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## Schedule at a Glance

### Wednesday, October 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:00-17:00</td>
<td>SSLW Registration and Check in (Paul's Office, Language and Literature Building 304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00-20:00</td>
<td>Pre-Symposium Social (on your own at Shady Park)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thursday, October 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-17:00</td>
<td>Registration (Alumni Lounge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-17:00</td>
<td>Exhibits (Alumni Lounge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-09:30</td>
<td>Opening Ceremony (Arizona Room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:30-10:30</td>
<td>Opening Plenary: Alister Cumming (Arizona Room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Exhibits Break/Refreshments (Alumni Lounge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Session A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:30</td>
<td>Lunch Break (lunch on your own)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-15:00</td>
<td>Session B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15:30</td>
<td>Exhibits Break/Refreshments (Alumni Lounge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-17:00</td>
<td>Session C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-17:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15-18:00</td>
<td>Reflections (Arizona Room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00-20:00</td>
<td>Opening Reception—for all registered participants (Engrained)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Friday, October 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-17:00</td>
<td>Registration (Alumni Lounge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-17:00</td>
<td>Exhibits (Alumni Lounge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30-10:00</td>
<td>Session D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>Exhibits Break/Refreshments (Alumni Lounge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:00</td>
<td>Session E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:30</td>
<td>Lunch Break (lunch on your own)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-15:00</td>
<td>Session F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15:30</td>
<td>Exhibits Break/Refreshments (Alumni Lounge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-17:00</td>
<td>Session G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-17:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15-18:00</td>
<td>Reflections (Arizona Room)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saturday, October 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00-12:00</td>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-12:00</td>
<td>Exhibits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30-10:00</td>
<td>Session H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-10:30</td>
<td>Exhibits Break/Refreshments (Alumni Lounge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:00</td>
<td>Session I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-13:30</td>
<td>Buffet Lunch—for all registered participants (Engrained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-15:00</td>
<td>Session J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-16:00</td>
<td>Reflections and Refreshments (Turquoise Room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-17:00</td>
<td>Closing Plenary: Diane D. Belcher (Turquoise Room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-18:00</td>
<td>Closing Remarks and SSLW 2017 Preview (Turquoise Room)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Welcome to SSLW 2016

Welcome to the 15th Symposium on Second Language Writing and welcome (back) to Arizona State University!

The Symposium on Second Language Writing started in 1998 in order to build a sense of community among second language writing specialists by bringing together second language writing researchers and teachers to discuss key issues and future directions. To stimulate the conversation about the field, we invited internationally recognized experts in the field of second language writing. Back then, identifying experts was not particularly challenging because second language writing was still a relatively small field with only a handful of specialists who regularly contributed new knowledge about second language writing and writers. Since then, the field has grown considerably, and there are many researchers and teachers from various philosophical, methodological and sociocultural contexts who take part in this knowledge enterprise.

With the growing size of the field and the diversity of orientations, defining expertise has become more challenging. What constitutes expertise in the field of second language writing? What do second language writing experts need to know and be able to do? Who can claim to be experts? Does being an expert require the knowledge of all aspects of second language writing? Or is having a small subset of knowledge and skill sufficient? What about those whose ideas are not situated in the ongoing conversation in the field? Where is the boundary between experts and non-experts? How do we know? How do we communicate expertise to others? This year’s theme, Expertise in Second Language Writing, highlights the need to explore and articulate what it means to have expertise in the field of second language writing.

Expertise in second language writing is sometimes conceptualized as a binary—either you are an expert or you are not. In reality, there are different types and degrees of expertise that are needed depending on the context and roles—writing center tutors, teachers, teacher educators, program administrators, researchers, research mentors, editors, reviewers. Different instructional contexts also require different sets of expertise. As the field of second language writing matures and continues to grow as a community of experts, it is important to move toward a shared understanding of what knowledge and skills are needed for various roles we play in various contexts, and to develop a mechanism for developing and recognizing those expertise.

Once again, this year’s symposium—featuring Alister Cuming and Diane Belcher, two of the original experts from 1998, as plenary speakers—brings together second language writing researchers and teachers from around the world. Together, we will explore the nature of expertise in second language writing and to move toward a shared understanding of what knowledge and skills are needed in order to function as second language writing experts in various contexts.

I hope you find this iteration of SSLW stimulating.

Paul Kei Matsuda, Founding Chair
Symposium on Second Language Writing
To Get the Most Out of SSLW 2016

Session Information

All sessions take place on the second floor of the Memorial Union (MU) unless otherwise noted. This year’s symposium includes the following session formats: Plenary talks, colloquia, papers, roundtables, institutes and reflections.

- **Plenary talks.** Plenary talks are scheduled at the beginning and at the end of the three-day event. The speakers, Alister Cumming and Diane Belcher, are two of the original “experts” from the first SSLW in 1998.
- **Colloquia.** There are two kinds of colloquia: invited and proposed. Invited colloquia are special sessions that address key issues related to the theme from various perspectives. Proposed colloquia are groups of papers that address a coherent theme from different perspectives.
- **Papers.** Papers are 30-minute presentations on any topic related to second language writing.
- **Roundtables.** Roundtable sessions are 20-minute informal presentations for the purpose of generating discussion or getting feedback on preliminary or work-in-progress work.
- **Institute Workshops.** Second Language Writing Institute, open to all SSLW 2016 participants, provides workshops that help the participants develop expertise in various aspects of second language writing. The seats are available on a first-come-first-served basis.
- **Reflections.** A reflection session at the end of each day provides an opportunity for sharing your thoughts about expertise in second language writing as well as other key issues that emerged during sessions and informal conversations.

The session code indicates the time slot, room, and order of presentation. For example, A.1.1 means the first concurrent session (Session A, 11:00-12:00), Arizona Room, and first presentation. (Special sessions and meetings that are scheduled outside the regular session slots are not numbered.)

A.1.1

Time Room Order

There are no session chairs. Each presenter is responsible for presenting only during the designated presentation time, and for starting and finishing the presentation on time. For smooth transitions, presenters are encouraged to communicate with other presenters in the session to share a laptop computer.

Technology

WiFi is available throughout ASU campus. The guest login information will be provided in the Exhibit Area (Alumni Lounge).

We encourage the use of social media to extend the discussion (hashtag: #sslw2016). During sessions, please put device to silent mode and be courteous to the presenter and other participants. To receive updates, reminders and other announcements during the conference, follow SSLW social media accounts: @sslwtg (twitter); @L2Writing (Facebook).
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Notes
Studies of second-language writing (SLW) have become increasingly sophisticated, focused, multi-faceted, and comprehensive. Correspondingly, demands have increased in the expertise required to conduct, publish, and interpret research in SLW, and to do so systematically, rigorously, and intelligently. Scholars of SLW need to know, identify, and analyze key issues in the practices and policies of teaching and learning SLW, of course, to acknowledge how they have been investigated previously, and to approach them in ways that will make a difference for others. Scholars of SLW also need to appreciate and investigate how these issues occur: locally as well as internationally; for populations of different ages and societal statuses; across different multiple language combinations; from theoretical perspectives related to psychology, linguistics, socio-anthropology, and education; and using methods of qualitative and quantitative research appropriately and judiciously. Are all of these areas of expertise necessary to be able to produce research insights into SLW that are credible, innovative, significant, and useful? In turn, what do readers or users of research about SLW need to know in order to be able to interpret such research critically and sensibly? What constitutes the relevant knowledge, skills, and purposes to do and act on studies of SLW? Should a scholar of SLW strive to act like a jack of all trades, but risk being a master of none? Or should a scholar of SLW act like a jackal that roams cleverly, alone or in packs, in a few choice territories? I will propose relevant criteria to answer these questions, review some notable research innovations in SLW, and suggest certain directions for future inquiry and professional development.

Alister Cumming is a professor in the Centre for Educational Research on Language and Literacies (CERLL, formerly the Modern Language Centre) at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, where he has been employed since 1991 following briefer periods at the University of British Columbia, McGill University, Carleton University, and Concordia University. For 2014 to 2017 Alister is also a Changjiang Scholar in the National Research Centre for Foreign Language Education at Beijing Foreign Studies University. His research and teaching focus on writing in second languages, language assessment, language program evaluation and policies, and research methods. Alister’s recent books are Agendas for Language Learning Research (with Lourdes Ortega and Nick Ellis, Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), Adolescent Literacies in a Multicultural Context (Routledge, 2012), A Synthesis of Research on Second Language Writing in English (with Ilona Leki and Tony Silva, Routledge, 2008), and Goals for Academic Writing (John Benjamins, 2006). Alister’s full CV appears on his university home page.
While decades of theory and research have encouraged a view of writing as integrally linked with reading and, less obviously, with oral communication, only more recently has writing been conceived of as part of a much larger technology-enhanced semiotic toolkit. L2 writers in particular have been seen as especially likely to benefit from such a digitally-enriched multimodal view of writing, and hence from guided use of the wealth of resources—audio and visual, graphic and video—now available for their composing processes. Few instructors or teacher-educators, however, have themselves been taught how to navigate, not to mention serve as guides to, composing in a digital environment. This presentation will discuss issues critical to considerations of how to become and effectively be a facilitator of multimodal composing and what forms assessment of such complex creative student work could take.

More specifically, drawing on theoretical, empirical, and pedagogical work reported on in both L1 and L2 literature relevant to facilitating new media composing, a number of questions, such as the following, will be explored: To what extent should the L2 writing class become a site of support for basic digital literacy acquisition for those still disadvantaged by the digital divide? Should instructors learn to leverage multimodality as a motivator for L2 literacy acquisition? How can students be guided in use of existing and developing print and multimodal literacies as mutually supportive scaffolds of each other? Should multimodal resources be used to enhance and critically problematize genre awareness and acquisition, and if so, how? Should writing assignments be designed to enable students to see multimodality as an ever-present means of expanding their composing repertoires, and again, if so, how? What heuristics already exist to guide teacher and peer development of rubrics for multimodal-ensembles, which, in turn, could guide collaborative creative processes and assessment of outcomes? And finally, how should teachers, as well as writing programs and multiliteracy centers, be assessed (or should they?) in their ability to foster student awareness of and facility with multimodal resources?
Invited Colloquia

B.1 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-15:00, Arizona (Invited Colloquium)
Developing Expertise: Using Student L1 Knowledge in the Teaching of L2 Writing
Organized by Kay Losey, Grand Valley State University, United States

G.1 Friday, October 21, 15:30-17:00, Arizona (Invited Colloquium)
Expertise Optional? What We Wish We Knew Before Becoming L2 WPAs
Organized by Dana Ferris, University of California, Davis, United States, and Christine Tardy, University of Arizona, United States

Second Language Writing Institute

B.2 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-15:00, Turquoise (Institute)
Developing Expertise in a Reading/Writing/Speaking Approach to L2 Writing
Diane Belcher, Georgia State University, United States

C.2 Thursday, October 20, 15:30-17:00, Turquoise (Institute)
Conventions and Contexts: Genre Awareness Through Reading-into-Writing
Ann M. Johns, San Diego State University, United States

D.2 Friday, October 21, 08:30-10:00, Turquoise (Institute)
Publishing Research in Second Language Writing
Guillaume Gentil, Carleton University, Canada
Christine Tardy, University of Arizona, United States

E.2 Friday, October 21, 10:30-12:00, Turquoise (Institute)
Surviving the Academic Job Market as an L2 Writing Specialist
Katherine Daily O’Meara, Emporia State University, United States

F.2 Friday, October 21, 13:30-15:00, Turquoise (Institute)
How to be a Productive Scholar in L2 Writing
Dana Ferris, University of California, Davis, United States

G.2 Friday, October 21, 15:30-17:00, Turquoise (Institute)
Taking SLW Expertise Abroad with the U.S. Department of State
Cristyn Elder, University of New Mexico, United States

H.2 Saturday, October 22, 08:30-10:00, Turquoise (Institute)
What Graduate Writers Need (and how to provide it)
Nigel Caplan, University of Delaware, United States
Christine Feak, University of Michigan, United States

J.2 Saturday, October 22, 13:30-15:00, Turquoise (Institute)
How to Read and Report Statistics in Studies of SLW
Alister Cumming, University of Toronto, Canada
Thursday, October 20

Thursday, October 20, 09:00-09:30, Arizona
Opening Ceremony

Thursday, October 20, 09:30-10:30, Arizona (Opening Plenary)

**A Jack(al) of All Trades? Expertise in Studies of SLW**
Alister Cumming, University of Toronto, Canada

Studies of second-language writing (SLW) have become increasingly sophisticated, focused, multi-faceted, and comprehensive. Correspondingly, demands have increased in the expertise required to conduct, publish, and interpret research in SLW, and to do so systematically, rigorously, and intelligently. Scholars of SLW need to know, identify, and analyze key issues in the practices and policies of teaching and learning SLW, of course, to acknowledge how they have been investigated previously, and to approach them in ways that will make a difference for others. Scholars of SLW also need to appreciate and investigate how these issues occur: locally as well as internationally; for populations of different ages and societal statuses; across different multiple language combinations; from theoretical perspectives related to psychology, linguistics, soci-anthropology, and education; and using methods of qualitative and quantitative research appropriately and judiciously. Are all of these areas of expertise necessary to be able to produce research insights into SLW that are credible, innovative, significant, and useful? In turn, what do readers or users of research about SLW need to know in order to be able to interpret such research critically and sensibly? What constitutes the relevant knowledge, skills, and purposes to do and act on studies of SLW? Should a scholar of SLW strive to act like a jack of all trades, but risk being a master of none? Or should a scholar of SLW act like a jackal that roams cleverly, alone or in packs, in a few choice territories? I will propose relevant criteria to answer these questions, review some notable research innovations in SLW, and suggest certain directions for future inquiry and professional development.

**Session A**

A.1.1 Thursday, October 20, 11:00-11:30, Arizona (Paper)
**Intersections of Expertise in Composition and Second Language Writing: Results from a Review of Research**
Karyn Mallett, George Mason University, United States
Paul Rogers, George Mason University, United States
Anna Habib, George Mason University, United States
Terry Zawacki, George Mason University, United States

This study maps the research landscape at the intersections of L2 Writing and Composition through a review of 10 key journals over the past five years, focusing on the questions, methods, audiences, sources, and topics of study across journals.

A.1.2 Thursday, October 20, 11:30-12:00, Arizona (Paper)
**Kairotic Moments: Urgency, Ethics, and Responses to a Shifting L2 Population**
Gail Shuck, Boise State University, United States
Daniel Wilber, Boise State University, United States

Seizing a kairotic opportunity, our university developed a 6-credit, first-year writing course option that meets the needs of a rapidly increasing international and U.S.-resident multilingual population. Presenters will share data revealing the course’s successes and the motivations that drive students’ placement decisions.
A.3.1 Thursday, October 20, 11:00-11:30, Gold (Paper)
**How Second Language Acquisition Theories Can Improve Writing Tutor Training**
Molly Rentscher, Arizona State University, United States

Empirical data reveals that writing tutors struggle with balancing attention to both local and global writing errors in tutoring sessions with L2 writers. This presentation demonstrates how writing center administrators can develop tutors’ expertise in second language acquisition theories. Tutors can then apply this knowledge to better serve L2 writers.

A.3.2 Thursday, October 20, 11:30-12:00, Gold (Paper)
**Facilitating Conversations Between Writing Tutors and L2 Writers: Using the Tutoring Cycle as a Guide**
Lisa Cahill, Arizona State University, United States

This presentation will describe how MacDonald’s (2000) tutoring cycle can be used to train writing tutors to engage L2 writers in analyses of their writing decisions, writing strengths, and possible revisions. The presenter will discuss how these conversations between tutors and L2 writers can result in richer discussions of writing.

A.4.1 Thursday, October 20, 11:00-11:30, Gila (Paper)
**Frameworks for Success after Failure: A Study of L2 Writers**
Sei Lee, University of California, Irvine, United States

Based on interviews with 104 L2 students who have previously failed an academic writing course, this presentation revisits the Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing. The presentation recommends foregrounding strategies to achieve success by strategically undoing failure for students such as these while also proactively avoiding failure for future students.

A.4.2 Thursday, October 20, 11:30-12:00, Gila (Paper)
**Crossing the Great Divide: Encouraging Practitioner-Researcher Dialogue**
Margi Wald, University of California, Berkeley, United States

This roundtable discussion focuses on the need and venues for more interaction between researchers and practitioners in general—so that we can share our expertise. Participants will brainstorm ideas and create action plans for increasing communication.

A.5.1 Thursday, October 20, 11:00-11:30, Graham (Paper)
**Syntactic Complexity in L2 Writing: A Diversity Dimension**
Ji-Hyun Park, Michigan State University, United States

The present study proposes a new measure of syntactic complexity that taps into the diversity dimension of the construct. The study investigates L2 writers’ use of syntactic structure patterns from the verb-argument construction (VAC) perspective. The frequency and distribution of VACs are examined based on the findings in usage-based approaches to grammar.

A.5.2 Thursday, October 20, 11:30-12:00, Graham (Paper)
**Syntactic Complexity, Lexical Complexity, and their Relationship to One Another: A Large-scale Analysis of L2 Writers’ Essays**
Mark Johnson, East Carolina University, United States

Responding to calls to examine a range of complexity measures (Norris & Ortega, 2009), this study examined 18 indices of lexical and syntactic complexity in 1,258 L2 essays. The results indicated consistent patterns of co-variance among nine measures, suggesting support for the developmental sequence noted in Norris and Ortega (2009).
A.6.1 Thursday, October 20, 11:00-11:30, Yuma (Paper)
**Attitudes toward Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback in Developmental Writing**

Kendon Kurzer, University of California, Davis, United States

While research has indicated that Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF) helps L2 writers improve their written grammatical accuracy, no research thus far has investigated student or teacher attitudes toward DWCF in their classes. This presentation reports on the attitudinal results of a study investigating DWCF with 350 total student participants.

A.6.2 Thursday, October 20, 11:30-12:00, Yuma (Paper)
**“You're the expert!”: Multilingual tutors in practice**

Aurora Aguirre, The University of Texas at San Antonio, United States

The purpose of this study was to explore the practices of multilingual tutors with multilingual writers. Nine sessions were analyzed with a special focus on the participants’ rejection and acceptance of the tutor’s expert status in language, writing, or the content area.

A.7.1 Thursday, October 20, 11:00-11:30, Yavapai (Paper)
**Flipping the Switch: Prioritizing Global over Local Concerns in L2 Writing**

Kelly Chase, Arizona State University, United States

Learn how tutors can ‘flip the switch’ and focus on content in L2 writing. Sentence-level errors in L2 writing can be distracting, but this presentation will demonstrate why a narrow focus on grammar—even if these concerns are a barrier to a reader’s understanding—is a disservice to L2 students.

A.7.2 Thursday, October 20, 11:30-12:00, Yavapai (Paper)
**Expert-like use of hedges and boosters in research articles written by Polish and English native-speaker writers**

Katarzyna Hryniiuk, Warsaw University, Poland

The present study compares the use of hedges and boosters in a corpus of 40 research articles from the area of applied linguistics, written by native English speakers and Polish writers. The author used a concordance program WordSmith Tools. It has important implications for developing writing for publication in EFL.

A.8.1 Thursday, October 20, 11:00-11:30, Pinal (Paper)
**Using Multilingual Students’ Expertise in Online Courses in the Design of an Online First-Year Writing Course**

Tanya Tercero, University of Arizona, United States

The purpose of this study is to develop expertise in the design and teaching of an online first-year composition course for multilingual students by creating a learner profile. Survey data, semi-structured interviews, and course evaluations are used to identify which affordances of online learning English Language Learners value most.

A.8.2 Thursday, October 20, 11:30-12:00, Pinal (Paper)
**Visual cues in EFL paragraph writing: effective ideas with a comic creator**

Takako Yasuta, University of Aizu, Japan

This study attempts to elaborate a new approach for teaching English paragraph structure to college-level EFL students using comic panels and metalinguistic activities with visual cues. The main focus is on finding an effective pedagogical strategy to assist EFL learners to identify and write a relevant topic sentence.
### A.9.1 Thursday, October 20, 11:00-11:30, Santa Cruz (Paper)

#### The impact of screen-capture video feedback

Michelle Cavaleri, Western Sydney University; Navitas Professional Institute, Australia  
Satomi Kawaguchi, Western Sydney University, Australia  
Bruno Di Biase, Western Sydney University, Australia  
Clare Power, Western Sydney University, Australia  

This presentation reports on a study that examines how screen-capture video feedback impacts the provision and uptake of feedback compared to conventional written comments. This presentation includes a demonstration of video feedback as experienced by the student and offers tips for creating effective feedback videos.

### Thursday, October 20, 12:00-13:30, Turquoise (Open Meeting)

#### Consortium on Graduate Communication Meeting and Discussion

Nigel Caplan, University of Delaware, United States

### Session B

#### B.1 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-15:00, Arizona (Invited Colloquium)

#### Developing Expertise: Using Student L1 Knowledge in the Teaching of L2 Writing

Kay Losey, Grand Valley State University, United States (Chair and Presenter)  
Lilian Mina, Auburn University at Montgomery, United States  
Pisarn Bee Chamcharatsri, University of New Mexico, United States  
Margi Wald, University of California, Berkeley, United States  
Gail Shuck, Boise State University, United States  

This colloquium invites second language writing experts with experience teaching, researching, and/or directing in writing programs at the college and university level to discuss ways that students’ previous language and rhetorical experiences have been used in their classes or their programs to benefit students’ second language writing development. What curricular and classroom practices, supported by research in our discipline, call on students to use their wealth of language expertise? And what potential issues does writing in a language other than English in school raise for multilingual students? Finally, it also addresses how these practices have been shared with and received by colleagues in their home programs.

Lilian will share an integrative pedagogical model that makes use of multilingual students’ knowledge of multiple languages and digital practices. She will discuss the model and its implications for teaching writing. Bee will argue that L2 students should be allowed to use L1s with their L1-speaking peers in providing detailed feedback on their drafts. Margi will outline an assignment used in FYC and tutor-training courses encouraging students to synthesize text and images incorporating different dialects, languages, and registers. Gail will describe a public, multilingual-student conference on language and identity as a mechanism not only for building a network of L2 writing experts but also for rethinking her own previous ideas about the complexity of multilingual identity in an English-dominant institution. Kay’s presentation provides an overview of findings teachers and administrators should keep in mind when considering assignments and activities that encourage or require code-switching.

After short presentations by panelists, the colloquium will offer time for a robust discussion of these issues between participants and attendees.
B.2 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-15:00, Turquoise (Institute)

**Developing expertise in a reading/writing/speaking approach to L2 writing**
Diane Belcher, Georgia State University, United States

Although it is not at all uncommon for intensive English programs (IEPs) to take an “integrated skills” approach, in theory blending all linguistic modalities, in their teaching of language, such an approach is, not surprisingly, less common in writing programs. In fact, even in many IEPs that claim to take this integrated approach, writing is often still conceptualized as a mainly stand-alone solitary process. What would it take to persuade language and writing professionals to think of and effectively teach writing as inherently, optimally, and indeed necessarily connected with reading and speaking? This workshop will present theory- and research-based rationales for mindful linking of writing with reading and speaking, and will analyze activities informed by pedagogical strategies for seamlessly making such connections with and without the help of digital technology.

B.3.1 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-14:00, Gold (Paper)

**Syntactic processing changed after written CF**
Su Li, AUT University, New Zealand

Empirical studies on the L2 learning potential of written CF have mainly focused on output sometimes without consistent results. Focusing on a learner whose score remained zero at the end of a quasi-experiment, this case study reveals her syntactic processing has changed after the written CF in the quasi-experiment.

B.3.2 Thursday, October 20, 14:00-14:30, Gold (Paper)

**Building Expertise in Second Language Writing: Visualizing Areas of Research Represented in JSLW**
Aleksandra Swatek, Purdue University, United States

Using Journal of Second Language Writing’s bibliometric data (author names, titles, abstracts, references, etc.) I created a series of maps using data visualization software. The maps represent key areas of research in SLW, through statistically measured relationship between cited sources, authors, and key terms.

B.3.3 Thursday, October 20, 14:30-15:00, Gold (Paper)

Tony Silva, Purdue University, United States

This presentation will address the problematic current political and economic situation of second language writing professionals in US institutions of higher education, identifying the serious challenges they face and offering suggestions for ways in which they might resist the forces behind these challenges that threaten the existence of the field.

B.4.1 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-14:00, Gila (Paper)

**The L.A.B. Project: Supplemental Language Instruction in a University Writing Center**
Phillip Heasley, University of Colorado Colorado Springs, United States
Kacey Ross, University of Colorado Colorado Springs, United States
Stacey Johnson, University of Colorado Colorado Springs, United States

The University Writing Center director and second-language experts within the first year composition faculty developed “LAB” (Language and Basics), a series of faculty-led one-hour sessions to improve students’ sentence-level skills. We describe the program’s prior and ongoing development, outcomes, and the successes and tensions involved in negotiating our varied expertise.
**The Meaningfulness of L2 Writing Conferences: Different Measures and Tutors’ and Learners’ Perspectives**

Junko Imai, University of Hawaii at Manoa; Juntendo University, United States

By using various measures and utilizing both tutors’ and learners’ reflections, this paper explored the meaningfulness of writing conferences (WCs) for L2 English learners in a US college setting. Implications will be discussed regarding the importance of L2 WCs, combining research methods, and tutor and learner training.

**Embedded Tutoring in Non-Composition Courses and in Accelerated English Composition for L2 Writers**

Christi Nogle, Boise State University, United States
Jenica Draney, College of Western Idaho, United States
Janet Newman, Boise State University, United States

Instructors of L2 composition and a Learning Assistant (LA) share the results of a qualitative study of current practices and details of an Embedded Tutoring (ET) program for multilingual students. Our purposes are to explain the ET/LA model, promote its use, and suggest ways to use it more effectively.

**Collaborative Writing Between Heritage and Second Language Learners: Linguistic Outcomes and Learning Opportunities**

Ana Fernandez Dobao, University of Washington, United States

This study analyzes collaborative writing activities completed by HL-L2 learner dyads. It compares the frequency, type, and outcome of LREs generated by HL and L2 learners. It shows how different learning opportunities are created for HL and L2 learners, and how these impact the nature of their written texts. Pedagogical implications are discussed.

**Using the DAE Framework in a Language and Culture Course for International Students**

Matthew Allen, Purdue Language and Cultural Exchange, United States
Sarah Fehrman, Purdue Language and Cultural Exchange, United States
Hannah Bush, Purdue Language and Cultural Exchange, United States

College writing is complex and challenging in a second language and new cultural context. Students and teachers need support. We show how we implement Nam and Condon’s (2010) DAE framework into EAP course activities, focusing on writing at different stages of the learning process. Attendees will receive sample assignments.

**First-Year Writing Course for Non-Native English Speakers: A Site of Academic Discourse Socialization**

LeeAnne Godfrey, Minnesota State University, Mankato, United States

This presentation will report on study that explored a FYW course for NNES students from a language socialization framework. Findings highlight the dual role of a first-year writing course in socializing students into valued discourse practices of academic writing and of being a student.
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B.6.1 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-14:00, Yuma (Paper)
**Narrative writing as a window into NS and ESL learner’s discourse competence**
Jongbong Lee, Michigan State University, United States

This study explores the relationship between L2 learners’ writing strategies and cohesion in narratives. The findings demonstrate that the ESL learner used fewer connectives than the native speaker of English, and the discussion explores how the differences are related to the writers’ uses of different writing strategies and processes.

B.6.2 Thursday, October 20, 14:00-14:30, Yuma (Paper)
**Advanced EFL learners’ uses of Reference Chains in L1 and L2 writings: A corpus-based study of cohesion and different linguistic traits**
Jungyeon Koo, Seoul National University, Korea

This is a corpus-based study which examines and compares the use of reference chains in Korean (L1) and English (L2) argumentative writings by Korean students in three respects: 1) types of RCs, 2) the relation between RCs and writing quality, and 3) differences/similarities of RC usage in L1 and L2.

B.6.3 Thursday, October 20, 14:30-15:00, Yuma (Paper)
**Understanding irregular patterns of syntactic complexity development in German FL through an analysis of cohesive devices**
Carola Strobl, Ghent University, Belgium

This longitudinal study aimed at exploring the developmental patterns in German FL over five collegiate semesters. The quantitative analysis revealed linear development patterns for accuracy and fluency, but an irregular pattern for syntactic complexity. This showed to be related to cohesive strategies, as an analysis of individual developmental profiles illustrates.

B.7.1 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-14:00, Yavapai (Paper)
**Teaching writing in traditional writing classes: An activity theory perspective**
Yin Ling Cheung, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Jason Loh, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Donna Lim, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
Hari Jang, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

The study investigates how primary school English language teachers in Singapore teach writing in traditional writing classes, using the activity theory; and examines differences in the compositions produced by underachieving students under the traditional methods and a teaching programme based on a socio-cognitive approach to writing.

B.7.2 Thursday, October 20, 14:00-14:30, Yavapai (Paper)
**Finding innovation in contradictions: An activity theory approach to expertise in L2 writing instruction**
Brooke Schreiber, Penn State University, United States

This presentation discusses a case study of EFL writing pedagogy at a Serbian university, highlighting how pedagogical innovations emerged from teachers’ resolution of tensions between international materials, local educational requirements, and students’ needs. The presentation considers implications for conceptions of teacher expertise and suggestions for L2 writing teacher education.
B.7.3 Thursday, October 20, 14:30-15:00, Yavapai (Paper)

**Valuing self and history: Immigrant adolescent girls writing outside of school**

Priscila Leal, University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States

Betsy Gilliland, University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States

This paper reports outcomes of a community-based workshop in Hawai‘i for underserved immigrant adolescent girls about writing a scholarship statement of purpose. Findings suggest that the workshops fostered emotional as well as academic identity development for participants by valuing the girls’ sense of selves and their life histories.

B.8.1 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-14:00, Pinal (Paper)

**Adolescent L2 writers’ digital and multimodal literacies: Expertise in L2 writing beyond print- and text-based practice**

Youngjoo Yi, The Ohio State University, United States

Joohoon Kang, The Ohio State University, United States

Chin-Chiang Kao, The Ohio State University, United States

The presentation reports findings from a qualitative study of adolescent L2 writers’ digital/multimodal composing practices. It focuses on their process of multimodal composition and their use of multimodal resources for meaning-making and communication. Findings give us insights into ways in which we re-conceptualize the notion of expertise in L2 writing.

B.8.2 Thursday, October 20, 14:00-14:30, Pinal (Paper)

**Recent online writing tools to promote effective writing expertise**

Suzanne Bardasz, University of California Davis Extension, United States

This presentation will describe recent online writing tools such as “Maptia”, “Storify”, and “Make Belief Comix” that can be incorporated into ESL writing classes. These writing tools can provide students an opportunity to write for an authentic audience, while making their writing more meaningful, focused, and relevant.

B.8.3 Thursday, October 20, 14:30-15:00, Pinal (Paper)

**Developing Humanism: Writing on the Web 2.0**

Benjamin Duncan, University of California, Irvine, United States

A survey (n=72) on Canvas’ (Schrödinger, 2015) use in L2 writing classes at UC-Irvine measured effectiveness of Web 2.0 technology to improve humanistic discourse. The survey sought to determine (a) students’ conceptions of writing on Web 2.0 platforms, (b) the perceived benefits, (c) problems they experienced, and (d) whether Web 2.0 software fosters “netiquette” and better social networks.

B.9.1 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-14:00, Santa Cruz (Paper)

**Degree of explicitness of written corrective feedback and grammatical accuracy in second language writing**

Wataru Suzuki, Miyagi University of Education, Japan

Kounosuke Sato, Miyagi University of Educatio, Japan

In order to examine short- and long-term effects of degree of explicitness of written corrective feedback on second language writing and what factors mediate that effect, we conducted an experiment under two feedback conditions (direct feedback vs. grammar explanation) and with two linguistic structures (past perfect vs. article).
The effectiveness of focused and unfocused corrective feedback on Japanese orthography, overall accuracy, complexity, fluency
Taichi Yamashira, Texas Tech University, United States

The present research investigated the effectiveness of focused and unfocused corrective feedback (CF) on orthography, overall accuracy, fluency, and complexity of L2 writing in Japanese. It was found that both CF did not improve any dependent variables except for fluency on the part of those who received unfocused CF.

Written Feedback in Study Abroad: A Case Study
Julieta Fernandez, Northern Arizona University, United States
Aziz Yuldashev, Northern Arizona University, United States

Although feedback is a permanent fixture in L2 writing literature, it has primarily been studied in ESL and EFL settings, with lack of research in study abroad contexts. This presentation describes a case study of feedback on a study abroad student’s written work and its efficacy based on draft-to-draft comparisons.

Assignment Design in an Elementary Composition Course for Multilingual Writers
Anita Seralathan, Indiana University, United States

This study focuses on examining assignment design, with the aim of gaining a better understanding of what difficulties second language writers face in being able to read and interpret assignment prompts. Document analysis, interviews, and observations helped inform the researcher of a variety of factors which influence students’ responses to assignments.

Exploring How ESL Students Respond to Teacher Written Feedback in a HSC Preparation Program Setting
Mazin Yousif, The University of Sydney, Australia

Little is known about how ESL students cognitively, behaviorally and affectively respond to teacher written feedback on the language and content quality of their writing. This presentation aims to illuminate this neglected area in L2 writing literature by reporting results of a naturalistic case study involving four ESL adolescent students.

Investigating tutors’ and students’ beliefs about good writing and a writer’s voice in an afterschool literacy program
Robert Kohls, San Francisco State University, United States

This research analyzes what multilingual adolescent writers and their adult tutors in an afterschool literacy program believe about good writing and a writer’s voice and how their beliefs about writing and voice both reflect particular linguistic and cultural values and shape attitudes towards language use, the writer, and writing development.
B.11.1 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-14:00, Chrysocolla (Paper)

**Examining the comparability between face-to-face and computer-mediated ESL writing placement tests: Text quality and placement outcomes**

Ha Ram Kim, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States
Melissa Bowles, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States
Xun Yan, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States
Sun Joo Chung, Gachon University, Korea

This study investigated whether different test delivery modes are comparable in terms of essay quality among college-level ESL writers. The essays were analyzed based on complexity, accuracy and fluency, and in relation to the scores. This study has implications for second language writing and testing, and also for test administrators.

B.11.2 Thursday, October 20, 14:00-14:30, Chrysocolla (Paper)

**Performance or placement: Revision of the rating scale for a workshop-style writing placement test**

Xun Yan, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States
Ha Ram Kim, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States
John Kotnarowski, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States

This study reports on revision of a placement-based rating scale for a workshop-style writing placement test. The revision resulted in a hybrid rating scale, comprising performance-based descriptors as well as placement options. The hybrid scale substantiates the alignment across curriculum, instruction and assessment, and helps inform teaching for writing instructors.

B.11.3 Thursday, October 20, 14:30-15:00, Chrysocolla (Paper)

**Tapping (Self-)Expertise in L2 Writing Placement: A Role for DSP?**

Dana Ferris, University of California, Davis, United States
Katherine Evans, University of California, Davis, United States
Kendon Kurzer, University of California, Davis, United States

In this study, nearly 1100 new multilingual university students completed an in-house writing placement examination and a Directed Self-Placement (DSP) survey. Students’ placement scores, their survey responses, and admission test scores (SAT, TOEFL, etc.) were examined to assess the viability of the DSP model for this four-level L2 writing program.

B.12.1 Thursday, October 20, 13:30-14:00, Plata (Paper)

**Tutoring Style for English Language Learners: Assessing Non-Directive Tutoring Methods**

Marta Shcherbakova, College of Lake County, United States

An investigation of tutoring style for English Language Learners (ELL) assesses non-directive approach through examination of theoretical foundations for non-directive pedagogy and analysis of tutoring sessions with ELLs, presents a more balanced approach, and proposes a model of assessment for tutors in order to better assist ELLs with their writing.

B.12.2 Thursday, October 20, 14:00-14:30, Plata (Paper)

**An Exploration of the Possibility of Developing Indigenous Writing Centers in Korean Colleges as Bridges between Diverse Languages**

Minsun Kim, Miami University, United States

This case study examines educational practices of two chosen college writing centers in an Expanding Circle country, Korea. Interviews with their tutors and administrators and observations of their tutoring strategies demonstrate those centers’ expertise or knowledge and skills to meet local needs, as a bridge between diverse languages and discourses.
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B.12.3 Thursday, October 20, 14:30-15:00, Plata (Paper)
From Community Colleges to Four Year Universities: Korean International Students’ Preparation for College Writing in the United States
Justin G. Whitney, The University of Utah, United States

International students increasingly enter universities through community colleges yet remain largely absent from Second Language Writing scholarship. This presentation reports on a semester long qualitative study with goals of bringing to light the struggles international community college students encounter in gaining college writing expertise and the agency realized in response.

Session C

C.1.1 Thursday, October 20, 15:30-17:00, Arizona (Colloquium)
Colloquium on Genre Expertise

Jointly Constructing Genre Expertise
Nigel Caplan, University of Delaware, United States

Joint Construction is a teacher-led collaborative writing task that forms part of the Teaching/Learning Cycle genre-based writing pedagogy. This mixed-methods, quasi-experimental study investigates the nature of the discursive moves and scaffolding techniques that occurred during eight Joint Construction lessons and traces their impact on Intensive English Program students’ subsequent writing.

Developing textual expertise: SFL metalanguage and middle school translinguals
Meg Gebhard, University of Massachusetts, United States

This critical qualitative study analyzes how a teacher designed curriculum in a U.S. middle school using a Hallidayan perspective of disciplinary knowledge and literacy development. The findings demonstrate how students creatively generated their own functional metalanguage as they engaged in constructing themselves as more expert readers, writers, and discourse analysts.

A knowledge base for elementary teachers to develop genre expertise through SFL
Luciana de Oliveira, University of Miami, United States

A knowledge base model for elementary teachers to develop genre expertise through systemic-functional linguistics (SFL) is proposed, based on multiple studies conducted by the presenter. The model provides five principles to guide analysis and construction of texts in the content areas and planning writing instruction that integrates these principles.
Conventions and Contexts: Genre Awareness Through Reading-into-Writing
Ann M. Johns, San Diego State University, United States

Though discussions of genre teaching are plentiful in the current literature (See, e.g., Bawarshi & Reiff, 2010; Hyland, 2016; Johns, 2015), there is still concern about how texts from a genre introduced into a classroom can be seen as more “authentic” in terms of the contexts in which they are processed, produced, and received. Influenced by English for Specific Purposes and Rhetorical Genre Studies approaches, this workshop is designed to assist teachers to enhance students’ rhetorical flexibility, that is, their openness to the variety of texts possible within or beyond a genre, as students consider a text’s both “repeated” and “social” nature (see Miller, 1986/94). Participants will first define “genre.” Then, using two exemplars from the same genre produced for different contexts, they will practice rhetorical flexibility enhancement and preparation for writing through the following: Comparison/contrast of two genre exemplars for both their repeated features (conventions) and their variation when produced for different situations; Prediction of text reception by targeted audiences; Prompt analysis, based on the genre exemplars, leading to text production; Text processing decisions, e.g., planning and revision, drawing from the above activities.

A Digital and Textual Construction of the Disciplinary History of Second Language Writing
Zhaozhe Wang, Purdue University, United States
Ge Lan, Purdue University, United States

We will introduce a corpus-driven historical study of publications in the field of second language writing to bring the expertise of corpus linguistics into the historical inquiry.

Situating Research Writing in Culture and Context: A Historical Inquiry of the Systemic Functional Linguistic and Academic Literacies Approaches to L2 Writing Lesson Design
Stephen Kopec, University of Pennsylvania, United States
Amanda Thompson, University of Pennsylvania, English Language Programs, United States

This presentation is a historical inquiry of research developments that have shaped two large approaches to L2 Writing: Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Academic Literacies (AcLits). Using historiographical methods, the presenters delve into the trends and patterns of L2 writing research from both SFL and AcLits research perspectives and offer directions for future L2 writing research.

A Longitudinal Study of Adolescent ESL Learners’ Written Texts
Winfred (Wenhui) Xuan, Hong Kong Community College; The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong

The study explores how adolescent ESL learners expand their meaning potential, aggregating registers across different contexts, through analyzing the written texts composed by a class of 50 junior students in Guangzhou, China.
Emerging Expertise in the Disciplines: Academic Writing for International Graduate Students
Angela Garner, University of Kentucky, United States
Whitney Sarver, University of Kentucky, United States

This presentation will explore how students in an “Academic Writing for International Graduate Students” class developed field-specific expertise as second language writers. This course was designed and delivered by an ESOL writing professional, illustrating that knowledge of academic writing—rather than content-specific knowledge—is significant in helping students develop expertise.

Expertise and risk in doctoral dissertation writing: Faking the former, fearing the latter, and acknowledging ignorance
Christine Pearson Casanave, Temple University, Japan Campus, Japan

In this talk I speculate about a dilemma facing doctoral students and their advisors—that of students’ needing to represent themselves as experts when they are usually still learning content, research, and writing skills. Honesty about this dilemma involves risk and possibly challenges to convention. Open discussion encouraged.

How do international PhD students negotiate expectations on their writing assignments?
Yoo Young Ahn, Indiana University, United States

Not many studies in second language writing have examined how international graduate students deal with the issue of audience in academic writings. Considering its importance, the present study is to address how the professor represents implicit but crucial evaluation standards in her instruction and feedback to realize their intentions. In addition, five students’ interviews were collected to compare discrepancies in expectations to assignment and professors’ feedback and to provide implications for both sides.

“They Told Me in English You Prefer Simple Sentences”: How L2 Writing Students Bring Previous Writing Knowledge to New Rhetorical Tasks
Kate Mangelsdorf, University of Texas at El Paso, United States

This paper describes how five L2 graduate writing students negotiated previously learned knowledge about writing when they encountered new rhetorical tasks. Students analyzed, tested, altered, and sometimes rejected what they had previously learned. Pedagogical implications for a variety of writing classes will be discussed.

Narratives of L2 writers’ prior knowledge, current difficulties and coping strategies in the transition to graduate study at an English-medium university.
Rosemary Wette, University of Auckland, New Zealand

Narrative frames and interviews elicited the views of twelve beginning L2 graduate writers. They reported feeling poorly prepared to cope with Anglo-western discourse, particularly ways of writing using sources, writer-responsible approaches, critical analysis and composing concise, logically structured texts. However, differences in participants’ self-awareness, self-efficacy, and strategy use were noted.
C.5.3 Thursday, October 20, 16:30-17:00, Graham (Paper)
**Second Language Writer’s Learning Experiences in the First Year Writing Class**
Hsing-Yin Cynthia Lin, The Ohio State University, United States

Second language writers cope with multi-layered difficulties in their learning to write experiences in the first year writing course. This presentation will provide insight into the writing processes and learning curves of L2 writers, and consider the extent to which rhetorical knowledge and strategies are involved in completing writing tasks.

C.6.1 Thursday, October 20, 15:30-16:00, Yuma (Paper)
**Expertise in Second Language Writing: Should We Invite L2 Students to Write Poems?**
Fang-Yu Liao, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, United States

This poetic autoethnography presentation aims to explore how the experiences of writing poetry in a second language over the years impact an L2 student in becoming a teacher. The methodology involves re-reading poems written before, free writing the experiences of writing poetry, and composing poetic representations of those free writes.

C.6.2 Thursday, October 20, 16:00-16:30, Yuma (Paper)
**Exploring the Expertise in ESL Poetry Writing**
Meng Zhang, The Ohio State University, United States

This qualitative research explores the expertise of creativity associated with processes of reasoning in advanced ESL poetry workshop writing. Expertise in this research is presented as the achievement of precision in wording, plotting, and formatting original ESL poems; it is shown in the writers’ capacity of connecting themselves with audience in meaningful and artistic ways; it is also exhibited in the writers’ voices and interdisciplinary-affected thinking patterns that make their ESL poems unique and valuable.

C.6.3 Thursday, October 20, 16:30-17:00, Yuma (Paper)
**Exploring Second Language Poetry Writing: A Comparative Analysis of Poetic Texts Produced by ESL and EFL Writers**
Atsushi Iida, Gunma University, Japan

In second language (L2) writing research, it is relatively unexplored the degree to which L2 writers have the ability to write poetry in the target language. The current study addresses this issue by exploring L2 poems written by ESL and EFL learners.

C.7.1 Thursday, October 20, 15:30-16:00, Yavapai (Paper)
**Textual Borrowing: Let Students Play the Game, Not Commit Crimes**
Eunsook Rhee, Temple University, United States
Cate Almon, Temple University, United States

This study presents ESL students’ inappropriate source use in the FYWP and the nature of interactions with their instructors on textual borrowing. We will show Chinese international students’ textual borrowing practices are closely related to their resistance to and/or negotiations with unfamiliar rules and conventions in the situated academic context.

C.7.2 Thursday, October 20, 16:00-16:30, Yavapai (Paper)
**English academic writing in EFL contexts: Plagiarism and how to avoid**
Lam Nguyen, Monash University, Australia

This study discusses the problem of plagiarism in English academic writing from the perspectives of a group of Vietnamese academics and students involving a TESOL postgraduate program in Vietnam. The author then suggests a pedagogy to help the students avoid plagiarism in their English academic writing.
C.7.3 Thursday, October 20, 16:30-17:00, Yavapai (Paper)
Beyond the spectre of plagiarism: contract cheating and pedagogies of fear in second language writing
Joel Heng Hartse, Simon Fraser University, Canada

This presentation attempts to develop a critical framework for understanding the phenomenon of “contract cheating,” (Clarke & Lancaster, 2006) or students paying others to write for them, by drawing on theoretical and empirical work on plagiarism and paper mills, and exploring prevailing popular discourses about cheating and second language writers.

C.8.1 Thursday, October 20, 15:30-16:00, Pinal (Paper)
Optimizing use of educational technology in a flipped university academic writing class.
Paul Spencer, University of California, Irvine, United States

Summary: As educational technology becomes increasingly popular, the expectation of teacher expertise in this area has grown. This presentation reports on a study that examines the effective use of technology in a flipped university-level undergraduate writing course, focusing in particular on increasing students’ in class activities that scaffold writing development.

C.8.2 Thursday, October 20, 16:00-16:30, Pinal (Paper)
Poetics: Literary Connections for First-Year, Multilingual Writers
Heidi Naylor, Boise State University, United States
Dan Lau, Boise State University, United States

Two university instructors illustrate the benefits of poetry in L2 first-year-writing classrooms. Poetries from within and outside Euro-American traditions invite multiple approaches for student-to-text engagement and encourage genre subversions; expressions of class, achievement, and personal challenge; structural play; and building from writers’ agencies and specific skill sets for language acquisition.

C.8.3 Thursday, October 20, 16:30-17:00, Pinal (Paper)
Teaching L2 writing in the Flipped Classroom: A thematic synthesis
Chin-Chiang Kao, The Ohio State University, United States

Using thematic synthesis, the presentation examines the current L2 studies on the flipped classroom model (FCM). It aims to understand the possibilities and limitations of applying the FCM into L2 writing classrooms. The findings will inform educators and researchers of directions for the FCM research.

C.9.1 Thursday, October 20, 15:30-16:00, Santa Cruz (Paper)
The effects of topic on L2 language use and writing quality
Jonathan Smart, University of Pittsburgh, United States
Randi Reppen, Northern Arizona University, United States
Shelley Staples, Purdue University, United States

This paper presents a study of computer-scored essays written by L1 Chinese participants, each writing on one of five topics. A corpus analysis of the essays identified differences in language use based on writing topic and holistic writing scores. The findings and implications for writing instruction are discussed.

C.9.2 Thursday, October 20, 16:00-16:30, Santa Cruz (Paper)
Exploring L2 Writers’ Engagement with Direct Written Corrective Feedback
Ryuichi Sato, Arizona State University, United States

This case study examines how L2 learners engage with direct written corrective feedback (WCF) and attempts to provide a better understanding of the implementation of direct WCF. The study particularly focuses on how an instruction along with the provision of direct feedback can elicit student engagement.
C.9.3 Thursday, October 20, 16:30-17:00, Santa Cruz (Paper)

Student engagement with feedback on their writing: Case studies on English majors in two Chinese universities
Zhe Zhang, The University of Hong Kong, China

This study, adopting the multiple-case studies design that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative methods, investigates student engagement with multiple sources of feedback on their writing. The result shows that the students could receive up to four sources of feedback and were found to affectively, behaviorally and cognitively engage with different sources of feedback on their writing.

C.10.1 Thursday, October 20, 15:30-16:00, Plata (Paper)

Exploration of Teacher's Perspectives on Teaching Writing: Use of Autobiographical Narratives
Yutaka Fujieda, Kyoai Gakuen University, Japan

This presentation will discuss the value of applying teachers’ autobiographical narratives into research on teacher development to construct identities as a writing teacher. The presenter suggests that exploring teaching autobiographical narratives helps teachers achieve a new insight into teaching writing in their teaching contexts.

C.10.2 Thursday, October 20, 16:00-16:30, Plata (Paper)

Developing Critically Reflective Teachers of L2 Writing: Voices of Graduate Teaching Assistants
Sarah Henderson Lee, Minnesota State University, United States

Framed by concepts of reflective language teaching and postmethod pedagogy this presentation details one TESL program’s approach to developing critically reflective L2 writing teachers. In addition to discussing pedagogical reflection areas and tools for L2 writing instructors, graduate teaching assistants’ related applications in the first-year composition course context are shared.

C.10.3 Thursday, October 20, 16:30-17:00, Plata (Paper)

How My L1 Journalistic Skills Assisted My L2 Writing Expertise—A Personal Narrative
Negin Hosseini-Goodrich, Purdue University, United States

In this personal narrative or qualitative self-discovery, I’ll explain how I have applied my L1 journalistic skills in L2 writing expertise, and how the interactions between: my Farsi and English writing skills, various writing genres, and writer-text interactions, have resulted in improving my L2 writing and teaching.

C.11.1 Thursday, October 20, 15:30-15:50, Chrysocolla (Roundtable)

A visual is worth a thousand words: A blind student’s rhetorical strategies to challenge notions of expertise in composing visual and multimodal arguments (CANCELLED)
Maria Pilar Milagros Garcia, Koç University, Turkey

C.11.2 Thursday, October 20, 15:50-16:10, Chrysocolla (Roundtable)

Twitter for enhancing EFL Saudi tertiary students’ writing skills: An exploratory study
Naif Althobaiti, Taif University, Saudi Arabia

This study investigates EFL tertiary teachers’ perceptions of the utility of Twitter in teaching writing as well as students’ perceptions about using twitter in writing. In addition, the investigation will include exploring the impact of using Twitter on EFL tertiary students’ writing at Taif University.
...and Acton!: Demystifying Technology-based Phobias by Becoming Digital Narrative Experts
Jennifer L. Campbell, University of Colorado-Boulder, United States

A new global language is emerging—Digital (Ohler, 2008). However, SLW instructors often feel inadequately prepared to teach digital composition. This presentation will discuss the rhetorical, pedagogical, and linguistic implications of integrating a digital narrative assignment into a FW course.

Genre Analysis of Second Language Writers in Writing Journal Articles Using CARS Model
Yasir Hussain, University of New Mexico, United States
Majed Alharbi, University of New Mexico, United States
Rahmah Fithriani, University of New Mexico, United States

International journals, especially in the US, publish articles from the expanding and outer circle of non-native English speakers. Authors struggling in the process of publication subscribe to learning about the speech community of journal articles—the genre of the inner circle. Academic writing is analyzed through the genre analysis.

Key factors that affect Arab learners in US universities: Implications for the writing instructor
Fatima Esseili, University of Dayton, United States

One type of expertise that writing instructors should have is an understanding of their students’ backgrounds. This will explore cultural, social, educational, and linguistic backgrounds of Arab learners and their implications for writing instructors. Participants will identify major learning challenges and potential sources of errors in students’ essays.

A case of lecturer expertise in vicious circle of developing an EAP writing curriculum
Salim Razi, Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey

This study depicts how the curriculum of Advanced Reading and Writing Skills course of English Language Teaching department at Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey has changed within the last decade and gave birth to anonymous multi-mediated writing model which might be beneficial for customizing the existing writing curriculums.

Reflections
Paul Kei Matsuda, Arizona State University, United States

The reflection session at the end of each day provides an opportunity to reflect on and discuss important issues, perspectives and insights generated through presentations and discussion as well as informal conversations.

Opening Reception (Open to all registered participants.)
Friday, October 21

Session D

D–E.1 Friday, October 21, 08:30-12:00, Arizona (Colloquium)

**Fostering L2 Writing Expertise in Secondary Schools**
Chair: Todd Ruecker, University of New Mexico

Through presentations based on researching and teaching experiences in different contexts, this panel aims to define what it means to be an L2 writing expert in secondary education, offering directions for teachers, researchers, and teacher education programs to foster this expertise in secondary schools.

**Paying Attention to Resident L2 Writers: An Introduction to the Challenges of Teacher Education for U.S. Secondary School Contexts**
Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, University of New Hampshire

This paper serves an introduction and brief historical overview of the challenges and opportunities in fostering teacher expertise in US secondary school contexts and with adolescent L2 writers.

**Missed Opportunities for Developing Expertise in High School Writing**
Betsy Gilliland, University of Hawai‘i Mānoa

Teachers’ knowledge about language teaching and their students’ future trajectories affect multilingual learners’ opportunities to develop expertise in academic writing. This paper highlights discontinuities in curriculum and teacher practices at one California high school from the perspectives of multilingual adolescents transitioning across programs and into college composition.

**L2 Writing Expertise in Rural High Schools: Challenges and Opportunities**
Todd Ruecker, University of New Mexico

The presenter shares findings from an ongoing study of literacy instruction for English Language Learners in rural and small town high schools, focusing on the challenges rural schools and teachers face in building L2 writing expertise as well as opportunities for change.

**What do L2 Writers “Really” Need? A Model for Secondary-school Teacher Expertise**
Amanda Kibler, University of Virginia

Multiple studies conducted by the author are synthesized to propose a model of teacher expertise sensitive to adolescent L2 writers and their teachers. I provide ten key tenets in efforts to begin a broader dialogue on definitions of L2 writing teacher expertise, particularly in U.S. secondary schools.

**Pushing the Boundaries: Cross-Contextual Research with Adolescent L2 Writers**
Shauna Wight, Southeast Missouri State University

This paper highlights opportunities and challenges that emerge while conducting research with adolescent multilingual writers. The presenter will draw from a collection of four longitudinal case studies to share strategies for collecting and analyzing data as adolescent multilingual writers cross social and institutional contexts.
Developing Genre Expertise: Beyond the CCSS Text Types  
Luciana C. de Oliveira, University of Miami

The presenter describes how developing genre expertise would help secondary teachers address the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) writing expectations. The presenter provides an overview of a learner pathway that includes different genres within each one of the CCSS text types (genre families) along a developmental trajectory.

D.2 Friday, October 21, 08:30-10:00, Turquoise (Institute)  
Publishing Research in Second Language Writing  
Guillaume Gentil, Carleton University, Canada  
Christine Tardy, University of Arizona, United States

This workshop will help demystify the review and publication process for graduate students and scholars with no or limited publishing experience. Drawing on behind-the-scene insight into the Journal of Second Language Writing, we will address questions such as: Is JSLW the right venue for my research? How can I prepare a manuscript for submission? How can I create a research article from my dissertation? What are editors and reviewers looking for in submissions? How should I respond to their feedback? What timeline should I expect from submission to publication? How could I get further help with getting published?

D.3.1 Friday, October 21, 08:30-09:00, Gold (Paper)  
Connections and Disconnects: Experiences and Expectations in an L2 Composition Program  
Tony Cimasko, Miami University, United States

This presentation reports on a study of (mis)matches between international students’ past experiences and expectations of a US-based ESL composition program, and the program’s actual goals and pedagogies. Findings suggest that while students are generally receptive to classroom practices, there are misconceptions about the role of composition courses.

D.3.2 Friday, October 21, 09:00-09:30, Gold (Paper)  
It Takes a University: Marshalling Cross-Campus Expertise In Support of L2 Graduate-Level Writers  
Lisa Russell-Pinson, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, United States  
Susan Barone, Vanderbilt University, United States

This presentation focuses on how SLW professionals at two institutions engage experts in multiple disciplines and across departmental boundaries to support L2 graduate student writers; it also contributes toward developing a framework for the collective effort of supporting L2 graduate students on university campuses in the U.S.

D.3.3 Friday, October 21, 09:30-10:00, Gold (Paper)  
Directing an ESL writing program: Challenges and solutions  
Melinda Reichelt, University of Toledo, United States

One ESL writing program faces these problems: students' low English-language proficiency and lack of L1 and L2 literacy experience; inexperienced TA instructors; classroom management problems; plagiarism; and lack of institutional support. Solutions relate to curriculum design; TA education and support; TA-to-TA mentoring; and assigning ESL TA’s to the writing center.
Introducing Tutorials into a Large SLW Class for Chinese PhD Students  
Jianbin Zeng, Fudan University, China  
Peiying Ji, Fudan University, China  
Jianwei Wang, Fudan University, China  
Ye Fan, Fudan University, China  

Surveys show that Chinese PhD students, who are academically required to publish or perish, are inadequate to participate in international academic publication and communications. Writing tutorials are introduced in English Research Paper Writing courses to facilitate the academically motivated learners in their English writing practices for academic purposes.

A Genre Awareness Approach to Writing Research Articles  
Fahimeh Marefat, Allameh Tabataba’i University, Iran  

Twelve Iranian MA students at Allameh Tabataba’i University participated in the study. The researcher attempted to make students aware of the organization of research articles, with particular emphasis on the moves. Analysis of the final projects indicated that genre awareness served as a learning tool and played a supportive role.

Modeling patterns, uniqueness, and beyond: The development of L2 writing strategy use  
Miyuki Sasaki, Nagoya City University, Japan  
Atsushi Mizumoto, Kansai University, Japan  

This study models change over four years in the use of three writing strategies (Global Planning, Local Planning, L1-to-L2 Translation) by L2 writers as it interacts with various internal and external factors. Using both quantitative and qualitative approaches helps better understand the patterns and individual uniqueness observed in the data.

Four L2 Writing Teachers’ Construction of Cross-Contextual Teacher Expertise  
Hae Sung Yang, Georgia State University, United States  

This cross-contextual study examines how writing teachers, i.e., two at an American university and two at a Korean one, construct their pedagogical expertise in a new sociocultural setting. How teachers’ disciplinary background, professional identity, and reflective practice facilitated (or not) the construction of situated writing teacher expertise will be reported.

Building Community Expertise: Developing a Corpus and Repository of Writing for Writing Professionals  
Hadi Banat, Purdue University, United States  
Zhaozhe Wang, Purdue University, United States  
Aleksandra Swatek, Purdue University, United States  
Shelley Staples, Purdue University, United States  

We describe the development of the Corpus and Repository of Writing (Crow) project, a web-based platform which helps L2 and L1 writing professionals build expertise in research, pedagogy, and mentoring.
D.6.1 Friday, October 21, 08:30-09:00, Yuma (Paper)

**Expertise on Student Identities**

Stephanie Vandrick, University of San Francisco, United States

Researchers and teachers of Second Language Writing (SLW) need expertise regarding various identities of SLW students. This paper outlines types of identities, discusses why and how these identities affect writing processes and writing classes, highlights relevant research that has already been done, and suggests areas for future research.

D.6.2 Friday, October 21, 09:00-09:30, Yuma (Paper)

**Embracing World Englishes in a First-Year Composition Class: Perceptions of Multilingual Writers**

Shyam Bahadur Pandey, Minnesota State University, United States
Sarah Henderson Lee, Minnesota State University, United States

Answering Matsuda and Matsuda’s (2010) call for teachers to “embrace the complexity of English and facilitate the development of global literacy” (p. 373), this presentation details one composition class’s incorporation of World Englishes. Multilingual writers’ perceptions of the use of World Englishes texts in relation to academic writing are discussed.

D.6.3 Friday, October 21, 09:30-10:00, Yuma (Paper)

**What World Englishes can do for Second Language Writing: Part II**

Margie Berns, Purdue University, United States

The presentation addresses the question of what World Englishes (WE) can do for SLW. It recommends ways in which such WE principles and concepts as, nativization, linguistic creativity, and ownership of English can be applied in teacher preparation, mentoring, course design, materials development, and assessment.

D.7.1 Friday, October 21, 08:30-09:00, Yavapai (Paper)

**Not Separate But Also Not Equal? The Language Needs of Multilingual Writers in a Mainstream First-Year Writing Course**

Grant Eckstein, Brigham Young University, United States
Dana Ferris, University of California, Davis, United States

In this study, we contrasted the language features of multilingual (N=74) and monolingual (N=56) English writers in a mainstream university first-year writing course. Survey and interview data also provide information about students’ own views of their needs. Implications for instruction of multilingual writers in mainstream and sheltered settings are discussed.

D.7.2 Friday, October 21, 09:00-09:30, Yavapai (Paper)

**The role of speaking in an undergraduate ESL writing group**

Hyoseon Lee, The Ohio State University, United States

This study examines how speaking contributes to undergraduate ESL students’ writing improvement. Observing a writing group composed of a facilitator and four undergraduate ESL students with qualitative methods, the researcher finds four major roles of speaking in the writing group discussion and reports how the dialogue influence students’ writing development.
SLW among pre- and low-literate adults: A review of the research
Colleen Brice, Grand Valley State University, United States

Little is known about how low-literate adults learn to write in an L2, and the scholarship that exists is not readily available. This presentation synthesizes the research on L2 writing among low-literate adult ESL users. Based on the review, the presenter draws implications for research and teaching.

L2 Collaboration and Peer-Feedback: Google Docs and Undergraduate L2 Composition
Ashley Velazquez, Purdue University, United States

This study is an exploration of the effects of collaborative prewriting activities and peer-feedback on the writing process of advanced L2 writers in a synchronous digital space (Google Docs).

Good or bad wiki group writing: its connection with peer interaction
Mimi Li, Georgia Southern University, United States
Wei Zhu, University of South Florida, United States

Collaborative wiki writing is increasingly investigated in L2 contexts, but little is known about the quality of wiki products in relation to peer interaction during writing processes. This presentation illustrates a multiple-case study that examined textual features of collaborative wiki papers and explored the links between products and interaction patterns.

The effectiveness of dialogical corrective feedback on L2 Japanese writing
Mizuki Mazzotta, Georgia State University, United States

The present case study examined how grammatical accuracy of L2 learners of Japanese who received dialogical corrective feedback on their writing developed over one year. The accuracy rate of 15 compositions and qualitative analysis of learner-teacher dyads indicated that Learners’ control of target structures incrementally improved in a non-linear way.

The Freshman 15: 15 Tips for Incorporating Genre in L2 First-Year Writing Courses
Rachel LaMance, University of Arizona, United States
Emily Palese, University of Arizona, United States

Our presentation will share the strategies and insight we gained from adapting, redesigning, and re-piloting a genre-based first-year composition curriculum to be more accessible for both domestic and international students. These strategies aim to raise genre awareness while also introducing international students to the American academic environment.

Challenges of Implementing a Genre-based Curriculum in the Portuguese Composition Class
Bruna Sommer Farias, University of Arizona, United States

This work describes a genre-based curriculum designed for an advanced level composition course of Portuguese as a Foreign Language, and examines the challenges faced during three semesters of implementation of the curriculum in a research university in the southern portion of the U.S.
D.10.3 Friday, October 21, 09:30-10:00, Copper (Paper)

**MBA Literacy Practices: Taiwanese MBA Students in Taiwan (CANCELLED)**

Wan-Ning Yeh, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, United States

---

D.11.1 Friday, October 21, 08:30-09:00, Chrysocolla (Paper)

**An Interpretative and Comparative Review on Digital Writing Assessment in First and Second Language**

Mariam Alamyar, Purdue University, United States

The presenter will begin with the explanation of how digital writing has been incorporated in writing classes. She will elaborate on issues related to the tools, frameworks, methods, opportunities, challenges, and other concerns related to digital writing assessment both in first and second language that have significant pedagogical implications starting from 2005 until present time.

---

D.11.2 Friday, October 21, 09:00-09:30, Chrysocolla (Paper)

**High-stakes Second Language Writing Assessments: What do the Students Think?**

Mark Chapman, University of Bedfordshire, United Kingdom

The purpose of this presentation is to report on how test takers chose and then responded to different writing prompts on a high-stakes second language writing assessment. The findings of the study provide insights into how test takers are affected by writing prompt wording and test time constraints.

---

D.12.1 Friday, October 21, 08:30-09:00, Plata (Paper)

**Preparing L2 Writing Teachers to Use Assessment Rubrics in Composition Classrooms: Teacher Perspectives**

Tanita Saenkhum, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, United States

This presentation explores how an explicit approach to teaching writing assessment, particularly the use of rubrics, can be incorporated into courses on teaching writing. Drawing on L2 writing teachers’ experience in designing and utilizing rubrics, I argue for reevaluating how rubrics as assessment tools should be integrated into teacher education/training.

---

D.12.2 Friday, October 21, 09:00-09:30, Plata (Paper)

**Composition Instructors’ Attitude toward and Use of Rubric**

Ozge Yol, State University of New York Binghamton, United States

This study investigated five freshman-composition instructors’ attitude toward and use of rubric while grading argumentative essays of ESL students. The results showed significant differences in their scores with low inter-rater reliability and in their rubric use although they had similar attitudes toward and understanding of grading and the rubric.

---

D.12.3 Friday, October 21, 09:30-10:00, Plata (Paper)

**Teacher Candidates’ Pedagogical Expertise in Corrective Feedback (CANCELLED)**

Christine Rosalia, Hunter College, United States
Session E

D–E.1 Friday, October 21, 8:30-12:00, Arizona (Colloquium)
**Fostering L2 Writing Expertise in Secondary Schools**
See D.1 for details.

E.2 Friday, October 21, 10:30 -12:00, Turquoise (Institute)
**Surviving the Academic Job Market as an L2 Writing Specialist**
Katherine Daily O’Meara, Emporia State University, United States
Presenter shares firsthand experience of being on the academic job market as a specialist in second language writing. Backed by practical and theoretical advice, the presentation shares suggestions for staying organized, strategies for tailoring job materials, time management tips, and the importance of creating a sustainable cohort of colleagues/commiserators.

E.3.1 Friday, October 21, 10:30-11:00, Gold (Paper)
**Relationships of Teacher and Peer Written Feedback—Complementary or Overlapping?**
Hui-Tzu Min, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan
The author challenges the static complementary relationship between teacher and peer written comments in existing second language writing literature and argues for a change of perspective on this relationship according to the preliminary findings of her study.

E.3.2 Friday, October 21, 11:00 -11:30, Gold (Paper)
**Empowering EFL Writers to become “Expert” Peer Reviewers**
Robert Cote, University of Arizona, United States
Twenty-five EFL students at an American university in Spain provided implicit and explicit feedback to their peers’ essays. The study, based on research by Liu & Hansen (2005) and Min (2006), showcases the students’ extensive peer review training, the feedback they gave, their comments about the experience, and lessons learned.

E.3.3 Friday, October 21, 11:30 -12:00, Gold (Paper)
**A Student-Centered Approach: Students’ ‘Expert Reviewers’ of Their Own Written Work**
Aylin Baris Atilgan, University of California, Davis, United States
The mixed methods study aims to help students become ‘expert reviewers’ of language use. It reports on findings on 39 students’ analysis of their language use in written work. Student analyzed four timed writing assignments and rated their major areas of linguistic need. Findings include word choice, articles, and sentence ambiguity caused by misuse of grammar and vocabulary.

E.4.1 Friday, October 21, 10:30-11:00, Gila (Paper)
**Conceptualizing and assessing coherence in second language writing at the graduate level in the Canadian context**
Saimou Zhang, The University of British Columbia, Canada
Problematising the fuzziness of teachers’ reference to meaning connectedness in their feedback, this study conceptualizes the notion of coherence in terms of lexical cohesion (sentence level) and topical structure analysis (paragraph level) by examining the academic writings produced by four Chinese graduate students studying TESL in Canada.
E.4.2 Friday, October 21, 11:00-11:30, Gila (Paper)
A Graduate student’s L2 writing anxiety in an academic composition course
Yanty Wirza, The Ohio State University, United States
Hyoseon Lee, The Ohio State University, United States

This study explores an international graduate student’s L2 writing anxiety in an academic composition course. Utilizing qualitative method through classroom observation, interview with the student and instructor, student’s drafts and journal, the study reveals how L2 writing anxiety is caused, processed, and dealt with.

E.4.3 Friday, October 21, 11:30-12:00, Gila (Paper)
Developing expertise in identifying and overcoming content shortcomings in doctoral thesis/dissertation part-genres
John Bitchener, AUT University, New Zealand

This paper discusses the content feedback of 45 applied linguistics and L2 writing supervisors in Australia, USA and UK on drafts of pert-genres, the reasons for the focus and how we can become better supervisors with the insights from the survey, sample text and interview findings of a recent study.

E.5.1 Friday, October 21, 10:30-11:00, Graham (Paper)
The Role of Reflective Writing in Shaping Attitudes about “Good Writing” for L2 Writers in Mainstream FYC Classrooms
Michelle Campbell, Purdue University, United States
Zhaozhe Wang, Purdue University, United States
Ji-young Shin, Purdue University, United States

The purpose of this presentation is to introduce the findings of a qualitative study that seeks to investigate how L2 writers in mainstream FYC classrooms at a large public Midwestern University use reflective writing to explore and explicate English-language writing and their identities as writers.

E.5.2 Friday, October 21, 11:00-11:30, Graham (Paper)
Building Critical Genre Awareness through Self-Reflexivity about Postmodern Identity in the Second-Language Writing Classroom
Lori Bable, University of Arizona, United States

This paper conceptualizes the major features of a second-language writing course focused on developing critical genre awareness by building upon students’ self-reflexivity about their own subject positions. This paper claims that a postmodern identity narrative serves as a key genre for scaffolding activities and assignments to develop critical genre awareness.

E.5.3 Friday, October 21, 11:30-12:00, Graham (Paper)
ESL Writers Constructing Academic Identity through Revision
Sara Amani, Michigan Tech University, United States
Anne Stander, Michigan Tech University, United States

The study was conducted to explore the effectiveness of intervention and revision to help ESL student writers construct an academic identity. The paper reports various pedagogical practices, designed to cultivate students’ awareness of their academic voice as they interact with discourses across a variety of disciplines.
E.6.1 Friday, October 21, 10:30-11:00, Yuma (Paper)

**L2 writing and motivation as a complex system: Patterns and variability in L2 writers’ motivated behaviors**
Katherine Evans, University of California, Davis, United States

In this presentation, I explore the motivational dynamics of 36 students in a university-level L2 writing course. Drawing on Complex Dynamic Systems Theory, the patterns and variability in their motivated behaviors as well as factors contributing to those patterns are analyzed and discussed through a pedagogical lens.

E.6.2 Friday, October 21, 11:00-11:30, Yuma (Paper)

**Towards A Quantitative Method to Identify Types of Collaboration in Collaborative L2 Writing (CANCELLED)**
Meixiu Zhang, United States

E.6.3 Friday, October 21, 11:30-12:00, Yuma (Paper)

**The Potential of Physiological Measures in SLW Research: EDA in Feedback & Revision**
Chase Meusel, Iowa State University, United States
Kelly Cunningham, Iowa State University, United States

This presentation discusses the potential of a physiological measure, electrodermal activity (EDA), as a measure of mental effort in SLW research. Results across two types of ESL writing feedback and EDA alongside gaze replays of revision will be used in addition to interview and survey results to showcase this potential.

E.7.1 Friday, October 21, 10:30-11:00, Yavapai (Paper)

**The Practices of a Novice Iranian Scholar in Writing for Scholarly Publication**
Pejman Habibie, The University of Western Ontario, Canada

This study examined (1) the challenges faced by this novice scholar in writing for scholarly publication in academic English-medium refereed journals, and (2) the ways in which he learned scholarly publication and was supported in Iranian academic context in communicating his work through scholarly publication.

E.7.2 Friday, October 21, 11:00-11:30, Yavapai (Paper)

**Cultivating “expertise” in writing for publication: Lessons learned from an intensive ERPP course**
James Corcoran, University of Toronto, Canada

Drawing on findings from a recent case study into the writing for publication experiences of Mexican doctoral students and their faculty supervisors, this presentation outlines suggestions for pedagogy and policy intended to facilitate writing for publication expertise among multilingual scholars from outside global centres of knowledge production.

E.7.3 Friday, October 21, 11:30-12:00, Yavapai (Paper)

**Academic Enculturation through International Co-Publication: The Case of a Senior Chinese Archaeologist**
Meng Ge, The University of Hong Kong, China

This paper reports a case study that investigated the academic enculturation experienced by a senior Chinese archaeologist through his international co-publication with a US researcher. It will be shown that the scholar’s publication experience shaped his identities and Chinese-medium literacy practices, while shifting the disciplinarity of his area of expertise.
E.8.1 Friday, October 21, 10:30-11:00, Pinal (Paper)

Writing into Flow
D.R. Ransdell, University of Arizona, United States

By capitalizing on Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi’s notion of “flow” combined with Zoltán Dörnyei’s strategies for developing self-concept, writing teachers can capitalize on the ultimate motivational tool to help their international students discover their English “selves” and find new stimulation for the difficult work of developing their writing in the target language.

E.8.2 Friday, October 21, 11:00-11:30, Pinal (Paper)

Lawyer v. non-lawyer: Expert negotiations in program transformation
Romy Frank, Vanderbilt University, United States
Debra Lee, Vanderbilt University English Language Center, United States

This presentation focuses on the transformation of a writing-centered four-week pre-LL.M. English course for international students. To better balance law and language, the program moved from being too content-oriented to a more genre-driven approach focusing on language. The main catalyst for change was instructors’ different backgrounds and areas of expertise.

E.8.3 Friday, October 21, 11:30-12:00, Pinal (Paper)

Author Stance and Writer Stance in ESL Undergraduate/Graduate Writings
Jun Zhao, Augusta University, United States

This study compares the functions and stances of reporting verbs and evaluative language towards cited sources in ESL undergraduate and graduate essays. Participants are also interviewed for their practices and perceptions of incorporating other voices. The presenter then provides pedagogical suggestions to help ESL writers integrate sources more effectively.

E.9.1 Friday, October 21, 10:30-11:00, Santa Cruz (Paper)

Teach What You Preach? A Case Study of a Non-Native Novice Writing Instructor’s Awareness of Student Needs, Feedback Beliefs, and Practices
Lee Jung Huang, Purdue University, United States

This study investigated a non-native, ESL writing instructor and three international students, taking freshmen composition in an US university, examining the teacher’s awareness of students’ needs, beliefs, and practices. Results demonstrated that providing indirect feedback with explanation and instruction, giving contextualized, individualized feedback are effective in meeting students’ expectations.

E.9.2 Friday, October 21, 11:00-11:30, Santa Cruz (Paper)

International Teaching Assistants Teaching in Multilingual First-year Composition Classrooms in the US: Strengths and Challenges
Kai Yang, Purdue University, United States

This study investigates international teaching assistants’ strengths and challenges in first-year composition classrooms in the US. Survey and interview data show that their academic writing experience, bilingual backgrounds, and language learning strategies are their strengths, and understanding American classroom dynamics, handling grade disputes, and providing feedback are their challenges.
E.9.3 Friday, October 21, 11:30-12:00, Santa Cruz (Paper)
**Envisioning Teacher Education for the Future: Decolonization and White Teachers**
Susan Naomi Bernstein, Arizona State University, United States

The process of “envisioning” (Smith 2012) offers teachers opportunities to participate in transformational classroom practices. Drawing on issues of whiteness as “a ‘native’ speaker of English status in teacher education, this presentation addresses white teachers as outsiders in communities that have endured long histories of white supremacy and economic oppression.

E.10.1 Friday, October 21, 10:30-10:50, Copper (Roundtable)
**“Revising Orally” L2 writers in the University Writing Center**
Juhi Kim, Miami University, United States

This study examines the L2 writer’s talk for a tutorial with an L1 tutor to revise a paper in the University Writing Center. By analyzing their talk, this study highlights how the Center’s pedagogical philosophy is enacted through the instruction and lays out specifically the work with L2 writer.

E.10.2 Friday, October 21, 10:50-11:10, Copper (Roundtable)
**Fostering Success in Academic English Writing Courses through Effective Student Support Services**
Catherine Vimuttinan, University of California, Irvine, United States

UCI’s Academic English/ESL Program has created support services to help foster student success in writing courses. We provide both writing-focused and grammar-focused workshops that supplement instruction. Data from these services show greatly increased pass rates in writing courses and positive student feedback.

E.11.1 Friday, October 21, 10:30-10:50, Chrysocolla (Roundtable)
**Balancing the Scales: Designing Curriculum to Address Diverse Language and Writing Needs**
Alicia Ambler, University of Iowa, United States
Craig Dresser, University of Iowa, United States

Academically-focused IEPs must effectively design curricula to prepare SLLs for matriculation. Their curricula must address the needs of a diverse group of students at different levels, and combine English language skills with academic writing skills. Presenters discuss their IEP curriculum’s range, cohesion, and presentation, and give examples for its implementation.

E.11.2 Friday, October 21, 10:50-11:10, Chrysocolla (Roundtable)
**Integrating Expertise Across the Curriculum to Optimize the L2 Writing Classroom**
Jane Dunphy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, United States

This round table considers research that L2 writing instructors can embrace to build their expertise in teaching students to achieve writing goals under real life constraints. The discussants build on the collective expertise of participants discussing disciplinary communication cultures and associated salient language and discourse patterns.

E.11.3 Friday, October 21, 11:10-11:30, Chrysocolla (Roundtable)
**Afghan Students Challenges in English Writing**
Fahima Alamyar, Kabul University; M. Anwar Besmel High School, Afghanistan

The presenter will begin with the explanation of how digital writing has been incorporated in writing classes. She will elaborate on issues related to the tools, frameworks, methods, opportunities, challenges, and other concerns related to digital writing assessment both in first and second language that have significant pedagogical implications starting from 2005 until present time.
E.12.1 Friday, October 21, 10:30-10:50, Plata (Roundtable)
**The strategic development of teaching expertise in shifting contexts: A critical reflection of L2 writing teacher**
Nugrahenny Zacharias, Miami University, United States

The present describes my critical reflection as an ‘expert’ L2 writing teacher from the periphery who recently relocated to the center (the US). My talk will be organized based on several critical incidents that led me to attach new meanings to my evolving teaching expertise in L2 writing.

E.12.2 Friday, October 21, 10:50-11:10, Plata (Roundtable)
**Teacher Cognition on the Ideal EAP Writing Student**
Jay Tanaka, University of Hawai at Manoa, United States

This study specifically examines what EAP writing teachers consider to be ideal student qualities. Due to the context-specific nature of this concept, personal construct interviews were conducted to create individually-defined lists of sub-constructs that contribute to the larger construct of the ideal EAP writing student.

E.12.3 Friday, October 21, 11:10-11:30, Plata (Roundtable)
**Using E-Portfolios in a L2 Writing Teacher Training Course**
Dongmei Cheng, Texas A & M University-Commerce, United States

This presentation illustrates an effective way of teacher training by implementing e-portfolios into the course design of an MA-TESOL course on teaching L2 composition. Students documented their processes in completing their major projects in e-portfolios, which received high praises and contributed to increasing intrinsic motivation among future L2 writing teachers.

E.12.4 Friday, October 21, 11:30-11:50, Plata (Roundtable)
**Adaptive Expertise in Teaching Argumentative Writing in ESL High School Classrooms**
Hyun Jung Joo, The Ohio State University, United States

This two-year longitudinal study illustrates more comprehensive understanding of how the ESL teacher’s adaptive expertise for applying a principled approach grounded in argumentative writing can effectively support her high school English language Learners’ argumentative writing practice and suggests professional development for ESL writing teachers to enhance their knowledge and practice.

Friday, October 21, 12:00-13:30, Turquoise (Closed Meeting)
**JSLW Editorial Board Meeting**

**Session F**

F.1.1 Friday, October 21, 13:30-14:00, Arizona (Colloquium)
**Too Many Pots on the Stove: Redefining the Spaces for Intersection**
Jeannie Waller, University of Arkansas, United States

This presentation critically examines the expanding role that writing center directors play when the transnational space must be intersected using technology.

F.1.2 Friday, October 21, 14:00-14:30, Arizona (Colloquium)
**Too Many Experts in the Kitchen: Working with Disciplinary Faculty in the SLW WAC/WID Context**
Amy Hodges, MIT; Singapore University of Technology and Design, Singapore

This presentation critically examines WAC/WID partnerships with disciplinary faculty members in a second language writing context.
F.2 Friday, October 21, 13:30-15:00, Turquoise (Institute)

**How to be a productive scholar in L2 writing**
Dana Ferris, University of California, Davis, United States

In this we will discuss principles and practical strategies for implementing and maintaining a sustainable and successful research program in L2 writing. Subtopics include finding interesting research questions, adapting models from previous researchers, and building on one’s own previous work to complete and disseminate an extended series of studies. We will also talk about ways to balance scholarly work with other academic responsibilities and how to maximize data collection and analysis from individual studies to meet productivity goals. This will be a highly interactive session, and participants’ comments and questions will be valued.

F.3.1 Friday, October 21, 13:30-14:00, Gold (Paper)

**Legitimizing Dual Publication: Knowledge Production and EAP Writing Expertise Revisited**
Fang Xu, Nanjing University, China

In this presentation, I call forth legitimizing non-native-English-speaking (NNES) scholars’ dual publication, that is, publication of their research in two languages. I argue that dual publication would function as a constructive mechanism for improving both the international publication culture and NNES scholars’ EAP writing expertise.

F.3.2 Friday, October 21, 14:00-14:30, Gold (Paper)

**Constructing Stand-Alone Literature Reviews: Insights from Move Analysis**
Heidi Wright, Murray State University, United States

Based on a “move” analysis of 210 recent stand-alone literature reviews, this presentation offers researchers and teachers of graduate writers an overview of sections, moves, and common expressions that can be used to construct qualitative and quantitative stand-alone reviews in education, medicine, and psychology.

F.3.3 Friday, October 21, 14:30-15:00, Gold (Paper)

**Tipping the scales: The expertise of English medium journal editors in Taiwan (CANCELLED)**
Cheryl Lynn Sheridan, Indiana University of Pennsylvania; National Chengchi University, United States

F.4.1 Friday, October 21, 13:30-14:00, Gila (Paper)

**Using Complex Dynamic Systems Theory in Chinese Language Writing Classroom: A Pedagogical Perspective**
I Ju Tu, University of Wisconsin-Madison, United States
Yu Lin Chiu, University of Wisconsin-Madison, East Asian Studies Department, United States

This study aims to use Complex Dynamic System theory to investigate three dimensions—heterogeneity, attractors, agency of Chinese Learners’ writing trajectories. Discourse analysis is adopted to examine interviewers’ Chinese written texts and interviews. The expected results of this study will offer pedagogical applications for Chinese instructors to rethink the complexities in the dynamic teaching processes.

F.4.2 Friday, October 21, 14:00-14:30, Gila (Paper)

**Building the New Babel of Cultural Literacies: Revising Curriculum for STEM Students**
Xiaobo Wang, Georgia State University, United States

This paper strives to revise the English Writing curriculum design in China, especially in the underdeveloped region of Northwestern China, for STEM students.
Symposium on Second Language Writing 2016

F.4.3 Friday, October 21, 14:30-15:00, Gila (Paper)

**Contextualizing students’ EFL academic writing: A case study at a major foreign studies university in China**
Qianshan CHEN, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
Yongyan Li, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

This paper presents a case study of the impact on students’ writing associated with a “cultivation model” for English majors which was implemented in the country from the early 2000s. Our study will generate theoretical insights which can potentially be drawn upon to shed light on SLW issues in other EFL contexts.

F.5.1 Friday, October 21, 13:30-14:00, Graham (Paper)

**Ready or Not: Students’ Perceptions of Academic Preparedness after FYW and IEP Courses (CANCELLED)**
Juliana Pybus and Bethany Bradshaw, North Carolina State University, United States

F.5.2 Friday, October 21, 14:00-14:30, Graham (Paper)

**The language of undergraduate science writing: Language features of highly-graded reports compared to the reports of novice NNS writers.**
Jean Parkinson, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

I report on language differences (personal language, tense, voice and modality) between highly graded NS undergraduate writing and the writing of novice NNS writers. My results include greater use of personal language by the NNS writers, and different patterns of tense use. I end with suggestions for science writing pedagogy.

F.5.3 Friday, October 21, 14:30-15:00, Graham (Paper)

**Rhetoric in the Discourse of Second Language Writing: Engineering Writing Instruction as a Case Study of Writing Center Teachers’ Expertise and Students’ Performance**
Jie-Wei Jiang, National Taiwan University, Taiwan

Rhetoric, a much-ignored discourse in engineering writing, shows potential for both writing teachers to fully exert their expertise and for engineering writers to extend their readership. Second language writers particularly benefit from approaching and presenting rhetorical discourse in paper writing, as it allows them to better speculate, elaborate, and articulate.

F.6.1 Friday, October 21, 13:30-14:00, Yuma (Paper)

**Towards a better understanding of a writing center: Whose expertise is fostered?**
Rachael Ruegg, Akita International University, Japan
Hinako Takeuchi, Akita International University, Japan

The presenters will describe a project which aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of a writing center at a public university in Japan, in terms of the academic achievement of both peer tutors and tutees and the learning which took place for both tutors and tutees during tutorials.

F.6.2 Friday, October 21, 14:00-14:30, Yuma (Paper)

**Understanding the Expertise of Peer Writing Tutors: A Narrative Analysis**
Kristina Lewis, University of Pennsylvania, United States
Anne Pomerantz, University of Pennsylvania, United States

This study examines how graduate-level peer tutors and the multilingual writers they serve perceive and narrate tutor expertise and challenges to expertise. Special attention will be given to the unique challenges of non-native English speakers serving as peer tutors. Implications will be shared for peer tutoring programs serving multilingual writers.
F.6.3 Friday, October 21, 14:30-15:00, Yuma (Paper)
“I had to discard initial assumptions”: Equipping Writing Center Tutors with Expertise in Second Language Writing
Vicki Kennell, Purdue University, United States

This presentation explores the need for and the methods for developing writing center tutor expertise in L2 writing. Using survey data, qualitative data, and concrete examples of activities, the speaker aims to equip listeners with the means to create an L2 writing training program relevant to their context.

F.7.1 Friday, October 21, 13:30-14:00, Yavapai (Paper)
A Putative Model for Training Chinese Students’ Critical Thinking in Academic English Writing
John Congjun Mu, Shanghai Maritime University, China

Previous studies indicated that students from Asia (China in particular) came not only with limited English proficiency but also with academic practices that made their negotiation of critical thinking and writing difficult. This research aims to propose a model for training students’ critical thinking in the context of literacy learning.

F.7.2 Friday, October 21, 14:00-14:30, Yavapai (Paper)
Expertise in Close Reading: Understanding what it means to teach second language writers to read closely for particular purposes
Christie Sosa, University of California, Irvine, United States
Robin Scarcella, University of California, Irvine, United States

The instruction of close reading in multilingual writing courses for students studying English has resulted in a reconsideration of the expertise that writing instructors need to teach students how to close read to improve both their command of language and indicate the ways texts can contribute to writing particular pieces.

F.7.3 Friday, October 21, 14:30-15:00, Yavapai (Paper)
Integrating Critical Thinking and English Writing for Chinese EFL Learners
Jiying Yu, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

The study examined the effect of integrated critical thinking and writing instruction on the writing of Chinese EFL learners. The findings suggest that such an intervention can not only increase students’ confidence and engagement, but also the overall writing quality.

F.8.1 Friday, October 21, 13:30-14:00, Pinal (Paper)
ESL students’ development of writing in a hybrid second language writing course
Oksana Vorobel, Borough of Manhattan Community College, CUNY, United States

Adopting an ecological perspective, this qualitative case study explores ESL students’ development of writing in a community college hybrid second language (L2) writing course. Specifically, the research focuses on ESL students’ perceptions of various aspects of hybrid L2 writing course and their role in ESL students’ development of writing.

F.8.2 Friday, October 21, 14:00-14:30, Pinal (Paper)
A longitudinal case study of the influence of L2 peer feedback on one EFL Taiwanese college student’s writing development
Carrie Yea-huey Chang, Tamkang University, Taiwan

The subject of this case study was one EFL Taiwanese college student (Lan), who had completed two consecutive writing courses with this researcher/instructor. To assess how peer feedback influenced Lan’s writing development, her 16 compositions (drafts, peer reviews of her drafts, and revised essays) completed over two years were analyzed.
This study explored how two Korean adolescent ELLs cultivated their literate identities and developed academic knowledge and English through multimodal composition. The findings provided a possibility of using multiliteracies as classroom practices, especially for ELL students who had quite recently arrived in the United States.

This study uses a language socialization approach (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986) to investigate how teachers understand expertise in an advanced Chinese L2 class and socialize students to become experts in the local discourse community, as well as how students perceive and react to such practices.

This presentation discusses how the expertise in L2 writing developed out of collaboration between an experienced ESL/FYC writing instructor and myself, a novice teacher educator in Applied Linguistics. More specifically, I explain how this collaborative efforts helped both me and the instructor to reconceptualize expertise in second language writing pedagogy.

This presentation offers insights concerning the implications of direct and indirect corrective feedback regarding (1) the construction of the writing task (e.g., facing varied issues) and (2) the facilitation of language learning opportunities, both embedded in collaboration within Spanish mixed classes—venues shared by heritage and L2 learners.

Framed in a perspective of writing centers as communal and empowering, this study outlines the design and methodology of a pilot project in which undergraduate experienced tutors bridge with new instructors at an institution, giving insight and feedback for crafting effective assignments for first-year writing students.
F.10.2 Friday, October 21, 14:00-14:30, Copper (Paper)

Understanding English academic writing expertise in Poland
Lukasz Salski, University of Lodz, Poland

This paper looks at how NES and NNS writing instructors define the construct of L2 writing expertise, understood both as the state of being an expert, and as a learning outcome. I report on a series of interviews carried out among teachers of academic writing to English majors in Poland.

F.10.3 Friday, October 21, 14:30-15:00, Copper (Paper)

Describing the proficiency of L2 novice undergraduate writers
Linnea Spitzer, Portland State University, United States
Errin Beck, Portland State University, United States

While expert academic prose is typified by syntactic density and phrasal modification, it is unclear how closely novice writers must emulate this to be considered proficient writers. To better understand novice writing, the presenters will demonstrate how patterns of noun modification correlate with proficiency in the prose of L2 freshman.

F.11.1 Friday, October 21, 13:30-14:00, Chrysocolla (Paper)

Writing to Read: English Learners’ Writing Proficiency as a Predictor of Their Reading Success
Nabat Erdogan, University of Missouri–Kansas City, United States

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between writing proficiency and reading success of the 3rd through 5th grade ELLs in an urban elementary school. The findings reveal a statistically significant correlation between writing proficiency and reading success among the English language learners in upper elementary grades.

F.11.2 Friday, October 21, 14:00-14:30, Chrysocolla (Paper)

Intervention Strategies into a Saudi EFL Writing Classroom at Majma’ah University
El-Sadig Ezza, Majma’ah University, Saudi Arabia

This presentation maintains that the use of ISs can enable underachieving Community College (CC) students to acquire composing skills similar to those of their counterparts at the College of Education (COE). In principle, low-achieving secondary school graduates are required to study for two academic years at CC to qualify for transfer to the English programme at COE.

F.11.3 Friday, October 21, 14:30-15:00, Chrysocolla (Paper)

Roles of receptive and productive vocabulary knowledge in L2 writing performance
Yeon Hee Choi, Ewha Womans University, Korea

This study purposes to investigate the roles of receptive and productive vocabulary of Korean EFL university students in their writing performance. The findings will shed light on whether receptive or productive vocabulary has a direct or indirect contribution to writing performance in L2.

F.12.1 Friday, October 21, 13:30-14:00, Plata (Paper)

Degrees of Expertise in Second Language Writing in disciplinary English Medium Instruction: A diversity of situations breeds a diversity of needs
Karen Barto, University of Arizona, United States

There is great diversity in English Medium Instruction professors’ expertise in L2 English academic writing. The Content Area Teacher Training program at the Center for English as a Second Language trains EMI professors and has seen a variety of needs in training in this area.
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F.12.2 Friday, October 21, 14:00-14:30, Plata (Paper)
“It Takes Expertise to Make Expertise”: Rethinking Teaching Practica
Sarah Snyder, Arizona State University, United States

This presentation illustrates the process of becoming a Second Language Writing expert, focusing on the topic of teaching practica. Discussing the problems with the definition of “deliberate practice” (sometimes referred to as the 10,000 hour rule), the presentation operationalizes teaching expertise in SLW as life-long learning through teaching practica.

F.12.3 Friday, October 21, 14:30-15:00, Plata (Paper)
“It’s more than grammar”: What expertise is required for teaching ESL writing?
Zhiwei Wu, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, China

This paper explores the expertise required for teaching ESL writing in China. By analyzing qualitative data (interviews and open-ended questions) and quantitative data (questionnaires), and informed by the Many-Facets Rasch Measurement (MFRM) model, the paper presents a framework of knowledge and skills, commonly endorsed by the experts and teacher practitioners.

Session G

G.1 Friday, October 21, 15:30-17:00, Arizona (Invited Colloquium)
Expertise Optional? What We Wish We Knew Before Becoming L2 WPAs
Dana Ferris, University of California, Davis, United States
Christine Tardy, University of Arizona, United States
Paul Kei Matsuda, Arizona State University, United States
Tanita Saenkhum, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, United States
Tony Silva, Purdue University, United States
Susan Miller-Cochran, University of Arizona, United States

In this panel, writing program administrators (WPAs) representing different L2 writing programs will discuss the expertise needed to be a successful administrator and what they wish they had known before taking on their roles. Follow-up discussion will explore what resources could be developed to better prepare future WPAs.

G.2 Friday, October 21, 15:30-17:00, Turquoise (Institute)
Taking SLW Expertise Abroad with the U.S. Department of State
Cristyn Elder, University of New Mexico, United States

This institute is designed for SLW professionals at any stage of their careers who are U.S. citizens and wish to take their expertise abroad with one or more of the following programs: the U.S. Peace Corps, the English Language Fellow Program, the English Language Specialist Program, and the Fulbright Specialist Program. SLW professionals who mentor such individuals are also encouraged to attend. The institute will begin with a presentation on the kinds of teaching and research opportunities often found within the context of each of the programs listed and whose length of commitment ranges from 2 weeks to 2 years. Participants will interpret application requirements, analyze example application materials, and review interview strategies. Finally, participants will be given the opportunity to work individually, in pairs, or in small groups and receive feedback on their own application materials for one or more of the programs covered. Participants are encouraged to bring a current draft of their curriculum vitae (printed or digital) to the workshop.
Comparing collaborative and individual peer feedback
Ali Aldosari, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia
Neomy Storch, The University of Melbourne, Australia

The study was conducted with EFL students in Saudi Arabia and investigated a peer feedback activity in two formats: collaborative and individual. The study found similarities in the quantity and focus of feedback comments in both formats, but more evidence of critical engagement with peers’ writing in the collaborative format.

Stances adopted by peers when giving and receiving peer feedback
Marzooq Aldossary, The University of Melbourne, Australia
Neomy Storch, The University of Melbourne, Australia
Ute Knoch, The University of Melbourne, Australia

This longitudinal study, conducted in EFL classes in Saudi Arabia, investigated the stances students adopted when giving or receiving peer feedback. The study found that givers and receivers assumed distinct and stable stances. These stances impacted on the feedback given and incorporated as well as students’ enjoyment of the activity.

Negotiation of Feedback in Peer Feedback-Rich Environment: Voices Weave Together into a Shared Text
Kyung Min Kim, Miami University, United States
Ayaz Afsar, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan

This presentation reports on an in-depth qualitative case study on the multiplicity of feedback practices. Specifically, it examines how two multilingual doctoral students created the networks of feedback in a peer feedback-rich environment and how they negotiated their voices throughout the whole process of working on a collaborative paper.

Separated or Connected? Academic, Social, and Language Integration of International Students
Kyongson Park, Purdue University, United States

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between academic, social, and language integration. The findings of survey revealed that international and domestic students interact with peers and instructors differently. I suggest a built-in syllabus to enhance formal social integration and specific language courses to support academic adaptation.

The experts have spoken: Socialization and effective feedback in ESL writing course chats
Estela Ene, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, United States
Thomas Upton, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, United States

This corpus-based study analyzes the rhetorical moves, uptake, and student perceptions of the teacher-student chats from 5 freshman ESL writing courses taught by 3 expert teachers. Findings show that chats are useful for establishing rapport and clarifying feedback, but we suggest that longer chat sessions may be more effective.
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G.4.3 Friday, October 21, 16:30-17:00, Gila (Paper)

Writing performance on knowledge-telling and knowledge-making tasks: A comparison
Weiwei Yang, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, China

The paper reports on a study that examined the performance differences for writing tasks that encouraged knowledge-telling and knowledge-making, in writing scores and linguistic features of writing production. The study also examined the difference in the predictive power of linguistic features on writing scores for the two tasks.

G.5.1 Friday, October 21, 15:30-16:00, Graham (Paper)

Common and Distinctive Features of ESL Writers at Graduate and Professional Levels
Elena Kallestinova, Yale University, United States

This paper discusses academic writing needs of ESL graduate students compared to native English writers. Based on two quantitative studies, the paper analyzes self-reported and production problems of L2 and L1 graduate writers at a US research university and identifies distinctive features of ESL writers.

G.5.2 Friday, October 21, 16:00-16:30, Graham (Paper)

The Socialization of Second-Language Doctoral Students through Written Feedback
Tim Anderson, University of British Columbia, Canada

This presentation discusses the socioculturally mediated written feedback practices experienced by six Chinese doctoral students at a major Canadian university. Findings reveal that feedback played a crucial role in the students’ broader academic socialization and contributed to their (co)construction of academic identities and access to preferred disciplinary discourse practices.

G.5.3 Friday, October 21, 16:30-17:00, Graham (Paper)

Second-language Graduate Students’ Experiences at the Writing Center: A Language Socialization Perspective
Tomoyo Okuda, University of British Columbia, Canada
Tim Anderson, University of British Columbia, Canada

This presentation discusses two complementary studies involving the use of writing centers by Chinese graduate students at a Canadian university. Mismatches in student needs and available supports resulted in disillusionment and marginalization. One student, however, was able to contravene writing center policies to achieve her desired goals. Implications are discussed.

G.6.1 Friday, October 21, 15:30-16:00, Yuma (Paper)

Speaking about Writing: Reflections on the Use of Strategies in L2 Writing
Sara Amani, Michigan Tech University, United States

The current study was conducted to explore the act of meaning production occurring under the direction of metacognitive monitoring and control processes. This paper reports how the investigation of L2 Learners’ moment-by-moment written production via think-aloud protocols enabled the researcher to gain an understanding of both writing and thinking about writing.

G.6.2 Friday, October 21, 16:00-16:30, Yuma (Paper)

Fostering Student Expertise through Formative Peer Feedback and Reflective Writing
Kelly Crosby, University of California, Davis, United States

As composition courses increasingly require students to reflect on how they navigate the writing process, L2 writers are learning to write academically and reflectively simultaneously. This action research explores a promising hybrid approach of reflective writing and peer feedback through peer-to-peer memos, empowering students to gain expertise of their writing.
The impact of two drafting strategies on Japanese L2 academic writing
Zeinab Shekarabi, Hiroshima University, Japan

In this study the effect of outlining and free writing strategies on JSL argumentative essays will be considered. Results concerning the impact of these strategies on the quality of academic writing and the instruction of academic writing focused on the stages of writing process will also be discussed.

Short- and long-term effectiveness of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on two linguistic structures
YingYing Bao, Miyagi University of Education, Japan
Wataru Suzuki, Miyagi University of Education, Japan

We report some findings of a study which investigates the effects of direct feedback and indirect feedback on the accurate use of two English linguistic structures (i.e., the past hypothetical conditional and the indefinite article) through revision (i.e., immediate posttest) and a new piece of writing (i.e., delayed posttest).

Errors, T-units, Criterial Features, Oh My: Ways of Quantifying Writing Development
Daniel Moglen, University of California, Davis, United States

This presentation will explore the myriad ways of measuring second language writing development, including error frequency, complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF), and criterial features, among others. Each of these measurements provides different information about writing and writing development and advantages and disadvantages of each will be considered.

Building Better Turkish L1 English Academic Writers: An over 900-student study pointing to a narrow cluster of common errors and a way forward
David Albachten, Istanbul Sehir Universitesi, Turkey

This paper is the outcome of a large/long-term longitudinal study of Turkish L1 university students. Using objective/consistent measures on more than 900 student’s writing, the results point to the need for Turkish L1-specific changes in curriculum using a handful of common errors as a starting point to build better writers.

First and Second Year Writing Tasks for International Students (CANCELLED)
Katie Donoviel, Northern Arizona University, United States

The Effect of Print-based Outlines and Multimodal Outlines on Essay Development and Organization (CANCELLED)
Matthew Andrew, The Petroleum Institute, United Arab Emirates

Academic Acculturation through L2 Writing in Case Studies and Corpus Research
Eunjeong Park, The Ohio State University, United States

The study investigated international graduate students’ academic acculturation through qualitative-oriented research—class observations, field notes, and semi-structured interviews—and corpus research. The use of lexical bundles was examined as one academic literacy adaptation indicator. Results revealed different degrees of acculturation and challenges. The implications of the findings are discussed.
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G.9.2 Friday, October 21, 16:00-16:30, Santa Cruz (Paper)
**Mobility Between Home and School: How Can Writing Support First Generation Spanish Students in their Transition from the Home to the Classroom?**
Anjanette Griego, The University of New Mexico, United States

In a study of the lack of connection in first generation Spanish college students’ transition between high school and college, it is seen how discursive, familial, and socioeconomic factors challenge success. My work offers suggestions that support writing teachers and administrators in facilitating these students in their transitions.

G.9.3 Friday, October 21, 16:30-17:00, Santa Cruz (Paper)
**Empowering Spanish heritage language learners’ literacy skills: From novice to expert writers.**
Carmen Thurlow, Kansas State University, United States
Laura Valentin, Kansas State University, United States
Magdalena Egan, Kansas State University, United States

This presentation offers a more complete understanding of the writing strategies employed by heritage language learners of Spanish, in addition to surveying the conflicts they often encounter while composing. Based on the findings, some recommendations concerning the design of a Spanish curriculum with a literacy focus are also provided.

G.10.1 Friday, October 21, 15:30-16:00, Copper (Paper)
**From Cramming to Creating: Ideational Frameworks in Learning Second Language Writing**
Ayaz Afsar, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan

This paper seeks to develop an integrated skills model for the teaching of writing at undergraduate level in Pakistan. This proposed model would replace the existing system which separates language into four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing, where students’ sole focus is on the rote learning of rules.

G.10.2 Friday, October 21, 16:00-16:30, Copper (Paper)
**Creative Writing in Second Language: Urduization of English in Shazaf Fatima Haider’s Novel How It Happened**
Muhammad Sheeraz, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan

My paper explores the deviant forms, and borrowed lexis in a novel in English written by an author who considers English as her second language. I will show how creative experiments with the language of this novel suggest the author has an advantage to write a linguistically more creative text.

G.10.3 Friday, October 21, 16:30-17:00, Copper (Paper)
**Academic Writing Expertise in Pakistan: Contexts and Patterns**
Lance Cummings, University of North Carolina Wilmington, United States

There are many complex socio-political factors that impact English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in Pakistan. This presentation will explore how these factors are interrelated at International Islamic University Islamabad (IIUI).

G.11.1 Friday, October 21, 15:30-16:00, Chrysocolla (Paper)
**Does Expertise in Reading Make You a Better Writer?**
Nadia Moraglio, University of Arizona, United States
Angelina Serratos, University of Arizona, United States

This project is based on our experience in team-teaching reading and writing classes for a group of high-intermediate students in an IEP program. Despite the agreement among research that reading helps writing, our project suggests that in an ESL context a better reader might not necessarily be a better writer.
G.11.2 Friday, October 21, 16:00-16:30, Chrysocolla (Paper)
**Time-constrained free writing promotes writing proficiency and motivation.**
Doreen Ewert, University of San Francisco, United States

Free-writing for idea generation is a well-known practice in process-oriented composition classrooms, but it is seldom implemented on a regular basis with time constraints to build writing fluency in general. Evidence from an analysis of SL student fluency-based freewriting suggests that the practice contributes to additional aspects of writing proficiency.

G.11.3 Friday, October 21, 16:30-17:00, Chrysocolla (Paper)
**Enhancing EFL learners’ academic writing skills through the use of rubrics**
Yamin Qian, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, China
Jinzhou Yan, No.2 High School, Guangzhou, Guangdong, China

This presentation reports a mixed case study on using rubrics in an advanced EFL academic writing program at a Chinese university. The findings show that the participants did not differentiate revision skills in their rating, yet using rubrics did effectively enhance the learning of revision skills.

G.12.1 Friday, October 21, 15:30-16:00, Plata (Paper)
**Cultural Negotiations and Legitimacy in the Classroom (CANCELLED)**
Lana Oweidat, Goucher College, United States

G.12.2 Friday, October 21, 16:00-16:30, Plata (Paper)
**There Will Be Snacks, and Other Expertise in Multilingual FYC Teacher Training Practica**
Heather Ackerman, Arizona State University, United States
Kelly Medina-Lopez, Arizona State University, United States
Mona Melendez, Arizona State University, United States
Katherine Daily O’Meara, Emporia State University, United States
Sarah Snyder, Arizona State University, United States
Hannah Way, Arizona State University, United States

Six writing teachers reflect on their initial L2 writing teacher practicum, noting the balance of negotiating and managing differences in theoretical, pedagogical and epistemological approaches to L2 writing training. A factor in their success was the creation of a destratified space independent from rank and/or disciplinary assumptions. #therewillbesnacks

G.12.3 Friday, October 21, 16:30-17:00, Plata (Paper)
**Writing for Speaking: Logico-semantic expansion and grammatical embedding in the transition from written to spoken mode**
Ji-young Shin, Purdue University, United States

This presentation examines how writing in cross-modality tasks promotes EFL writers’ microgenetic and ontogenetic development in intra- and inter-clauses. Using Matthiessen’s Rhetorical Structure Theory and Halliday’s Systemic Functional Grammar, this study observed transitions between three EFL writers’ written drafts and their presentations and compared the results with an expert’s presentation.

Friday, October 21, 17:15-18:00, Arizona (Discussion)

**Reflections**
Paul Kei Matsuda, Arizona State University

The reflection session at the end of each day provides an opportunity to reflect on and discuss important issues, perspectives and insights generated through presentations and discussion as well as informal conversations.
Saturday, October 22

Session H

H.2 Saturday, October 22, 08:30-10:00, Turquoise (Institute)

What graduate writers need (and how to provide it)
Nigel Caplan, University of Delaware, United States
Christine Feak, University of Michigan, United States

Graduate students have specialized needs in both language and writing. This workshop guides participants through needs analysis and curriculum design for graduate writing classes, including pre-matriculation (IEP) courses and those offered throughout the student’s graduate program. Drawing on both EAP and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) approaches to genre as well as corpus linguistics, the presenters share ideas for the scope, learning outcomes, materials, and assignments of graduate writing classes and invite participants to discuss options for classes they are teaching or designing. Resources, research, and bibliographies will also be shared.

H.3.1 Saturday, October 22, 08:30-09:00, Gold (Paper)
Does Teaching Code-switching Improve Student Writing? Examining the Effectiveness Question
Kay Losey, Grand Valley State University, United States

This presentation responds to concerns about the effectiveness of teaching written code-switching (also called “code-meshing”). It provides a close analysis of the educational goals and evidence supporting them provided by proponents of code-switching. Participants will leave with a greater understanding of the research behind the calls for written code-switching pedagogy.

H.3.2 Saturday, October 22, 09:00-09:30, Gold (Paper)
A translingual and multimodal approach to ESL/EFL academic writing: An analysis on Chinese students’ writing
Chaoran Wang, Indiana University Bloomington, United States

This presentation will show how a translingual and multimodal approach can be integrated into academic writing classrooms and how this approach can help multilingual students represent and negotiate their different linguistic and cultural identities, based on the pedagogical practice of a multilingual freshmen composition class in a Midwest US university.

H.3.3 Saturday, October 22, 09:30-10:00, Gold (Paper)
From L2 to Bi to Multi to Trans: Shifting Lenses on Writing Expertise and Language Knowledge
Guillaume Gentil, Carleton University, Canada

This paper reviews three shifting lenses on the relationship between writing expertise and language knowledge and the crosslinguistic transfer of writing expertise: 1) the more traditional L2-L1 proficiency lens, 2) the multicompetence/biliteracy lens, and 3) the translingual/translanguaging lens. Implications for a multilingual genre pedagogy are drawn.
H.6.1 Saturday, October 22, 08:30-09:00, Yuma (Paper)

**Features affecting quality of paraphrases in 3rd-year Costa Rican EFL university students**

Randolph Zúñiga Coudin, Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica
Jose Miguel Vargas Vásquez, Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

An examination of paraphrases written by third-year students of the B.A. in English at the University of Costa Rica and students’ responses about perceived difficulty are expected to shed light on the students’ most frequent problems for developing paraphrasing competences needed in academic assignments requiring the use of source materials.

H.6.2 Saturday, October 22, 09:00-09:30, Yuma (Paper)

**Exploring L2 Writing Researchers’ Expertise in Mixed Methods**

Soo Hyon Kim, University of New Hampshire, United States

This questionnaire study examines L2 writing researchers’ perception and knowledge of mixed methods methodology. Based on the study results, the presenter discusses implications for improving graduate education on mixed methods research, and establishing sound guidelines as a research community for conducting more robust and meaningful mixed methods research.

H.6.3 Saturday, October 22, 09:30-10:00, Yuma (Paper)

**Formative feedback on college-level ESL students’ writing processes via keystroke-logging and eye-tracking: Initial outcomes of a design-based research study**

Evgeny Chukharev-Hudilainen, Iowa State University, United States
Jim Ranalli, Iowa State University, United States
Hui-Hsien Feng, Iowa State University, United States

This paper describes the initial outcomes of a design-based research project to generate formative feedback on students’ engagement in writing processes using keystroke-logging and low-cost eyetrackers. We demonstrate the technology, present a logic model showing how it could work, and discuss plans for iteratively developing both of these components in subsequent stages of the project.

H.7.1 Saturday, October 22, 08:30-09:00, Yavapai (Paper)

**Teaching writing to non-matriculated, multilingual students**

Friederike Kaufel, University of California, Irvine, United States

IUPP (International University Preparatory Program) students and their needs differ from those of American and ‘regular’ international students. This presentation will provide data exploring what makes these students unique and an analysis geared toward effective ways to help them excel in writing classes and transition smoothly to the main campus.

H.7.2 Saturday, October 22, 09:00-09:30, Yavapai (Paper)

**Human Writes: Human Rights Education in the Second Language Writing Classroom**

Lauren Harvey, University of Arizona, United States

This presentation discusses the use of human rights education as a thematic organization for second language writing instruction, creating a new hybrid field connecting work done in human rights education and critical pedagogies and literacies with that done in the field of second language writing.
H.7.3 Saturday, October 22, 09:30-10:00, Yavapai (Paper)
Service Learning: Allowing Experience to Guide Content & Identify Allies
Jenica Draney, College of Western Idaho, United States

An ESL Reading & Writing Instructor shares the ESL Partners project, a service-learning project that pairs Psychology students with ESL Reading & Writing students. This project connects educators, supports students, reinforces course content, and provides ESL students with opportunities to reinvent identities in academia.

H.8.1 Saturday, October 22, 08:30-09:00, Pinal (Paper)
What do ESL Teachers Consider when Designing and Selecting Tasks to Assess Students’ L2 Writing?
Antonella Valeo, York University, Canada
Khaled Barkaoui, York University, Canada

We examined how ESL teachers in two language teaching contexts design and select writing tasks to assess students’ L2 writing abilities. A variety of individual and contextual factors shape how teachers select and design writing tasks, with certain aspects of context having a greater impact on teacher decisions than others.

H.8.2 Saturday, October 22, 09:00-09:30, Pinal (Paper)
Reading between the lines: Teacher expertise in textbook use
Stefan Vogel, The University of Arizona, United States

Textbooks have long played a dominant role in the classroom, and their hidden agendas may easily lead ESL writing instructors to override their students’ needs and interests. This talk will use Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to provide a hands-on introduction to how textbooks can be used more flexibly and deliberately.

H.8.3 Saturday, October 22, 09:30-10:00, Pinal (Paper)
Implementing the expert’s curriculum: L2 writing instructors’ perspectives on using a common curriculum
Jamie Ferrando, University of California, Davis, United States
Katherine Evans, University of California, Davis, United States

In this presentation, we explore the use of a common curriculum in a university L2 writing program. Drawing on the perspectives of the “expert” who designed and implemented the materials as well as other instructors who used them, we discuss the advantages and potential pitfalls of implementing common curriculum.

H.9.1 Saturday, October 22, 08:30-09:00, Santa Cruz (Paper)
Have We Been Here Before? Corpus-Aided Pedagogy for L2 Writing Classrooms
Robert Poole, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, United States

This presentation will briefly review recent developments in corpus-aided pedagogy as well as the affordances of corpus-aided pedagogy. Attendees will view examples of corpus-aided pedagogy, how these examples connect to language learning theories, and how corpus activities can be implemented in L2 writing classrooms.
Effects of corpus-based technology on L2 genre learning
Elena Cotos, Iowa State University, United States
Stephanie Link, Oklahoma State University, United States
Sarah Huffman, Iowa State University, United States

This study investigated L2 writers’ genre learning facilitated by a CALL platform that offers: a corpus rhetorically annotated for input enhancement; a concordancer searchable for rhetorical functions; and an engine generating rhetorical feedback. The findings indicate that such technology can foster exploration, application, evaluation, and production of genre artifacts.

Classroom activity using google as a native speaker corpus
Tanya Roy, University of Delhi, India

Use a native speaker corpus to help students learn to write in a FL? Can students learn not only the language in question but how to help themselves? This paper will give the steps required to develop classroom practice to make this come about. At the end we will see how the students view their mistakes. And their self-corrections.

The Effects of Different Error Correction Conditions on Learner-initiated Noticing in Written Corrective Feedback
Maria Elena Solares Altamirano, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico

Framed within the ‘noticing’ debate, the ‘language learning potential of writing’, the ‘writing-to-learn’ and ‘feedback-for-acquisition’ dimensions, this quasi-experimental study investigates the way different error correction conditions (ECCs) influence the error types learners ‘attend to’. Among other findings, different error types were amenable to noticing and correction in the tested ECCs.

Integrating self-editing, peer feedback, group feedback and teacher feedback: A creation of multi-lateral ZPD
Chunyan Shao, Shandong University, China

Drawing upon the ZPD, this case study examines the effectiveness of integrating self-editing, peer feedback, group feedback and teacher feedback on students’ writing quality. It then discusses the effect of the integration on the creation of multi-lateral ZPD and its implication in professionalizing the EFL writing teaching.

Guiding L2 Writing Students in Processing Feedback
Cyndriel Meimban, Northern Arizona University, United States
Aziz Yuldashev, Northern Arizona University, United States

Understanding how L2 writing students engage with and process feedback is a critical component of teaching L2 writing; however, little research has been done on such an internal cognitive act. This presentation explores instructional strategies for helping students deepen their meta-awareness and processing of feedback through audio recorded guided reflections.
Methodological synthesis of research on rater effects in L2 writing
Jungmin Lim, Michigan State University, United States

A methodological synthesis was conducted on essay rater effect studies following meta-analytic procedures. Findings showed differences such as use of Rasch model for statistical analysis and popular application of mixed-methods design. Limitations of research designs suggest future directions to include test-taking parameters and to exploit different types of mixed-methods design.

Exploring the Relationship between Raters’ Personality Traits and Rating Severity in Writing Assessment of Chinese as a Second Language: A Pilot Study
Yu Zhu, Xiamen University, China
Andy Shui-Lung Fung, United International College, Hong Kong
Chi-Yi Hsieh, National Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan

The study to be presented attempts to explore the relationship between raters’ personality traits and rating severity. It confirmed for the first time that the relationships between extraversion, agreeableness, impulsivity, and severity as implied in some previous studies could be generalized to writing assessment of Chinese as a foreign language.

How Composition and TESL Writing Teachers Differ when Reading L1 and L2 Student Texts
Wesley Schramm, Brigham Young University, United States
Jenna Snyder, Brigham Young University, United States
Madelaine Burnette, Brigham Young University, United States
Grant Eckstein, Brigham Young University, United States

We report on an eye-tracking study comparing how 5 composition and 5 TESL teachers read L1 and L2 student texts. Preliminary findings suggest raters read L2 texts with diminished fluency even when both texts contain similar error counts. Implications are discussed for composition classrooms with mixed L1 and L2 writers.

Session I

An investigation into the interplay between inductive/deductive learning style, explicit/implicit feedback, and writing accuracy
Mohammad Rahimi, Shiraz University, Iran

The study compared the impact of inductive/deductive styles and explicit/implicit corrective feedback (CF) on improving L2 students’ writing accuracy. The results showed that inductive learners benefited more from implicit CF in improving their verb errors. However, explicit CF was more helpful to both groups in improving their sentence structure errors.

The interaction between grammatical knowledge and feedback type in L2 written corrective feedback
Dan Brown, Northern Arizona University, United States

This study explores the role of grammatical knowledge as a moderator to the effectiveness of L2 written corrective feedback on the development of accuracy over time. Results point to an interaction between the explicitness of feedback type and grammatical knowledge, suggesting the benefit of tailored strategies in feedback provision.
I.2.3 Saturday, October 22, 11:30-12:00, Turquoise (Colloquium)

**Relationship between Learner Attitudes and the Intake and Uptake of Corrective Feedback in L2 writing**
Qiandi Liu, Northern Arizona University, United States

This study investigated the association between learner attitudes and the intake and uptake of L2 written corrective feedback. A forty-item questionnaire consisting of ten sub-constructs was created and administered. Multiple regression showed positive correlations between uptake of feedback and learners’ attitudes towards the error codes and the in-class grammar activities.

I.3.1 Saturday, October 22, 10:30-11:00, Gold (Paper)

**Building Genre Knowledge on Prior Genre Knowledge: L2 Students’ Negotiating New Writing Contexts during Study Abroad**
Minkyung Kim, Georgia State University, United States
Diane Belcher, Georgia State University, United States

The study explores how four Korean L2 study-abroad students utilize antecedent genre knowledge and build new genre knowledge in negotiating rhetorical situations in US classes. Findings suggest L2 study-abroad students be considered as boundary crossers between L1 and L2, who actively repurpose prior genre knowledge and build new genre knowledge.

I.3.2 Saturday, October 22, 11:00-11:30, Gold (Paper)

**Adaptive transfer of expertise in adolescent ELLs’ writing across contexts**
Joohoon Kang, The Ohio State University, United States

The presenter demonstrates how to conceptualize adolescent ELLs’ multimodal literacy practices with a theory of adaptive transfer. Findings from the qualitative study report how ELLs effectively used and adapted their diverse previous knowledge/expertise in an unfamiliar context. Some implications are presented for conducting further research and teaching multimodal literacy practices.

I.3.3 Saturday, October 22, 11:30-12:00, Gold (Paper)

**Reverse transfer from L2 to L1: The effects of L2 writing instruction in L1 writing of Chinese ESL students**
Hyojung Park, Ohio University, United States
Yiyang Li, Purdue University, United States
Kai Yang, Purdue University, United States

This study investigates how explicit instruction on L2 proposal writing affects L1 proposal writing for Chinese ESL students in an ESL first-year composition course. The preliminary findings show that L2 instruction influences L1 writing and frequent use of writing strategies in L2 were found in L1 writing process.

I.6.1 Saturday, October 22, 10:30-11:00, Yuma (Paper)

**The Writing Process: Perspectives and Purpose**
Karen Lenz, University of California, Irvine, United States
Christie Sosa, University of California, Irvine, United States

At some institutions, the writing process is taught differently across ESL and composition disciplines. An effort to ensure students are prepared for composition courses has led ESL instructors to reassess their expertise in the writing process, examine instructor and student perceptions of the writing process, and clarify curricular goals.
Lexical Richness of L1 and L2 Students’ Writing
Jinrong Li, Georgia Southern University, United States

The study examines the lexical richness of L1 and intermediate to advanced L2 students’ writing, and explores how the patterns of vocabulary use may correlate with the perceived quality of their writing respectively. Challenges of teaching and assessing vocabulary in L2 writing and pedagogical implications are discussed.

A study on the Impact of Contextual Elements on the Internal Resources that Mediate Writing
Alessia Valfredini, Fordham University, United States

This sociocultural study investigated the internal tools that mediated four students’ academic writing in multiple languages. A comparison of commonalities and idiosyncrasies across cases supported the hypothesis that internal mediational tools are a site of convergence of contextual influences (simultaneous and diachronic) and internal motives.

Processing the Language of the Paraphrase
Antoanela Denchuk, University of Manitoba, Canada

Approaches to teaching ELL writers to paraphrase correctly are scant. In this, presentation I will talk about some practical considerations in teaching ELL’s to paraphrase and explain a pedagogically grounded approach to scaffolding the paraphrasing process. This approach makes this obscure academic writing technique more accessible to EAL writers.

Japanese University Students’ Task Representations of “Summarizing” and “Writing in Their Own Words”
Fumiko Yoshimura, Tohoku Gakuin University, Japan
Keith Adams, Tohoku Gakuin University, Japan

This presentation reports on an analysis of Japanese university students’ summary text and survey responses on their task representations of “summarizing” and “writing in their own words.” Text and survey analysis revealed that their task representations of summarizing might not include “using their own words.”

A Mixed Method Analysis of Post-secondary L1 and L2 Synthesis Writing
Stephen Doolan, Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi, United States

A study is presented identifying the ways in which L1 and L2 FYC students use source text in writing. Building on quantitative patterns found in student writing (N = 147), this presentation uses qualitative analysis to highlight strengths and challenges of L2 (and L1) synthesis writing. Pedagogical implications are discussed.
I.8.1 Saturday, October 22, 10:30-11:00, Pinal (Paper)

*International Undergraduate Students’ Perceptions of Their Second Language Writing Development and the Role of Writing Resources in It*

Carol Severino, University of Iowa, United States  
Deirdre Egan, University of Iowa, United States  
Shih-Ni Prim, University of Iowa, United States

Preliminary results of a survey of L2 writing development indicate that international L2 writers perceive more improvement in their rhetorical than linguistic abilities, possibly because of knowledge transfer from their first languages (Cumming, 1989). They also report more focus on rhetorical than linguistic components in their Writing Center tutoring sessions.

I.8.2 Saturday, October 22, 11:00-11:30, Pinal (Paper)

*Indicators of an ‘immigrant advantage’ in the writing of L3 French learners*

Ibtissem Knouzi, OISE/University of Toronto, Canada  
Callie Mady, Nipissing University, Canada

This study used various measures to compare texts written by three groups of L2/L3 French learners: Canadian-born Anglophones, Canadian-born multilinguals and immigrant multilinguals. Use of English, vocabulary richness, and grammatical accuracy were the strongest predictors of differences in text quality across groups, particularly between the Anglophone and Immigrant groups.

I.9.1 Saturday, October 22, 10:30-11:00, Santa Cruz (Paper)

*International and Domestic Writing Instructors’ Motivation to Use Feedback Technology*

Xiaorui Li, Purdue University, United States  
Kyongson Park, Purdue University, United States

The purpose of this study is to identify and analyze both domestic and international instructor motivation to use feedback technology of first year composition courses. The findings present inconvenient reality as well as promising potential of using feedback technology. This study has pedagogical implementation in composition classroom, especially for internationals.

I.9.2 Saturday, October 22, 11:00-11:30, Santa Cruz (Paper)

*The sequences of technology-enhanced and face-to-face peer feedback in L2 writing: Feedback and revision*

Ha Pham, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Researchers of peer feedback in second language writing have recommended that electronic feedback precede face-to-face negotiations in a review sequence. This study examines the efficacy of that method.

I.9.3 Saturday, October 22, 11:30-12:00, Santa Cruz (Paper)

*Are Our Technology Choices Changing the Nature of Our Feedback? An Appraisal Analysis of MS Word & Screencast Instructor Commentary on ESL Writing*

Kelly Cunningham, Iowa State University, United States

This presentation investigates the use of evaluative language in text and screencast feedback through the lens of appraisal to reveal differences in the role of the instructor and the feedback as seen through language. The findings can help instructors match their technological choices in giving feedback to their pedagogical purposes.
Using Pattern Poems to Entice Novice Writers
Vicki Holmes, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, United States

The goal of this workshop is to provide participants with hands-on experience in using student-written pattern poems to encourage language acquisition—form and lexicon. The presenter will demonstrate what pattern poems are; 2) how to use them in teaching syntax and meaning to all levels of L2 learners. The presenter will model different methods for teaching the poems and integrating them into the writing curriculum. These easy lessons bring creativity alive in your language class, motivating students to write and perform their poems.

Nurturing Confident Academic Writers through Technology-Based Feedback
Marina Wobeck, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, United States
Gabriella Megyesi-Bries, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, United States

First-year composition courses are intimidating to many ESL college students. In this session, the presenters demonstrate a multilevel approach to providing feedback to ESL writers through the use of technology. Specifically, the presenters explain the use of Faronics Insight and Turnitin to improve ESL students’ academic writing skills.

Amplifying Academic Writing: Six Research-based, High-leverage Instructional Practices to Prevent and Support Long-term English Learners
Julie Goldman, San Diego County Office of Education, United States

This presentation provides a synthesis of current research on best instructional writing practices for teachers of long-term English learners. The will highlight the impact of these practices in K-12 contexts throughout California.

Teaching Second Language Writing from the Post-process Theory
Ling He, Miami University, United States

This longitudinal, mixed method classroom research explores the teaching approach of second language writing from post-process perspectives among the university level ESL students attending a U.S. College. The study calls for explicit instruction in the writing process while using genre as a guide to each stage there.

What I Believe and Why I May Be Wrong: A Case for Anti-Expertise in L2 Writing
Kyle McIntosh, University of Tampa, United States

This paper explores self-ascribed anti-expertise as a rational response to teaching and researching second language writing. Its purpose is not to challenge a particular theory or deny the need for experts in our field, but to encourage scholars and practitioners to embrace uncertainty and show humility in their work.

Plugging-in Deleuze to Plagiarism and SLW Research
Gene Vasilopoulos, University of Ottawa, Canada

This presentation explores how Deleuzian ontology can inform SLW and plagiarism research by viewing academic writing and plagiarism through the concept of assemblage. Doing so may provide a coherent theoretical foundation upon which pedagogical implications and practical solutions can move beyond the privileging of original voice and moralist-based interventions.
I.12.1 Saturday, October 22, 10:30-11:00, Plata (Paper)

Understanding Expertise in Second Language Writing Teaching
Cate Crosby, Teachers College, Columbia University, United States

The purpose of this multiple case study is to flesh out the concept of expertise in second language writing teaching. The study is an investigation and analysis of the SLW knowledge of teaching candidates that includes their personal, practical, and situated knowledge.

I.12.2 Saturday, October 22, 11:00-11:30, Plata (Paper)

Addressing the “Tipping Point” of Linguistic Diversity: Strategies for “Non-Expert” Teachers of Second Language Writers
Madelyn Pawlowski, University of Arizona, United States

Teachers of writing, regardless of disciplinary expertise, have a responsibility for addressing linguistic diversity in the classroom. This presentation offers teachers who may not identify as “experts” in second language writing strategies for making language a more central part of the writing classroom through carefully designed rubrics and assignment sheets.

I.12.3 Saturday, October 22, 11:30-12:00, Plata (Paper)

Metadiscourse and Identity Construction in a Teaching Philosophy: A Case Study of Two MATESOL Students
Sarut Supasiraprapa, Michigan State University, United States
Peter De Costa, Michigan State University, United States

Drawing on Hyland’s (2005) metadiscourse framework, the study investigated how two experienced ESL/EFL teachers constructed their identity in their teaching philosophy. Results revealed that each participant has multiple identities, which can be harmonious or at odds with each other, and demonstrated how rhetorical devices can be manipulated to express individuality.

Session J

J.2 Saturday, October 22, 13:30-15:00, Turquoise (Institute)

How to Read and Report Statistics in Studies of SLW
Alister Cumming, University of Toronto, Canada

This workshop will provide a brief introduction to conventions and standards for reading and reporting statistics in publications about empirical research, drawing on examples from studies of L2 writing. Participants are expected to want to become familiar with basic concepts and practices for statistical analyses but not to be very familiar or experienced with them. Standard practices and common symbols and abbreviations will be outlined for: sampling and describing populations, reporting descriptive statistics (frequencies, central tendencies, and dispersion); distinguishing between and using non-parametric and inferential statistics; establishing reliability of instruments, evaluations, and coding; making comparisons (probability, statistical significance, and effect sizes), and presenting graphical representations. Please expect only a cursory review in an hour and a half as each of these topics could constitute a full university course (and they often do in Measurement programs). Follow-up resources will be suggested.
Collaborative Writing in Pairs versus Individual Writing: The Effects of Collaboration in a Beginning-Level Japanese as a Foreign Language Class
Yoriko Ito, University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States

This study investigates beginning-level JFL learners' performance in collaborative writing in pairs versus individual writing. Quantitative and qualitative findings from the pre-test, experimental-test/control-test, and delayed-post-test demonstrate how experimental-group pairs outperform in terms of accuracy (of CAF), assist each other via various LREs, and retain improvements in a delayed-post-test.

Developing expertise in new spaces and places: Academic writing month and other writing events
Sue Starfield, UNSW Australia, Australia
Claire Aitchison, Western Sydney University, Australia

This presentation discusses the extent to which the expertise of teachers of graduate writing is challenged by the affordances now available online. The experience of launching Academic Writing Month (AcWriMo) at an Australian university provides a lens through which to reflect on teachers' roles and capacities.

Intersections of Expertise: A Case Study of a Professional Writer's Journey into L2 Writing
Mark Hannah, Arizona State University, United States
Kevin Kato, Arizona State University, United States

The influx of L2 writers within and across U.S. higher education has presented challenges for WPAs to provide staff with opportunities to develop L2 writing expertise. Presentation reports on how findings from a pilot professional writing teacher training curriculum initiative can help writing teachers work more effectively with L2 writers.

Direct quotation in L2 academic writing: A corpus-based study
Leonie Wiemeyer, University of Bremen, Germany

This corpus-based study aims to clarify the use of direct quotes by advanced German learners of English. It explores 1) how these writers embed quotations into their writing, 2) which reporting structures they use and whether they encode evaluation, and 3) how they attribute and reference quoted source text material.

Examining the effectiveness of data-driven instruction of reporting verbs in L2 writing: a corpus-based study
R. Scott Partridge, Purdue University, United States
Shelley Staples, Purdue University, United States
Ashley Velazquez, Purdue University, United States
Ji-Young Shin, Purdue University, Korea

This presentation examines the effectiveness of data-driven learning in a FYW class for L2 writers. The intervention employed previous corpus-based findings that highlighted L2 writers' reporting verb use in a literature review assignment. The students' essays pre and post intervention will be compared to our corpus as a control group.
J.6.3 Saturday, October 22, 14:30-15:00, Yuma (Paper)
Investigating writing development through the Examination for the Certificate of Proficiency in English: A multi-dimensional analysis
Shelley Staples, Purdue University, United States
Xun Yan, University of Illinois Urbana Champaign, United States

This presentation investigates lexical and grammatical complexity as well as stance in relation to writing development using the ECPE writing exam. By examining a large number of linguistic features together, we are able to identify key functions of co-occurring features and their relation to scores on the ECPE exam.

J.7.1 Saturday, October 22, 13:30-14:00, Yavapai (Paper)
Relationship-Building Through Embodied Feedback: Teacher-Student Alignment in Writing Conferences
Elena Shvidko, Purdue University, United States

The discusses oral response to writing as a relational and embodied activity, constructed moment-to-moment through teacher’s relational moves. By analyzing students’ responses to these moves and comparing the episodes of alignment and disalignment, the author argues that oral feedback is not only an instructional but also a relationship-building activity.

J.7.2 Saturday, October 22, 14:00-14:30, Yavapai (Paper)
Exploring L2 Writing Conferences: Its Discourse and Effect
Soohyon Ji, Purdue University, United States

In teaching writing, conferencing has been a widely adopted method in giving feedback. In order to explore the effectiveness of it with L2 writers, the study examines L2 writing conference discourse, along with students’ revisions that occur post-conference.

J.7.3 Saturday, October 22, 14:30-15:00, Yavapai (Paper)
It’s all about timing: Pre-draft conferencing as a negotiative practice
Tonya Eick, Arizona State University, United States

Rather than more typical post-draft writing conferences where feedback becomes the dominant feature, this research tested pre-draft conferencing. This made conferencing a strategic negotiation of the transition from invention work to completing draft and responding to feedback a streamlined process multilingual students and instructors.

J.8.1 Saturday, October 22, 13:30-14:00, Pinal (Paper)
Advantages of digital technologies: Using Snapchat to scaffold academic writing
Marie-Louise Koelzer, University of Texas at San Antonio, United States
M. Sidury Christiansen, University of Texas at San Antonio, United States

This presentation will report on the impact of using a digital literacy activity on intermediate students’ overall academic writing quality. By incorporating Snapchat in the classroom, teachers are able to enhance students’ motivation and literacy skills as it transforms academic writing into a concrete and relevant literacy task.

J.8.2 Saturday, October 22, 14:00-14:30, Pinal (Paper)
Changes in the Linguistic and Discourse Characteristics of the Texts of L2 Learners when Repeating a L2 Writing Test
Khaled Barkaoui, York University, Canada

This study examined changes over time in the linguistic and discourse characteristics (e.g., fluency, accuracy, complexity, cohesion, register) of texts written in response to a L2 writing test by 78 L2 learners with different levels of initial writing abilities who took the test multiple times.
Spotlight on YouTube: Using short video clips as ideal writing prompts
Vicki Holmes, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, United States
Meagan Madariaga-Hopkins, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, United States
Jessica Cline, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, United States

YouTube videos engage learners. These clips are impactful, often humorous, trendy, multi-dimensional and abundantly available. They appeal to students, and they make excellent writing prompts for evolving writers. Because they are indexed, YouTube video clips can be accessed and sorted through easily. Teachers can convert them to writing prompts with little effort, matching the prompt to the writing purpose of the moment. This demonstration will share a teacher-project which used short clips from YouTube and YouTube's “Screening Room” to generate longer and more robust pieces of student writing. Student writing and interviews about their writing will be shared.

The Influence of Emotion in Learning to Write in a Second Language
Brian Guthrie, Rikkyo University, Japan

This presentation examines the role of emotion in a student learning English academic writing at a Japanese university. The study finds that the emotional history of both the student and her instructor have influential roles in how particular written discourse conventions are valued and how written feedback about these conventions is received.

Addressing L2 writing anxiety during pre-writing stage
Youngwha Lee, Arizona State University, United States

The presenter will make a case for the importance of addressing students’ writing anxiety during the pre-writing stage of the writing process and explain how a measure of students’ writing anxiety can predict their writing performance. A literature review will examine how to promote writing confidence exploring various self-concepts.

Examining Learners' Self-regulatory Behaviors and Their Task Engagement in Writing Revision
Karen Chung-chien Chang, National Taipei University, Taiwan

Through teacher feedback and a multi-drafting process, this study aimed at examining the relationship between students’ self-regulatory behaviors, indicated by their autonomous levels, and their task engagement in writing revision. In this study, most students (64%) demonstrated consistency between their Relative Autonomous Indexes (RAIs) and their task engagement levels.

Building L2 Writers’ Rhetorical Expertise: Teaching Strategies for US Composition Classrooms
Mariya Tseptsura, University of New Mexico, United States
Majed Alharbi, University of New Mexico, United States

This presentation discusses the results of an L2 composition course designed to raise students’ awareness of discursive and rhetorical differences between their L1 and L2. Focusing on Arab and Eastern European students, the presenters suggest teaching strategies to help students adjust and contribute to their new educational setting.
How Much and What do Students Write in the Classroom?: A Cross-National Survey in East Asia

Sachiko Yasuda, Kyushu University, Japan

Intercultural Rhetoric Revisited: the Case of L2 Arab Writers

Ghada Gherwash, Colby College, United States

Using life history interviews, this presentation discusses new data that problematizes previous IR scholarship regarding Arab writers. Mainly that their L2 texts are highly influenced by classical Arabic. Findings suggest that Classical Arabic is an unlikely source of transfer, due to Arab writers' limited socialization in that form of Arabic.

Reflections

Paul Kei Matsuda, Arizona State University

The reflection session at the end of each day provides an opportunity to reflect on and discuss important issues, perspectives and insights generated through presentations and discussion as well as informal conversations.

On Becoming Enablers and Assessors of Multimodal Composing

Diane D. Belcher, Georgia State University, USA

While decades of theory and research have encouraged a view of writing as integrally linked with reading and, less obviously, with oral communication, only more recently has writing been conceived of as part of a much larger technology-enhanced semiotic toolkit. L2 writers in particular have been seen as especially likely to benefit from such a digitally-enriched multimodal view of writing, and hence from guided use of the wealth of resources—audio and visual, graphic and video—now available for their composing processes. Few instructors or teacher-educators, however, have themselves been taught how to navigate, not to mention serve as guides to, composing in a digital environment. This presentation will discuss issues critical to considerations of how to become and effectively be a facilitator of multimodal composing and what forms assessment of such complex creative student work could take.

More specifically, drawing on theoretical, empirical, and pedagogical work reported on in both L1 and L2 literature relevant to facilitating new media composing, a number of questions, such as the following, will be explored: To what extent should the L2 writing class become a site of support for basic digital literacy acquisition for those still disadvantaged by the digital divide? Should instructors learn to leverage multimodality as a motivator for L2 literacy acquisition? How can students be guided in use of existing and developing print and multimodal literacies as mutually supportive scaffolds of each other? Should multimodal resources be used to enhance and critically problematize genre awareness and acquisition, and if so, how? Should writing assignments be designed to enable students to see multimodality as an ever-present means of expanding their composing repertoires, and again, if so, how? What heuristics already exist to guide teacher and peer development of rubrics for multimodal-ensembles, which, in turn, could guide collaborative creative processes and assessment of outcomes? And finally, how should teachers, as well as writing programs and multiliteracy centers, be assessed (or should they?) in their ability to foster student awareness of and facility with multimodal resources?
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