacy by emphasizing the importance of the process of writing: once writing is seen as a process and students learn the importance of making an effort and taking responsibility, they can become active learners and active learning is the key to enjoy writing and be successful. The research methods that are used are practise-based and involve my writing courses on a particular programme, Pre-Master’s Diploma for International Students, and my observations since September 2016. This paper will explore the relation between self-efficacy, motivation and writing and will be of particular benefit for academic writing teachers.
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Looking into feedback givers' minds: a case study and its implications for feedback giver training and the orchestration of feedback by different types of feedback givers

Speaker(s):  Susanne E. Göpferich, Justus Liebig University

Session Type:  Paper presentation

Session:  24C  Room:  Windsor 0-05

To lift part of the burden involved in providing profound feedback on student academic writing from the shoulders of subject-domain teachers, co-teaching courses and peer tutoring services have been established in many universities (Göpferich 2016). To gain insight into the aspects of text quality that are addressed by the different types of feedback givers available at a German university, a case study was conducted in which, apart from a linguistics professor as subject-domain teacher, four types of feedback givers (i.e., one of her research assistants, a language teacher, a peer tutor from the university's peer tutoring service and a writing fellow) were requested to think aloud while reading the L2 (English) MA thesis proposal that a Master’s student had composed as part of the portfolio he had to submit in an English Linguistics seminar, and then provide written feedback on this proposal. In contrast to earlier studies on feedback (e.g., Leibowitz 2013), this case study does not focus on feedback from the perspective of the feedback receiver but on feedback from the perspective of the feedback giver. The participants were required to read the text with a focus on text quality and potential defects. Prior to the experiments, the participants were familiarized with the material that had been handed out to the seminar participants to inform them of their teacher’s expectations concerning the quality of their proposals. After the experiment, the participants had to write a short meta-text reflecting on the aspects they had provided feedback on and their satisfaction with the quality of the feedback they had provided. The data were analyzed for the text quality awareness documented in them, the aspects that feedback was provided on, the insecurities that the feedback givers verbalized, and the language in which feedback was provided. The results show both overlap and complementarity in the feedback. The subject-domain teacher provided content-related background information that no other feedback giver was able to provide, and the research assistant, for example, also addressed more generalizable strategies of academic writing mentioned by none of the other feedback givers. Insecurities uttered, unrealistic quality standards expected of student texts, and potentially harmful feedback, such as unjustified praise, revealed areas to be addressed in feedback giver training and instruction to ensure feedback quality and orchestrate the different types of feedback provided. The paper will focus on the implications of the study for feedback giver training and the collaboration of different types of feedback givers.
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Show me your true colours: scaffolding thinking-reading-writing through an on-line learning platform

Speaker(s): Weronika Fernando, Queen Mary, University of London

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 24D Room: Windsor 1-02

Academic literacy often stands for a short-cut to ‘academic writing’ (Wingate 2015). Such conceptualisation emphasises the focus on the product, i.e. a written text, rather than the process, i.e. an engagement with disciplinary knowledge through questioning, reading and proposing an argument. Theoretically underpinned by an Academic Literacies approach (Lea and Street, 1998), Genre Studies (Rose et al 2008) and Multimodality (Kress 2009), this paper questions the focus on the final written product and discusses findings from a pedagogical intervention which viewed academic literacy as a process, and which relied on the scaffolding of mutually inclusive stages of thinking-reading-writing through the use of a Moodle based platform. The intervention constituted an integral part of literacy support on a pre-sessional EAP module, and it required each student to work on their written assignments in an on-line space and through the use of multimodal resources, in particular different font or background colours. The discussion of the pedagogic intervention builds on a micro-ethnographic analysis of a variety of data: screenshots, essays, student interviews and reflections on the classroom instruction (Green and Bloome 2004). The paper provides evidence that the scaffolding of the writing process not only boosts students’ understanding of what is involved in composing academic texts but also helps to uncover and overcome previously obscure areas of difficulty that student-writers encounter while learning to write. It is hoped that this innovative pedagogic approach can offer an alternative to a text-focused instruction and can help to make a more effective use of on-line technologies in student writing support.
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Writing a PhD thesis requires the understanding of genre- and discipline-specific conventions in addition to advanced knowledge of subject matter. While research has identified genre conventions specific to PhD thesis introductions (e.g., Bunton’s 2002 move-step analysis), less is known about how source use, especially direct quotations, is contextualised in this genre and how it interacts with its rhetorical structure. The use of direct quotations varies among disciplines, being much more common in the humanities than the social sciences and sciences (Hyland, 2000). It is, therefore, the humanities that provide a fruitful arena for investigating this type of source use. This study aims at investigating L1 English writers’ use of direct quotations in Literature PhD thesis introductions, focusing on the relationship between the direct quotation use and rhetorical structures. Our corpus consisted of 15 PhD thesis introductions (approximately 100,000 words) and was analysed based on Swales’ revised CARS model which included some Literature-specific steps. Among a total of 1096 steps in the corpus, 480 steps contained direct quotations. Findings showed that direct quotations occurred predominantly for the purpose of steps specific to Literature, such as presenting fictional work and/or its author as well as some generic steps, such as reviewing previous research and making topic generalisations and giving background information. These findings suggest that the relationship between direct quotation use and the rhetorical structure of thesis introductions is partially generic and partially discipline-specific. The pedagogical implications of these findings will also be discussed.
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The dialectic of learning and teaching: tutor education and obuchenie

Speaker(s): Deryn Verity, The Pennsylvania State University

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 25A Room: Windsor Auditorium

The concept of praxis—a dialectically-constructed relationship of unified opposites—is brought into particular focus in the field of teacher education, where everything that is taught is also learnt, and vice-versa. When the teacher is being schooled in the strategies and techniques of helping novice academic writers produce coherent and ethical prose, this dialectic can be especially important: graduate students in an MA TESL course are frequently second-language writers of English themselves, and every tutoring session with an undergraduate student brings into focus their own strengths and weaknesses as writers. From the viewpoint of sociocultural theory, the intertwining of learning (through teaching) and teaching (while learning) can be summarized by a term used in Vygotskian research, obuchenie. This paper will track instances of obuchenie in tutoring as they occur in a semester-long tutoring internship offered as part of the MA TESL curriculum. These moments characterize encounters during which the tutor identifies, or reflects upon, how tutoring an inexperienced writer prompts his or her own understanding and growth. Data is collected from ongoing reflective posts written by each tutor after every tutoring session.
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Peer review fosters student critical thinking and self-evaluation (Wood and Kurzel 2008). Even though studies show that peer review is effective in improving student writing (Althauser and Darnall 2001) and that it benefits both the students receiving as well as those giving the feedback (van den Berg, Admiraal and Pilot 2006), these issues have not been adequately researched in Greece. I have embarked on a small-scale, exploratory, classroom-based study conducted at Deree - The American College of Greece where English is the medium of instruction. It is addressed to thirty tertiary level students in two introductory academic writing classes. Data include first and revised (final) drafts of three academic writing assignments with written peer comments and learner reflections on the experience of peer reviewing. To further explore student attitudes toward and reaction to peer review, an online questionnaire was also administered to the students. Initial quantitative and qualitative analyses reveal (a) in general students as reviewers and/or reviewees accept peer review as an appropriate pedagogical activity; (b) good percentage of students (higher percentage of female over male students) revise their writing taking into account peer feedback; and (c) as reviewers, most students were not more critical in giving feedback when doing peer review anonymously. The preliminary results are interpreted with an understanding of the limitations of the ongoing study and need for further research.
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Learning to lead: how academic writing circles prepare doctoral students to extend their peers’ academic writing skills

Speaker(s): Emma Caukill, Queensland University of Technology

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 25C

Room: Windsor 0-05

The recent ‘Students as Partners’ initiative in higher education provides opportunities for students to gain valuable leadership experience in collaboration with university teaching staff. However, opportunities for involving doctoral students in the program are limited. One opportunity for doctoral students to gain leadership experience are academic writing circles. Writing circles offer safe empowering spaces for doctoral students to improve their own academic writing (Aitchison and Lee 2006), but often overlooked are opportunities for developing sustainable professional identities so students can learn to lead academic writing circles with their peers, thus developing important skills that can prepare them for work beyond their research degree. This paper examines the question: How do academic writing circles prepare doctoral students for leading their own writing circles with their peers? Adopting a learning as a social practice pedagogical approach (Lantolf 2004; Vygotsky, 1962), a facilitator met with four doctoral students regularly for a two hour writing circle between May 2015 and November 2016. With the students positioned as colleagues collaborating equally in a shared practice (Kamler and Thomson 2014), each student developed the skills to successfully extend their own and their peers’ academic writing principles and practices. The resulting impact included one student who, to date, continues to facilitate his own writing circle sessions with other doctoral students, and another student who gained the confidence to begin tutoring for the first time at the university. This presentation will be useful for educators teaching academic writing to doctoral students, facilitating writing circles, or responding to similar initiatives that call for greater student involvement in leadership within higher education.
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Anonymity and identity in academia

Speaker(s): Anna Skene-Hill, Research and Writing Center, University of Tuebingen

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 25E Room: Windsor 1-03

As academia becomes increasingly international and diverse, both teachers of academic writing and their students are facing issues of anonymity and identity, particularly as they change and develop their approaches to students’ individuality in their work. Traditionally, students have searched for anonymity in their writing, aiming to write ‘correctly’ or searching to ‘improve’ their work. Such terminology is often linked to the suppression of one’s culture, something that is instilled in education from an early age but is increasingly being identified as problematic, particularly as academia becomes more multicultural (Okawa et al 2010). Translingualism has become the buzzword in writing pedagogy, with norms increasingly being seen as challengeable and negotiable (Horner et al 2011). But it is also important to acknowledge the student’s identity beyond linguistics, acknowledging features such as class, sexuality and personality.

After introducing students’ search for conformity and anonymity, as is particularly expressed in the search for ‘good’ writing, this presentation will identify the contradiction between anonymity and identity, as has been introduced, going beyond the focus of translingualism. The presenter will then discuss how teachers of academic writing could overcome such contradiction, developing the students’ writing while nurturing and protecting their identity, both ‘passing’ (conforming) and ‘coming out’ (expressing identity), particularly in the physical and mental spaces that teachers provide (Denny, 2005). Along with challenging the discrimination identified in academia (Horner et al), this allows teachers to respond to and progress with the changing nature of academic writing as it becomes more multicultural and diverse.
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Teaching for transfer: strengthening students' mental representations of writing

Speaker(s): Mark Sidey, University of Texas

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 25F Room: Windsor 1-04

Several recent studies indicate that composition courses are not doing enough to prepare students for the writing they will do across the curriculum and in their disciplines. Traditionally, the approach to foster transfer has been to have students write the same genres they will write in their disciplines. Research indicates that because these genres are taught out of context, transfer is low. To address this problem, Yancey et al (2014), and other researchers, advocate a focus on genre analysis rather than on genre replication. This presentation builds on Yancey et al's (2014) approach to teaching for transfer, and Beaufort's (2007) model of writing. The results of a study on ways to measure students' mental representation of writing and ways to help students build a framework for writing that they can build on in classes across the disciplines and in writing tasks outside of the university will be discussed. Research questions include: What can writing classes do to teach students to be able to identify what it means to write well in various contexts? How can reflective writing help students conceptualize writing and incorporate new knowledge into their preexisting mental representation of writing? Data includes surveys on students writing knowledge, analysis of student portfolios, and analysis of difficulty papers in which students analyze what specifically they are struggling for various writing tasks. Changes made to Yancey et al’s (2014) approach based on the results of the research will be discussed as will strategies teachers can use to strengthen students’ writing framework.
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Preventing plagiarism: embedding academic integrity as a core communication capability in first year Architecture

Speaker(s): Dorothy Economou, University of Sydney

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 25G Room: Windsor 1-05

This paper will present one component of a larger ongoing project to embed development of communication as a graduate quality into a core first year unit of study in the Architecture Faculty at the University of Sydney. The focus here will be the first stage of the project - the embedding of knowledge and skills required to ensure academic integrity in written communication as required in the unit of study, Architectural History and Theory. This initial phase was a response to the recent university-wide focus on academic integrity as a core value and the prioritizing of strategies to prevent plagiarism. The approach taken in this embedding project is based on both Academic Literacies and Systemic Functional Linguistics work in the field, following Coffin and Donohue (2015).

Working in collaboration with faculty staff, the presenter embedded this foundational communication component in both face-to-face sessions within regular lectures and in associated online resources within the Unit of Study website. The response was positive and the faculty is considering rolling this out to all first year units of study. The paper will elaborate on the design and content of both face-face and online components, illustrating the student tasks and the supportive pre- and post-task resources. The rationale for decisions made regarding content, design and execution of this initiative will be outlined, and staff feedback and student evaluations discussed.
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Formative feedback on academic writing in large class environments

Speaker(s): Gayle Pringle Barnes, University of Glasgow

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 25H Room: Moore Annexe 034

Large class sizes are characteristic of contemporary higher education, driven by increased student mobility and marketisation (Maringe and Sing 2014). These bring challenges to the provision of formative feedback, as there are fewer opportunities for teachers to discuss work with students (Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick 2006; Boud and Molloy 2013). This presentation will evaluate strategies used to increase opportunities for formative feedback on academic writing in large-class environments.

The context is a discipline-specific academic writing programme delivered to more than 300 international taught postgraduates in Social Sciences subjects within a UK university. The programme is delivered in-sessionally, with students attending weekly classes on an optional, non-credit-bearing basis. Two key strategies were employed in order to maximise opportunities for formative assessment: completion of short, teacher-designed tasks during class, and submission of extracts from students’ work for their credit-bearing courses. These were then returned with formative feedback from the tutor.

This session will compare and evaluate these two strategies for delivering formative feedback using both student and teacher views. Implications for the design of subsequent formative assessment tasks will be explored. The paper will reflect on how challenges raised by increasing class sizes might be addressed in the teaching of academic writing.
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This paper investigates the changing status and forms of writing in Higher Education in a digital age with a focus on student access and diversity. Contemporary writing is marked by an increasing multiplicity and integration of different forms of meaning-making, including images, sound, layout (Jewitt 2014; Kress 2010). Technological changes are transforming how writing is produced, distributed and accessed (Bezemer and Kress 2008). This has implications for teaching writing in Higher Education particularly as writing remains the main mode of assessment. This paper looks at changing texts (including digital media) and focuses on the implications for ‘voice’ and multimodal academic argument. Using a multimodal social semiotic approach, the study focuses on texts produced by first year architecture students. It examines the ways in which organizational patterns encode meaning in academic argument in order to establish a critical metalanguage to assist students both in the production and critique of different kinds of texts. This is important in developing and inequitable contexts like South Africa and globally where diversity is a feature of Higher Education.
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Holistic peer assessment: a way of embedding learning about writing into the discipline?

Speaker(s): Natalie Usher, University of Oxford

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 26B Room: Windsor 0-04

In recent years, there has been growing debate about how to support discipline-specific writing (e.g. Bazerman et al 2009). This paper reports on a study examining the potential for students to learn about a disciplinary genre through holistic peer assessment. Several recent studies highlight the positive impact of peer assessment on writing outcomes (e.g. Cho and MacArthur 2011). This study offers an in-depth qualitative evaluation of how students learn during a peer assessment intervention, using self-regulated learning (SRL) as a lens (Winne and Hadwin 1998). The participants, 21 first-year English Literature students at a university in England, were learning to write in an exam essay genre. Following Sadler (2010), four workshops were designed for students to appraise work holistically. Criteria were not pre-determined, instead emerging through assessment and discussion of a range of examples. After appraising four example essays, participants wrote their own, then wrote and received anonymous feedback from three peers. Analysis draws on coding and analytical memos of pre- and post-intervention think-aloud protocols, timed essays and writing interviews with ten case study participants. Through appraising example and peer essays, participants developed their metacognitive awareness, or to quote one writer: ‘now I’m actually thinking about how I write instead of just what I write’. As a result, writers self-regulated their processes to meet both the genre and time demands of the exam essay task. While peer assessment isn’t in itself a standalone writing pedagogy, it is a practicable and valuable opportunity for learning about writing within the discipline.
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Developing a researcher identity in the doctoral journey: an inquiry into the process of writing a dissertation proposal

Speaker(s): Zinat Goodarzi, University of Ottawa

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 26C Room: Windsor 0-05

The doctoral dissertation proposal contributes significantly to a solid basis for a successful doctoral study and can be viewed as pivotal to the journey of becoming a researcher. There is a growing body of research on how doctoral students write course papers, doctoral dissertations, and grant proposals. However, writing doctoral dissertation proposals has not received enough attention. The dissertation proposal is an ideal site for investigating the process of becoming a researcher, because it represents the combination of learning experiences at social, political, emotional and cognitive levels (Jansen, Herman and Pillay 2004). This research aims to explore how doctoral candidates move to a researcher identity through understanding, negotiating, and undertaking this research writing experience. As part of a larger work in progress, this proposal mainly focuses on the theoretical framework used in the study. I first draw on Bakhtin’s (1981) concepts of ‘dialogicality of voices’ and ‘ideological becoming’ and how the dialogical interactions between ‘authoritative’ institutional discourses and ‘internally persuasive’ private discourses help us construct new ideologies for ourselves. These concepts allow me to examine how doctoral students interpret the languages and expectations of others in their discipline and form their own voice based on their understanding. Second I use the notion of ‘figured worlds’ (Holland, Lachicotte, Skinner and Cain’s 1998) as part of the theory of self and identity. This concept facilitates the exploration of how doctoral students’ self-understandings, or researcher identities form within different worlds (institutional, social, cultural, personal) in which they participate while developing their dissertation proposals.
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Focusing on 'correctness': perspectives of multilingual student writers

Speaker(s): Magdalena Knappik, University of Vienna

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 26E Room: Windsor 1-03

Many students in higher education today are multilingual, due to the internationalisation of HE, but also due to migration(s) earlier in students’ lives. Universities, however, expect students to adhere to monolingually oriented standards in their academic writing. The question of 'correctness' is still of crucial importance in German academic writing, in particular in teacher training courses. How do students perceive this standard and how important is it to them? How does the goal of 'correctness' impact the writing processes of students, their self-positioning as writers, and their overall writing development? How can writing tutors and teachers deal with this? Is a focus on 'correctness' important as a means for a better chance of success (cf. Delpit 2006), or is it detrimental to the writing process and writing development, as it enlarges the inner critic and puts a constraint on generating ideas and text? To respond to these questions, I will present student writers’ perspectives, drawing on material of my PhD dissertation. I analysed the writing biographies of 58 students in a teacher-training course, using Grounded Theory Methodology, and a framework based on academic literacies (Lillis and Scott, 2008) and Judith Butler’s take on subjectivation theory (Butler 1997, Davies 2006) to account for the institutional context of writing development. The question of 'correctness' proved to be pivotal for multilingual students. Their voices help to draw conclusions for persons who give feedback and who grade the works of multilingual student writers and ask themselves how much they should focus on 'correctness'.
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Curating learning across the curriculum: practicing ePortfolio pedagogy

Speaker(s): Julie Karaus, Appalachian State University
Brendan Hawkins, Appalachian State University

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 26F     Room: Windsor 1-04

Writing is a complex cognitive process, and the extent to which students are able to transfer writing knowledge from one context to another is not always evident. Writing across the Curriculum (WAC) pedagogies developed in order to improve students’ awareness of genre and disciplinary conventions and help them transfer writing knowledge across different contexts. WAC pedagogies broker transference between generic and disciplinary writing as students leave general education classes to writing situations in upper-level, discipline specific, or professional classes. Similarly, assessing if, how, where, and when this learning and ability to transfer learning takes place is a difficult task for teachers; however, electronic portfolios (ePortfolios) are the answer to this difficult assessment question for an increasing number of educators.

The medium of a ePortfolio naturally lends itself to teachers being able to see students’ learning, because students represent their learning process visually as well as textually. Therefore, teachers are able to evaluate students’ learning more organically with a ePortfolio than current traditional assessment methods. Moreover, the ePortfolio encourages contextualization by allowing students to curate their learning beyond individual courses. The ePortfolio in conjunction with a WAC curriculum is particularly helpful in its ability to promote learning over time and across contexts. The presenters will lead a workshop that engages participants in ePortfolio building activities that transcend mediums, genre, and discipline. Additionally, the workshop will engage in discussion, and the presenters will provide sample assignments and activities that faculty can add to their repertoire.
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Embedding academic writing support into discipline-specific science teaching: examples from Psychology

Speaker(s): Alana James, Royal Holloway, University of London

Session Type: Workshop
Session: 26G Room: Windsor 1-05

Aim: This workshop aims to enable the sharing of practice around the teaching of academic writing within science subjects, using examples from a Psychology-specific academic skills course to facilitate discussion.

Practice problem: The workshop will consider the challenges involved in teaching academic writing to large cohorts of science students with mixed academic backgrounds. It will focus upon Psychology as a useful example discipline. Psychology is the only science where a pre-tertiary qualification in the discipline, or in any science subject, is not required for university entry meaning that new students typically have very diverse academic backgrounds. Entry students also often hold common misconceptions about the discipline (Reddy and Lantz 2010), including not conceptualizing psychology as a science, and can thus be particularly unprepared for scientific academic writing. Practice sharing: The Psychology Toolkit academic skills course at Royal Holloway will be briefly outlined. Academic writing teaching has been embedded using co-teaching by discipline-specific lecturers and teachers from the university Centre for the Development of Academic Skills and Library. Examples of challenges faced and how the course has tried to address these will be provided to facilitate discussion. Workshop participants will be invited to share practice in small groups, drawing upon their expertise and experience to consider how key challenges in the teaching of academic writing to science students can be addressed. Following feedback from groups, there will be a general discussion of the issues raised. Key points from the discussion and practice examples will be shared with participants by email afterwards.
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Coping with expanding academic writing classrooms: rethinking collaborative projects

Speaker(s): Nicola Wilson Clasby, State University of New York at New Paltz
Erin Zimmerman, American University of Beirut

Contributor: Danica Schieber, Sam Houston State University

Session Type: Workshop

Session: 26H Room: Moore Annexe 034

Despite NCTE’s recommendation that writing classes be capped at 15 and writing instructors teach no more than 60 students per term, the reality is many instructors teach more. Thus, instructors are pressured to offer students meaningful learning opportunities while finding time and space for designing practical curricula and giving quality feedback.

Group work is one response to this challenge. Researchers like Oakley et al (2004) and Bruffee (1973 and 1984) recognise the value of collaboration to facilitate student learning; however, persisting assumptions maintain that small groups are most manageable in the classroom. Yet, according to Ede and Lunsford (1986), small groups do not necessarily alleviate instructor workload stress. Based on this scholarship, the presenters designed a curriculum to help groups of 4, 8, and 12 collaborate effectively while ensuring the instructors’ work was manageable. Addressing ‘start-up fumbling’ concerns posed by Hoag and Baldwin (2000), the presenters designed practical team-building/communication activities early in their projects to effectively engage students while making the customization of activities and feedback manageable for instructors (p. 343).

Based on observations and student feedback from presenter’s curriculum, this workshop aims to

1. Generate ideas for integrating collaborative work in participants’ courses by examining the presenters’ curriculum packet, which includes student-tested team-building/management tasks to create spaces for diverse collaborative academic communication.

2. Discuss the challenges of designing and assessing group work tasks, the technology used by students to participate effectively, and the successes and complications of the curriculum for small, medium, and large groups.
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From EFL to EMI in a semester: transitioning Nordic students to academic English

Speaker(s): Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, University of Iceland
             Patricia Prinz, Mercy College

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 27A Room: Windsor Auditorium

The increasing internationalization of European universities and concurrent growth in EMI programs have exposed significant limitations in traditional EFL based pedagogies related to Academic English (Dearden 2015; Dimova et al 2015; Arnbjörnsdóttir and Prinz 2014; Arnbjörnsdóttir and Ingvarsdóttir 2010). This paper describes a program design that draws from a range of pedagogical traditions (Flowerdew 2016) to address challenges in English writing for EMI students at the University of Iceland.

The paper presents a six-semester study involving 800 participants from Icelandic and mixed-language backgrounds. Data includes surveys, writing samples, student/instructor interviews, and students’ reflections. Pre-study surveys reveal that years of EFL writing instruction developed students’ awareness of the principles of academic writing. Yet, most students fail to apply the principles when writing in the disciplines.

The program’s goal is to operationalize a targeted set of core writing competencies to improve writing in a single semester. Program design draws from research on L1 writing and L2 English writing pedagogy. To maximize writing practice, a concise textbook was developed which reduces reading time through graphic representations and examples. Explicit instruction ‘shows’ how to reproduce a targeted writing or revision skill, follows with scaffolded practice, and finally production during independent writing. New skills are integrated progressively into longer essays, culminating in a research paper. Guided metacognitive reflections support acquisition of autonomous writing skills and writer efficacy.

End-of-semester data analysis reveals improved academic writing, increased writer efficacy and autonomy, and reduced plagiarism. Students and instructors report satisfaction with the textbook and program.
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Providing support in developing high quality academic writing is crucial in helping more students achieve better results and realise their full potential whilst at university. Since generic skills and attributes (such as critical thinking, constructing an argument, developing an authorial voice or supporting claims with evidence) are increasingly seen as discipline- and context-specific rather than supra-disciplinary (Scott 2000; Hyland 2002; Jones 2009; Gimenez 2012), subject tutors may be best placed to make the features of good writing in their subject area more ‘visible’ for students.

This presentation reports on a project exploring how staff from different departments at a UK university conceptualise and articulate the attributes of high quality writing in their respective disciplines. The results suggest that whilst there are some themes and expectations that are common among academics across the university, the requirements of high quality writing at different undergraduate levels can vary by discipline. A number of focus group participants also commented on how articulating their expectations regarding high quality writing encouraged them to reflect on the ways in which they communicate those messages to students. Along with exploring some of the findings of this research, the presentation will discuss how conversations between disciplinary and writing specialists can help develop both parties’ understanding of the conventions of academic writing in particular disciplines, and how such discussions can help establish meaningful collaborations and create opportunities for embedding writing development within study programmes. This study has direct implications for both generic and embedded models of writing development at university.
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Building academic genre knowledge in multilingual contexts: the case of a Kazakhstani university
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The purpose of this paper is to build on previous research regarding how students develop genre knowledge in a foreign language (e.g., Bruce 2008; Coffin and Hewings 2003; Li 2008; Zemliansky and Amant 2016) to consider the dynamic, recursive nature (García 2009) of building such knowledge across three languages. In 2013, Nazarbayev University Graduate School of Education, an autonomous institution in the Republic of Kazakhstan, accepted the first cohort of students for its Masters and PhD programmes in Education. The university uses English as a medium of instruction, with academic English courses and thesis supervision conducted by local and international professors. Upon completion of the programme, students are expected to produce a research-based thesis or dissertation in English and to disseminate their findings in three languages—English, Russian, and Kazakh—in local and international academic journals. The authors will present the results of an explanatory mixed methods study which sought to address two main questions: 1) To what extent and in what ways do students apply and transfer their knowledge of genre structures and practices across three languages, English, Kazakh, and Russian? 2) Which pedagogical approaches or strategies do students and teachers identify as beneficial in supporting genre knowledge and skills development across three languages? A survey was administered to students who matriculated between 2013-2016 in the university’s Masters and PhD programmes in Education (N=364). Follow up interviews were conducted with a subsample of current students (n=12), alumni (n=12), faculty (n=4) and Academic English instructors (n=2).
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Languaging in a CLIL-based EAP writing course: the case of writing in English for Urban Design

Speaker(s): Eva Braidwood, University of Oulu

Session Type: Paper presentation

Session: 27E Room: Windsor 1-03

To enhance the relevance of language learning at graduate level, several of our English for Academic Purposes courses have been recently integrated with subject courses across the disciplines. As basic pedagogical approach in this integration process, CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning) has been applied owing to its quadruple framework of developmental target: Content, Communication, Cognition and Culture. One such course is the integrated Urban Design seminar and EAP course, for second year students of architecture. The major common assignment is an argumentative academic essay (quasi-publishable), based on a set book, a classic in urban design. The examples taken from various stages of the students’ essays will demonstrate how the writing process contributes to the acquisition of new Content, such as concepts and analytical tools in urban design; the development of written Communication, such as creating definitions, extending definitions, connecting textual elements, using multi-modal communicational tools; the enhancement of Cognition, such as critical thinking, opinion formation, argumentation, recognising and providing evidence; and the encouragement of the awareness of Cultural aspects in both discipline-specific and discourse-specific language use. To provide for all these aspects of developmental targets, we have adopted the process writing approach, which is accompanied by close reading tasks, revisions and self-corrections based on teacher and student feedback. In addition, small group discussions, consultations and tutorials enhance the learning process, as these focus primarily on supporting students with languaging, ‘the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language’ (Swain 2006, p.8), which in turn advances their competence in writing. These examples from a B2/C1 level writing assignment demonstrate how the essay writing process ‘involves learning to use language appropriately whilst using language to learn effectively’ (Coyle 2006, p.9).
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