



**Canadian Association  
for the Study of  
Discourse and Writing**



## **Detailed Program**

**Final Version: May 22, 2012**

### **Discourse, Writing and Interdisciplinarity**

**The 4th Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing / Association canadienne de redactologie (CASDW/ACR)**

**Wilfrid Laurier University  
Kitchener-Waterloo, Ontario, Canada,  
May 26, 27, 28 2012**

### **Discours, écriture et interdisciplinarité**

**La quatrième Conférence annuelle de l'Association canadienne de rédaction/Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing (ACR/CASDW)**

**Université Wilfrid Laurier  
Kitchener-Waterloo, Ontario, Canada  
Les 26, 27 et 28 mai 2012**

## CASDW 2012 – Detailed Program

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Day 1 Saturday May 26, 2012</b>   |  |
| <b>9:00-10:00 KEYNOTE</b> – Peters Building 3067<br><b>Natasha Artemeva (with Janna Fox) - From the Academy to the Workplace: The Formation of a Professional Communicator</b>   |  |
| The overview of recent and current literature presented in this talk focuses on the approaches to bridging the gap between the academic and workplace contexts and on the current understanding of how novices become (or fail to become) competent communicators within their professional communities of practice. I will attempt to review the current state of research in the area and discuss possible directions in which this area may be developing in the future.  |  |
| 10:00-10:30 Break  |  |
| 10:30--12:00 Sessions  |  |
| <p><b>INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS</b> – Peters Building 3067</p> <p><b><i>Discourses of Social Issues</i></b></p> <p>1. <b>Diana Wegner - Tactical Responses to Uncertainty in the Struggle for the Homeless.</b></p> <p>How does the presence of advocacy discourse in lower level genres affect responses to underfunding of the homeless and the consequent, general uncertainty about funding for housing the homeless? The framework for this study integrates rhetorical genre theory, the concept of uptake, Foucault’s representation of the subject and power, and the study of enduring struggles. Data is drawn from interviews and meetings of stakeholders, a corpus of Homelessness Strategy plans, and other related documents.</p> <p>2. <b>Graham Smart - The Discursive Construction of Trust/Distrust through Social Representations of Science: The Case of Global Climate Change</b></p> <p>This presentation demonstrates how social representations of science found in different instances of climate-change argumentation serve, rhetorically, to create both trust in and distrust of scientific claims. I use a discourse analysis-grounded framework that draws on theories of socially-created trust, environmental discourse, social representations, and risk to examine a corpus of 100 Internet-published texts, each of which takes a clear position either advocating or opposing the view that human-caused climate change threatens the world with impending catastrophe and that policy-makers must act without delay to counter this risk.</p> <p>1. <b>Erin M. Schartner - The Rhetoric and Ideology of Canadian Midwifery</b></p> <p>The discourse of midwifery resurged in BC during the 1980’s and 1990’s. In 1998 midwifery became a registered form of maternity care. Fourteen years later, even though fully funded by BC Health, only 10 percent of women choose maternity care. This presentation engages with two genres: a student demographics survey and an interview with a practicing midwife. These genres provide valuable information pertaining to the current status of midwifery. In addition, the genres reveal how imperative it is for information to be publicly accessible in order to influence social ideology, and thus the social action pertaining to midwifery.</p> | <p><b>PANEL</b> – Peters Building 3007</p> <p><b>Margaret Procter, Andrea Williams, Brock MacDonald - Teaching and Talking about Writing in the Disciplines</b></p> <p>This panel consists of three writing specialists who have been involved at various stages of the Arts and Science WID initiative. They will use a combination of reflective narrative, discourse analysis, and references to the scholarship of teaching and learning to trace some ways the program has recognized and met its challenges over a period of rapid growth and changes in leadership. Panelists will share the presentation, moving among document display, spoken commentary, and interactive discussion with the audience to further our understanding of writing in the disciplines in a Canadian context.</p> |
| 12:00-1:30 Lunch (On Your Own)   |  |

**Day 1 Saturday May 26, 2012: 1:30-3:00 Sessions**

INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS – Peters Building 3067

**Issues in Writing from Sources**

**1. Doug Brent - The “Research Paper”: What it Is, and Why We Should Still Care**

In this presentation, I will review and rethink the literature on the research paper in order to map out the main threads of argument in this contested domain, focussing especially on arguments about what the form is and why we might or might not want to teach it. Although I will address the matter of instruction, I will concentrate on issues of definition and teleology that are prior to the question of instruction, and try to locate the genre’s place in the mission of the university and of writing studies.

**2. Stephanie Bell - Why Johnny Can’t Cite: WAC Research On Student Citation Practices**

I will discuss my research on the source use and speech representation strategies used by undergraduate history students as they completed book review assignments. I will focus on an interesting case of source misuse in my study corpora and illustrate its connections to the discursive context in which it was produced. In addition, I will detail the interdisciplinary and recursive 3-stage method of analysis that I developed in this study and discuss how it might be repurposed for studies of student citation in other disciplines.

**3. Theresa Moritz - Studying the Treatment of “Common Knowledge” in Expert and Student Writing**

Recent studies suggest that a key concept of writing pedagogy, the handling of source material considered to be common knowledge, needs further attention. The Internet, with its breadth of diverse source material, makes researching more difficult than ever to teach, especially to students confident in their Internet skills. I propose to add to England and Shi’s suggestions for pedagogical techniques one informed by Dimitra Koutsantoni’s 2004 article, “Attitude, Certainty and Allusions to Common Knowledge in Scientific Research Articles,” in which Koutsantoni points to the “markers” in expert academic writing that identify passages considered common knowledge.

INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS – Peters Building 3007

**Pedagogical Practices and Programs**

**1. Ken Tallman - Can An Instructor’s Lack of Familiarity within a Discipline be an Advantage to Students?**

Many instructors find themselves teaching in disciplines in which they are not formally trained. This presentation will propose that an instructor’s lack of familiarity within a discipline can be an asset to students, particularly in those professional disciplines that require students to learn to communicate with a diverse audience. Drawing on student work produced in a second-year course in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Toronto, as well as literature in the Professional Communications field, the presentation will show the specific benefits of multidisciplinary instruction.

**2. Kathryn Alexander, Michael Arntfield - Flourishing in the Contact Zone of Exigency: A Writing Program at the Crossroads**

Unlike many other departments in Arts, the Program in Writing Rhetoric and Professional Communication PWRP at the University of Western Ontario is experiencing exponential growth. We are an emerging Writing Studies department in the making, situated at the crossroads of creative writing, media studies, rhetoric, technical communication, creative writing and professional writing. This presentation will investigate multiple sites within the program and aim to show how the current growth of the creative writing and writing studies minors is reflective of the changing university climate.

**3. Nadeane Trowse - Crossroads or Intersections: Interpreting the Novice/Expert Continuum**

This presentation deconstructs the unitary concept of “good writing” by exploring the distinctions between “expert” and “novice” discourse where we might have expected to uncover similarities. I compare discourse features in prize winning student papers and published papers in the same field to gain insight into how some markers of novice -hood might be a rewarded and rhetorically necessary situational accommodation or social action.

3:00-3:30 Break

**Day 1 Saturday May 26, 2012: 3:30-5:00 Sessions**

**INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS – Peters Building 3067**

***Writing in the Professions***

**1. Jerry Plotnick - Unexamined Assumptions in Evidence-Based Medicine**

This presentation reports on my ongoing research into the logical and epistemological underpinnings of evidence-based medicine. My research asks, what is the relationship between evidence from clinical trials and assertions about the long-term effectiveness of medical treatments? My investigation into practices within the field of clinical trials has led me to believe that certain questions are less likely to be asked by someone within the field than by someone outside. In my talk, I will press the case for interdisciplinarity as a way of broadening the types of questions that can be asked within a discipline.

**2. Rob Irish - Analyzing Models for Negotiating Disagreement in Engineering**

This study examines disagreements between engineers working on a bridge replacement project to understand how they address disagreements. The case reveals a surprising range of practices to facilitate engineering work, from Rogerian rhetorical practices to invocations of ethos to coalescent argumentation (Gilbert, 1997). Analyzing such real-life practices demonstrates how they might inform theoretical understandings of disagreement.

**3. Shahin Moghaddasi Sarabi, Heather Graves - Mathematics is the Method: Exploring the Unique Structure of Argument in Mathematical Research Articles**

The Methods and Results sections in mathematics research articles appear to be unique among academic disciplines in that there are no methods sections in this type of article and there are often multiple results sections. This study demonstrates how these variations are directly linked to global disciplinary assumptions about epistemological contributions; the local demand posed by subject matter, i.e. the problem focused on; the status of the subject in previous research; and, occasionally, authorial preferences. Our findings have implications for teaching academic writing to graduate students and novice writers in the disciplines (especially in mathematics and computer science).

**WORKSHOP– Peters Building 3007**

**Elaine Khoo, Maggie Roberts, Tom Robles, Lydia Wilkinson - Examining an Alternative Paradigm for Supporting English Language Learners' Academic Writing Skills Development**

How can we support student writing across the disciplines in ways that help students develop the skills to cope with the academic reading and writing needs in their courses? This session reports on an innovative approach used at University of Toronto Scarborough since 2006, and adapted at the U of T Faculty of Engineering.

Participants are invited to examine the structure and components of this program to explain how it helps students develop higher levels of critical thinking, academic reading and writing skills. Examination of sample student/tutor exchanges will provide insights about student needs and capabilities, and possible trajectories for the programs. Participants will also critically evaluate assumptions about ELL student needs and abilities in their respective teaching contexts in order to inform future pedagogical decisions.

Evening: No formal plans

**Day 2 Sunday May 27, 2012 9:00 – 10:30 Sessions**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>PANEL – Peters Building 3067</p> <p><b>Dirty Oil/ethical oil/snake oil: Discursive Positioning in Environmental Rhetoric</b></p> <p>This panel examines the rhetorical strategies being used in the competing discourses of the Alberta Oil Sands.</p> <p>“How Dirty are your Ethics? Rhetorical and Philosophical Positioning in the Rhetoric of Oil”<br/>Heather Graves, University of Alberta<br/>Lianne Lefsrud, University of Alberta<br/>Nelson Phillips, Imperial College Business School<br/>This presentation reports the results of a rhetorical and visual analysis of the argumentative strategies used to legitimate/illegitimate the Alberta Oil Sands in a variety of advertisements.</p> <p>“ ‘Ethical Oil’ as a Rhetorical Management Strategy”<br/>Sheena Wilson, University of Alberta<br/>This paper examines how the ethical oil argument is a rhetorical management strategy linked to larger economic and political discourses and how it attempts to persuade citizens from across the political spectrum to support oil sands development through a manufactured media spectacle.</p> <p>“Fuel for Thought: Rhetorics of the Environmental Movement”<br/>Roger Graves, University of Alberta<br/>This presentation will sketch the rhetorical strategies employed by the environmental side in the resource debate.</p> | <p>INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS – Peters Building 3007</p> <p><b>Issues in Plain Language</b></p> <p>1. <b>Kim Garwood - More than words: Examining hidden barriers in plain language texts</b></p> <p>Plain language is generally understood as language that is easy for a document’s intended readers to understand. Most current definitions of plain language focus primarily on word choice and sentence structure. This presentation will discuss other potential barriers to understanding that plain language theorists need to consider, such as figurative language and rhetorical strategies. One potential model for this research, which focuses on a particular audience of readers--seniors (adults aged 65+)--will be presented.</p> <p>2. <b>Bernadette Kassi - Littératie et Rédactologie, Combinaison Gagnante pour une Information Accessible</b></p> <p>Présentation d’une étude documentaire (50 sources) précisant les critères d’élaboration de documents destinés aux personnes vivant avec un handicap ou ayant des compétences réduites en littératie. Ces critères sont regroupés selon les concepts clés (accessibilité, lisibilité, intelligibilité, langage simplifié) et structurés selon les aspects d’un texte (visuel, linguistique, informatif, structurel). Le Guide de rédaction pour une information accessible (2011), résultat de cette recherche, est destiné aux rédacteurs de textes utilitaires.</p> <p><b>Issues in Educational Policy</b></p> <p>3. <b>Tyler Evans-Tokaryk - Repetition and Difference in the Discourse of Plagiarism: A Discursive Analysis of Canadian Universities’ Policies and Practices</b></p> <p>This paper uses Critical Discourse Analysis to perform a micro-level textual analysis of 3 rather different Canadian universities’ websites, focusing specifically on the language in documents relating to policies, practices, and procedures surrounding plagiarism. I discuss two findings: 1) a set of correlations between an institution’s definition of plagiarism and the practices surrounding; 2) similarities and differences among different institutions’ approaches to the issue of plagiarism. I conclude that there is no single definition of plagiarism in the Canadian post-secondary system, and that the confusion surrounding this term contributes to a number of conflicting pedagogical practices.</p> |
|---|---|

**10:30-11:00 Break**

**Day 2 Sunday May 27, 2012 11:00 – 12:30 Sessions**

**INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS – Peters Building 3067**

***Studies in Genre and Rhetorical Moves***

**1. Elena Afros - Replying/Responding in Language Studies**

It has increasingly been recognized that academic discourse constitutes not only a site of consensus and further development of research but also a forum for debate, which at times can be contentious and face threatening. Cross-disciplinary investigations demonstrate that negative evaluation figures prominently in Language Studies. To gain a deeper insight into the discourse of conflict in Linguistics, the present paper focuses on Replies/Responses, a genre whose primary communicative purpose is to ward off counterclaims raised in previous publications. In particular, it explores rhetorical strategies linguists employ to respond to negative evaluation of their work or of theories/schools they associate themselves with.

**2. Philip Sloan - "A different way of thinking": Literate practices and professional identity of three Canadian lawyers**

This presentation reports the results of a qualitative study of the literate practices of three Canadian lawyers. Drawing on a series of ethnographic interviews, I discuss the tense and often conflicted relationship between lawyers and the discourses they employ, touching on a number of interrelated issues, including legalese and "plain English," the characterization of writing as "skills," and lawyerly identity. Participant responses indicate that assimilating a legal identity – "thinking like a lawyer" – is highly valued by the legal community, but that this identity is often difficult to reconcile with one's non-legal self.

**3. Jacqueline McLeod-Rogers - Reading and Writing the Linguistic Landscape**

I propose to connect recent developments in Linguistic Landscape theory to writing studies and to present a brief LL reading of place to model how this approach is effective in defamiliarizing "taken for granted" local discourses. An LL approach is responsive to the interests of writing scholars and teachers committed to reading and writing the local environment and to understanding how place influences identity and language and how language produces place.

**PANEL – Peters Building 3007**

**Katharine Patterson, Rick Gooding, Katja Theime, Anneke van Enk, Jackie Rae**

**The Researching "Research" Project: Implications for Teaching Writing-in-the-Disciplines**

This multi-method project has focused on students' understandings of "research," including understandings which may conflict with the scholarly idea of research as a knowledge-making enterprise directed by disciplinary epistemologies and protocols. Our study design included corpus analysis, discourse analysis, closed and open-ended questionnaires, and visual methods to investigate representations of research in the press, popular culture, British Columbia Ministry of Education curriculum documents, and students' experiences on campus and in high school. In this talk, we will highlight the pedagogical implications of our research, focusing on students' varied responses to the invitation to embrace scholarly identities and practices.

12:30-2:00 Lunch (On Your Own)

| Day 2 Sunday May 27, 2012: 2:00-3:30 Sessions   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>ROUNDTABLE</b>– Peters Building 3067<br/> <b>Melinda Gough, Melissa Carroll, Heather Graves, Kathryn Alexander, Penelope Ironstone, Susan Searls Giroux</b><br/> <b>How and Why to Teach Writing in and through the Humanities</b></p> <p>This roundtable takes up what is at stake in teaching undergraduate writing in the humanities in Canada today given institutional contexts that include larger class sizes, greater reliance on graduate TA labour, an increasingly neo-liberal political and economic framework, and a national history of writing instruction that, as Roger Graves has shown, focuses less on creating engaged citizens and more on fostering good traditional "academic writers." Against this backdrop, how are the changing needs and expectations of our students helping universities to re-envision the role of composition and rhetoric instruction in provocative and diverse ways? In what ways is teaching writing a political act, one that pushes beyond academia?</p> <p>Heather Graves (University of Alberta) makes the case for teaching writing with an eye to critical thinking and analysis.</p> <p>Susan Searls Giroux (McMaster) suggests that a commitment to writing pedagogy underscores the moral and political nature of the teacher-student relationship and marks the classroom as an "interested," rather than neutral or objective, site.</p> <p>Melissa Carroll and Melinda Gough (McMaster) discuss a recent writing pilot for large first-year lecture courses in literature and cultural studies; present research regarding TA expectations that writing instruction must be undertaken with an eye to the anti-neoliberal framework that underpins cultural studies frameworks; and describe how professorial mentorship in the teaching of writing can have positive effects on graduate TA confidence levels in and commitment to teaching writing.</p> <p>Penelope Ironstone (Wilfrid Laurier) describes her participation in a recent Faculty of Arts effort to "stop the drop" through a first-year seminar course designed to encompass "University 101" skills remediation, including critical reading and writing.</p> <p>Kathryn Alexander (Western Ontario) reflects on teaching scientific and technical communication and facilitating the development of professional writing portfolios from an academic background in writing studies, critical and feminist literacy studies, social justice, and curriculum theory.</p> | <p><b>WORKSHOP</b> – Peters Building 3007<br/> <b>Rosamund Woodhouse</b><br/> <b>What are the implications of academic literacies for writing instruction and research?</b></p> <p>This workshop is a collaborative exploration of the opportunities and challenges of academic literacies for teaching and research on academic writing. We will use an inquiry-based approach to examine our roles and work with students in comparison to 'deficit models' of academic writing instruction, to identify strategies that participants currently use to address or integrate academic literacies in their work with students or faculty, to explore the perceived benefits and challenges of connecting academic writing (and other instruction) with academic literacies, and to generate questions for future research.</p> |
| 3:30-4:00 Break   |  |

**Day 2 Sunday May 27, 2012: 4:00 – 5:30 Sessions**

INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS – Peters Building 3067

***Writing in Professional Communities***

**1. Peter Eliot Weiss - The Engineering Communication Program at a Crossroad: Portfolios and the Evolution of Language**

This paper will explore the connections between instruction modes in Language Across the Curriculum and those we implement and are planning to implement in portfolio courses in U of T's Engineering Communication Program. What parts of the LAC process can be applied to the current situation to ensure our methods benefit from our experiences? From what we have experienced, what information can we pass on to current LAC and WAC programs looking to increase their work with students through portfolio type projects?

**2. Allan McDougall, Lorelei Lingard, Catherine Schryer, Marlee Spafford - Dimensions of team distribution in transplant care: An ethnographic study**

Genre theory is a theoretical lens with which to explore communication in healthcare. We present data gathered from a longitudinal, ethnographic study of a tertiary care transplant team, a fascinating point of study for communication researchers, as professional specializations, high-stakes clinical decisions, and unique genres are mediated by philosophies of donor organ allocation.

INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS – Peters Building 3007

***Aboriginal Voices***

**1. Jon Gordon, Anna Chilewska - Cree Students Writing About Writing in English**

Is it possible for Aboriginal identity to establish a place for itself in academic writing? We consider this question in relation to our experiences teaching Writing Studies 1101 using a writing-about-writing approach at Maskwachees Cultural College. We argue that using this approach, while encouraging explicit examination of the place of Aboriginal identity in academic writing, can lessen the cultural imposition First Year Composition can carry. This approach encourages students to make informed choices about their writing, how it needs to be shaped according to genre constraints, discourse community expectations, rhetorical situation, academic guidelines, and also cultural background and language variety.

**2. Shurli Makmillen, Katja Thieme - Indigenization and Academic Writing: Writing Assignments in Courses with Aboriginal Content**

Our presentation explores the consequences of Indigenization for the genres of undergraduate student writing. For example, we ask how and to what degree course outlines and assignment descriptions make space for what Jo-ann Archibald calls "storywork." What is the relation between a course's writing assignments and attempts at bringing Aboriginal ways of making knowledge into university settings? To explore these questions, this project relies on discourse-based interviews with instructors of Aboriginal studies courses.

**6:30: Dinner at Solé, 83 Erb St. West, Building 2, Waterloo, Ontario. RSVP Boba Samuels, bsamuels@wlu.ca**



|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Day 3 Monday May 28, 2012</b>  |  |
| <b>9:00-10:00 KEYNOTE</b> – Peters Building 3067<br><b>Louise Phelps, Old Dominion University, Virginia</b><br><b>The Historical Formation of Academic Identities: Rhetoric and Composition, Discourse and Writing</b><br>In Canadian discourse about these prospects, Canadian futures are often framed in terms of cultural differences and opposition to what is called the “American model” of first-year composition as a basis for the intellectual development of a field. I will complicate and ultimately challenge the standard version of that comparison as reflecting an incomplete, oversimplified, and outdated view of the historical formation of rhetoric and composition in the U.S. By deconstructing and reconstructing that comparison in more pluralistic terms, I will lay the ground for suggestions about a way forward for Canadian efforts to develop a distinctive identity and place—territoire—for its writing scholars and teachers.  |  |
| 10:00-10:30 Break   |  |
| 10:30-12:00 Sessions  |  |
| <p>INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS – Peters Building 3067</p> <p><b>Writing Programs and Pedagogies</b></p> <p>1. <b>Steve Marshall - Foundational Academic Literacy at SFU : Multilingualism, Multiliteracies, and Making the Transition to Writing-Intensive Learning</b><br/>I present data from an ongoing, SSHRC-funded, longitudinal research project into the multilingualism and multiliteracies of first year university students in Vancouver, British Columbia. Analysis of participants’ interview responses and literacy practices reveals how they make informed and knowledgeable choices about how, where, and when they should conform to the hegemonic norms of the academy, and when they can take risks with the multi in their multilingualism and multiliteracies.</p> <p>2. <b>Jodie Salter, Margaret Hundleby, J. P. Lewis, Kim Garwood - Helping Graduate Student Writers Get Back On Track: Dissertation Boot Camp</b><br/>In an effort to assist graduate students struggling with thesis writing, in 2011 the University of Guelph piloted a “dissertation boot camp” modeled after successful programs in the United States. The program has been well-received by students and faculty and is now offered once a term. In this presentation, we will describe the program’s structure and rationale, planning and implementation, participants’ feedback, and our future plans. This session will be of interest to those who work with graduate student writers or who are graduate student writers themselves.</p> <p>3. <b>Theresa Hyland, Grace Howell, Allan McDougall - Upstairs/ Downstairs: Conversations from the Attic (about the classrooms below): How professors convey their expectations about writing assignments to their students</b><br/>This presentation discusses a series of discipline-based, faculty focus groups in which professors outlined their expectations for students’ writing. The study has three objectives: (1) to gain a fuller understanding of how professors convey their expectations to their students; (2) to allow professors to critically reflect on their practice; (3) to contribute to the Graves et al, Canada-wide mapping project. We will outline the forms and focus-group questions we developed and the preliminary findings from our analysis of these materials.</p> | <p>WORKSHOP - TBA</p> <p><b>Betsy Sargent</b><br/><b>Assessing Assessment: Testing to Teach What We Want to Teach</b></p> <p>At the University of Alberta, we have been collecting data through a 50-question Writing Strategies Inventory (WSI) since the fall of 2007. After completing it a second time, students compare their answers (start of term to end of term) and then reflect (via inkshedding) for a minimum of thirty minutes on 3-5 paired questions that intrigue them. The WSI thus helps students and instructors alike to focus on our primary goal in WRS 101, which is to build together a richer and more useful conception of writing expertise which will transfer to each student’s subsequent courses and writing tasks.</p> <p>In this workshop, all participants will complete the latest version of the WSI online themselves and see how the online version works for students in class, including the charts it produces instantly for students as soon as they complete the WSI the second time near the end of term.</p> |
| <b>12:00-1:30 Lunch (On Your Own)</b>   |  |

**Day 3 Monday May 28, 2012: 1:30-3:00 Sessions**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS – Peters Building 3067</p> <p><b><i>Pedagogical Practices</i></b></p> <p>1. <b>Melissa Duffy, Roger Azevedo, Krista Muis – Getting Lost in a Great Idea: Why Students with a Mastery Goal may Jeopardize their Performance on Writing Assignments</b></p> <p>This study examines relations between university students’ epistemic beliefs, achievement goals, and self-reported writing strategies. Data was collected from questionnaires, interviews, and journals. Quantitative analyses revealed that a performance goal significantly predicted writing achievement, whereas a mastery goal did not. Qualitative findings suggested that students with different goal orientations approach the task in distinctive ways.</p> <p>4. <b>Ryan Gibbs - Determining Remedial Best Practices for Ontario Community Colleges</b></p> <p>In 2010 Roger Fisher and Whitney Hoth wrote a report surveying current practices on literacy assessment, placement, and remediation in the province’s community colleges. The proposed model for remediation in the report is ladder curriculum whereby remediation is provided through mandatory remedial courses for students requiring further preparation in language proficiency to ensure success in their first postsecondary English courses. My paper will present an inventory of best practices that goes beyond standard conceptions of “remedial” instruction.</p> <p>5. <b>Ali Hadidi - Fostering Argumentative Writing Ability in the Zone of Proximal Development: A Dynamic Assessment</b></p> <p>This research report concerns the different information obtained from summative and dynamic assessments of argumentative writing ability. After a brief theoretical and methodological overview, the talk will feature the application of Vygotskian informed socio-cultural theory of mind to writing assessment. Toulmin-based argumentative writing was taught to operationalize a knowledge-transforming mode of writing, in which the very act of writing helps transform knowledge. The dynamic assessment of students within their zone of proximal development helped the researcher (a) know the student abilities that would only emerge through mediation and (b) promote such abilities so that the learner would move toward self-regulation.</p> | <p>PANEL – Peters Building 3007</p> <p><b>Xuemei Li, Cecile Badenhorst, Morgan Gardner, Elizabeth Yeoman</b></p> <p><b>Negotiating Culture and Voice in Academic Writing</b></p> <p>Academic writing entails specific requirements that are not consistent across cultures and contexts. At the crossroad when writers find a direct route is impossible for them, they have to negotiate a path to reach their destinations. In this panel, we discuss the negotiation of culture and voice in academic writing from four perspectives: international graduate students writing for academic courses, faculty members writing for publications, high school youth learning to write academic text, and an aboriginal elder trying to maintain her voice in English.</p> |
|--|--|

**3:00-3:30 Break**

**3:30-4:30 Annual General Meeting – Peters Building 3067**