

SUNDAY, MAY 28

All sessions to take place virtually and in Accolade West, room ACW 205, Keele Campus, York U

TIME	PRESENTERS	SESSION TITLE
8:30 AM COFFEE/TEA	Coffee, tea, and snacks available outside ACW 205	
8:50 AM	Sarah Banting and Joel Heng Hartse (in person)	Welcome to CASDW/ACR 2023
9-10 AM	Intro: Sarah Banting Katja Thieme (in person)	Plenary 1
10-11 AM SESSION 1	Chair: Karen Ruddy Andrea Williams (in person) Sara Humphreys (virtual) Taunya Tremblay, Jamie Zeppa, Lavaughn John, Christine Dalton & Victoria Yeoman (in person)	Experiments in Course Design Writing the Land and the Self in the City: Reconciling Land-Based Pedagogy with an Environmental Writing Course in an Urban University (presentation of research) Where's the Data? Designing a First Year Writing Course in Canada (presentation of research) The Anxiety of Non-Mastery: Professor and Student Voices Around Authentic Assessments (presentation of research)
11-11:15 AM BREAK		
11:15 AM -12:15 PM SESSION 2	Chair: Sreemali Herath Jonathan Vroom, Zach Richer, Julius Haag, & Catherine Yeh (in person) Moberley Luger & Craig Stensrud (virtual) Loren Gaudet & Lydia Toorenburgh (virtual)	Equity, Belonging, Well-being in the Writing Course The Self-Efficacy and Wellbeing Benefits of One-off Virtual Writing Retreats for Large Introductory Undergraduate Courses (presentation of research) Equitable Assessments for Oral Presentations: Seeking Connections Between Academic Writing and Speaking Instruction (presentation of an innovative approach to teaching or assessment) Belonging as a Learning Outcome (presentation of research)

12:15-1:15 PM LUNCH BREAK	Happening at this time: Congress Big Thinking Lecture: Alanis Obomsawin, “Seeds of the future: Climate justice, racial justice, and Indigenous resurgence”	
1:30-2:30 PM SESSION 3	Sreemali Harath, Antoinette Gagne, Mary-Ann Fowler, Jade Kim, Victorina Baxan, Elena Danilina (in person)	Let’s talk about writing support for plurilingual graduate students: A critical analytic collaborative autoethnography (ROUNDTABLE)
2:30-3:30 PM SESSION 4	Chair: Michael Cournoyea Fiona Coll (in person) Kelvin Quintyne (in person) Joel Heng Hartse and Kiyu Itoi (in person)	Students Learning, Writing, Teaching Writing as thinking, genre as model: an approach to genre-based academic writing pedagogy in the graduate STEM context. (presentation of an innovative approach to teaching or assessment) Taking Note of Doctoral Comprehensive Exam Preparation (presentation of research) “It’s Still My Work”: International Undergraduates Discuss The Use of Paid Writing Help (presentation of research)
3:30-3:45 PM BREAK		
3:45-4:45 PM SESSION 5	Joel Heng Hartse, Sibon Chen, Britt Amel, & Emilie Brancato (in person and virtual)	This was (not) written by AI: On the panic, power, and possibilities of twenty-first century text generation (ROUNDTABLE)
4:45-5:45 PM SESSION 6	Chair: Boba Samuels James Southworth (in person) Stephen Guy (in person) Nazih El-Bezre (virtual)	Writing to Reflect, Create, Relate How Writing Challenges the “Mainstream Concept of Critical Thinking” (presentation of research) Using Creative Methods in Technical and Professional Writing Classrooms (presentation of innovative approach to teaching or assessment) Raising Undergraduate Students’ Genre Awareness through Reflective Writing (presentation of research)
6:00 – 10:00 PM Rendezvous no later than 6:00 PM 5:45 - 7:00 PM	CASDW/ACR dinner at Her Father’s Cider Bar + Kitchen at Spadina and Harbord in downtown Toronto (pay your own way) Meet outside our conference room (AC 205) no later than 6:00 pm to travel together via subway, guided by James Corcoran Also on: Congress President’s Reception for CASDW/ACR and other associations (5-7pm) Atrium, Scott Library, York University Keele Campus	

MONDAY, MAY 29

All sessions to take place virtually and in Accolade West, room ACW 205, Keele Campus, York U

TIME	PRESENTERS	SESSION TITLE
8:30 AM COFFEE/TEA	Coffee, tea, and snacks available outside ACW 205	
9-10 AM	Intro: James Corcoran Caroline Payant	Découvrir la littérature à travers un prisme plurilingue : une déconstruction des idéologies monolingues afin de favoriser des pratiques inclusives en littérature
10-11 AM SESSION 7	Chair: Andrea Williams Tyler Evans-Tokaryk and Michael Karani (in person and virtual) Saul Carliner (in person) Michael Kaler (in person)	Teaching Writing in Complex Contexts Measuring writing transfer at the University of Dar es Salaam: A report on the baseline data (presentation of research) One course, two paths: Differentiating among educational and professional communication (presentation of innovative approach to teaching or assessment) How TAs see and work with student writing (presentation of research)
11-11:15 AM BREAK		
11:15 AM - 12:00 PM SESSION 8	Chair: Saul Carliner Diana Wegner (in person) Michael Cournoyea & Boba Samuels (in person)	Public Genres A Genre Analysis of the Intermediary Function of Public Inquiries: Uptake Anxiety and Enactments as Indices of Genre Stability and Viability (presentation of research) Red Flags and Dog Children: A Genre Analysis of CaRMS Personal Statements (presentation of research)
12:00-2:00 PM CATERED LUNCH & CASDW AGM	Please join us for catered lunch and conversation starting at 12:00 noon The CASDW/ACR Annual General Meeting starts at 12:30pm – all conference attendees are warmly encouraged to attend	

<p>2:00-3:00 PM SESSION 9</p>	<p>Chair: James Corcoran</p> <p>Ibtissem Knouzi, Olga Makinina and Saskia Van Viegen (in person)</p> <p>Ali Hadidi (in person)</p> <p>James Corcoran and Sophie Corbière (in person)</p>	<p>L2 Writing: Research from York University</p> <p>Fostering Instructor Professional Learning and Student Success through the Implementation of Genre-based Pedagogy in an ESL Course</p> <p>Learner empowerment through dynamic assessment of writing development</p> <p>Scholarly Writing at a Bilingual College: Charting the Plurilingual Landscape</p>
<p>3:00-3:15 PM BREAK</p>		
<p>3:15-4:15 PM SESSION 10</p>	<p>Chair: James Corcoran</p> <p>Eugenia Vasilopoulos (in person)</p> <p>Katie Fry (in person)</p> <p>Srividya Natarajan & Emily Pez (virtual)</p>	<p>Innovations in EAP Pedagogies</p> <p>The Potential for Transformative Pedagogies in Canadian EAP: Instructors' Perceptions of Plurilingualism in English Academic Writing (presentation of research)</p> <p>A Corpus-Based Approach to Academic Vocabulary Building in L2 Writing (Presentation of an innovative approach to teaching or assessment)</p> <p>Critical Pedagogy, Multilingual Writing Instruction, and Textbook Creation (presentation of an innovative approach to teaching or assessment)</p>
<p>4:15- 5:15 PM SESSION 11</p>	<p>Chair: Tessa Troughton</p> <p>Karen Ruddy (in person)</p> <p>Émilie Michaud (in person)</p> <p>Codie Fortin Lalonde (in person)</p>	<p>Inquiries in Writing Theory and Methods</p> <p>The Affective Dimensions of Writing Transfer (presentation of research)</p> <p>La recherche-action, au cœur de la rédactologie (presentation of research)</p> <p>Critical Discourse Studies Approaches to Education: Doctoral Wayfinding to an Analytic Tapestry (presentation of research)</p>

Abstracts on following pages

PLENARIES

Caroline Payant (in person)

Découvrir la littératie à travers un prisme plurilingue : une déconstruction des idéologies monolingues afin de favoriser des pratiques inclusives en littératie [English version follows]

La recherche empirique dans le domaine de la littératie en langue seconde/additionnelle continue d'évoluer et l'adoption d'une posture critique crée un espace pour examiner les façons dont les individus mobilisent leurs ressources plurilingues pour créer du sens « socialement situé ». Cependant, la recherche continue de se concentrer principalement sur l'apprentissage et l'enseignement d'une langue, notamment l'anglais, de sorte que la recherche sur les pratiques en littératie plurilingue est reléguée au second-plan. Dans cette présentation, j'aborderai la nécessité de se pencher sur les questions relatives à l'hégémonie de l'anglais dans le milieu universitaire et je discuterai des différentes manières de promouvoir la pratique de littératie plurilingue. Je soulignerai que, pour voir l'impact réel à long terme de la recherche plurilingue, nous devons ancrer notre pratique dans la praxis, c'est-à-dire nous engager véritablement dans une démarche de réflexion et d'action pour façonner et transformer le monde par le biais de la recherche plurilingue dans les espaces scolaires traditionnellement monolingues.

Je commencerai par un survol de la recherche sur la littératie, tout en mettant l'accent sur les pratiques d'écriture plurilingues, qui illustrent la relation fluide et interconnectée entre les ressources langagières des individus. J'aborderai ensuite la recherche que j'ai menée avec des chercheurs plurilingues émergents et établis pour mettre en évidence la manière dont l'adoption d'une position plurilingue permet de remettre en question l'idéologie linguistique monolingue si répandue aujourd'hui dans l'enseignement supérieur. Je conclurai cette communication en abordant les stratégies qui soutiennent les chercheurs émergents et établis dans le développement d'une posture qui valorise les pratiques de littératie plurilingue.

Exploring literacy through a plurilingual lens: Challenging monolingual ideologies to foster inclusive and empowering practices

Empirical research in the field of second/additional language writing continues to evolve and the adoption of a critical stance creates a space to examine the ways in which individuals engage their rich plurilingual resources to create socially-situated meaning. However, research continues to focus primarily on the learning and teaching of English, such that research with other languages continues to be positioned on the periphery. In this presentation, I address the urgency to examine issues pertaining to the hegemony of English in academia and discuss ways to engage in plurilingual literacies. I will argue that, in order to see the real long-term impact of plurilingual scholarship, we must ground our practice in praxis, namely, engage in committed reflection and action to shape and transform the world through plurilingual scholarship in traditionally monolingual academic spaces.

I begin with an overview of literacy and writing research with a focus on plurilingual writing practices, illustrating the fluid and interconnected relationship between individuals' linguistic resources. I then discuss research with emerging and established plurilingual researchers to highlight how adopting a plurilingual stance challenges the monolingual language ideology that is so prevalent today in higher education. I will conclude this talk by addressing strategies that support emerging and established researchers as they develop a stance that values plurilingual literacy practices.

Payant, C. et Bell, P. (2023). Developing academic biliteracies through plurilingual integrated writing tasks: Students perceptions and reported practices. Dans R. Wette (Dir.), Teaching and learning source-based writing: Current perspectives and future directions. Routledge.

Payant, C. et Galante, A. (Dir.) (2022). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: Pedagogical approaches for empowerment and validation [Numéro spécial]. *TESL Canada Journal*, 2(31).
<https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v38i2.1363>

Payant, C, Potvin-Cloutier, E. et Atramah, A. (soumis). Une exploration de la discrimination linguistique de la perspective de participantes-chercheuses en contexte franco-québécois.

Katja Thieme (in person)

PRESENTATIONS AND ROUNDTABLES

In alphabetical order by first author/presenter's last name

Saul Carliner, presentation of innovative approach to teaching (in person)

ONE COURSE, TWO PATHS: DIFFERENTIATING AMONG EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION

e-Concordia, the online education unit of Concordia University, recently overhauled its undergraduate writing elective, Educational Communication. The course is intended for students who have successfully completed basic writing instruction and want to develop professional communication skills. When originally designed, the course was intended as a technical writing course but it was offered by an education department. Although successful in terms of enrolment, it never fully addressed the needs of its students. Many students were education majors and minors and students in adjacent fields like Applied Human Sciences for which this course. But they received little guidance in developing educational materials. Similarly, many other students taking the course were commerce majors, especially marketing and management majors, but received limited guidance in developing materials in genres they would encounter in their work.

The revised course addressed this challenge by providing two paths through the content: one focusing on educational genres and the other focusing on commerce-oriented genres. To do this, however, required identifying which genres applies to both paths, which ones would be most relevant to education students and which ones would be most relevant to commerce students. This presentation explores the selection of genres and identification of specific writing conventions for purposes of education and commerce. First considered is the essential difference between communicating for instructional purposes (education) and informational purposes (commerce). In both academic and professional circles, the two are unique. In education, the subfield of instructional design called message design addresses communication for instructional purposes. Instructional design is an application of educational (behaviorist and cognitive) psychology (Molenda, Reigeluth, & Nelson, 1983) and takes a cognitive approach to writing (Foshay, Silber, & Stelnicki, 2003; Schriver, 1997; Felker, Pickering, Charrow, Holland, & Redish, 1981). The communication supports instruction, whose goal is mastering skills and learners should retain the material (Carliner, 2015). By contrast, the subfield of rhetoric and composition called professional and technical communication explores communication for informational purposes (Johnson-Eiola & Selber, 2013). It primarily takes a rhetorical approach and is influenced by user experience design (Spinuzzi 2005, 2003). The goal of communicating for informational purposes is to provide material needed to perform a task and users need not retain the material (Spinuzzi, 2003).

Despite the differences in goals and need to retain material, both instructional and informational communication use many of the same core "components" of writing, including definitions, descriptions, and procedures. Instructional

material also includes other specific components, including objectives and tests. The former establish goals for the resulting materials and the latter assess the extent to which students have achieved those objectives (Dick, Carey, & Carey, 2014).

The genres that apply these components differ. One example of an instructional genre is the lesson plan, a moment-by-moment outline of an individual class session that also identifies related objectives and the relationship of the lesson to the associated course (Milkova, 2012). Two examples of informational genres include references, collections of similar technical information presented with the same template (Alred, Brusaw, & Oliu, 2009), and announcements, which share news about organizations through press releases and social media posts (Bremner, 2014). Some genres serve both instructional and informational purposes, such as how-to articles, which provide guidance in performing tasks more efficiently and effectively.

Although both instructional and informational communication benefit from clarity, conciseness, and precision, certain specific communication techniques characterize each. For example, because instructional material builds skills, it includes activities to provide opportunities to practice skills and receive feedback. Instructional communication also emphasizes clear feedback that recognizes students' likely reaction to the feedback to minimize the likelihood that the feedback inhibits motivation to master the skill. Informational communication, too, considers reactions to the overall message of the material.

Although an introductory course trying to address both instructional and informational communication cannot address all of the unique characteristics of each, it can familiarize students with the distinct natures of the two, some key similarities and some differences and prepare students to apply these skills in their academic work now and professional work later.

References

- Alred, G. J., Brusaw, C. T., & Oliu, W. E. (2009). *Handbook of technical writing*. Macmillan.
- Bremner, S. (2014). Genres and processes in the PR industry: Behind the scenes with an intern writer. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 51(3), 259-278.
- Carliner, S. (2015.) *Training Design Basics* (2nd ed). Alexandria, VA: ATD Press.
- Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2014). *The Systematic Design of Instruction* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Felker, D. B., Pickering, F., Charrow, V. R., Holland, V. M., & Redish, J. C. (1981.) *Guidelines for Document Designers*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Foshay, R., Silber, K. H., & Stelnicki, M. (2003). Writing training materials that work. *TechTrends*, 47(2), 67.
- Johnson-Eilola, J., & Selber, S. A. (2013). Solving problems in technical communication. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 56(3), 256-259.
- Milkova, S. (2012). Strategies for effective lesson planning. *Center for Research on Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 1-29.
- Molenda, M., Reigeluth, C. M., & Nelson, L. M. (2003). Instructional design. In L. Nadel (Ed.),

Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. Retrieved from http://search.credoreference.com/content/entry/wiley/cs/instructional_design/0

Schrivver, K. A. (1997). *Dynamics in Document Design: Creating Text for Readers*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc..

Spinuzzi, C. (2005). The methodology of participatory design. *Technical communication*, 52(2), 163-174.

Spinuzzi, C. (2003). *Tracing genres through organizations: A sociocultural approach to information design* (Vol. 1). Mit Press.

Fiona Coll, presentation of innovative approach to teaching (in person)

WRITING AS THINKING, GENRE AS MODEL: AN APPROACH TO GENRE-BASED ACADEMIC WRITING PEDAGOGY IN THE GRADUATE STEM CONTEXT

In what ways do communicative genres and scientific models resemble one another? In what ways do they differ? And what pedagogical affordances might unfold in a juxtaposition of genre and model as theoretical frameworks? In this presentation, I will combine ideas from genre-based academic writing pedagogy with recent epistemological arguments about the nature of scientific explanatory representation to suggest a conceptual grounding that helps to explain what writing instructors mean when we say that “writing is thinking.” Specifically, I will describe my efforts to show graduate students in STEM fields how they might consider academic writing genres less in terms of templates to be filled out for the purposes of informing or persuading other people and more in terms of discursive representations akin to scientific models that can enable their own understanding. By shifting attention away from the external-facing endpoints that often dominate graduate students’ thinking about their writing and towards the internal-facing benefits of writing as an epistemic practice, this genre-as-tool-for-thinking approach encourages graduate STEM students to re-imagine their relationship to writing, and I will offer examples of student writing and reflection on that writing to demonstrate the benefits and challenges of this reimagining. At the same time, this approach offers some purchase on the larger question of how we might reckon with writing in an age of proliferating artificial-intelligence writing platforms. As platforms like WriteSonic, Jasper, and ChatGPT build on remarkable performances of writing output, the benefits of writing-to-think processes seem ever more salient, as long as those benefits can be successfully communicated in creative, discipline-specific ways.

James Corcoran and Sophie Corbière, presentation of research (in person)

SCHOLARLY WRITING AT A BILINGUAL COLLEGE: CHARTING THE PLURILINGUAL LANDSCAPE

The past decades have seen a growing body of work charting the experiences of global scholars writing for publication from a variety of peripheral and semi-peripheral locales outside Anglophone centres of knowledge production (Bennett, 2014; Sheldon, 2020). However, relatively little research has investigated the scholarly writing for publication practices of scholars writing in Canada (Gentil, 2005; Habibie, 2016), including in minority language contexts (St. Onge et al., 2021). This presentation outlines results of the first phase of a mixed-methods instrumental case study (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2014), which, drawing on a recent national survey of Francophone scholars (St-Onge et al., 2021), examines scholarly

writing processes by academics at a bilingual university college, within an English-speaking university. Findings include a varied, plurilingual landscape of knowledge production that points to significant differences by disciplinary affiliation (STEM vs. Social Sciences vs. Humanities) and dominant language of writing (English vs. French vs. English and French). Also noteworthy are the similar and different production processes of those writing for publication in their L1 vs. L2, with widespread use of e-resources. This presentation will be of interest to policy makers, writing scholars, and those supporting emerging and established scholars' research writing.

Michael Cournoyea & Boba Samuels, presentation of research (in person)

RED FLAGS AND DOG CHILDREN: A GENRE ANALYSIS OF CARMS PERSONAL STATEMENTS

Our research presents a genre analysis of residency personal statements for the Canadian Resident Matching Service (CaRMS) submitted by final-year medical students at the University of Toronto Faculty of Medicine. These high stakes applications require final-year medical students to detail their experience, skills, and fit to a specialty in response to program-specific prompts and questions. Given the stakes, students often express anxiety and concern about preparing their personal statements while completing clinical rotations. While some informal resources are available to students as they prepare their statements, they often rely on the guidance and advice of mentors, residents, and career counselors. This research will contribute to the development of personal statement resources and workshops (e.g., Campbell et al., 2016) for final-year medical students and more broadly to similar genres. The analysis is also an opportunity to explore specialty-specific trends, potential biases, and conflicts that arise from disclosures, inclusion of personal stories, and so-called red flags.

Our analysis identifies the typical structures, rhetorical moves, and lexical choices made within these statements both broadly and specific to each medical specialty. Genre and thematic analyses have been conducted on personal statements for doctoral programs (e.g., Chiu, 2016), medical school admissions (Ding, 2007; Wright, 2015), and medical residencies in the United States (Barton et al., 2004; Chandran et al., 2020; Lacy et al., 2020; Osman et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2019). However, no genre analysis has been performed on Canadian residency statements. Such an analysis is especially important given recent concerns about mental health self-disclosure in medical programs and residencies (Aggarwal et al., 2020; Hauer & Hung, 2022; Frush, 2017; Ostapenko et al., 2018; Pheister et al., 2020; Salzer, 2022; Sukhera et al., 2022) and gender-bias in residency personal statements (Babel et al., 2019; Demzik et al., 2021).

References

Aggarwal, R., Coverdale, J., Balon, R., Beresin, E. V., Guerrero, A. P., Louie, A. K., ... & Brenner, A. M. (2020). To disclose or not: Residency application and psychiatric illness. *Academic Psychiatry*, 44(5), 515-518.

Babal, J. C., Gower, A. D., Frohna, J. G., & Moreno, M. A. (2019). Linguistic analysis of pediatric residency personal statements: gender differences. *BMC medical education*, 19(1), 1-9.

Barton, E., Ariail, J., & Smith, T. (2004). The Professional in the Personal: The Genre of Personal Statements in Residency Applications. *Issues in Writing*, 15(1), 76.

Campbell, B. H., Havas, N., Derse, A. R., & Holloway, R. L. (2016). Creating a residency application personal statement writers workshop: fostering narrative, teamwork, and insight at a time of stress. *Academic Medicine*, 91(3), 371-375.

- Chandran, L., Chandran, A. S., & Fischel, J. E. (2020). Crafting compelling personal statements. *Academic Psychiatry*, 44(6), 785-788.
- Chiu, Y. L. T. (2016). 'Singing your tune': Genre structure and writer identity in personal statements for doctoral applications. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 21, 48-59.
- Demzik, A., Filippou, P., Chew, C., Deal, A., Mercer, E., Mahajan, S., ... & Smith, A. B. (2021). Gender-based differences in urology residency applicant personal statements. *Urology*, 150, 2-8.
- Ding, H. (2007). Genre analysis of personal statements: Analysis of moves in application essays to medical and dental schools. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(3), 368-392.
- Frush, B. W. (2017). To Those "Out There". *JAMA*, 318(12), 1107-1108.
- Hauer, K. E., & Hung, E. (2022). Mental health self-disclosure: from stigma to empowerment. *Medical Education*, 56(8), 784-787.
- Lacy, F. A., Chen, H. X., & Morrell, D. S. (2020). Dermatology residency applications: correlation of applicant personal statement content with match result. *Cutis*, 105(2), 83-85.
- Osman, N. Y., Schonhardt-Bailey, C., Walling, J. L., Katz, J. T., & Alexander, E. K. (2015). Textual analysis of internal medicine residency personal statements: themes and gender differences. *Medical Education*, 49(1), 93-102.
- Ostapenko, L., Schonhardt-Bailey, C., Sublette, J. W., Smink, D. S., & Osman, N. Y. (2018). Textual analysis of general surgery residency personal statements: topics and gender differences. *Journal of Surgical Education*, 75(3), 573-581.
- Pheister, M., Peters, R. M., & Wrzosek, M. I. (2020). The impact of mental illness disclosure in applying for residency. *Academic Psychiatry*, 44(5), 554-561.
- Salzer, M. S. (2022). The quandary: Disclosing a mental illness in applications to helping professional academic programs. *Stigma and Health*, 7(1), 80.
- Sukhera, J., Poleksic, J., Zaheer, J., & Pack, R. (2022). Normalising disclosure or reinforcing heroism? An exploratory critical discourse analysis of mental health stigma in medical education. *Medical Education*, 56(8), 823-833.
- Wright, S. (2015). Medical school personal statements: a measure of motivation or proxy for cultural privilege? *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 20(3), 627-643.
- Zhang, X. C., Lipman, J., Jensen, R., & Parekh, K. (2019). Thematic Analysis of Emergency Medicine Applicants' Personal Statements. *Medical Science Educator*, 29(3), 659-665.

Nazih El-Bezre, presentation of research (virtual)

RAISING UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS' GENRE AWARENESS THROUGH REFLECTIVE WRITING

Recent pedagogical studies have pointed out that online learning during Covid-19 has had a negative impact on first year university students' reflective thinking (e.g., Farahian et al., 2021). They have also suggested that higher education students' reflective writing tends to be superficial. In a demanding, exam-heavy curriculum, setting aside time for reflection may not be a priority for busy students. In order to help the students, whose reflective thinking may have been impacted by online learning, benefit from the well-established usefulness of reflective learning (e.g., Ambrose et al., 2010; Bowen, 2012; Brown et al., 2014; Yancey, 1998; 2016), it is imperative for university instructors to emphasize the impactful role reflective writing can play in enhancing students' critical abilities. This is necessitated

by the fact that many students do not even read the feedback from their instructors on their assignment and exams (e.g., Laflen & Smith, 2017). This makes reflective learning/writing doubly-important. In my field of Writing Studies, researchers have long argued for the value of reflective writing as a way for the writer to know more about themselves, the topics about which they write, and their process of writing (e.g., Berlin, 1987; Britton, Burgess, Martin, McLeod, & Rosen, 1975; Flower, 1979, 1989; Graves, 1983, 1984; Moffett, 1968; Murray, 1968 1980, 1982). Writing Studies has taken a turn from the process approach to Rhetorical Genre Studies (e.g., Bazerman, 1988, 1994; Bawarshi, 2000, 2003; Devitt, 1996, 2000, 2004; Dias, Freedman, Medway, & Paré, 1999; Dias & Paré, 2000; Miller, 1984), in which teaching writing means “raising students’ genre knowledge of the following dimensions: form, rhetoric, process, and subject-matter knowledge (Tardy, 2009). We don’t know whether reflective writing will promote genre knowledge or not; this project seeks to throw light on that question. To address this research gap, this study aims to answer the following questions:

- 1) What genre and rhetorical aspects of writing do students focus on in their reflective writing?
- 2) Do students problem-solve rhetorical goals? Do they even formulate goals?
- 3) Do students write about the purpose of their writing?
- 4) Does reflective writing seem to give the students insights into the form, rhetoric, process, and subject-matter knowledge that form the dimensions of genre knowledge about which the students are writing?

To conduct my study, students’ reflective writings on various genres that have been written throughout the semester will be analyzed. Using the genre studies approach and aided by the grounded theory to data collection and analysis, students’ reflective writings will be coded and analyzed for instances where various dimensions of genre learning occurs.

Using reflective writing as part of the repertoire of teaching and learning practices and teaching it explicitly (via modeling) to students has the potential to become a transformative and powerful practice that produces many benefits: reinforcing student learning by developing their metacognitive skills and improving assessment to better understand our teaching practices.

References

Ambrose, S.A., Bridges, M.W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M.C., & Norman, M.K. (2010). *How learning works: 7 Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bazerman, C. (1988). *Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bazerman, C. (1994). Systems of genres and the enactment of social intentions. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.). *Genre and the new rhetoric*. (pp.79-101). London: Taylor & Francis.

Bawarshi, A. (2000). The genre function. *College English*, 62(3), 335-360.

Bawarshi, A. (2003). *Genre and the invention of the writer: Reconsidering the place of invention in Composition*. Logan: Utah State University Press.

Berlin, J. (1987). *Rhetoric and reality: Writing instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.

Bowen, J.A. (2012). *Teaching Naked: How Moving Technology Out of Your College Classroom*

Will Improve Student Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A. & Rosen, H. (1975). The development of writing abilities. London: Macmillan.

Brown, P.C., Roedigger III, H.L., & McDaniel, M. A. (2014). Make it Stick: The Science of Successful Learning. Boston: Belknap Press.

Devitt, A. J. (1996). Genre, genres, and the teaching of genre. *College Composition and Communication* 47(4), 605-615.

Devitt, A. J. (2000). Integrating rhetorical and literary theories of genre. *College English* 62(6), 696- 717.

Devitt, A. (2004). Writing genres. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dias, P., Freedman, A., Medway, P., & Paré, A. (1999). Worlds apart: Acting and writing in academic and workplace contexts. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dias, P., & Paré, A. (Eds.). (2000). Transitions: Writing in academic and workplace settings. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Farahian, M., Avarzamani, F., & Rajabi, Y. (2021). Reflective thinking in an EFL Writing course: To what level do portfolios improve reflection in writing? *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 39, 100759, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2020.100759>.

Flower, L. (1979). Writer-based prose: A cognitive basis for problems in writing. *College English*, 41, 19-37, <https://doi.org/10.2307/376357>

Flower, L. (1989). Cognition, context, and theory building. *College Composition and Communication*, 40(3), 282-311, <https://doi.org/10.2307/357775>

Graves, D. (1983). Teachers and children at work. London and Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann.

Graves, D. (1984). Researchers learn to write: Selected articles and monographs. Exeter, New Hampshire: Heinemann.

Lafren, A., & Smith, M. (2017). Responding to student writing online: Tracking student interactions with instructor feedback in a Learning Management System. *Assessing Writing*, 31, 39-52, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.07.003>

Miller, C. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly journal of speech*, 70, 151-167.

Moffett, J. (1983). Teaching the universe of discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Murray, D. (1968). A writer teaches writing. New York: Holt.

Murray, D. (1980). Writing as process: How writing finds its own meaning. In T. R. Donovan & B.

McClelland (Eds.), Eight approaches to teaching composition (pp. 3-20). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Murray, D. (1982). *Learning by teaching: Selected articles on writing and teaching*. Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook.

Tardy, C.M. (2009). *Building genre knowledge*. West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Yancey, K. (1998). *Reflection in the Writing Classroom*. Logan, UT: USU Press.

Yancey, K. (2016). *A Rhetoric of Reflection*. Logan, UT: USU Press.

Tyler Evans-Tokaryk and Michael Karani, presentation of research (in person and virtual)

MEASURING WRITING TRANSFER AT THE UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM: A REPORT ON THE BASELINE DATA

Writing transfer has emerged as one of the most important areas of research in writing studies over the past 30 years (Beaufort, 2007; Bergmann & Zepernick, 2007; Elon Statement, 2015; Kaufer & Young, 1993; Moore, 2012; Moore & Anson, 2016; Nelms & Dively, 2007; Wardle, 2007; Yancey Robertson & Taczak, 2014.) Virtually all undergraduate students in the United States are required to take at least one first-year composition course that is explicitly designed to prepare them for the writing they will do in other courses. In Canada and elsewhere in the world, universities invest significant resources in writing instruction and writing support. Clearly, the assumption informing such investments is that students will transfer the knowledge and skills they acquire in one course to other courses and contexts. It is less clear, however, that this assumption is borne out by the evidence.

In this session, we report on a longitudinal study of writing transfer undertaken at the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania. We address the conference theme by exploring how the discourse of “writing studies” reckons with the current historical and social responsibilities of the stakeholders of the mandatory Communication Skills courses and by studying the ways those stakeholders position themselves within the conflicted territory of an English-medium university in a postcolonial space where very few people speak English as a first language.

Our presentation includes a description of our experimental design, a discussion of our data collection methods and instruments, and a detailed analysis of the baseline data collected in the first year of our research. Baseline data were collected through interviews with 22 Communication Skills instructors and surveys sent to over 3,100 students enrolled in first-year Communication Skills courses in November 2022. Themes emerging in these data relate to instructors’ perceptions of UDSM students, the course, and context within which they work; students’ linguistic, cultural, social, and academic backgrounds; and students’ perceptions of their writing skills, the Communication Skills course, and the kind of writing they expect to do in the future.

References

Beaufort, A. (2007). *College Writing and Beyond: A New Framework for University Writing Instruction*. Utah State University Press.

Bergmann, L.S. & Zepernick, J. (2007). *Disciplinary and Transfer: Students’ Perceptions of Learning to Write*. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 31(1-2): 124-49.

Elon Statement on Writing Transfer. (2015). Retrieved from <https://www.centerforengagedlearning.org/elon-statement-on-writing-transfer/>

Kaufer, D. & Young, R. (1993). Writing in the content areas: Some theoretical complexities. In L. Odell (Ed.), *Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing: Rethinking the Discipline*. (pp. 71-104). Southern Illinois University Press.

Moore, J. (2012). Mapping the question: The state of writing-related transfer research. *Composition Forum*, 26.

Moore, J. & Anson, C. (2016). Introduction. In C. Anson and K. Moore (Eds.), *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Power*. (pp. 3-16). The WAC Clearinghouse. DOI 10.37514/PER-B.2016.0797

Nelms, G. & Dively, R. L. (2007). Perceived roadblocks to transferring knowledge from first-year composition to writing intensive major courses: A pilot study. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 31(1-2), 214-240.

Wardle, E. (2007). Understanding 'transfer' from FYC: Preliminary results of a longitudinal study. *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, 31(1-2): 65-85.

Yancey, K. B., Robertson, L. & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across contexts: Transfer, composition, and sites of writing*. Utah State University Press.

Codie Fortin Lalonde, presentation of research (in person)

CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES APPROACHES TO EDUCATION: DOCTORAL WAYFINDING TO AN ANALYTIC TAPESTRY

Education is a well-saturated topic of research with innumerable philosophical groundings, theoretical foundations, and methodological approaches. But as scholars attempt to navigate the unrelenting and intersecting crises and injustices of the current time, it becomes increasingly crucial that research be critically anchored (Fortin Lalonde, 2022). A critical anchoring can facilitate research that is reflective, questions the common-sense or status quo, is anti-oppressive, and imagines better and more just futures (Fairclough, 2018; Giroux, 2016; Patel, 2016; den Heyer, 2018). Thus, borrowing from Hollingsworth et al.'s (1993) notion of a theoretical tapestry, I propose that (critical) discourse approaches to education can provide a rich analytic tapestry for scholars interested in investigating the myriad discourses of and in education. Drawing on the mixed and multi-method analytical approach of my PhD research and dissertation, I bring forward a methodological framework which incorporates the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) (Reisigl & Wodak, 2016) and Corpus-Assisted Discourse Studies (CADS) (Mautner, 2016; Taylor & Marchi, 2018) for consideration. This presentation will touch on the foundations of Critical Discourse Studies (CDS), outline the DHA (which has been heretofore underutilized in investigating education discourse) and CADS, and discuss the merits of pairing these two frameworks and their respective and adjacent methods for investigating and untangling discursive constructions of actors and phenomena. The latter will be exemplified through a selection of findings from my PhD research which investigated public education policy in Canada and its discursive constructions of students and citizenship (Fortin Lalonde, 2022). In particular, the mindful pairing of the DHA and CADS may work together recursively to keep one another in check (as it were), facilitate a richer analysis and nuance-sensitive findings, and embrace the discomfort of reckoning with privilege, oppression, and injustice.

Katie Fry, presentation of innovative approach to teaching (in person)

A CORPUS-BASED APPROACH TO ACADEMIC VOCABULARY BUILDING IN L2 WRITING

Anyone who teaches academic writing to L2 students has probably been asked the following question many times: How can I improve my vocabulary? While explicit vocabulary instruction has been shown to be an effective method for improving students' knowledge of target words (Donley & Reppen, 2001; Nation and Newton, 1996), equipping

students with strategies they can use outside the classroom, when they come across unfamiliar words in texts or struggle to use new words in their own writing, may provide more long-lasting benefit. This presentation will argue for the value of teaching L2 students some basic tools of corpus analysis to foster autonomous vocabulary building during the writing process. I will discuss my own recent experiment in incorporating elements of corpus linguistics into my teaching practice, demonstrating how relatively simple it is to learn and teach the basics of corpus analysis to graduate students. Building on the work of other scholars (Charles, 2012, 2018; Hirsh, 2021; Szudarski, 2017; Timmis, 2015), I will show how both readymade and do-it-yourself corpora can be used in the L2 writing classroom to deepen students' awareness of how words are used in context. Concordances can be generated and analyzed to reveal valuable insight into lexical aspects such as frequency, collocations, and grammatical function (e.g., countable/uncountable or active/passive). Ultimately, my presentation will suggest that teaching L2 students how to create and analyze corpora enables them to improve their vocabulary independently while they write, thereby reducing the linguistic gap between L2 writers and their L1 peers.

References

Charles, M. (2012). 'Proper vocabulary and juicy collocations': EAP students evaluate do-it-yourself corpus-building. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31(2), 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.12.003>

Charles, M. (2018). Corpus-assisted editing for doctoral students: More than just concordancing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 36, 15–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.08.003>

Donley, K. K., & Reppen, R. (2001). Using Corpus Tools to Highlight Academic Vocabulary in SCLT. *TESOL Journal*, 10(2–3), 7–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1949-3533.2001.tb00027.x>

Hirsh, D. (2021). *Vocabulary and Second Language Writing*. University of Michigan Press.

Nation, P., & Newton, J. (1996). Teaching vocabulary. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy* (pp. 238–254). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524643.017>

Szudarski, P. (2017). *Corpus Linguistics for Vocabulary: A Guide for Research*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315107769>

Timmis, I. (2015). *Corpus Linguistics for ELT: Research and Practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315715537>

Loren Gaudet & Lydia Toorenburgh, presentation of research (virtual)

BELONGING AS A LEARNING OUTCOME

In this presentation, we detail our experiences in and with cultivating belonging in a first-year writing course dedicated for self-identified Indigenous students. We argue that including “belonging” as intended learning outcome in the composition course syllabus serves as an important reminder to the instructor and students to prioritize belonging, community, and compassion in the classroom; all of which are foundational to the success of all students but is particularly key for Indigenous students who have historically and continue to be systematically excluded from post-secondary education (Arvidson et al., 2020; Restoule et al., 2013).

Cultivating belonging in the writing classroom is a growing area of focus for equity work in writing studies (Kumari, Evans, Prasad, 2023). As Powell and Menedian (n.d.) explain, belongingness “entails the unwavering commitment to not simply tolerating and respecting difference but to ensuring that all people are welcome and feel that they belong.” While literature on belonging has been written in the context of the United States, Canada has a history of racism and colonization unique from the United States, and anti-racist and decolonial resources must consider these contexts. Our work, then, focuses specifically on cultivating belonging for and with Indigenous students in the context of ongoing colonization in Canada.

We begin our presentation by situating ourselves and our relationship to the course (one as an Indigenous staff working as the Tri-Faculty Indigenous Resurgence Coordinator, the other as a non-Indigenous faculty serving as the course instructor). We then discuss the reasons for including “belonging” as a learning outcome in the syllabus, and share some of the ways we worked to cultivate belonging in the classroom. We conclude by sharing survey data from 2 sections of our first-year writing course dedicated to Indigenous students (from Fall 2021 and 2022), and discuss how intentionally prioritizing belonging shaped students’ perceptions of belonging in the classroom and in the larger institution.

References

Arvidson, S. A., Desnomie, C., Davies, S., & Luhanga, F. (2020). Exploring factors influencing the retention rates of Indigenous students in post-secondary education. *Journal of Nursing Education and Practice*, 10(11), 24–.

<https://doi.org/10.5430/jnep.v10n11p24>

Kumari, A. , Evans, A.N., & Prasad, P. (2023) “The Politics of Belonging in Writing Studies. Online. Hosted by University of British Columbia, School of Journalism, Writing, and Media.

Powell, John a. and Stephen Menedian. (n.d.) “The Problem of Othering: Towards Inclusiveness and Belonging”

<http://www.otheringandbelonging.org/the-problem-of-othering/>.

Restoule, J.-P., Mashford-Pringle, A., Chacaby, M., Smillie, C., Brunette, C., & Russel, G. (2013). Supporting Successful Transitions to Post-Secondary Education for Indigenous Students: Lessons from an Institutional Ethnography in Ontario, Canada. *International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 4(4), 4–. <https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2013.4.4.4>

Stephen Guy, presentation of innovative approach to teaching (in person)

USING CREATIVE METHODS IN TECHNICAL AND PROFESSIONAL WRITING CLASSROOMS

Technical and professional writing students demand practicality, and program designers and instructors are eager to reassure them that their compulsory English and Communications courses mimic real world writing contexts. Assignments and exercises familiarize students with typical workplace writing tasks—instruction manuals, cover letters, etc.—but they occasionally suffer from the same problem we face when working on these documents in our jobs: tedium. Drawing on the work of Shipka (2011) and Santos and McIntyre (2016), I discuss pedagogical strategies in polytechnic and continuing education classes that are designed to generate creative responses to typical project prompts. Adding creative options for important projects like reports and presentations and deploying creative in-class exercises when delivering lessons on drafting or summarizing pushes reluctant students to think of themselves as imaginative writers. I will discuss specific examples from technical and professional writing classes delivered

at post-secondary institutions in Alberta in the last five years, including online synchronous pandemic-era classes, to show that some students embrace opportunities to augment demonstrations of professional skills with expressions of personal interest.

To prepare students for an always-on, text-drenched, 21st-century digital workplace, it will be essential to encourage students to treat even the most mundane writing contexts as opportunities for expression. If AI-backed tools are set to autocomplete many of our quotidian messages, it is even more important to emphasize the way human expression can add impact and nuance to the most straightforward workplace writing.

References

Santos, Marc C. and McIntyre, Megan M. "Toward a Technical Communication Made Whole." *Composition Forum* 33, Spring 2016.

Shipka, Jody. *Toward a Composition Made Whole*, University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011.

Ali Hadidi, presentation of research (in person)

LEARNER EMPOWERMENT THROUGH DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT OF WRITING DEVELOPMENT

Dynamic assessment (DA) is the dialectical integration of assessment and instruction. It simultaneously assesses and promotes development by enacting zones of proximal development, which are sensitive to both past and emergent learning. DA is grounded in Vygotskian sociocultural theory of mind which posits that higher mental processes are socioculturally mediated. This talk reports on a study of the DA of an English language learner's writing whose summative assessment (SA) after a period of instruction did not indicate remarkable signs of learning, as though his development had stalled. However, there was reason to believe that this was not necessarily the case, since there was evidence of his past learning that did not simply manifest itself in the SA. DA was employed to test the hypothesis of no-learning. The DA findings indicated that with varying degrees of mediation the learner did successfully generate the learning outcomes that seemed absent in the SA. The DA empowered the learner who could otherwise be cast aside as a failure. The validity of the DA processes and outcomes will also be discussed.

Joel Heng Hartse, Sibó Chen, Britt Amel, & Emilie Brancato, roundtable presentation (in person and virtual)

THIS WAS (NOT) WRITTEN BY AI: ON THE PANIC, POWER, AND POSSIBILITIES OF TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY TEXT GENERATION

In "What we know about writing, and why it matters," Parè (2009) wrote:

Writing is a specialized and collective practice that develops locally, in communities, organizations, and disciplines. ... writing makes things happen, it has consequences. Writing is social action. We don't write writing, we write something. . .that we hope will have an effect, produce results, change minds, spur to action, create solidarity, or

seed doubt. I thought about dividing this point into two—writing is social, and writing is action—but they are inseparable: writing works both in and on collectives to produce desired or required outcomes. (p. 5)

ChatGPT--a fine-tuned set of algorithms capable of producing text that can, at times, appear to be written by a human rather than a machine--introduces some fascinating opportunities to think through the notion of writing as social and rhetorical action. And, on the flipside, socio-rhetorical understandings of writing can offer some fascinating and useful insights into writing completed by or with ChatGPT. This roundtable will bring together four complementary perspectives on emerging thought and practice regarding AI text generation in the field of writing and discourse studies.

Briefly, the four presenters' individual talks will unfold as follows:

Presenter 1: Writing with/as AI: Problem, potentials, and provocations

I'm interested in exploring some of the theoretical and practical implications that surface when socio-rhetorical understandings of writing and writing with/by AI (ChatGPT) are brought together in the same conversation. I've studied and drawn on academic literacies and socio-rhetorical perspectives of writing and genre to examine writing in contexts of higher education. More recently, my doctoral research brought these perspectives together to understand what unconventional dissertations are, including how they are brought about.

Presenter 2: Chat GPT and Anti-racist Writing and Language Teaching Pedagogies

Widespread awareness of ChatGPT has arisen at a key moment: as a variety of academic discourse communities (e.g. linguistics, writing studies, second language pedagogy) have begun to explore and incorporate raciolinguistic perspectives and anti-racist and translanguaging pedagogies. Within this context, the potential challenge(s) ChatGPT presents to established methods of teaching and assessing academic writing provide further opportunities to surface the unspoken premises and unacknowledged biases underpinning these methods. I will share some initial experiences and strategies from research and discussion at OCAD University.

Presenter 3: Online Narratives about #ChatGPT

The ongoing #ChatGPT buzz is primarily mediated by Twitter. GPT-3, the predecessor to ChatGPT, was published by Open AI in June of 2020; nonetheless, the platform's potential remained largely unknown to the public until the #ChatGPT hashtag went viral at the end of 2022. How is #ChatGPT being discussed online? Do public conversations on AI-powered text generation represent changing public perceptions of academic and professional writing? Using my expertise in social media discourse research, I will present a preliminary analysis of #ChatGPT public narratives.

Presenter 4: Writing about GPT3 in first-year writing courses

I'll discuss my experiences using published texts about GPT3 as the basis of student assignments, offering a synthesis of student perspectives and beliefs about GPT3 and the ways they intersect with the discourses students produce about writing, intellectual property, and academic integrity. I will also discuss the relationship of students' views of GPT3 and other forms of writing "help" - licit or illicit - that some students access to complete writing assignments. Depending on how the semester plays out, I may also include a discussion of using GPT3 in the first-year writing classroom itself.

Reference

Paré, A. (2009). What we know about writing, and why it matters. *Compendium 2: Writing Teaching, and Learning in the University*, 2(1), 1–7. <https://ojs.library.dal.ca/C2/article/view/3720/3408>

Joel Heng Hartse and Kiyu Itoi, research presentation (in person)

“IT’S STILL MY WORK”: INTERNATIONAL UNDERGRADUATES DISCUSS THE USE OF PAID WRITING HELP

This presentation will discuss a subsection of results from a larger study of students’ self-reported use of what we call “Private Academic Support Services” (PASS), a spectrum of paid academic assistance ranging from more accepted services like tutoring, to proofreading and editing, to potentially unethical or illicit ghostwriting or contract cheating services (see Chang, 2018, and Conrad, 2022). The larger study, which includes a survey (n= 898) and interviews (n = 26) of participants from three major universities in western Canada, seeks to understand how and why some undergraduate students – particularly those who are considered “international” and/or “ESL” students – seek paid private help with academic work.

Drawing research traditions involving plagiarism and paper mills in first and second language composition (e.g. Pennycook, 1996, Ritter, 2005, 2006, Shi, 2006), ghostwriting and contract cheating in education and academic integrity research (Lines, 2016, Lancaster & Clarke, 2016), and situated in an academic literacies perspective (Lea & Street, 1998) which views students’ use of PASS as socially situated instantiations of literacy brokering (Curry & Lillis, 2006) rather than simply cases of “cheating,” this study aims to demystify this under-researched and little-understood phenomenon.

This presentation will focus more narrowly on qualitative accounts provided by students who describe paying for “help” of various types with writing assignments. The range of responses analyzed reveal diverse perspectives on the reasons for seeking paid help with writing, such as perceived convenience, cultural and linguistic familiarity with tutors who share the student’s first language, and targeted help with grammar and language issues. Participants also report varying degrees of comfort with accessing para-educational services that may be ethically ambiguous. We conclude by discussing the implications of the students’ use of and beliefs about PASS for pedagogy and policy.

References

- Chang, D. (2018). Academic Dishonesty in a Post-Secondary Multilingual Institution. *BC TEAL Journal*, 3(1), 49-62. Retrieved from <https://ojs-o.library.ubc.ca/index.php/BCTJ/article/view/287>
- Conrad, N. (2022). How Students Seek and Use Writing Support: Exploring the Spectrum of Literacy Brokering Practices in Higher Education. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Arizona.
- Lancaster, T. & Clarke, R. (2016). Contract Cheating: The Outsourcing of Assessed Student Work. In T. Briettag (Ed.), *the Handbook of Academic Integrity* (639-654).
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157-172.
- Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2006). Professional academic writing by multilingual scholars. *Interactions with literacy brokers in the production of English-medium texts. Written Communication*, 23(1), 3-35.
- Lines, L. (2016). "Ghostwriters guaranteeing grades? The quality of online ghostwriting services available to tertiary students in Australia." *Teaching in Higher Education*: 1-26.
- Pennycook, A. (1996) Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly* 30 (2), 201–230.

Ritter, K. (2005). The economics of authorship: Online paper mills, student writers, and first-year composition. *College Composition and Communication*, 56(4), 601-631.

Ritter, K. (2006). Buying in, selling short: A pedagogy against the rhetoric of online paper mills. *Pedagogy*, 6, 25–51.

Shi, L. (2006). Cultural backgrounds and textual appropriation. *Language Awareness*, 15, 264-282.

Sreemali Herath, Antoinette Gagne, Mary-Ann Fowler, Jade Kim, Victorina Baxan, Elena Danilina, roundtable presentation (in person)

LET'S TALK ABOUT WRITING SUPPORT FOR PLURILINGUAL GRADUATE STUDENTS: A CRITICAL ANALYTIC COLLABORATIVE AUTOETHNOGRAPHY

Set within the higher education landscape where the number of plurilingual graduate students continues to grow, this critical analytic collaborative autoethnography (Anderson, 2016; Kempny, 2022) addresses an often-overlooked aspect of L2 writing – faculty perspectives on academic writing support for plurilingual graduate students. While academic writing is an inseparable aspect of graduate school (Holmes et al., 2018), writing development often remains up to chance (Odena & Burgess, 2017), with plurilingual students frequently asked to “tidy up” their writing (Corcoran et al., 2018). Discussions of academic writing in previous studies do not sufficiently address linguistically and culturally diverse students (Phillips, 2013).

Informed by intersectionality (Crenshaw, 2017) and critical race theories foregrounding identity and challenging deficit views that ignore epistemologies of racialized communities (Yosso, 2005), six graduate faculty members engage in critical conversations about providing academic writing support to plurilingual students in course-based and research-oriented programs in Canadian universities. Woven into their personal narratives are discussions of larger sociopolitical issues shaping the provision of academic writing support.

Considering the particularities of each of our contexts, we aim to broaden mainstream conversations about creating inclusive and asset-oriented approaches to graduate writing in English-dominant universities.

References

Anderson, L. (2006). Analytical autoethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 35(4), 373–395. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241605280449>

Crenshaw, K. (2017). *On intersectionality: Essential writings*. The New Press.

Corcoran, J., Gagné, A., & McIntosh, M. (2018). A conversation about “editing” plurilingual scholars' thesis writing. *Canadian Journal for Studies in Discourse and Writing*, 27, 114-138. <http://journals.sfu.ca/cjsdw>

Holmes, B., Waterbury, T., Baltrinic, E., & Davies, A. (2018). Angst about academic writing: Graduate students at the brink. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 11(2), 65-70. <https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v11i2.10149>

Kempny, M. (2022). Towards critical analytical auto-ethnography. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures*, 31(1), 58-71. <https://www.berghahnjournals.com/view/journals/ajec/31/1/ajec310105.xml>

Odena, O., & Burgess, H. (2017). How doctoral students describe facilitating experiences and strategies for their thesis writing learning process: A qualitative approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(3), 572-590. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1063598>

Phillips, T. (2013). Tutor training and services for multilingual graduate writers: A reconsideration. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal*, 10(2), 1-7. <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/62180>

Yosso, T. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-91, <https://doi-org/10.1080/1361332052000341006>

Sara Humphreys, presentation of research (virtual)

WHERE'S THE DATA? DESIGNING A FIRST YEAR WRITING COURSE IN CANADA

In 2019, the Academic and Technical Writing Program (ATWP) at the University of Victoria began a three year journey to redesign its flagship first year composition course (FYC). At the time, the design team thought this redesign would be a simple process of updating assignments and training instructors. However, we quickly realized that if we wanted to meet both local and disciplinary needs, then data on must be collected. We turned to Dynamic Criteria Mapping or DCM, which is a form assessment that values input from local participants in writing programs rather than solely relying on external principles mapped onto writing environments.[1] However, we were faced with a dilemma: there is a paucity of data on writing programs, outcomes, and student needs in Canada.

To solve this issue, we balanced wise disciplinary practices drawn from the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) and the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) with the situated interests of our students and instructors as well as interviews with writing experts, English as an Additional Language (EAL) experts, Indigenous pedagogy experts, and writing centre experts from across the nation. We interviewed Dr. Jay Dolmage (writing and disability studies expert), Dr. Stephanie White (writing and learning expert), Dr. Stevie Bell (writing centre and writing expert), Dr. Erynne Gilpin (Indigenous pedagogy expert), and Dr. Jennifer Clary-Lemon (writing expert). While the answers our interviewees provided dovetail with U.S. writing studies practices, their specific take on the Canadian context reveals a vibrant academic community invested in building FYC courses that are accessible, welcoming, and illuminating for all students. This paper will share this data with participants both in the presentation and in open-source documents.

[1] Bob Broad, Linda Adler-Kassner, Barry Alford, Jane Detweiler (2009). *Organic Writing Assessment: Dynamic Criteria Mapping in Action*. In *Organic Writing Assessment*. Utah State University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cgpzz>.

Michael Kaler, presentation of research (in person)

HOW TAS SEE AND WORK WITH STUDENT WRITING

As teachers of writing, our responsibilities often overlap with those of Teaching Assistants (TAs), who grade and give feedback on much of the writing produced in courses, particularly in larger courses. Like us, they are inextricably involved with reading and thinking about student writing.

Previous research (Rodrigue 2012 and 2013; Cripps, Hall, & Robinson, 2016; Winzenreid, 2016) has shown that TAs “occupy complex liminal positions” (Winzenreid 2016, “Introduction”), and this liminality extends to writing

instruction. TAs may lack training in writing instruction and may not see themselves as teachers of writing (Hedengren 2004; Rodrigue 2013); as well, they may not receive support in their writing assessment (Rodrigue 2012). We can assume that anyone in a TA role is at least familiar with writing in their discipline, but they may not be trained to analyze that writing (see e.g. Rodrigue 2013; Alford 1997). On the other hand, many TAs will have a clear vision of themselves as writing teachers and a great deal of experience. Overall, there is a real need for more information about the abilities, concerns, and training of our TA partners, so as to help us work productively with them.

To assist in this, I will present an analysis of the responses to surveys used in training sessions for TAs across the disciplines between 2020-2022. These training sessions cover foundational concepts of writing pedagogy dealing with sentence level issues, best practices for feedback/feedforward, and working productively with English Language Learners. The pedagogical goal of these surveys is to encourage respondents to think reflectively about their practice, but the surveys also provide valuable insight into how TAs understand their work with writing.

In this presentation, I will discuss such issues as the training that these TAs say they have received, their perceptions of the challenges of teaching writing in their discipline, their approaches to giving feedback, and their approaches to working directly with students.

References

Alford, E. M. (1997). Training TAs to help students learn engineering discourse. Proceedings Frontiers in Education 1997 27th Annual Conference. Teaching and Learning in an Era of Change 3, 1543-1548.

Cripps, M., Hall, J., & Robinson, H. (2016). "A way to talk about the institution as opposed to just my field": WAC fellowships and graduate student professional development. *Across the Disciplines*, 13(3), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2016.13.3.09>

Hedengren, B. (2004). *A TA's guide to teaching writing in all disciplines*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Rodrigue, T. K. (2012). The (in)visible world of teaching assistants in the disciplines: preparing TAs to teach writing. *Across the Disciplines*, 9(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2012.9.1.01>

Rodrigue, T. K. (2013). Listening Across the Curriculum: What Disciplinary TAs Can Teach Us About TA Professional Development In The Teaching of Writing. *Teaching/Writing: The Journal of Writing Teacher Education*, 2(2), Article 5, 1-14.

Winzenried, M. A. (2016). Brokering Disciplinary Writing: TAs and the Teaching of Writing Across the Disciplines. *Across the Disciplines*, 13(3), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2016.13.3.11>

Ibtissem Knouzi, Olga Makinina and Saskia Van Viegen, presentation of research (in person)

FOSTERING INSTRUCTOR PROFESSIONAL LEARNING AND STUDENT SUCCESS THROUGH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF GENRE-BASED PEDAGOGY IN AN ESL COURSE

Despite the centrality of genre theory in the English for Academic Purposes (EAP) scholarship, there are limited teaching materials and professional learning opportunities to support EAP instructors' adoption of

a genre-based pedagogy (GBP) (Tardy et al., 2022). This paper examines the barriers and concerns raised by four experienced EAP instructors teaching an advanced EAP course that was recently redesigned to include readings and assignments in line with a functional model of language. Drawing on perceptual data from pre- and post-instruction interviews with instructors, this paper shares insights related to evolving understanding of concepts such as definitions of genre, social situatedness of text, and the premises of Systemic Functional Linguistics and impact on their instructional practices.

Moberley Luger & Craig Stensrud, presentation of an innovative approach to teaching (virtual)

EQUITABLE ASSESSMENTS FOR ORAL PRESENTATIONS: SEEKING CONNECTIONS BETWEEN ACADEMIC WRITING AND SPEAKING INSTRUCTION

Our presentation will discuss how instructors can make oral presentation assessment more equitable. Our research finds that many standard ways of teaching scholarly speaking to undergraduate students reinforce both classroom and social inequities. Often, existing approaches to teaching oral presentations privilege what Michael Motley (1990) describes as “performance-oriented” criteria which focusses on the aesthetic factors of public speaking, like accent or tone of voice—criteria that advantages, say, the neurotypical, or those speaking in their first language. Our work on scholarly speaking pedagogy (citation redacted to maintain anonymity), modelled on Writing in the Disciplines pedagogical approaches, focuses on teaching the rhetorical “moves” specific to scholarly speaking, rather than reiterating generic, and often prejudicial, public speaking “skills.”

In doing this work, however, we have come to see that performance-oriented assessment remains a key obstacle to student buy-in for our speaking pedagogy. In surveys, students consistently report that concern about grades is a major source of scholarly speaking anxiety. And this emphasis on grades means students won’t adopt a scholarly approach to oral presentations until they’re sure that their instructors will be assessing them using scholarly criteria. Many currently available rubrics, however, remain invested in the performance approach. For example, a rubric found in a recent publication (Nadolski et al., 2021) features an entire section on “ethos,” which evaluates how “effectively” the presenter “uses the voice” and “provides non-verbal information”—i.e., “uses the body.” We will argue for an approach to assessment that instead rewards students’ ability to demonstrate required (and instructed) scholarly moves: e.g., delivering a literature review, or sharing an argument. Beyond simply providing a “checklist” rubric for these moves, our assessment model encourages instructors to evaluate how student presenters have considered the needs of their audience in adapting their research for the specific speaking situation. We will share a recent presentation assignment from a first-year composition course, along with student feedback on how the scholarly assessment criteria impacted their attitudes about giving oral presentations. Our hope is to inspire a conversation about how instructors might make scholarly speaking assessment more equitable.

References

Motley, M. T. (1990). Public speaking anxiety qua performance anxiety: A revised model and an alternative therapy. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 5(2), 85–104.

Nadolski, R.J., Hummel, H.G.K., Rusman, E., & Ackermans, K. (2021). Rubric formats for the formative assessment of oral presentation skills acquisition in secondary education. *Educational Research and Development* 69, 2663-2682.

Émilie Michaud, presentation of research (in person)

LA RECHERCHE-ACTION, AU CŒUR DE LA RÉDACTOLOGIE

La recherche-action s'appuie sur une méthode inductive ainsi que sur une approche participative qui implique une collaboration active et un dialogue constant entre les chercheurs et les acteurs concernés dans le but de comprendre et d'agir sur des problèmes rencontrés par ces mêmes acteurs (Roy et Prévost 2013). Si la recherche-action, dans sa définition et sa typologie (voir Lewin, 1946), est une méthodologie bien établie dans le domaine de la sociologie, des sciences de la gestion ou de l'éducation, il appert qu'elle trouve également sa place en rédactologie.

Épistémologiquement, la rédactologie étudie les pratiques professionnelles de la rédaction, aussi bien du point de vue des rédacteurs que des lecteurs-utilisateurs. La discipline couvre autant la place des acteurs, que les pratiques professionnelles, les processus ou les outils. Sa pluridisciplinarité lui permet de se rattacher aisément à la méthodologie de la recherche-action.

En s'interrogeant sur les conditions de pratique, les chercheurs en rédactologie et en communication peuvent ainsi les décrire, les analyser, les modéliser et les enseigner. Sans nécessairement donner le nom officiel de recherche-action à leurs projets, les chercheurs mettent en pratique son cycle (Roy et Prévost 2013 : 136) depuis longtemps déjà.

On pense à la Reader-focused method de Schriver (1989 : 247), à la nécessaire «collaboration entre le(s) terminologue(s) et les experts de domaine», selon Beaudet et al. (2016 : paragr. 51) ou plus récemment à l'ouvrage dirigé par Clerc (2022) mettant en lumière de nombreuses initiatives gouvernementales et les projets associés, au niveau international.

En nous intéressant plus spécifiquement à certains projets du Groupe Rédiger de l'Université Laval à Québec, réalisés en collaboration avec des organismes académiques et gouvernementaux québécois et nous en profiterons pour ouvrir le dialogue et nous interroger sur les Nouvelles réalités du chercheur en recherche-action, ses limites et ses besoins.

Bibliographie

BEAUDET, Céline, A. CONDAMINES, C. LEBLAY et A. PICTON (2016) «Rédactologie et didactique de l'écriture professionnelle : un chantier terminologique à mettre en place», *Pratiques [En ligne]*, 171-172 | 2016, mis en ligne le 7 février 2017, consulté le 5 janvier 2023.

CLERC, I. (dir.). (2022). *Communication écrite État-citoyens : Défis numériques, perspectives rédactologiques*. Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

LEWIN, K. (1946). « Action research and minority problems. » *Journal of Social Issues*, 2(4), 34-46.

ROY, M. & PRÉVOST, P. (2013). « La recherche-action : origines, caractéristiques et implications de son utilisation dans les sciences de la gestion. » *Recherches qualitatives*, 32(2), 129–151. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1084625ar>

SCHRIVER, Karen A. (1989). «Evaluating text quality: the continuum from text-focused to reader-focused methods» in *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 32(4), 238-255.

Srividya Natarajan & Emily Pez, presentation of an innovative approach to teaching (virtual)

MULTILINGUAL WRITING INSTRUCTION, AND TEXTBOOK CREATION

The pedagogic assumption that English is not only a target language for international students and other L2 English users, but also a metonym for the desirable culture to which they must be assimilated is still prevalent in the institution where we teach. Our presentation discusses our attempt to write and curate a first-year (ESL) Writing course-pack that draws on critical pedagogy (Freire, 2000; Canagarajah, 2002; hooks, 1994) to resist this form of white language supremacy while also resolving the vexed question of content in Writing textbooks. The “textbook” we created brought together short articles written by us and articles written by established Writing Studies scholars. The articles named, contextualized, and challenged deficit understandings of L2 learner identities, cultures, and concerns (Martínez, 2018), and invited students to think critically about the very course they were taking. We believe that students felt engaged and interested in the course’s readings because they so directly addressed their identities and situations. At the same time the textbook discussed and modelled the conventions of North American academic writing by using authentic academic articles (rather than journalistic or belle-lettrist ones), by introducing the concept of genre as well as the rationales for specific genres, by showcasing citation practices, and so on. In doing this, we believe we were attending to what this conference’s CFP refers to as the “divergent emphases or conflicting priorities” of different stakeholders: social justice through affirmation of minoritized raciolinguistic identities and resistance, on the one hand; and, on the other, the academic survival and success of L2 students despite the prevailing assessment ecologies within the white habitus (Inoue, 2015; Davila, 2022) of the Canadian university. As we plan to develop this course-pack more into an open access textbook, we hope to hear feedback from our colleagues in the field.

References

- Canagarajah, S. (2002). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. University of Michigan.
- Davila, B. (2022). White Language Supremacy in course descriptions. *College Composition and Communication*, 73(4), 640–664.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. 30th anniversary ed. (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Continuum. (Original publication 1970).
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge.
- Inoue, A. B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future*. The WAC Clearinghouse.

Kelvin Quintyne, presentation of research (in person)

TAKING NOTE OF DOCTORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAM PREPARATION

The comprehensive exam is an important mechanism for assessing and facilitating student learning, allowing passage to the research or candidacy phase of a doctoral programme (Guloy et al., 2020; Kelley, 2014). However, there is little focus on it within scholarly literature (Allard et al., 2021; Guloy et al., 2020; Kelley, 2014), particularly regarding strategies for preparation from the student’s perspective. Allard et al. (2021) note that doctoral students typically

used the preparatory phase of the examination to mainly index materials for easy later retrieval rather than for understanding and synthesising information. Students “often saw this understanding and synthesis happening during the examination itself” (Allard et al., 2021, p. 286). Despite such perceptions, the preparatory phase can be instrumental in facilitating deep learning, and pedagogical approaches that facilitate this need to be shared within the scholarly literature.

In preparation for my March-April 2022 comprehensive examination at a university in Atlantic Canada, my supervisor required submission of two-page digital notes, each containing an argumentative response to a source in my reading list. Short synthesis papers were to follow these notes. I submitted notes periodically over the winter semester, and I received prompt feedback via email, and during regular face-to-face meetings. The purpose of my proposed presentation is to explore how my note-taking processes facilitated deep learning and successful completion of my comprehensive examination. I will use an autoethnographic approach incorporating Lillis’ (2008) theory of “ethnography as deep theorising,” drawing on data gathered from my handwritten and digital notes, my supervisor’s feedback, and my journal of my exam preparations. This approach will relate my note-taking practices towards my comprehensive exams to the wider social context. Similar preparations can be done, with adjustments where necessary, for other doctoral students and their supervisors.

References

- Allard, E., Leclarc-Loiselle, J., Lavallee, A., & Larue, C. (2021) PhD nursing students’ changing needs relative to the comprehensive doctoral examination. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 50, 102917. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2020.102917>
- Guloy, S., Hum, G., & O’Neill, D. K. (2020). Voices at the gate: Faculty members’ and students’ differing perspectives on the purposes of the PhD comprehensive examination. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(2), 279–291.
- Kelley, A. (2014). Layers of consciousness: An autoethnographic study of the comprehensive exam process. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 9, 347-360. doi:<https://doi.org/10.28945/2079>
- Lillis, T. (2008). Ethnography as method, methodology, and “deep theorizing”: Closing the gap between text and context in academic writing research. *Written Communication*, 25(3), 353–388. <https://doi-org.qe2a-proxy.mun.ca/10.1177/0741088308319229>

Karen Ruddy, presentation of research (in person)

THE AFFECTIVE DIMENSIONS OF WRITING TRANSFER

Current research in the field of “Teaching for Writing Transfer” acknowledges that writing is not an inherently transferrable set of skills and that student transfer of learning from previous writing and rhetorical situations involves a complex process of remixing and repurposing that requires explicit instruction (Adler et al; Driscoll; Haskell; Wardle). Yet little research exists on how writing transfer pedagogy should be adapted to support differing populations of students or how the experience of prior writing challenges or setbacks might affect students’ transfer of learning from one context to another (Yancey et al.). Moreover, the affective roots of students’ academic challenges are rarely addressed in writing for transfer scholarship. This presentation will report on the results of an IRB-approved study of the efficacy of writing transfer pedagogy in supporting undergraduate students on academic probation. Drawing from writing transfer research and psychoanalytic approaches to teaching and learning, I argue that the affective dimensions of “writing failure” must be placed at the center of any writing pedagogy aimed at

supporting students experiencing academic setbacks. I share three patterns of students' affective responses to previous academic challenges—disavowal of previous failures; shame; and “cruel optimism” (Berlant)—that must be adequately addressed by writing faculty who seek to support students constructed by institutional retention rhetoric as “at risk” of dismissal from the university. I offer a theoretical discussion of why affect matters to the study of writing transfer and outline some practical strategies for addressing affect in the teaching and learning of writing transfer.

Adler-Kassner, Linda, John Majewski, and Damian Koshnick. *The Value of Troublesome Knowledge: Transfer and Threshold Concepts in Writing and History*. *Composition Forum* 26 (2012). Web.

Driscoll, Dana Lynn. *Connected, Disconnected, or Uncertain: Student Attitudes about Future Writing Contexts and Perceptions of Transfer from First Year Writing to the Disciplines*. *Across the Disciplines* 8.2 (2011). Web. 15 January 2012 <<http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/driscoll2011/index.cfm>>.

Haskell, Robert. *Transfer of Learning: Cognition, Instruction, and Reasoning*. San Diego, CA: Academic, 2001.

Hamman, K. J. Factors that contribute to the likeliness of academic recovery. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice* 20.2 (2018): 162-175.

James, C., and S. Graham. An empirical study of students on academic probation. *Journal of the First-year experience & Students in Transition* 22.2 (2010): 71-91.

Wardle, Elizabeth. Understanding ‘Transfer’ from FYC: Preliminary Results from a Longitudinal Study. *Writing Program Administration* 31.1/2 (2007): 65-85. Print

Yancey, Kathellen Blake, Liane Robertson and Kara Taczak. *Writing across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing*. Utah: Utah State University Press, 2014.

James Southworth, presentation of research (in person)

HOW WRITING CHALLENGES THE “MAINSTREAM CONCEPT OF CRITICAL THINKING”

Writing and thinking are inextricably linked (Zinsser, 1994). John Bean (2011), for example, has emphasized that “writing is both a process of doing critical thinking and a product that communicates the results of critical thinking” (p. 4). For the most part, however, conceptions of critical thinking tend to inform writing studies rather than the other way around. There are some exceptions to this, including Peter Elbow’s (1983) mapping of freewriting and revision onto first and second order thinking. Although our conception of critical thinking has transformed over the decades and although there are numerous contemporary views, a cluster of researchers posit what Robert Ennis (2018) has called “the mainstream concept of critical thinking” defined broadly as “reasonable reflective thinking focused on deciding what to believe or do” (p. 166). In this paper, I challenge the presupposition that critical thinking is directed only towards oneself (i.e., one’s beliefs and actions). I argue that critical thinking is reasonable reflective thinking that also informs relations with others. To support this argument, I discuss three writing genres:

- 1) the persuasive essay, which has a purpose of convincing a reader,
- 2) the scientific research paper (IMRaD), which seeks to advance our collective scientific knowledge, and
- 3) Rogerian argument, which is intended to understand others with different perspectives.

Although these three genres emphasize different ways of relating with others – through civil debate, the advancement and communication of knowledge, and the increased understanding of others – they all highlight the outward directedness of critical thinking. Ultimately, it is the outward directedness of critical thinking, developed at least in part through writing, that is crucial for inculcating the virtues of democratic citizenship.

Bean, J.C. (2011). *Engaging Ideas* (2nd ed). Jossey-Bass.

Elbow, P. (1983). Teaching thinking by teaching writing. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 15(6), 37-40.

Ennis, R. (2018). Critical thinking across the curriculum: A vision. *Topoi*, 37(1), 165–184.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-016-9401-4>

Zinsser, W. (1994). *On writing well* (5th ed.). HarperCollins.

Taunya Tremblay, Jamie Zeppa, Lavaughn John, Christine Dalton & Victoria Yeoman, presentation of research (in person)

THE ANXIETY OF NON-MASTERY: PROFESSOR AND STUDENT VOICES AROUND AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENTS

In 2018, [a Canadian college] first launched its requisite diploma-level communications course based on promoting writing skills-transfer called “COM101: Communicating Across Contexts”. As a required course for most diploma students, COM111 offers students more time (an additional three hours/week) for enhanced English reading and writing practice while keeping them in the same cohort as students taking COM101, its sister course which uses the same content without additional time and literacy supports. Its predecessor, run from 1985-2018, took an analytical, essay-focused approach to developing academic literacy skills. In that COM101 was one of the first of its kind in Canadian colleges, and few of the active faculty had taught a course like it before, we sought to understand how students and professors were responding to the new course. We collected surveys, using a mix of open and closed questions, during three semesters over the 2018 - 2020. In total, we had 1,984 students and 59 professors participate, and we used inductive, multiple coding to identify key themes arising from the data. In this presentation, we will discuss two years of survey data (2020-2021) we collected with COM111 students’ (666 total participants) and professors (25 total participants) and will reflect on each population’s response to the course.

This presentation will discuss several inter-related themes emerging from the survey data, including participants’ responses around authentic assessments and concerns around the theme of “mastery”.

Relevant References:

Adams, P., & McKusick, D. (2014). Steps and Missteps: Redesigning, Piloting, and Scaling a Developmental Writing Program. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2014(167), 15-25.

Avni, S., & Finn, H. (2021). Meeting the Needs of English Language Learners in Co-Requisite Courses at Community College. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 45(8), 560–574. DOI: 10.1080/10668926.2020.1727383

Beaufort, A. (1999). *Writing in the Real World: Making the Transition from School to Work*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Beaufort, A. (2007). *College Writing and Beyond: A New Framework for University Writing*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Beaufort, A. (2012) *College Writing and Beyond: Five Years Later*. *Composition Forum*26, retrieved from <https://compositionforum.com/issue/26/college-writing-beyond.php>

Bergmann, L.S. & Zepernick, J. (2007). *Disciplinary and Transfer: Students' Perceptions of Learning to Write*. *Journal of The Council of Writing Program Administrators*, 31(1-2), 124-149. Retrieved from <http://wpacouncil.org/archives/31n1-2/31n1-2bergmann-zepernick.pdf>

Cheng, An. (2007). *Transferring generic features and recontextualizing genre awareness: Understanding writing performance in the ESP genre-based literacy framework*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 26(3), 287-307. doi:10.1016/j.esp.2006.12.002

Childers, A., & Shi, X. (2021). *Co-Requisite Remediation: A Pilot Study on Expanding the Placement Range into Co Requisite Courses*. *Practitioner to Practitioner*, 10(7), 4-12.

Clark, I. & Hernandez, A. (2011). *Genre Awareness, Academic Argument, and Transferability*. *The WAC Journal* 22, 65-78. Retrieved from <https://www.nwp.org/cs/public/print/resource/3873>

Cote-Meek, S. (2014). *Colonized classrooms: Racism, trauma and resistance in post-secondary education*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Cozart, S.M., Jensen, T.W., Wichmann-Hansen, G., Kupatadze, K. & Chiu, S.C. (2017). *Negotiating Multiple Identities in Second-or Foreign Language Writing in Higher Education*. In C.M. Anson & J.L. Moore, (Eds.). *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer*(pp.299-330). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

DasBender, G. (2017). *Liminal Space as Generative Site of Struggle: Writing Transfer and L2 Students*. In C.M. Anson & J.L. Moore, (Eds.). *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer* (pp.273-298). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Donahue, C. (2012). *Transfer, Portability, Generalization: (How) Does Composition Expertise "Carry"?* In K. Ritter and P.K Matsuda, (Eds.). *Exploring Composition Studies: Sites, Issues, and Perspectives*.(pp. 145-166). Logan, UT: University Press of Colorado. *Elon Statement of Transfer*. (2014). Retrieved from http://www.elon.edu/eweb/academics/teaching/ers/writing_transfer/statement.xhtml

I Gorzelsky, G., Driscoll, D.L., Paszek, J., Jones, E., Hayes, C. (2017). *Cultivating Constructive Metacognition: A New Taxonomy for Writing Studies*. In C.M. Anson and J. L. Moore, (Eds.). *Critical Transitions: Writing and the Question of Transfer*.(pp. 215-346) Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Graff, N. (2010). *Teaching Rhetorical Analysis to Promote Transfer of Learning*. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*,53(5), 376-385.

Hern, K. & Snell, M. (2014). *The California Acceleration Project: Reforming Developmental Education to Increase Student Completion of College-Level Math and English*. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2014(167), 27-39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20108>

James, M.A. (2010) *An Investigation of Learning Transfer in English-for-General-Academic-Purposes Writing Instruction*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*,19(4), 183-206. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1060374310000408>

Logue, A. W. (2018, July 17). The Extensive Evidence of Co-Requisite Remediation's Effectiveness. Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2018/07/17/data-already-tell-us-how-effective-co-requisite-education-opinion>

McCarthy, L. (1987). A Stranger in Strange Lands: A College Student Writing across the Curriculum. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 21(3), 233-265. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40171114>

Robertson, L. & Taczak, K. (2017). Teaching for Transfer. In J.L. Moore & R. Bass, (Eds.), *Understanding Writing Transfer: Implications for Transformative Student Learning in Higher Education*. Herndon: Stylus Publishing, LLC

Tinberg, H. (2017). Teaching for Transfer: A Passport for Writing in New Contexts. *Peer Review*, 19(1), 17-20. Retrieved from <https://aacu.org/peerreview/2017/Winter/Tinberg>

Wardle, E. (2016). Understanding 'Transfer' from FYC: Preliminary Results of a Longitudinal Study. *Journal of The Council of Writing Program Administrators*, 31(1-2), 65-85. Retrieved from <http://wpacouncil.org/archives/31n1-2/31n1-2wardle.pdf>

Yancey, K., Robertson, L. & Taczak, K. (2014). *Writing across Contexts: Transfer, Composition and Sites of Writing*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Eugenia Vasilopoulos, presentation of research (in person)

THE POTENTIAL FOR TRANSFORMATIVE PEDAGOGIES IN CANADIAN EAP: INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF PLURILINGUALISM IN ENGLISH ACADEMIC WRITING

This study reports on the first phase of a two-year SSHRC-funded project that examines Canadian EAP (English for Academic Purposes) writing instructors' perceptions of monolingual policies, and conversely, plurilingual pedagogies in the EAP writing classroom. Canadian EAP programs are largely governed by English-only monolingual policies (Chen, 2020); however, recent research has highlighted the benefits of plurilingual pedagogies to support academic writing by: 1) enhancing linguistic and academic skills (Adamson & Coulson, 2015); 2) expanding knowledge, problem-solving and meta-linguistic awareness (Garcia & Kano, 2014); 3) increasing opportunity for students to exhibit their agency as thinkers and writers (Makalela, 2015); 4) legitimizing plurilingual writers' identities (Canagarajah, 2013); and 5) validating difference in students' written work (Horner, Lu, Royster & Trimbur, 2011). Simultaneously, denying students' L1 linguistic and epistemic resources in the EAP writing classroom marginalizes students' translingual repertoires (Marshall & Marr, 2018), devalues students' multilingual resources (Galante, 2020), and perpetuates epistemic racism (Kubota, 2020).

The purpose of the study is to explore the place for plurilingual pedagogies in a domain traditionally governed by monolingual bias. For this study, 10-12 EAP writing instructors from a Canadian university will be invited to participate in a 90-minute interview examining their perceptions of plurilingualism, L2 writing instruction, and decolonial pedagogies. Interviews data will be analysed with Nvivo software and coded thematically around themes relevant to the two research questions: 1) How does monolingual bias impact L2 writing instruction and learning, and 2) how can plurilingual pedagogies impact L2 writing teaching and learning in EAP programs? Data collection is anticipated in January 2023, with analysis conducted in February and March 2023. Findings are expected to shed light on the possible need and potential for pedagogies to improve student learning and address implicit socio-linguistic-cultural inequity in L2 writing instruction in Canadian EAP programs.

Jonathan Vroom, Zach Richer, Julius Haag, & Catherine Yeh, presentation of research (in person)

THE SELF-EFFICACY AND WELLBEING BENEFITS OF ONE-OFF VIRTUAL WRITING RETREATS FOR LARGE INTRODUCTORY UNDERGRADUATE COURSES

Research on writing in group contexts (e.g., writing retreats and writing groups) has typically emphasized increases in publication output among professional academics (e.g., see reviews by Kornhaber et al., 2016; and Manzano-Nunez et al., 2020) or greater dissertation-writing productivity among graduate students (e.g., see the collection of essays in Guerin & Aitchison, 2014). This focus on scholarly output, however, neglects an important demographic of academic writers: namely undergraduate students. Although the stakes for undergraduate writers are distinct from professional academics, they confront many of the same challenges to successful writing and could stand to benefit from interventions that recognize the benefits of writing in group contexts. Research on writing retreats and writing groups show a host of internal and affective benefits beyond the bottom line of publication output that should also be available to undergraduates. These include feelings of connectedness with colleagues, reduced feelings of isolation, increased self-efficacy, a stronger sense of self, and greater pleasure in writing (e.g., Bigelow et al., 2022; Eardley, 2021; Vincent et al., 2021; and Papen & Thériault, 2018).

In this presentation, we introduce a scalable, group-based writing intervention that we call the Undergraduate Writing Retreat (UWR). These UWRs create opportunities for students to speak to one another about common writing challenges, share assignment strategies, and engage in silent writing time. Original survey data from a large introductory lecture course (N=180) reveal that students participating in a 90-minute writing retreat enjoy measurable increases in writing self-efficacy and academic-wellbeing compared to classmates who did not participate in a retreat. Controlling for office hour attendance, program year, and experience with assignment-relevant tasks, we demonstrate that even in a single administration, participating students express greater confidence in meeting the challenges of university writing, report decreased levels of anxiety related to assignment deadlines, and profess feelings of greater connectivity to their peers. We present these findings alongside qualitative student feedback on elements of UWR design that students found most conducive to their success.

References

Bigelow, T. M., Das, B., Gilfillan, B. H., Forziat-Pytel, K., Galván, A., & Kim, S. R. (2022). Wellness-based Writing Retreats: Promoting Academic Productivity across Professional Stages within Counselor Education. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, 17(4), 502–517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15401383.2021.1924096>

Guerin, C., & Aitchison, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Writing groups for doctoral education and beyond: innovations in practice and theory*. Routledge.

Eardley, A. F., Banister, E., & Fletcher, M. (2021). Can academic writing retreats function as wellbeing interventions? *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(2), 183–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2020.1744542>

Kornhaber, R., Cross, M., Betihavas, V., & Bridgman, H. (2016). The benefits and challenges of academic writing retreats: an integrative review. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 35(6), 1210–1227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1144572>

Manzano-Nunez, R., Ariza, F., Rengifo, J. E., Munoz, L. E., Gempeler, A., Ortega, G., & García, A. F. (2020). A Scoping Review of Peer Support Writing Groups in Academic Medicine as a Valuable Tool for Physician-Scientists in the Publish or Perish Era. *Medical Science Educator*, 30(3), 1313–1319. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-020-00983-4>

Papen, U., & Thériault, V. (2018). Writing retreats as a milestone in the development of PhD students' sense of self as academic writers. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 40(2), 166– 180.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2017.1396973>

Vincent, C., Tremblay-Wragg, É., Déri, C., Plante, I., & Mathieu Chartier, S. (2021). How writing retreats represent an ideal opportunity to enhance PhD candidates' writing self-efficacy and self-regulation. *Teaching in Higher Education*.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1918661>

Diana Wegner, presentation of research (in person)

A GENRE ANALYSIS OF THE INTERMEDIARY FUNCTION OF PUBLIC INQUIRIES: UPTAKE ANXIETY AND ENACTMENTS AS INDICES OF GENRE STABILITY AND VIABILITY

This paper extends a preliminary study of the public inquiry (PI) genre to focus on the dynamics of uptake anxiety and uptake enactments into Inquiry recommendations, and both the consequent destabilizing effects and opportunities or affordances for genre restabilization.

The theoretical framework for this study is drawn from key concepts in rhetorical genre studies: uptake (Freadman 2002, Tachino 2012), meta-genre (Giltrow 2002), and genre stability (Schryer 1993).

While uptake tends to occur automatically in routine genres, it is never guaranteed, and, in other more contentious genres, it can become a fraught expectation, especially in genres like the PI, whose main function is intermediary--its recommendations ostensibly to be taken up as policy, but mandated as non-binding. The PI genre involves both citizen expectations and institutional inertia, so that there is uptake anxiety for different reasons by different participants. Uptake anxiety materializes in dialogical anticipations of and responses to those uptakes from legal, citizen, and advocacy genres that have been selected to be recontextualized as recommendations in the report and to those that have not. Such uptake enactments and responses have the potential to contribute to not only destabilizing effects but also affordances for restabilizing a genre constructively.

To what extent is uptake anxiety and response constitutive of meaningful citizen engagement with the state? To what extent a functioning genre? To recall Miller (1984), to what extent is the PI genre a viable “form of life” for a community?

The vehicle for this study is the Portapique Mass Casualty Commission (2022-23). Methodology includes an analysis of the Final Report (Mar. 31/23) and an extended thematic analysis of meta-generic commentary from mainstream and social media occasioned by the process and aftermath of genre deployment, and reflecting participants' expectations of and responses to uptake by the Inquiry (May 2022 to May 2023).

Key words: rhetorical genre studies, uptake, meta-genre, genre stability, public inquiries.

References

Ashforth, A. (1990). Reckoning schemes of legitimation: On commissions of inquiry as power/knowledge forms. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, (3), 1-22.

Bessner, R. (2017). Introduction to public inquiries in Canada. In R. Bessner & S. Lightstone (Eds.), *Public inquiries in Canada: Law and practice* (pp. 1-17). Toronto: Thomson Reuters.

- Collard, J. (2015). Into the archive: Vancouver's missing women commission of inquiry. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 33 (5), 779-795.
- Des Rosiers, N. (2016). Public inquiries and law reform institutions. "Truth findings" and "truth producing." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, 28 (2), 374-392.
- Inquiries Act (Canada). (1985/2020). Government of Canada.
- Freadman, A. (2002). Uptake. In R. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko (Eds.), *The rhetoric and ideology of genre* (pp. 39-53). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Gerster, J. (November 2021). The RCMP revisited. *The Walrus*. Vol. 18, no. 7: pp. 44-56.
- Giltrow, J. (2002). Meta-genre. In R. Coe, L. Lingard, & T. Teslenko (Eds.), *The rhetoric and ideology of genre* (pp. 105-132). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Giltrow, J. (2016). Form alone: The supreme court of Canada reading historical treaties. In N. Artemeva & A. Freedman, A. (Eds.), *Genre studies around the globe: beyond three traditions* (Opp. 207-224). Edmonton, AB: Inkshed Publications.
- Jamieson, K. M. (1975). Antecedent genre as rhetorical constraint. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61(4), 406-415.
- Kennedy, G. (2018). Public inquiries' terms of reference: lessons from the past—and for the future. *Manitoba Law Journal*, (41)1,317-341.
- Miller, C. (1984/1994). Genre as social action. In A. Freedman, & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric*, pp. 23-42). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Nova Scotia's Act Respecting Public Inquiries, 1989.
- Rolston, B., & Scraton, P. (2005). In the full glare of English politics: Ireland, inquiries and the British state. *Brit. J. Criminol*, (45), 547-564.
- Ruel, S. (2020). The use of public inquiries in rooting out corruption and collusion—the Canadian experience. *Criminal Law Forum*, (31), 553-577.
- Schryer, C. (1993). Records as genre. *Written Communication*, 10(2), 200-234. Stanton, K. (2022). *Reconciling truths: Reimagining public inquiries in Canada*. UBC Press.
- Stark, A. & Yates, S. (2021). Public inquiries as procedural policy tools. *Policy and Society*, (40)3, 345-361.
- Tachino, F. (2012). Theorizing uptake and knowledge mobilization: A case for intermediary genre. *Written Communication*, 29(4), 455-476.
- Walsh, J. (2017). The national inquiry into the missing and murdered indigenous women and girls of Canada. *Indigenous Law Bulletin*, 30(8), 6-10.

Andrea Williams, presentation of research (in person)

WRITING THE LAND AND THE SELF IN THE CITY: RECONCILING LAND-BASED PEDAGOGY WITH AN ENVIRONMENTAL WRITING COURSE IN AN URBAN UNIVERSITY

The field of writing studies in Canada has just begun to reckon with the climate crisis and its attendant social inequalities, and along with it the impact of colonialism on Indigenous people. Land-based learning, experiential learning, and place-based writing (Rhodes) are some of the pedagogies taking root in our field and beyond as ways to engage our students with climate justice and reimagine settlers' relationship to the land. This presentation explores ways to apply and adapt such theories and pedagogies to writing courses at universities located in large urban centres—ways that enable diverse groups of students to participate and for whom full-scale land-based courses are not possible.

Reporting on a pilot study of an environmental writing course aimed at challenging Eurocentric understandings of nature and the environment, this presentation describes how land-based rhetoric can support students' reflection and in some cases transformation with respect to their own relationship to the land—both their current locations as well as their lands of origin. Drawing on the work of scholars like Gabriela Raquel Rios, and Kristin L. Arola, this presentation explores the power and possibilities for land-based rhetoric in acknowledging how people's relationships with the land is formed not just textually but also sensorially and through memory. In addition to the underlying theory, I share practical strategies for planning outdoor excursions in urban areas and building relationships with partners who support land-based learning.

Works Cited

Arola, Kristin L. A Land-Based Digital Rhetoric. *The Routledge Handbook of Digital Writing and Rhetoric*. Eds. Jonathan Alexander and Jacqueline Rhodes. 2018. 10.4324/9781315518497-20

Jacobs, Elliot. Re(Place) Your Typical Writing Assignment: An Argument for Place-Based Writing. *The English Journal*, 2011, Vol. 100, No. 3pp. 49-54. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/25790061>

Rios, Gabriela Raquel. "Cultivating Land-Based Literacies and Rhetorics." *Literacy in Composition Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2015, pp. 60–70.