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Dear Symposium Participants:

Welcome to the 2014 Symposium on Second Language Writing (SSLW 2014). The Symposium began in 1998 as a way of bringing together internationally-recognized experts in the field of second language writing to discuss key issues in the field, and it has grown into an annual international gathering of teachers and researchers who are working with second language writers in various capacities.

The theme of SSLW 2014 is "Professionalizing Second Language Writing." As the field of second language writing comes of age, it seems important to reflect on the professionalization of the field and explore the need for a shared sense of professional identity and standards.

The field of second language writing has grown tremendously over the last two decades, and many teachers, scholars, and administrators from various disciplinary and institutional perspectives have come to identify themselves as second language writing specialists. While the disciplinary infrastructure has grown and opportunities for graduate education have expanded, there is a dearth of resources for the professional development of mid-career specialists who wish to continue to expand their repertoire and engage in more advanced professional work—such as administration, consulting, teacher education, mentoring doctoral students, and giving plenary talks.

Furthermore, as the demand for second language writing instruction increases in various parts of the world, more and more mid-career teachers and researchers who already have advanced degrees in various other fields are finding themselves in need of entry-level professional development opportunities. In the meantime, there continues to be a growing number of graduate students who wish to develop expertise in second language writing but do not have access to established specialists who can act as their mentors.

To address these professionalization issues, this year's Symposium brings together accomplished second language writing researchers and teachers to share experiences and to explore ways to further professionalize second language writing. In addition, this year's Symposium introduces a new feature, the SLW Institute, which provides a range of professional development workshops for second language writing specialists at various levels—from beginning graduate students to established scholars. And, of course, concurrent sessions continue to constitute the intellectual body of the gathering.

The opportunity to network and meet fellow second language writing specialists from around the world is another important feature of the Symposium. In addition to the pre-Symposium social (Wednesday) and the opening reception (Thursday), there will be an optional banquet (Friday) and an optional lunch seminar (Saturday).

We also hope that your stay at Arizona State University is a comfortable and enjoyable one. If you have any questions about this Symposium, Arizona State University, or Tempe and Greater Phoenix, please feel free to ask any of the Symposium staff members who are wearing a Symposium button.
Finally, I would like to extend my thanks and heartfelt welcome to the presenters and session chairs as well as participants, who are here to make valuable contributions—formally and informally—to the Symposium and to the development of the field of second language writing.

On behalf of the members of the Organizing Committee, I am pleased to welcome you to Arizona State University and to the Symposium on Second Language Writing.

Paul Kei Matsuda, Founding Chair
Symposium on Second Language Writing
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SSLW 2014 Best Student Paper Award

The award, which will be presented at the Evening Banquet on Friday, November 14, recognizes three best papers presented at this year’s symposium. The recipients of the award will receive gift certificates redeemable at the De Gruyter Mouton publisher’s website.

1st Place ($350)

**Writing Across Communities: Service Learning Composition for University L2 Writers**
Bonnie Vidrine-Isbell
Norah Fahim
Dan Zhu
University of Washington, United States
Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Gila

2nd Place ($250)

**Becoming Second Language Writing Specialists: A Self-Reflective Study of a TESOL Graduate Student Writing Group**
Rae-Ping Lin
Joel Heng Hartse
Nasrin Kowkabi
Ismaeil Fazel
Tomoyo Okuda
Bong-gi Sohn
Junghyun Hwag
Klara Abdi
University of British Columbia, Canada
Saturday, November 15, 2014, 11:35-12:00, Yuma

3rd Place ($150)

**Understanding Peer Response in an EAP Course: An Activity Theory Perspective**
Qi Zhang
University of South Florida, United States
Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:50-15:15, Yuma
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Learning to Write for Academic Purposes:  
Advancing Theory, Research and Practice

The 14th Symposium on Second Language Writing will take place 19-21 November, 2015, at AUT University, Auckland, New Zealand. The theme, *Learning to write for academic purposes: Advancing theory, research and practice*, will focus on advancing our knowledge and understanding of what is involved in learning to write for the many and varied academic purposes that second language (L2) writers encounter while studying in educational settings and working in various professions and workplaces.

The importance of the theme is underscored by the increasing number of L2 writers studying and working in educational and professional settings where epistemologies and expectations may be quite different to those they have grown up with.

The particular academic purposes that L2 writers encounter as students and as working professionals can vary according to the contexts and settings in which writing for academic purposes is undertaken. These can be broadly categorised as follows:

**Educational contexts and settings where teaching and learning take place**
- Schools (e.g. primary and secondary; public and private institutions)
- Pre-tertiary (e.g. foundation programmes; private language schools)
- Tertiary (e.g. university, polytechnic, college)

**Workplace contexts and settings where L2 writers are employed**
- Training institutions (e.g. teachers’ colleges)
- Teacher/academic professional activities (e.g. writing books, articles, reports, conference papers; reviewing, assessing and examining)

In educational contexts, issues associated with learning to write for academic purposes can be viewed from both the L2 learners’ and teachers’ perspectives. In workplace contexts, they can be seen from both the L2 writers’ and assessors’/gate-keepers’ perspectives.

Whenever academic texts are produced, some form of assessment is expected. It may be offered in a formative sense (responding to the work in progress) or in a summative sense (test/assignment/examination grades; acceptance of a text for publication or presentation). Issues associated with the assessment of L2 writers’ texts or with L2 writers assessing texts may also be considered relevant to the theme.

While the symposium invites proposals on any aspect of second language writing, those that address one or more aspects of the theme will be particularly welcome.
Introduction

The Auckland organizing committee is particularly proud to be hosting the 2015 symposium as it is the first time the event has come ‘downunder.’ We are also pleased to be able to showcase our beautiful city—known as the ‘city of sails’—and hope you will have time to see other parts of the country as well.

Plenary Speakers

The plenary speakers for SSLW 2015 will be announced on this site before the end of 2014.

There will be 3 keynote speakers and each of these will address both parts of the theme (‘learning to write for academic purposes’ and ‘advancing theory, research and practice’) in relation to the contexts and settings they are familiar with.

In addition, there will be a number of 30 minute plenary presentations and each invited speaker will deliver a hands-on, practice-focused address on an ‘issue’ that L2 students and practitioners encounter in the contexts and settings they are familiar with.

Key Dates (New Zealand time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 15 December 2014</td>
<td>Call for papers opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 27 February 2015</td>
<td>Call for papers closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 27 March 2015</td>
<td>Call for papers notification of acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 13 February 2015</td>
<td>Registration opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 1 May 2015</td>
<td>Early bird registration closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 12 November 2015</td>
<td>Standard registration closes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizing Committee

- Founding Chair SSLW: Paul Kei Matsuda
- Symposium Chair: John Bitchener
- Associate Symposium Chair: Annelies Roskvist
- Programme Chairs: John Bitchener; Rosemary Wette
- Call for Papers Coordinators: Neomy Storch; Helen Basturkmen
- Programme Book Coordinators: Martin East; Denise Cameron
- Registration Coordinators: AUT conferences; Annelies Roskvist; Martin East
- Local Information Coordinators: Helen Cartner; Denise Cameron
- Accommodation Coordinators: Rosemary Wette; Helen Basturkmen
- Social Coordinators: Annelies Roskvist; Helen Cartner
- Student Assistants Coordinators: Denise Cameron; Rosemary Wette
- IT Coordinators: Helen Cartner; AUT conferences
- Web Manager: Paul Kei Matsuda
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Arizona</th>
<th>Turquoise</th>
<th>Gila</th>
<th>Graham</th>
<th>Yuma</th>
<th>Pinal</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
<th>Yavapai</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Copper</th>
<th>Chrysocolla</th>
<th>Plata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30-</td>
<td>SLWI.6 An</td>
<td>SLWI.4</td>
<td>SLWI.1</td>
<td>SLWI.5</td>
<td>SLWI.3</td>
<td>SLWI.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Introduction to</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Success on the Job</td>
<td>Writing Program Administrator</td>
<td>Making Your Presentation</td>
<td>Designing and Satisfying a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing in</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>the Job</td>
<td>Process (Elder)</td>
<td>Striking (Matsuda)</td>
<td>and Sustaining a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Journals</td>
<td>Administration and ESL Writers</td>
<td>Market: Demystifying the Process (Elder)</td>
<td>Consultant (Rose)</td>
<td>Successful Research Program in (Ferris)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45-</td>
<td>Opening Ceremony</td>
<td>Plenary I: Reflections of a Post-Mid-Career L2 Writing Professional on the Ever-Increasing (Silva) in Arizona Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-</td>
<td>Consortium on</td>
<td>Translating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45-</td>
<td>Issues Working</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45-14:10</td>
<td>Consortium on</td>
<td>Translating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45-14:10</td>
<td>Plenary I:</td>
<td>Reflections of a Post-Mid-Career L2 Writing Professional on the Ever-Increasing (Silva) in Arizona Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:35-15:15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Across</td>
<td>the YMCA Technical</td>
<td>One-on-One Writing Instruction (Freeman</td>
<td>as a Consultant (Elder)</td>
<td>(Park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Graduate</td>
<td>Diverse CALL</td>
<td>Writing Classroom</td>
<td>et al.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Lee et al.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Research, Pedagogy, and Program Design (Zawacki et al.)</td>
<td>13:45-15:15</td>
<td>(Cummings)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:35-15:15</td>
<td>A.2.2 Writing</td>
<td>A.4.2 L1 and L2</td>
<td>A.4.2 A Methodological Synthesis of Research</td>
<td>A.4.3 Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback: A Case Study (Tanova)</td>
<td>A.6.3 ESL Composition Instruction: Redress Its Balance (He)</td>
<td>A.8.3 Linguistic Agency and Ability in Large-Scale Writing Programs in Korean Higher Education (Kim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Across</td>
<td>Vocabulary Use in</td>
<td>Research on the Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback (Liu et al.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities:</td>
<td>Freshman Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>(Qureshi)</td>
<td>(Liu et al.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composition for University L2 Writers (Vidrine-Isbell et al.)</td>
<td>13:45-15:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:35-15:00</td>
<td>A.3.3 Developing</td>
<td>A.4.3 Language Use in Third Language Writing</td>
<td>A.5.3 Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback: Its Past, Present, and Future (Kurzer et al.)</td>
<td>A.6.3 ESL Composition Instruction: Redress Its Balance (He)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Leadership</td>
<td>Writing: A Case Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for Writing Teachers: Examples from &quot;Head&quot; Teaching (Lawson)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:35-15:00</td>
<td>A.3.4 Developing</td>
<td>A.4.4 Language Use in Third Language Writing</td>
<td>A.5.4 Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback: Its Past, Present, and Future (Kurzer et al.)</td>
<td>A.6.4 ESL Composition Instruction: Redress Its Balance (He)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous Ae</td>
<td>Writing: A Case Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability in Large-Scale Writing Programs in Korean Higher Education (Kim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetorical Trends Across Three Discourse Styles of Thai-English Bilinguals (Saengngoen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Turquoise</td>
<td>Gila</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>Pinal</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Yavapai</td>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>Chrysocolla</td>
<td>Plata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-15:55</td>
<td>B.1.C</td>
<td>Collaborative L2 Writing in Social Media Environments: Student Interactions and (Li et al.)</td>
<td>B.2.1 A</td>
<td>Dialogic Conversation or a Unidirectional Monologue Between Supervisor and (Bitchener)</td>
<td>B.3.1</td>
<td>Tracing Identity Changes in Disciplinary Genre Learning: A Case Study (Jwa)</td>
<td>B.4.1</td>
<td>CANCELED</td>
<td>B.5.1</td>
<td>Before the Dissertation Writing Begins: Tips for L2 Doctoral Students (Casanave)</td>
<td>B.6.1</td>
<td>An Alternative Approach for Understandi...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:55-16:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.2.2</td>
<td>Assessing the Impact of Teacher Feedback on Accuracy in the Writing of ESL learners (Rastgou)</td>
<td>B.3.2</td>
<td>What Are Writing Difficulties? (Tarawhiti)</td>
<td>B.4.2</td>
<td>Tutoring One's Way to L2 Writing Teacher Cognition (Belcher et al.)</td>
<td>B.5.2</td>
<td>Perceptions of Multilingual Students in a Graduate L2 Writing Course (O'Meara)</td>
<td>B.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:20-16:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.2.3</td>
<td>Different Modes of Teacher Feedback: Types and Nature, Students’ Responses (Shen et al.)</td>
<td>B.3.3</td>
<td>Complex Personal Letter-Writing in Advanced Collegiate FL Instruction (Crane)</td>
<td>B.4.3</td>
<td>Understandin...</td>
<td>B.5.3</td>
<td>Multilingual Graduate Students Attitudes Towards Writing Practices and Support (Khoury)</td>
<td>B.6.3 A Cross-Disciplinary Interaction: Embrace a TESOL Perspective in Compositio...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15-18:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:15-20:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:25</td>
<td>C.1.C Exploring the Professional Pathways of Early-Career L2 Writing Specialists (Saenkhum et al.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00-10:30   | C.2.1 L1 vs. L2 Written Peer Feedback Effects on L2 English (Williams)  
|              | C.3.W Measuring Journal and Research Prestige (Tancock)                 |
|              | C.4.1 The Impact of Composing Short Books in an EAP Writing (Houston)   |
|              | C.5.1 Use of Moves and Intertextual Connections to Understand How L2 writers (Angay-Crowder et al.) |
|              | C.6.1 Writing Conferences as Mediated Worlds for Academic Writing (Do)  |
|              | C.7.1 Exploring the Interaction Among Contextual, Student, and Teacher Variables Influencing (Jeon) |
|              | C.8.1 Writing Comic Strips to Teach False Cognates to Young Brazilian L2 learners (Vila López) |
|              | C.9.1 A Longitudinal Study of Written Language Development in Two Genres (Pollo et al.) |
|              | C.10.1 A Cross-Sectional Study of Writing Development of Second Language Learners (Kikuchi et al.) |
|              | C.11.1 CANCELED                                                        |
|              | C.12.1 Making the Game Plan: A Study of Multilingual Writers' Genre (Glymph) |
| 9:25-9:50    | C.2.2 Acquiring and Retaining Detecting and Commenting Skills Through Peer Review (Min et al.) |
|              | C.4.2 Professionalizing Writing Instruction in English for Academic Purposes Classes (Sapp) |
|              | C.5.2 Blogging in the EAP Composition Classroom: Embracing the 21st Century (Bleye) |
|              | C.6.2 Instructor Commentary on L1 and L2 Writing: Similarities and (Slinkard) |
|              | C.7.2 Writing Center Tutors Working with L2 Writers: Challenges and Opportunities (Kang) |
|              | C.9.2 CANCELED                                                        |
| 9:50-10:15   | C.2.3 Self- and Peer-Assessment in Second Language Writing: Students' Perspective (Zappa et al.) |
|              | C.4.3 Disciplinary Writing Differences, Expectation, and Challenges for Undergraduate L2 Writers (Evans et al.) |
|              | C.5.3 Examining the Role of Online Machine Translators in the Writing (Halsey) |
|              | C.6.3 Engaging Students in a Reflective Dialogue About Their Writing (Shvidko) |
|              | C.7.3 "At-Risk" College Writers and Evolution of an Athletics Writing Center (Stacey) |
|              | C.9.3 Multilingual Writers, Comp, and Grammar: Grammar Contracts in the First-Year (Shepherd et al.) |
|              | C.10.3 Undergraduate Academic Writing Across Languages: A Sociocultural Study (Valfredini) |
|              | C.11.3 Learners' Processing of Two Different Types of Written Feedback on (Kim) |
|              | C.12.3 Online Intercultural Collaboration: Insights into the Writing Process (Chen et al.) |
| 10:45-11:45  | Plenary III: Pedagogical Imports of Western Practices for Professionalizing Second Language Writing (Zhang) in Arizona Room |
| 11:45-13:30  | Closed Meeting  
<p>|              | JSLW Editorial Board Meeting (Tancock) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.2.C European Perspectives on Professionalizing L2 Writing (Schmitt et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.3.1 Professionalizing the Training of Raters of Second Language Writing (Chapman et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.4.1 Computer-Mediated Synchronous and Asynchronous Direct Corrective Feedback on Writing (Shintani)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.5.1 CANCELED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.6.1 Vague Noun Usage in L2 Emergent Academic Writing (Ontiveros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.7.1 Advancing Knowledge of L1 Arabic ESL Students’ Language Repertoires and (Kopec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.8.1 English Writing Instruction in College Level in Algeria (Belmihoub)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.9.1 Individual Differences and Written Corrective Feedback: Exploring the Differential Effects (Yingying)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.10.1 Multilingual Students’ Use of Their Linguistic Repertoires When Writing (Gunnarsson et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.11.1 Perceptions on Teacher Feedback: A Comparison Between L1 and L2 (Thirakunkovit et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.12.1 Examining Preparation of Mainstream Composition Teachers Working with Multilingual Writers (Shvidko)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:55-14:20</td>
<td>D.3.2 How Rubrics and Collaboration Can Facilitate Grading (Barto et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.4.2 Introducing Undergraduates to Word Engine and Peer Review of (Cheung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.5.2 Departmental Academic Support for International Doctoral Students (Ahn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.6.2 *From My Own Point of View, and Standing at Your (Heng Harts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.8.2 Linguistic and Cognitive Obstacles Encountered by L2 Writers in UAE (Banat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.9.2 Exploring Student Engagement with Written Corrective Feedback in First-Year Composition (Usbinski)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.10.2 A Discourse Analysis: On the Study of Interaction Between Identity (Tu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.11.2 Assessing the Placement of L2 Writers: An Institutional Case Study (Slayton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.12.2 Taking a Stance: Normalizing L2 Needs in Mainstream Composition Classes (Fahim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20-14:45</td>
<td>D.3.3 Going Digital: Professionalizing Web Portfolio Assessments Through Rubrics (Kwon et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.4.3 Second Language Writing MOOCs: Affordances and Missed Opportunities (Gilliland et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.5.3 Concept Mapping to Gather Student-Generated Evidence of Reflection and Conceptual (Wette)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.6.3 Investigating the Relationship Between Second Language Writing Proficiency and Noun (Lan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.8.3 Exploring Local Conditions that Affect L2 Writing Instruction in Korean (Yang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.9.3 &quot;Reviseing&quot; L2 Feedback and Revision Research: Looking to the Future (Goldstein)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.10.3 Roles of Translingualism and Transactionalism in Second Language Writing (Nahar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.11.3 Reexamining Perception of L2 Writing (Yang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.12.3 Narrative Analysis of a Multilingual Writer’s L2 Writing Experience (Kim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15-15:40</td>
<td>E.1.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.2.C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.3.W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:40-16:05</td>
<td>E.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:05-16:30</td>
<td>E.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-18:00</td>
<td>Plenary IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00-21:00</td>
<td>Ticketed Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:25-9:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50-10:15</td>
<td>F.5.3 Singing &quot;My Way&quot; in Developing Second Language Writing: Graduate Students' Own Experiences (Kayican)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10-11:35</td>
<td>G.5.2 Teacher Study Group: Teachers' Views Before and After (Andrei et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35-12:00</td>
<td>G.5.3 Becoming Second Language Writing Specialists: A Self-Reflective Study of a (Lin et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:45</td>
<td>Ticketed Event: Lunch Seminar in Engrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing Apocalypse and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Future of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field (Matsuda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:00-15:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:25-14:50</td>
<td>H.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From Scaffolding to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy: The Role of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a Teacher in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vorobel et al.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:50-15:15</td>
<td>H.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrant Students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Differing Needs When</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing One-on-One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Eckstein)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45-16:45</td>
<td>Plenary V: Fake It ‘Til You Make It: The Imposter Syndrome—the Dilemma (Crusan) in Arizona Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45-17:45</td>
<td>Plenary VI: Representations of Professionalization in Second Language Writing (Tardy) in Arizona Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:45-18:00</td>
<td>Reflections and SSLW 2015 Preview (Matsuda et al.) in Arizona Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second Language Writing Institute

Symposium Program

Second Language Writing Institute

SLWI.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 8:30-10:30, Graham (Ticketed Event)
Chair: Katherine Daily O’Meara, Arizona State University, United States
Success on the Job Market: Demystifying the Process
Cristyn Elder, University of New Mexico, United States

The primary audience for this institute includes those on or soon to be on the job market and those mentoring others about the job market. This hands-on workshop will include reading and understanding job ads, analyzing successful job materials, and discussing the interview, campus visit, and negotiation process.

SLWI.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 8:30-10:30, Gold (Ticketed Event)
Chair: Izabela Uscinski, Arizona State University, United States
Designing and Sustaining a Satisfying and Successful Research Program in Second Language Writing
Dana Ferris, University of California, Davis, United States

In this session we will discuss principles and practical strategies for implementing and maintaining a sustainable 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. Resource issues will also be discussed.

SLWI.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 8:30-10:30, Santa Cruz (Ticketed Event)
Making Your Presentation Striking
Paul Kei Matsuda, Arizona State University, United States

This workshop will help you learn how to give advanced academic presentation genres such as plenary and keynote talks. Drawing on his extensive experience, the presenter will discuss how plenary talks differ from other types of presentation, and provide strategies for designing and delivering talks that are engaging, entertaining and enlightening.

SLWI.4 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 8:30-10:30, Gila (Ticketed Event)
Writing Program Administration and ESL Writers
Susan Miller-Cochran, North Carolina State University, United States

How can writing program administrators and second language writing specialists work together to develop approaches that will best serve ESL writers? During this institute, participants will look at recommendations offered in scholarship in both the WPA and SLW communities and work together to find commonalities and develop solutions that will work in specific institutional contexts.
SLWI.5 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 8:30-10:30, Yuma (Ticketed Event)
Chair: Sarah Elizabeth Snyder, Arizona State University, United States
Writing Program Administrator as a Consultant
Shirley Rose, Arizona State University, United States

In this session, an experienced consultant-evaluator for various college writing programs will take you through the world of academic consulting. After a brief overview of various types of work—from invited talks and curriculum development projects to program evaluation visits—she will share a wealth of information about the work of consultant-evaluator, including how to get started, how to prepare for a consultation visit, how to conduct yourself during the visit, and how to follow up.

SLWI.6 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 8:30-10:30, Turquoise (Ticketed Event)
An Introduction to Writing in Academic Journals: How to Get Published
Christopher Tancock, Elsevier, United Kingdom

In this presentation, the Publisher for Elsevier’s language and linguistics portfolio will host a session covering: best practice on how to get write scholarly articles; how to identify the right journal for your paper and common pitfalls to avoid when submitting your work. This will be an open and informative session, aimed at those looking to publish their first paper and/or who are interested in the world of scholarly publishing and how it works.

Writing & Pedagogy
Edited by Martha Pennington
City University of Hong Kong

Writing & Pedagogy provides a forum for discussion and dissemination of knowledge focused on both writing and the teaching of writing. It is international in scope and spans all levels of education, from K-12 to doctoral level. The journal provides information and stimulates conversations that can advance the theory and practice of writing pedagogy in first- and second-language environments by revealing similarities and differences in the practices and concerns regarding writing and the teaching of writing across different contexts and educational systems.

The journal solicits essays, research reports, pedagogical reflections, discussions of technology, and book reviews. Although the primary focus is on the teaching of English writing within formal education, the journal welcomes articles on writing outside of English education, such as the teaching of writing in other languages, the writing needs of specific workplace contexts, and issues of a theoretical or practical nature involving the nature of writing or research on writing.

3 issues per year ISSN 1756-5839 (print) / ISSN 1756-5847 (online)

For more information and to subscribe visit
www.equinoxpub.com/WAP
Thursday, November 13, 2014

Opening Ceremony

Plenary I
Thursday, November 13, 2014, 11:00-12:00, Arizona
Chair: Christine Tardy, University of Arizona, United States

Reflections of a Post-Mid-Career L2 Writing Professional on the Ever-Increasing Challenges of Working at a Large Public Research University in the United States: Facing the Specter of Deprofessionalization
Tony Silva, Purdue University, United States

The number of international students in public institutions of higher education in the United States continues to grow rapidly. These increases are due in large part to intensive recruiting efforts by these institutions. This recruiting is driven in large part (especially at the undergraduate level) by the desire to develop new “revenue streams”—international students typically pay non-resident tuition and fees and more. New revenue is necessary because of declining state funding and strong resistance to increases in tuition for in-state students.

While university administrations welcome this additional revenue, they are much less enthusiastic about providing funds for language support—including L2 writing instruction—for their growing international student populations. Administrations tend to offer short-term, soft money, band-aid fixes rather than to provide long term recurring funds to invest in a professionally sound response. Ideally, universities with well-established graduate programs in second language studies that have been successfully preparing teaching assistants to staff L2 writing courses would invest in and expand these graduate programs by hiring additional tenure-track faculty to prepare more graduate students to staff more sections of L2 writing courses.

Unfortunately, this type of response seems to be more the exception than the rule. All of this suggests that even though L2 writing in recent years has seen a substantial expansion in disciplinary infrastructure, an increase in inquiry in and knowledge about L2 writing and writing instruction, and growth in the number of qualified L2 writing professionals, graduate programs in second language studies still serve at the pleasure (or the whim) of university administrators who are typically unlikely to understand, value, or strongly support the development of the field.

This presentation will illustrate the foregoing state of affairs by providing an account of events that transpired recently at a particular large public research university in the United States and address the implications of these events for the field of L2 writing.

Tony Silva is a Professor and the Director of the ESL Writing Program in the Department of English at Purdue University, where he teaches graduate courses for Ph.D., M.A., and Certificate students and writing support courses for graduate and undergraduate international students. He has also directed the Graduate Program in Second Language Studies/ESL. At Purdue, he has served as chair or member of more than 100 doctoral committees and has won eleven departmental Excellence in Teaching Awards.
With Ilona Leki, he founded and edited the *Journal of Second Language Writing* from 1992-2007; he continues to co-assemble the Journal’s annotated bibliography. With Paul Kei Matsuda he founded and hosted the (now annual and international) Symposium on Second Language Writing from 1998-2013.


He has published articles in a number of journals, including, *College Composition and Communication, Composition Studies, ELT Journal, Foreign Languages and their Teaching, Journal of Second Language Writing, Modern Language Journal, TESL Canada Journal, TESOL Journal, TESOL Quarterly, Writing Program Administration, and Written Communication*.

He is an active member of TESOL, where he has organized the Graduate Student Forum, served as a member of the Search Committee for the Editor of *TESOL Quarterly*, as a member of the Steering Committee of the Second Language Writing Interest Section, and, currently, as a member of the TESOL Board of Directors; he has also served CCCC as a member of the Committee on Second Language Writing, the Special Interest Group on Second Language Writing, and the Executive Board.

Thursday, November 13, 2014, 12:00-13:45, Gold (Open Meeting)

**Consortium on Graduate Communication**
Chair: Nigel Caplan, University of Delaware, United States
Chair: Michelle Cox, Cornell University, United States

Thursday, November 13, 2014, 12:00-13:45, Copper (Closed Meeting)

**Translingual Writing Issues Working Group**
Over the past several decades, scholars in second language writing have developed a robust body of research and pedagogy on working with L2 graduate students and the processes of writing for publication in scholarly and scientific journals. Such research and pedagogical inquiry have led to the development of graduate-level English for Academic Purposes classes.

Recently, researchers and higher education administrators outside second language writing have also expressed interest in graduate writing support for all students, prompted in part by international concerns about the overall structure of graduate education, graduate student retention and time-to-degree, and job placement. For example, in the US, the Council of Graduate Schools’ (2010) report on PhD completion identifies writing support at the dissertation stage as critical to student success, and lists notable programs and strategies that have been developed across US institutions. This broader interest in graduate writing support presents second language writing researchers with both an exciting opportunity and an interesting challenge. Because of our longstanding interest in L2 graduate writers, we have the opportunity not only to bolster our own field’s research but to impact discussions of graduate writing research and pedagogy outside our field. Doing so, however, requires us to identify and tackle new and emerging issues for graduate writing in institutions worldwide, to consider the broader implications of our field’s knowledge base, and to explore ways our programs can intersect with others across our institutions.

The purpose of this colloquium is both to reflect on our field’s current body of knowledge on graduate writing pedagogy and to explore future trajectories for research, pedagogy, and program design. We also would like to announce the creation of the new Consortium on Graduate Communication, a network of scholars and teachers worldwide who work with both L2 and L1 graduate student writers.
Invited Colloquium
Organizer: Bryan Smith, Arizona State University, United States

L2 Writing Across Diverse CALL Contexts
Idoia Elola, Texas Tech University, United States
Ana Oskoz, University of Maryland Baltimore County, United States
Jeff Kuhn, Ohio University, United States
Bryan Smith, Arizona State University, United States

This colloquium will present on L2 writing across diverse CALL contexts.

Idoia Elola’s presentation will highlight how the development of research agendas based on the connections between L2 writing (in Spanish) and the use of technology (e.g., the use of social tools) is at the core of the professionalization of FL writing. Ana Oskoz’s presentation will highlight new forms of interaction among the authors themselves and with their audience when using social tools. This presentation, therefore, will focus on the purposes, implementations and outcomes of writing practices that keep in mind the learners’ writing development within wider educational and professional contexts. Jeff Kuhn reports findings from a study on a digital game-based course in which students co-created a shared context via technology. The course was freshman composition composed of 15 university non-native English speakers, and the digital game was a modified version of Minecraft. This qualitative study seeks to explore students’ experiences in this learning environment, focusing on how the environment affected student engagement and subsequent writing. Bryan Smith will discuss a study (conducted with Marije Michele, Lancaster University) that employed eye tracking technology during synchronous written computer-mediated interaction (chat) among advanced-level L2 learning peers. The eye gaze of each participant was recorded while performing weekly dialogic writing tasks over two months. Eye gaze records were correlated with instances of learner lexical and structural alignment during the interaction. How eye tracking can help shed light on the nature of learner alignment during the task as well as lexical and structural convergence in subsequent writing tasks will be discussed.

Idoia Elola’s presentation will highlight how the development of research agendas based on the connections between L2 writing (in Spanish) and the use of technology (e.g., the use of social tools) is at the core of the professionalization of FL writing. Research on writing in Spanish as a FL has formulated two specific needs: (a) the development of FL writing courses for graduate students, who see the need to teach writing using social tools for both linguistic and rhetorical purposes; and (b) the development of research studies that address, for example, how learners write in these new tools-related genres, and how FL writers write collaboratively while interacting and scaffolding each other.

Ana Oskoz’s presentation will highlight new forms of interaction among the authors themselves and with their audience when using social tools. The discussion and reflection on rhetorical concepts of traditional texts as well as more recent technology-created genres have allowed Spanish language learners to engage in the production of written texts and the acquisition of technological knowledge that can be directly applied to their personal and professional
environments. This presentation, therefore, will focus on the purposes, implementations and outcomes of writing practices that keep in mind the learners’ writing development within wider educational and professional contexts.

Jeff Kuhn reports findings from a study on a digital game-based course in which students co-created a shared context via technology. The course was freshman composition composed of 15 university non-native English speakers, and the digital game was a modified version of Minecraft. This qualitative study seeks to explore students’ experiences in this learning environment, focusing on how the environment affected student engagement and subsequent writing.

Bryan Smith will discuss a study (conducted with Marije Michele, Lancaster University) that employed eye tracking technology during synchronous written computer-mediated interaction (chat) among advanced-level L2 learning peers. The eye gaze of each participant was recorded while performing weekly dialogic writing tasks over two months. Eye gaze records were correlated with instances of learner lexical and structural alignment during the interaction. How eye tracking can help shed light on the nature of learner alignment during the task as well as lexical and structural convergence in subsequent writing tasks will be discussed.

A.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-15:00, Gila
Chair: Juliana Kocsis, North Carolina State University, United States

A.3.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-14:10, Gila
“Plain English” and the YMCA Technical Writing Classroom: Recovering Pre-Professional Moments in SLW
Lance Cummings, University of North Carolina Wilmington, United States

This presentation will examine how the idea of “plain English” emerged within the early 20th century YMCA’s technical writing classes.

Best Student Paper
A.3.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Gila
Writing Across Communities: Service Learning Composition for University L2 Writers
Bonnie Vidrine-Isbell, University of Washington, United States
Norah Fahim, University of Washington, United States
Dan Zhu, University of Washington, United States

An innovative area in composition programs is the combination of L2 writing with service learning. This unique setting enables international students to practice translilingual approaches while engaging with their local communities. This study reports on the impact of a pilot program and offers further pedagogical approaches for multilingual service learning.
A.3.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:35-15:00, Gila

**Developing Early Leadership for Writing Teachers: Examples from “Head” Teaching Assistants (TAs) of Advanced EAP Writing**
Lynee Lawson, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States

“Head” TA’s in a university ESL writing program provide teachers with unique leadership opportunities at an early stage of their careers by directing meetings, overseeing lesson design, managing curriculum websites, and conducting informal observations. Practical implementation, benefits, and personal experiences will be shared for the benefit of any writing program.

A.4 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-15:00, Graham

Chair: Bethany Bradshaw, North Carolina State University, United States

A.4.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-14:10, Graham

**Applying the Lexical Approach to One-on-One Writing Instruction**
Leora Freedman, University of Toronto, Canada
Rebecca Smollett, OCAD University, Canada

The “lexical approach” focuses on the importance of mastery of “lexical bundles” to fluency in all modalities. In this talk, two university program administrators demonstrate the effectiveness of a lexical approach in one-on-one work with second language writers, as a means to both improving grammatical accuracy and fostering critical thinking.

A.4.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Graham

**L1 and L2 Vocabulary Use in Freshman Writing**
Muhammad Qureshi, Northern Arizona University, United States

Although widely researched, academic vocabulary has been ignored for productive use. How do L1 English and L2-writers Arabic and Chinese writers differ in productive vocabulary use? What percentage of vocabulary from the Academic Word List is covered in L1 and L2 writing? Join the session to learn about it.

A.4.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:35-15:00, Graham

**Language Use in Third Language Writing: A Case Study of Six Multilingual College Students**
Nadya Tanova, University of Dayton, United States

This presentation reports on and synthesizes the results of a study investigating how multilingual writers make use of their language repertoire while writing in their third language. The findings point to distinct roles of L1 and L2 in L3 composing. Implications for L2 writing theory and pedagogy will be drawn.
Thursday, November 13, 2014

A.5 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-15:00, Yuma
Chair: Susan Bleyle, Georgia Gwinnett College, United States

A.5.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-14:10, Yuma
Corrective Feedback Embedded in a Writing Conference: How Graduated and How Contingent Is It to L2 Learners’ Need?
Ye Han, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

The naturalistic case study drew the concepts of “graduation” and “contingency” from Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994) to investigate how graduated oral feedback is and how contingent that feedback is to the learner’s need in a one-on-one conference involving a native-speaking English teacher and a non-English major in a Chinese university.

A.5.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Yuma
A Methodological Synthesis of Research on the Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing
Qiandi Liu, Northern Arizona University, United States
Dan Brown, Northern Arizona University, United States

This study systematically reviews methodological features across 45 L2 written corrective feedback studies that investigate accuracy development. Results reveal several design trends and limitations that complicate results, including insufficient reporting of data, treatments lacking ecological validity, inconsistent operationalization of control groups, inconsistent measures of accuracy, and mixing of feedback types.

A.5.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:35-15:00, Yuma
Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback: Its Past, Present, and Future
Kendon Kurzer, University of California, Davis, United States
Grant Eckstein, University of California, Davis, United States

Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback is believed to help L2 writers improve their written grammatical accuracy. In this presentation, we discuss the findings of previous DWCF studies and their methodological limitations and then describe how DWCF is being implemented and studied in a large university L2 writing program.

A.6 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-15:00, Pinal
Chair: Elena Shvidko, Purdue University, United States

A.6.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-14:10, Pinal
Comparing Goals of L1 and L2 College Writers: A Survey Study of First-Year Composition Students
Kyongson Park, Purdue University, United States

This paper investigates the different goals of domestic (US) and international students in the first-year composition classes at Purdue. The mismatch between instructors’ and students’ priorities will be examined. The findings contribute to research on SLW
curricula and professional development of instructors, meeting the needs of L1 and L2 writers.

A.6.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Pinal
CANCELED

A.6.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:35-15:00, Pinal
**ESL Composition Instruction: Redress Its Balance**
Ling He, Miami University, United States

The complexity of composing for ESL writers calls for writing teachers’ reflection on the existent practice. This study explores pedagogy through teaching ESL freshmen composition at a U.S. college based on qualitative and quantitative datasets. The findings show need of balancing writing processes and writing products in teaching ESL composition.

A.7 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-15:00, Santa Cruz
Chair: Shizhou Yang, Yunnan Minzu University, China

A.7.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-14:10, Santa Cruz
**The Cultural Impact on Academic Writing in Korean Universities**
Jiyon Lee, Yonsei University, Korea
Inyoung Kim, Yonsei University, Korea
Hyejin Hwang, Yonsei University, Korea

Both Korea’s formal education system and culture have influenced students’ reliance on prescribed organizational patterns of writing in English as taught by their professors. This paper aims to provide a greater understanding of the cultural interference that causes Korean university students to face difficulties when writing in English.

A.7.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Santa Cruz
**The Usage of Lexical Bundles in Korean Learner Corpus (YELC): Directing the Next Step to Korean EFL Writing Class**
Jungyeon Koo, Seoul National University, Korea
Bitna Choi, Seoul National University, Korea

The current study is to examine the distinctiveness of LBs use in Korean Learner Corpus (YELC) and to compare the usage of LBs by NNS to those by NS. The results suggest some pedagogical implications on how to teach academic prose in Korean EFL writing class.
A.7.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:35-15:00, Santa Cruz

**Developing Indigenous Second Language Writing Programs in Korean Higher Education**
Minsun Kim, Miami University, United States

This proposal examines professional work of one Korean university, focusing on their writing program administration. By discussing new writing programs and administration practices, this study investigates factors in the development of Korean college writing and how it has served the need of related participants in its distinctive local context.

A.8 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-15:00, Yavapai
Chair: Yoo Young Ahn, Indiana University, United States

A.8.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-14:10, Yavapai

**Writer's Block and Writing Apprehension in EFL Academic Writing in China**
Jin Bi, The University of Utah, United States
Xiaoqing Qin, Central China Normal University, China

We examined writer’s blocks and writing apprehensions that Chinese non-English major graduates often encounter in academic writing. Data were collected from 357 participants through questionnaire and interviews. We identified the types of writer’s blocks and writing apprehensions prevalent among graduate students, and tried to clarify the major reasons for them.

A.8.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Yavapai

**Are They Still “Anxious”? A Pilot Study of Treatment for Second Language Writing Anxiety of EFL College Students**
Taimin Tammy Wu, Arizona State University, United States
Karen C. C. Chang, National Taipei University, Taiwan

This study explores EFL students’ perceived feelings when engaging themselves in L2 writing via semi-structured interviews. It is expected that descriptors other than the term “writing anxiety” will emerge to better describe the affective factors students encounter during their L2 writing processes.

A.8.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:35-15:00, Yavapai

**Linguistic Agency and Ability in Large-Scale Writing Assessment Rubrics and Band Descriptors**
Salena Anderson, Valparaiso University, United States

This study explores differences in depictions of agency and ability in score and band descriptors for large-scale writing assessment rubrics for the IELTS, TOEFL, SAT, ACT, and GRE. For the IELTS, TOEFL, and GRE exams, descriptions of effective essays feature more agency. The IELTS references ability in low score descriptions.
A.9 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-15:00, Gold
Chair: Darby Smith, IELP at Portland State University, United States

A.9.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-14:10, Gold
The Firsts of Second Language Writing: An Argument for Disciplinarity
Terese Thonus, University of Kansas, United States

This presentation examines the Journal of Second Language Writing’s December 2013 “Disciplinary Dialogue” for perceptions and opinions that support and refute SLW’s claims to disciplinarity. Using varying meanings of “first” and “second” in English, I alternate between solemnity and humor in making a cautious case for SLW’s (trans)disciplinarity.

A.9.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Gold
Beyond Generalizability: What Do We Know about Case Studies in the Field of SLW and What Can We Learn from Them?
Ghada Gherwash, Purdue University, United States

This presentation provides a critical and comprehensive understanding of case study methods as valuable tools of investigation in the field of SLW. It will: 1) define case study methods; 2) look briefly at its history; and 3) conclude by analyzing three exemplar case studies in the field of SLW.

A.9.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:35-15:00, Gold
The Grass Is Greener: Comparing L2 Writing Research as a Discipline in the U.S. and China
Ju Zhan, Jilin University, China

This meta-disciplinary study compares L2 writing symposia in the U.S. and EFL writing conferences in China. The similarities and differences in the aspect of themes and presentations reveal the development of L2 writing research as a discipline and provide implications for further promotion of EFL writing research in China.

A.10 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-15:00, Copper
Chair: Jin Kim, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States

A.10.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-14:10, Copper
Professionalizing L2 Creative Writing Pedagogy: M.A. TESOL Students’ Perceptions on Their English Writing Experiences
Fang Yu Liao, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, United States

Utilizing interview-based design, this study aims to address 18 M.A. TESOL prospective teachers’ understandings toward general writing and creative writing based on their own English writing experiences. The study seeks to contribute to the L2 educators by considering L2 creative writing pedagogy as a valuable approach in ESL/EFL contexts.
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A.10.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Copper
**Code-Meshing and Self-Discovery: Bilingual Poetry in the Composition Course**
Ana Maria Wetzl, Kent State University Trumbull, United States

The paper describes the use of poetry (Espaillat’s “Bilingue/Bilingual”) to increase L1 or L2 students’ understanding of their uniquely diverse linguistic repertoire as they are struggling to transition from their everyday English to the language of their new community of practice, i.e. the academia.

A.10.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:35-15:00, Copper
**Journalogue: Voicing L2 Student Challenges in Writing**
Suneeta Thomas, Purdue University, United States

This study qualitatively assessed student reflections and responses to student reflections on writing. 15 students posted reflections on their writing, and commented on at least two such posts. Findings show that the students developed a virtual support group by sharing their challenges and providing advice to each other.

A.11 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-15:00, Chrysocolla
Chair: Jacqueline Brady, Arizona State University, United States

A.11.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-14:10, Chrysocolla
**Imagined Voice in Academic Writing: Conceptualization and Construction of Voice by Multilingual Graduate Writers in a Writing Course**
Eunjeong Lee, Penn State University, United States

The current study examines how the notion of voice in writing is discussed and understood by the instructor and multilingual graduate writers through a classroom-based ethnographic case study. The study reports how the instructor’s and students’ understanding of their ideal disciplinary voice was dialogically constructed and evolved throughout the course.

A.11.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Chrysocolla
**Helping L2 Students Find Their Writers’ Voice: From Student Newsletter Conceptualization to Production to Distribution**
Cyndriel Meimban, Northern Arizona University, Program in Intensive English, United States

This presentation features a case study on the process of launching a student newsletter, applicable for a program-wide newsletter or a single writing class. The numerous benefits, challenges, solutions, and applications of such a project are discussed in both theoretical and practical terms.
A.11.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:35-15:00, Chrysocolla

*Cultivating Voice in the Academic Writing of Japanese University Students: A Case for Employing Literature Studies in the Writing Classroom*
Gary Fogal, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada

Despite copious descriptive reports highlighting the benefits of literature studies for language learners, there are limited quantifiable data supporting the use of literary texts for developing English L2 academic essay writing. This classroom-based, mixed-method study reports on the benefits of such analyses for improving authorial voice on the TOEFL iBT.

A.12 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-15:00, Plata
Chair: Linda Henriksen, Kansas State University, United States

A.12.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 13:45-14:10, Plata
CANCELED

A.12.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:10-14:35, Plata

*Indirectness Trends Across Three Rhetorical Patterns in English Writing of Costa Rican EFL Learners*
Randolph Zúñiga Coudin, Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica
José Miguel Vargas Vásquez, Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

An examination of writing samples with three rhetorical patterns: comparison-contrast, cause-effect, and argumentation provided information on the use of rhetorical indirectness features and discourse habits of second- and third-year students of the B.A. in English at the University of Costa Rica. The data pointed to increased indirectness in argumentative writing.

A.12.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 14:35-15:00, Plata

*Contrasting Thai Versus English Written Discourse Styles of Thai-English Bilinguals*
Jet Saengngoen, University of New Mexico, United States

This contrastive study of the written discourse styles of Thai-English bilinguals reveals correlations of syntactical patterns between L1 and L2 narrative essays in English and Thai. Narrative discourse structures of both the Thai and English essays were influenced by the amount of previous writing experience, personal background, and religious beliefs.
Session B

Invited Colloquium
B.1.C Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-17:00, Arizona
Organizer: Neomy Storch, University of Melbourne, Australia

Collaborative L2 Writing in Social Media Environments: Student Interactions and Pedagogical Insights
Mimi Li, Marshall University, United States
Neomy Storch, University of Melbourne, Australia
Amir Rouhshad, University of Melbourne, Australia
Greg Kessler, Ohio University, United States

Recent developments in Web 2.0 technology have revolutionized the ways in which we create, communicate and share information, with a greater focus on collaboration. For L2 learners, these new technologies can provide opportunities for extended and genuine collaborative writing practice. Yet to fully understand the opportunities these new technologies afford our learners, we need to investigate how learners approach online writing tasks, how they interact with each other, and the texts they produce.

In this colloquium, the three presenters (Li, Storch and Kessler) present findings of studies conducted in three different L2 writing contexts. Mimi Li reports on a qualitative study that explored and interpreted ESL students’ dynamic interactions during wiki-based collaborative writing in an EAP context. Neomy Storch reports on a study conducted with Amir Rouhshad which investigated how mode of communication impacts on learners’ collaborative writing activities. In the study, the same pairs of low intermediate pre-university ESL learners completed a collaborative writing task in two modes: face-to-face and computer mediated (Google Docs). Greg Kessler will discuss findings from a number of recent studies into pair and larger group collaborative writing practices. He will focus upon the behavior of students and emerging pedagogical practices that are explored in these studies. The findings of the three studies shed light on the complex nature of learners’ interactions when engaging in collaborative online writing, and bear important implications for L2 writing pedagogy.

B.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-16:45, Turquoise
Chair: Veronika Maliborska, Purdue University, United States

B.2.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-15:55, Turquoise
A Dialogic Conversation or a Uni-Directional Monologue Between Supervisor and Student: The Relationship between Feedback Content, Pragmatic Realization and Co-Constructed Understandings
John Bitchener, AUT University, New Zealand

This paper examines the extent to which the pragmatic realization of feedback comments on drafts of US, Australian and New Zealand doctoral students’ thesis/dissertation chapters invites a dialogic ‘conversation’ between supervisor and student rather than a uni-directional monologue.
B.2.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:55-16:20, Turquoise
Assessing the Impact of Teacher Feedback on Accuracy in the Writing of EFL Learners: A Longitudinal Study
Ali Rastgou, The University of Melbourne, Australia

The longitudinal study explored the effectiveness of feedback on accuracy by comparing the performance of EFL learners who received different types of feedback. The study found that learners who received sustained written corrective feedback with or without feedback on content/organization outperformed those who received feedback on content/organization only or no feedback.

B.2.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 16:20-16:45, Turquoise
Different Modes of Teacher Feedback: Types and Nature, Students’ Responses and Contextual Issues
Yun Shen, The Language Company, United States
Diane Potts, Lancaster University, United Kingdom

This research focused on different modes of teacher feedback: types and nature, students’ responses and contextual issues.

B.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-16:45, Gila
Chair: Ye Han, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

B.3.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-15:55, Gila
Tracing Identity Changes in Disciplinary Genre Learning: A Case Study of L2 Undergraduate Students
Soomin Jwa, University of Arizona, United States

The present study focuses on the genre of business letters to explore the ways in which L2 undergraduate students’ disciplinary identities change in relation to their developing knowledge of the genre over time. The presenter will address implications for teaching disciplinary genres to L2 undergraduate students in the university classroom.

B.3.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:55-16:20, Gila
What Are Writing Difficulties?
Nancy Tarawhiti, Brigham Young University Hawaii, United States

Writing difficulties (WDs) have often been referred to as any challenge or problem experienced by L2 writers. This study, however, narrows the definition of WDs to: a writing problem that hinders development and successful task completion in the process of text construction for a discipline specific genre.
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B.3.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 16:20-16:45, Gila
**Complex Personal Letter-Writing in Advanced Collegiate FL Instruction**
Cori Crane, University of Texas at Austin, United States

Genre analyses of two personal letter types (condolence and love letters) are presented to illustrate how the letter genre can help foster complex writing abilities among advanced L2 writers. Texts written by advanced collegiate L2 learners of German are analyzed according to schematic structure, and transitivity and appraisal patterns.

B.4 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-16:45, Graham
Chair: Betsy Gilliland, University of Hawaii Manoa, United States

B.4.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-15:55, Graham
CANCELED

B.4.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:55-16:20, Graham
**Tutoring One’s Way to L2 Writing Teacher Cognition**
Diane Belcher, Georgia State University, United States
Hae Sung Yang, Georgia State University, United States

This qualitative study considers the extent to which L2 writing teacher cognition can be enhanced by the experience of tutoring. How dialogic interaction with L2 students affected novice tutor/teachers’ evolving notions of what it means to facilitate L2 writers’ growth will be reported on and implications for professional development discussed.

B.4.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 16:20-16:45, Graham
**Understanding the Knowledge Bases of L2 Writing Teachers in FYC**
Juval V. Racelis, Arizona State University, United States

Second language writing research relies on multiple disciplinary perspectives to address issues in the field. Few studies, however, investigate how teachers negotiate these transdisciplinary perspectives in their daily practices. This presentation describes a study that looks at how teachers negotiate multiple knowledge bases and the beliefs that underlie their practices.

B.5 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-16:45, Yuma
Chair: Taimin Tammy Wu, Arizona State University, United States

B.5.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-15:55, Yuma
**Before the Dissertation Writing Begins: Tips for L2 Doctoral Students**
Christine Pearson Casanave, Temple University, Japan Campus, United States

In this talk I discuss challenges facing L2 doctoral students before they begin writing dissertations. These issues are not covered well in guidebooks or in typical doctoral supervising, and include struggles with topic choice, reading, adviser choice, and quality of life. Pre-dissertation guidance thus requires careful attention in doctoral programs.
B.5.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:55-16:20, Yuma
**Perceptions of Multilingual Students in a Graduate L2 Writing Course**
Katherine Daily O’Meara, Arizona State University, United States

Presenter shares her experiences designing and piloting a graduate-level L2 writing course. Study includes student perceptions and experiences negotiating multilingual challenges at the graduate level, including genre awareness, research expectations and overall professionalization. Graduate writers’ literacy practices are also investigated in an overall evaluation of the piloted grad course.

B.5.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 16:20-16:45, Yuma
**Multilingual Graduate Students Attitudes Towards Writing Practices and Support**
Nicole Khoury, Saint Xavier University, United States

This presentation highlights the results of a survey of L2 graduate writers from an international university to present how multilingual graduate students negotiate disciplinary identities through writing practices.

B.6 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-16:45, Pinal
Chair: Keith Miller, Arizona State University, United States

B.6.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-15:55, Pinal
**An Alternative Approach for Understanding Second Language Texts: Prototype Effects in L2 Writing**
Song-Eun Lee, Purdue University, United States

The study investigates to what extent the prototype semantics explains and helps one understand distinct features of second language texts. Theoretical concepts of prototypes are explicated; then, prototype effects in L2 students’ English texts are analyzed. Findings suggest that prototype semantics provides an alternative way to understand L2 writing.

B.6.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:55-16:20, Pinal
**The Effects of Instruction Based on Conceptual Metaphor Theory on EFL Students’ Writing Performance**
Amanda Hilliard, Arizona State University, American English and Culture Program, United States

This study investigated the effects of metaphor and idiom instruction based on conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) on a group of Vietnamese EFL students’ writing. The results suggest that instruction based on CMT can improve students’ metaphoric cohesion, overall use of figurative language, and general metaphoric competence in L2 writing.
Thursday, November 13, 2014

B.6.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 16:20-16:45, Pinal
A Cross-Disciplinary Interaction: Embrace a TESOL Perspective in Composition
Dan Zhu, University of Washington, United States
Norah Fahim, University of Washington, United States
Bonnie Vidrine-Isbell, University of Washington, United States

MA TESOL practicum students co-teaching in composition courses identified major issues in L2 writing, provided effective L2 writer support, and helped composition TAs reflect on their teaching practices. Meanwhile, the exposure to realistic L2 writing expectation in a university setting proved insightful to their TESOL training through this unique setting of cross-disciplinary collaboration.

B.7 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-16:45, Santa Cruz
Chair: Peter Goggin, Arizona State University, United States

B.7.1 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:30-15:55, Santa Cruz
Learn and Grow as a Writing Teacher
Yanan Fan, San Francisco State University, United States

This presentation draws on English writing projects of immigrant students in an urban middle school where secondary teacher candidates facilitated the projects and reflected on becoming language teachers. Implications for effective planning and assessment strategies for mainstream teachers to better support English language learners will be discussed.

B.7.2 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 15:55-16:20, Santa Cruz
Embracing Complexity: In-House Training for Teaching L2 Academic Writing
Maria Zlateva, Boston University, United States

Proposed training curriculum for faculty, writing fellows, and tutors in a university writing program. The modules, informed by linguistics/SLA research and SLW theory, create awareness of L2 writing specifics in the context of mixed classes, and put in place a knowledge base to maximize faculty resources and facilitate professional dialogue.

B.7.3 Thursday, November 13, 2014, 16:20-16:45, Santa Cruz
Professionalizing Teaching Practicums Through Digital Collaboration
R. Scott Partridge, Purdue University, United States
Heejung Kwon, Purdue University, United States

Teaching practicums support second language writing teachers’ classroom skills by creating a scaffolded framework to share with and learn from their colleagues. Our projects presents a pilot program incorporating a digital platform to extend and preserve these practices while facilitating research opportunities to further professionalize traditional teacher training systems.
Maximizing the Benefits of Prewriting: An Example from College Level ESL Research Papers
Jin Kim, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States
Lynee Lawson, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States
Cassandra Rosado, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States

Prewriting is of particular value for ESL students facing the daunting complexity of research paper writing. To maximize prewriting benefits, a “Pre-Research Portfolio Assignment” was developed to systematically guide students through compiling, analyzing, and documenting preliminary information. The assignment template, samples, related lessons, and encouraging student feedback will be shared.

Developing Professionalism in Teaching Reading and Writing in EFL Contexts
Yichun Liu, National Chengchi University, Taiwan

This study investigated the causal relations between instructors’ academic background and the teaching of L2W in the EFL context of Bangladesh. Forty-seven L2W instructors from different universities participated in the study. Three measures were used to collect the data, which showed a unique context of L2W teaching. It was not informed by the theories of L2W. It must undergo modifications.

Effectively Enhancing EFL Learners’ Writing Through Extensive Reading
Aaron David Mermelstein, Ming Chuan University, Taiwan

This one-year qualitative study examined the effects of ER on writing using 211 Asian EFL students. Specifically, to determine whether a long-term ER intervention with less accountability and access to large amounts of reading materials would show significant effects on writing, including: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, mechanics, and fluency.
Expressing Emotions in L2 Writing
Youngwha Lee, Arizona State University, United States

Expressing emotions in L2 writing has received particular attention in narrative and poetry. However, much research has shown that writing to describe emotions in L2 is frequently under-explored by L2 writers. It can be challenging for L2 writers to engage in expressing emotions, but it is not always true.

Effects of Model-Text Analysis on Genre Writing Abilities
Aran Choi, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Korea
Pamela Stacey, University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States

This study seeks to determine whether model text analysis has a greater effect upon students’ genre writing abilities than explicit genre instruction alone. Both qualitative and quantitative methods will be utilized in investigating whether Thai university students studying English writing benefited from explicit genre instruction and model text analysis.

Towards a More Integrative Approach to Genre Research
Soo Hyon Kim, University of New Hampshire, United States

This presentation reports on a systematic review of genre-based scholarship. It provides an assessment of the affordances and limitations of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches, and a discussion of the possibilities that a more integrated approach holds for the specific contexts and purposes of future genre-based research.

When the First Language Can’t Be Written: Resources and Strategies for Working with Speakers of American Sign Language in Composition and Basic Writing Classes
Sarah-Hope Parmeter, University of California, Santa Cruz, United States

This paper examines a two quarter-long series of conferences with a student whose first language is ASL. Instructor and student met for extended office hours, “speaking” together on computers by means of a shared Google document. Drawing on excerpts from these conversations (representing 30+ hours meetings), this paper will illustrate exchanges on topics ranging from large-scale to sentence-level writing issues, contextualizing these within discussion of the student’s understanding of what it is to write English.
The purpose of this study was to develop and pilot a survey that examines the writing practices of upper level content area teachers of the deaf. The survey is similar to other national surveys on writing practices but also contains a section to specifically inquire about American Sign Language users.

Susan Miller-Cochran is Professor of English and Director of First-Year Writing at North Carolina State University. Her research focuses on technology, ESL writing, and writing program administration. Her work has appeared in College Composition and Communication, Composition Studies, Computers and Composition, Teaching English in the Two-Year College, and Writing Program Administration. She is also an editor of Rhetorically Rethinking Usability (Hampton Press, 2009) and Strategies for Teaching First-Year Composition (NCTE, 2002). Additionally, she is a co-author of The Wadsworth Guide to Research (with Shelley Rodrigo, Cengage, 2014) and Keys for Writers (with Ann Raimes, Cengage, 2014). Before
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joining the faculty at NC State, she was a faculty member at Mesa Community College, Arizona. She has served on the Executive Committee of the Conference on College Composition and Communication and the Executive Board of the Council of Writing Program Administrators. She currently serves as Vice President of the Council of Writing Program Administrators.

Thursday, November 13, 2014, 18:30-20:30, Engrained
Opening Reception
Friday, November 14, 2014

Session C

Invited Colloquium
C.1.C Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:30, Arizona
Organizer: Tanita Saenkhum, University of Tennesse, Knoxville, United States

Exploring the Professional Pathways of Early-Career L2 Writing Specialists
Tanita Saenkhum, University of Tennesse, Knoxville, United States
Pisarn Bee Chamcharatsri, University of New Mexico, United States
Soo Hyon Kim, University of New Hampshire, United States
Atsushi Iida, Gunma University, Japan
Todd Ruecker, University of New Mexico, United States
Discussant, Christine Tardy, University of Arizona, United States

As the field of L2 writing has grown over the past few decades, an increasing number of people have pursued PhDs in this field. They come from diverse graduate programs, ranging from applied linguistics to TESOL to rhetoric and composition or combined programs. They enter institutions where they are situated in English departments, linguistics departments, intensive English programs, education departments, or elsewhere. As professionals like Shuck (2006) have noted, they are often the lone L2 writing person in their new institution, which means their services are requested by a variety of institutional individuals and bodies, potentially putting their tenure bids at risk. As public professionals, they need to negotiate the expectations of different fields, whether citation style or expected research methodologies. The diverse landscapes that emerging L2 writing scholars navigate make their professionalization processes unique compared to those who pursue careers in less interdisciplinary fields.

In order to explore some of these pathways and provide guidance for graduate students preparing to transition from student to faculty, this panel brings together early-career L2 writing specialists from different institutions. Five emerging professionals will give brief presentations on their experiences and discuss some issues and challenges they have encountered in local or broader disciplinary contexts, which were not clearly addressed during their PhD studies. They will also describe strategies they have developed along the way to be successful.

After the presentations, an established member of the field will respond to the presenters, offering advice for them and audience members as they move forward in L2 writing careers. The panel will leave ample time for discussion at the end.

Presenter 1 will draw on her experience directing an ESL writing program as junior faculty to discuss how she has grappled with expectations from her department and institution, and how she has developed ways for making administrative work visible and valuable to her colleagues. As a pre-tenure writing program administrator, a position that an increasing number of junior faculty members are asked to take on, she will explore the strategies employed while negotiating the workload in order to balance research, administrative duties, and teaching.
Presenter 2 will share his experience as a joint appointment, and how he negotiates his identities as an L2 writing/TESOL specialist, mentors graduate students, and balances administrative work between two colleges in College of Education and College of Arts and Sciences. As an early career faculty member, he will focus on emotional aspects of being an L2 writing/TESOL scholar, sharing effective strategies of how being a joint appointment can create a unique opportunity to create changes in the two departments.

Presenter 3 will take the audience through the transitions that occurred as she stepped into her new role as faculty in an interdisciplinary English department; she will explore the delicate balancing act of further developing her areas of expertise in applied linguistics and SLW, while also broadening her knowledge base in composition studies and English Education to better meet the needs of her institution. Based on this experience, she will reflect on possible ways in which graduate programs can help mentor and prepare the next generation of L2 writing scholars who will likely find themselves working in various institutional contexts.

Presenter 4 will share his experience as a coordinator of a first-year engineering English curriculum at a national university in Japan and discuss struggles and challenges of an early-career faculty member coordinating a program. As an L2 writing teacher-researcher, he will explore how he has developed his scholarship in this context and describe some strategies to negotiate workloads while maintaining a good balance among teaching, research, and administrative duties.

Presenter 5 will move beyond institutional contexts to explore his experience creating and disseminating knowledge across the intersecting fields of SLW, composition studies, and applied linguistics. Drawing on feedback commentary from mentors, reviewers, and editors, he will explain the successes and challenges he has faced in publishing in venues across the different fields, such as TESOL Quarterly and College Composition and Communication, and how he has had to adapt to differing expectations in doing so.

**Reference**

C.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Turquoise
Chair: Maria Zlateva, Boston University, United States

C.2.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Turquoise
**L1 vs. L2 Written Peer Feedback Effects on L2 English Essay Composition**
Clay Williams, Akita International University, Japan

This study investigates whether conducting peer review sessions in the students’ L1 or L2 leads to significant variation in peer commentary produced and writers’ willingness to integrate peer commentary into their writing. The results show that L2 review focuses more on mechanical issues and L1 review on more holistic commentary.
C.2.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:25-9:50, Turquoise
Acquiring and Retaining Detecting and Commenting Skills Through Peer Review Training: Effects of Observation and Feedback
Hui-Tzu Min, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan
Yi-Min Chiu, National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan

Scant knowledge is available about the combined effect of different modeling and feedback types on the observed success of peer review training. The result shows that Mastery model and Correction and Explication help EFL students make significant progress in detecting and commenting on higher-order issues in comparison and contrast paragraphs.

C.2.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Turquoise
Self- and Peer-Assessment in Second Language Writing: Students’ Perspective
Sandra Zappa, The University of British Columbia, Canada
Ismaeil Fazel, The University of British Columbia, Canada

In this exploratory study, we investigated eight Japanese students’ perceptions of self and peer-assessment in an academic writing course at a North American University. Findings indicate that the students perceived both self and peer-assessment to be immensely helpful in raising their consciousness of their own writing processes.

C.3.W Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Gila (Workshop)
Measuring Journal and Research Prestige
Chair: Ann Johns, San Diego State University, United States
Christopher Tancock, Elsevier, United Kingdom

C.4 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Graham
Chair: Nathan Lindberg, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, United States

C.4.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Graham
The Impact of Composing Short Books in an EAP Writing Class on the Students’ Perceived Writing Abilities and Attitudes to Writing in English
Maria Houston, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, United States

The session presents a classroom research project. The main goal of the session is to provide the audience with a better understanding of the impact of mixed-genre book writing pedagogy on pre-admission Advanced English proficiency EAP students’ writing abilities as well as their attitudes towards writing in English.

C.4.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:25-9:50, Graham
Professionalizing Writing Instruction in English for Academic Purposes Classes
Dinorah Sapp, University of Mississippi, United States

The focus of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classes often fall short of the expectations of a mainstream First Year Composition (FYC) curriculum. This
presentation reports on an attempt to bridge the gap between FYC and EAP at a large public university.

C.4.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Graham

**Disciplinary Writing Differences, Expectations, and Challenges for Undergraduate L2 Writers**

Norman Evans, Brigham Young University, United States
James Hartshorn, Brigham Young University, United States

This nation-wide study investigates the types of writing required in entry-level courses within the five most common majors for international students in the United States. Results indicate that disciplinary expectations vary considerably among the five majors and that genre-specific requirements can be challenging for L2 writers new to a discipline.

C.5 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Yuma
Chair: Alice Daer, Arizona State University, United States

C.5.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Yuma

**Use of Moves and Intertextual Connections to Understand How L2 Writers Construct Professional Identities at Web Seminars**

Tuba Angay-Crowder, Georgia State University, United States
Peggy Albers, Georgia State University, United States

This presentation discusses how L2 writers coordinate moves and intertextuality to construct professional identities in web seminars. Findings indicate that use of intertextuality and rhetorical moves significantly improves the understanding of how L2 writers gain active agency in navigating through new, emerging genres.

C.5.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:25-9:50, Yuma

**Blogging in the EAP Composition Classroom: Embracing the 21st Century Two Decades In**

Susan Bleyle, Georgia Gwinnett College, United States

This study examines a shift in a college EAP writing curriculum from a focus on traditional alphabetic texts to the creation and publication of online digital blogs which are multimodal as well as social in that they promote Web 2.0 sensibilities of participation and connection concurrently with academic literacy.

C.5.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Yuma

**Examining the Role of Online Machine Translators in the Writing Processes of College-Level L2 Writers**

Nick Halsey, University of Arizona, United States

College-level L2 writers were surveyed on their uses of free online MT applications. Students then participated in a workshop on various translation technologies, and
subsequently wrote a reflection. The survey and reflections were analyzed to determine whether the workshop had encouraged students to use online MT more strategically.

C.6 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Pinal
Chair: Lindsay Vecchio, University of Florida, United States

C.6.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Pinal
Writing Conferences as Mediated Worlds for Academic Writing
Juhyun Do, The Ohio State University, United States

This study examines how “revision talk” in writing conferences is constructed and changes over time and across participants. Based on situated learning theory, video-recorded data were analyzed using micro-analytic discourse analysis. Results suggest that writing conferences play a critical mediating role in L2 writing development.

Instructor Commentary on L1 and L2 First-Year Writing: Similarities and Differences
Jennifer Slinkard, University of Arizona, United States

L1 and L2 composition studies are often treated separately, but as classrooms become more diverse, the distinctions between L1 and L2 writers become less clear. This research study explores similarities and differences in the feedback provided in classes that combined L1 and L2 student writers in a first-year composition environment.

C.6.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Pinal
Engaging Students in a Reflective Dialogue About Their Writing
Elena Shvidko, Purdue University, United States

The presenters will share how a short reflective note to the reader (the teacher) that students attach to each draft facilitates a collaborative dialogue between the teacher and the student, engages students in the two-way revision process and helps them become more reflective and analytical writers.

C.7 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Santa Cruz
Chair: Tony Cimasko, Miami University, United States

C.7.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Santa Cruz
Exploring the Interaction Among Contextual, Student, and Teacher Variables Influencing ESL Undergraduate Students’ Writing Tutorial Based Revision
Heon Jeon, The Ohio State University, United States

This study investigates what and how ESL undergraduate students revise after writing tutorials and how contextual, student, and teacher factors influence revision. The preliminary findings illustrate that students are limited to using writing tutorial feedbacks due to complicated interaction among ESL context, student, and teacher factors.
C.7.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:25-9:50, Santa Cruz
Writing Center Tutors Working with L2 Writers: Challenges and Opportunities for Professional Development
Hee-Seung Kang, Case Western Reserve University, United States

This study examined writing center tutors’ challenges of working with L2 writers. Through observation, interviews, and surveys, this study taps into issues of power, identity, and culture. In addition to tutors’ challenges, this presentation addresses ways of educating tutors so that they are better prepared to work with L2 writers.

C.7.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Santa Cruz
“At-Risk” College Writers and Evolution of an Athletics Writing Center
Pamela Stacey, University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States

This presentation charts the evolution of writing tutoring practices over a two-year span in an athletic tutoring center, highlighting the specific writing struggles of the “underprepared athlete” population (second language learners, mainstream students, and speakers of non-standard English varieties alike) as they encounter the “second language” of academic English writing.

C.8.W Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Yavapai (Workshop)
Chair: Steve Simpson, New Mexico Tech, United States
Writing Comic Strips to Teach False Cognates to Young Brazilian L2 Learners of Spanish
Eduardo Vila López, Kroton Educacional, Brazil

The purpose of this workshop is to share an experience on writing comic strips for young L2 students. More specifically, we will focus on how false friends (false cognates) and comics can become true friends and can make the learning process more pleasant and efficient.

C.9 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Gold
Chair: Jungyeon Koo, Seoul National University, Korea (Republic of)

C.9.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Gold
A Longitudinal Study of Written Language Development in Two Genres
Charlene Polio, Michigan State University, United States
Hyung-Jo Yoon, Michigan State University, United States

We examined the relationship among complexity, accuracy, and fluency with regard to time and genre. ESL students wrote at two-week intervals, six times over one semester, with the genre alternated. Results showed that there were time and genre effects for complexity but not for accuracy or fluency.

CANCELED
Symposium on Second Language Writing – Day 2

C.9.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Gold
Multilingual Writers, Comp, and Grammar: Grammar Contracts in the First-Year Composition Classroom
Ryan P. Shepherd, Arizona State University, United States
Katherine Daily O’Meara, Arizona State University, United States
Sarah Elizabeth Snyder, Arizona State University, United States

Grammar feedback is a contentious issue in first-year composition classes for multilingual students. The researchers suggest the use of “grammar contracts” with students as a means of negotiating this problem. Extensive writing and survey data gathered from the use of grammar contracts will be presented.

C.10 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Copper
Chair: Fang-Yu Liao, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, United States

C.10.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Copper
A Cross-Sectional Study of Writing Development of Second Language Learners of Japanese (Tertiary Level) in Australia
Yuka Kikuchi, The University of Melbourne, Australia
Neomy Storch, The University of Melbourne, Australia
Ute Knoch, The University of Melbourne, Australia

This cross-sectional study, part of a larger project, aimed to examine the writing development of university students learning Japanese in Australia. The study assessed and determined discourse analytical measures that are successful in distinguishing between Japanese writing scripts at five different levels of proficiency.

C.10.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:25-9:50, Copper
Narratives Among Heritage and Foreign Language Learners: A Sociocultural Inside of the Writing Process
Laura Valentin-Rivera, Texas Tech University, United States

More than a pedagogic challenge, due to the varied linguistic strengths and weaknesses of Heritage and Foreign language learners, regular Spanish classrooms at the college level could represent an opportunity to a) foster linguistic knowledge and b) facilitate the development of writing skills through collaborative work done by mixed pairs.

C.10.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Copper
Undergraduate Academic Writing Across Languages: A Sociocultural Study
Alessia Valfredini, Fordham University, United States

This case study investigates from a multicompetency, ecological, and sociocultural standpoint a) which resources four undergraduate students used in writing tasks in various languages, b) the relationship between tasks, and c) the impact of contextual factors. The in-progress qualitative analysis of journals, students’ and instructors’
interviews, and texts suggests that the writers relied on mediation tools that were acquired via one language to write in other languages.

C.11 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Chrysocolla
Chair: Ju Zhan, Jilin University, China

C.11.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Chrysocolla
CANCELED

**Examining an Alternative Way of Providing Corrective Feedback to EFL Writers**
Karen C. C. Chang, National Taipei University, Taiwan

This study examined whether providing EFL students with corrective feedback in their L1 could facilitate and increase their engagement in revision. The findings indicated the students perceived corrective feedback given in their L1 as more helpful, easier to process, and more easily understood. Their overall engagement in revision was higher.

C.11.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Chrysocolla
**Learners’ Processing of Two Different Types of Written Feedback on Academic L2 Writing**
Ha Ram Kim, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States

Much research has studied the efficacy of various written feedback types but not what learners do with them. This study investigates how L2 learners of English process two types of written feedback—error correction and reformulation. In a within-subjects design, concurrent verbal protocols were employed to study learners’ reported awareness.

C.12 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Plata
Chair: Bonnie Vidrine-Isbell, University of Washington, United States

C.12.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Plata
**Making the Game Plan: A Study of Multilingual Writers’ Genre and Audience Perceptions During the Planning Stage of the Writing Process**
Mary Ellis Glymph, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, United States

First-year composition students—especially multilingual writers—struggle with defining their genres and audiences in writing assignments, particularly in that crucial planning process. This study identifies these students’ concerns and suggests how FYC instructors can better teach their students to become self-aware writers for any anticipated audience.
C.12.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:25-9:50, Plata

**Developing Writing Processes: Beyond the Writing Classroom**
Kara Reed, University of Arizona, United States

Framed in a social theory of learning, this study investigates longitudinal data of students who experienced peer review in the writing classroom, with findings analyzed for implications to developing a peer review process that can benefit students as they develop a practice for engaging with peers in future authentic contexts.

C.12.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Plata

**Online Intercultural Collaboration: Insights into the Writing Process**
Hsin-I Chen, Tunghai University, Taiwan
Kara Reed, University of Arizona, United States

This study outlines the design and methodology of a cross-cultural collaborative writing project framed in sociocultural theory and situated learning theory and explores the factors considered and the practicality of implementing such projects to engage international writers in collaborative experiences that accomplish second writing course objectives.

---

**Plenary III**
Friday, November 14, 2014, 10:45-11:45, Arizona
Chair: John Bitchener, Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand

**Pedagogical Imports of Western Practices for Professionalizing Second Language Writing and Writing Teacher Education**
Lawrence Jun Zhang, University of Auckland, New Zealand

Globalization has brought in dynamism in all spheres of life and it is no exception in the academia in general and in language teacher education programs in particular. It is equally true of teacher preparation programs commissioned by the local ministry of education (MOE) for training qualified second language writing teachers. While Western universities compete for international students to maintain sustainable development and international reputation, students of strong calibre from non-Western cultures do leverage on this great opportunity to pursue their dreams of a Western education.

Undoubtedly, the presence of such students in Western universities affords domestic students rich opportunities for understanding different cultures through direct interaction with these international students, who, as a reciprocal benefit, have easy access to the rich resources they aspired back home by virtue of the very study-abroad opportunity. However, when plunged into Western universities to engage themselves for academic communication in English, especially in writing, these international students face challenges, which are acknowledged by scholars. These challenges do not always arise from their less mature mastery of academic English.

The institutionalized practices in professionalizing them into academic writers do not always yield success because of other non-linguistic factors. Good-willed pedagogical imports of such
practices oftentimes clash with the indigenous conventions and pedagogical practices, in which these students were educated in their home countries before their arrival in the West. Such a scenario is often manifested in classrooms in other contexts, too (e.g., Asia), when Western-trained teachers or teacher-educators want to do a ‘better’ job.

My presentation focuses on discussion of the issues relating to professionalizing L2 writers in postgraduate study and writing teacher education. I take a case study approach to delving into the experiences of two EFL students in China preparing for IELTS to seek admission to the Graduate School, two doctoral students writing Applied Linguistics theses in New Zealand, and two pre-service student-teachers receiving training to become writing teachers in Singapore. I examine in particular how perceptions and practices diverge and henceforth attempt to draw implications for working with students whose first academic language is not English, or whose English is not exactly the same as the varieties used in BANA (Britain, America, New Zealand and Australia) countries.

Lawrence Jun Zhang (Ph.D.) is Associate Professor and Associate Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Auckland, New Zealand. He earned his B.A. in English Language and Literature from Shanghai International Studies University, M.A. (Hon.) from Northwestern Normal and Henan Universities, China, Postgraduate Diploma in ELT (with Distinction), and PhD from the National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. He was a Post-Doctoral Visiting Fellow (Applied Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition) at the Department of Education, University of Oxford, UK and a tenured Associate Professor at the National Institute of Education of Singapore prior to relocating to New Zealand.

Currently, Dr. Zhang teaches educational linguistics and TESOL courses in the Masters programs and supervises Ph.D. thesis students. His main teaching responsibility is doctoral thesis supervision, and he is now working with 16 full-time PhD thesis students as the primary supervisor in the School of Curriculum and Pedagogy. His research program spans cognitive, linguistic, sociocultural and developmental factors in bilingual/biliteracy acquisition and teacher identity and cognition. Recently, he has been immensely interested in second language writing and writing teacher preparation. The recipient of the “TESOL Award for Distinguished Research” in 2011 from the TESOL International Association for his article “A dynamic metacognitive systems perspective on Chinese university EFL readers” in TESOL Quarterly, 44(2), he has served on the editorial boards of several international journals, including Applied Linguistics Review, Metacognition and Learning, System, and RELC Journal.

A Co-Editor of TESOL Quarterly, he has recently published two co-edited books, Asian Englishes: Changing Perspectives in a Globalized World (Pearson Prentice-Hall, 2012) and Language Teachers and Teaching: Global Perspectives, Local Initiatives (Taylor & Francis Group/Routledge, 2014). He has published articles and reviews in international refereed journals such as Applied Linguistics Review, Instructional Science (SSCI), British Journal of Educational Psychology (SSCI), Language Awareness (SSCI), Language & Education, Journal of Second Language Writing (SSCI), TESOL Quarterly (SSCI), System (SSCI), Asia Pacific Education Researcher (SSCI), RECL Journal, Journal of Psycholinguistic Research (SSCI), Asia Pacific Journal of Education (SSCI), and Applied Linguistics (SSCI). He is the current secretary of the New Zealand Association of Applied Linguistics, past secretary of the Singapore Association for
Applied Linguistics and Past-Chair of the Nonnative English-Speaking Teachers (NNEST) Interest Section of the International TESOL Association.
Web: www.education.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/lawrence-zhang

Closed Meeting Friday, November 14, 2014, 11:45-13:30, Gold (Closed Meeting)

**JSLW Editorial Board Meeting**
Christopher Tancock, Elsevier, United Kingdom

**Session D**

**Invited Colloquium**
D.1.C Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-15:00, Arizona
Organizer: Luciana de Oliveira, Teacher’s College, Columbia University, United States

**L2 Writing in K-12 Contexts**
Luciana de Oliveira, Columbia University, United States
María Estela Brisk, Boston College, United States
Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, University of New Hampshire, United States
Ditlev Larsen, Winona State University, United States

This colloquium will address the teaching and learning of L2 writing in K-12 contexts. Presenters describe research at the elementary and secondary levels as well as the preparation of teachers to work with L2 writers. Colloquium participants are invited to discuss the transition from elementary to secondary to post-secondary levels.

**L2 writing in K-12: An overview**
Luciana C. de Oliveira, Teachers College, Columbia University

The presenter describes current work done on L2 writing in K-12 and provides an overview of key issues for L2 writers and the teaching and learning of L2 writing in K-12 contexts.

**Bilingual fourth graders develop a central character for their narratives**
Maria Estela Brisk, Boston College

Instruction of narratives tends to focus on features of text structure such as setting, recounting events that lead to a crisis, a resolution, and a conclusion (Wright, 1997). However, the main characters in a narrative drive the plot and hold the readers’ interest (Roser, Martinez, Fuhrken & McDonnold, 2007). This presentation reports on a study of bilingual 4th graders’ character development resulting from targeted instruction on external attributes and internal qualities. This instruction used character development rather than plot as the point of departure in narrative writing instruction. In addition, the study analyzed how features of characters impacted the plot.

**An Adolescent Refugee’s Experiences in High School**
Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, University of New Hampshire

Currently, refugee students in U.S. high schools remain an understudied group in SLW research. To address this gap, I will share recent data on the refugee children in U.S. schools and consider
the challenges faced by many refugee second-language students and their teachers. Drawing on a recent book chapter, I will share one example of how language history and political pasts impacted one adolescent refugee’s sense of English ownership, “writerly” identity, and academic experiences in the U.S. high school setting.

Preparing elementary and secondary teachers for teaching L2 writing
Ditlev Larsen, Winona State University

This presentation reports on a study that surveyed practicing elementary and secondary ESL teachers about their preparedness for teaching L2 writing after completing their teacher education programs (results published in partly in de Oliveira & Silva, 2013). The teachers reported that their programs offered very little or no specific instruction on L2 writing pedagogy, which is problematic as the teachers also reported that they deal with English language learners’ writing every day in their ESL classrooms on both the elementary and the secondary level. The presentation suggests that in order to make sure teachers become adequately prepared for teaching writing, ESL pedagogy needs to include explicit recognition of L2 writing as a major component of second language acquisition.

Invited Colloquium
D.2.C Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-15:00, Turquoise
Organizer: Bojana Petrić, University of Essex, United Kingdom

European Perspectives on Professionalising L2 Writing
Diane Schmitt, Nottingham Trent University, United Kingdom
Łukasz Salski, University of Łódź, Poland
Bojana Petrić, University of Essex, United Kingdom

This colloquium will present the work of European associations dealing with second language writing and their approaches to supporting professions and professionals in the field. The colloquium will start with a brief overview of the European second language writing landscape, which will provide a general background to what constitutes second language writing in the European context, where it occurs and what professions are involved in it. This will be followed by presentations of three different Europe-based association dealing with an aspect of second language writing: BALEAP (originally the British Association of Lecturers of English for Academic Purposes), EATAW (European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing), and EWCA (European Writing Centre Association). The presenters, Diane Schmitt (Chair of BALEAP), Łukasz Salski (EWCA Board member) and Bojana Petrić (EATAW Board member), are long-standing members of their respective associations and are actively involved in their work. The speakers will provide a brief overview of their association’s history, goals, membership, scope of activities and current projects of interest, with a particular emphasis on the association’s approach to professionalising second language writing. This will lead to a discussion of common strategies, challenges, and directions for the future. The discussion will also provide an opportunity to exchange experiences and ideas about possible collaborative activities with similar organisations in other parts of the world.
D.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-14:45, Gila
Chair: Aylin Atilgan, Purdue University, United States

D.3.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-13:55, Gila
Professionalizing the Training of Raters of Second Language Writing: Who, Why, and How?
Mark Chapman, CaMLA, United Kingdom
Heather Elliott, CaMLA, United States
Ummehaany Jameel, CaMLA, United States

The aim of this presentation is to outline a set of practical, theoretically-grounded procedures for the design and delivery of a comprehensive rater training program. The presentation will focus on both the materials and steps required to train raters to score second language writing fairly and reliably.

D.3.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:55-14:20, Gila
How Rubrics and Collaboration Can Facilitate Grading
Karen Barto, Center for English as a Second Language, The University of Arizona, United States
Marlena Goodsitt, Center for English as a Second Language, The University of Arizona, United States
Nadia Moraglio, Center for English as a Second Language, The University of Arizona, United States

This presentation explains how inter-rater reliability and the development of holistic and analytic rubrics for an intermediate-advanced ESL writing class can be successfully achieved through peer collaboration.

D.3.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 14:20-14:45, Gila
Going Digital: Professionalizing Web Portfolio Assessments Through Rubrics
Heejung Kwon, Purdue University, United States
Song-Eun Lee, Purdue University, United States

This study explores ways to professionalize Web portfolio assessment—using a rubric developed by the researchers and tested by students throughout the semester. To this end, student reactions after rubric use were collected and analyzed through peer- and self-assessment, a survey, and final reflection essays.

D.4 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-14:45, Graham
Chair: Ashley Velazquez, Purdue University, United States

D.4.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-13:55, Graham
Computer-Mediated Synchronous and Asynchronous Direct Corrective Feedback on Writing: A Case Study of Two L2 Writers
Natsuko Shintani, University of Auckland, New Zealand
The study investigated two learners’ responses to synchronous and asynchronous corrective feedback in a computer-mediated environment. The main findings suggest that in the synchronous condition, focus on meaning and form took place contiguously while in the asynchronous condition focus on meaning and form occurred separately.

D.4.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:55-14:20, Graham
Introducing Undergraduate Students to Word Engine and Peer Review of Writing: An Assessment for Learning Perspective
Yin Ling Cheung, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

This paper reports on a study to investigate the types of peer response that 323 undergraduates incorporated into the final versions of their papers. It also examines students’ perceptions on the effectiveness of a database of academic texts and a custom search engine in providing a writing reference for them.

D.4.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 14:20-14:45, Graham
Second Language Writing MOOCs: Affordances and Missed Opportunities
Betsy Gilliland, University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States
Ai Oyama, University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States
Pamela Stacey, University of at Hawaii at Manoa, United States

This paper describes a MOOC (massive open online course) intended specifically to introduce second language learners to basic concepts of English language academic writing and reflect critically on its successes and challenges. The presenters participated in the course and analyze participation and interactions with students through a multimodal literacies lens.

D.5 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-14:45, Yuma
Chair: Shirley Rose, Arizona State University, United States

D.5.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-13:55, Yuma
CANCELED

D.5.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:55-14:20, Yuma
Departmental Academic Support for International Doctoral Students
Yoo Young Ahn, Indiana University Bloomington, United States

To address unique needs of international doctoral students to attain academic literacy, this study will examine how a department assists its doctoral students by offering a sequential seminar designed to develop their discipline-specific academic literacy and how international students perceive the course. The findings from this study will enable me to provide practical suggestions for any department planning to develop a seminar to develop doctoral-level academic literacy.
Concept Mapping to Gather Student-Generated Evidence of Reflection and Conceptual Development in a Graduate Writing Course
Rosemary Wette, University of Auckland, New Zealand

This study of concept mapping by graduate students in an academic writing course showed how students’ visual representations of key concepts provided a useful adjunct assessment tool for measuring knowledge growth. Concept mapping also developed students’ meta-knowledge through the requirement to critically reflect on and coherently organise map content.

Vague Noun Usage in L2 Emergent Academic Writing
Terry Ontiveros, University of Texas at El Paso, United States

This presentation reports on the analysis of vague noun frequency usage using a sub-set of the ULCAE, a local learner corpus of academic English. Different types of essays are analyzed and the relationship between essay types and writing conditions (e.g., exam writing) on the use of vague nouns discussed.

“From My Own Point of View, and Standing at Your Place”: Chinese and Non-Chinese English Teachers’ Judgments of Lexical and Grammatical Variation in Academic Writing
Joel Heng Hartse, University of British Columbia, Canada

This study solicits Chinese and non-Chinese English teachers’ judgments of (un)acceptability in writing by presenting teachers with essays by Chinese university students and asking them to comment on unacceptable features. It also examines the reasons they give for their judgments and the ways they claim the authority to make judgments.

Investigating the Relationship Between Second Language Writing Proficiency and Noun Modification
Ge Lan, Northern Arizona University, United States

This paper explores how L2 writing proficiency influences the use of noun modifiers in an intensive English program setting. Results show that L2 learners with different writing proficiencies use noun modifiers differently in their essays. Results provide ESL teachers with some good insights into teaching L2 writers.
**Advancing Knowledge of L1 Arabic ESL Students’ Language Repertoires and the Impacts on Instruction and Feedback in an Intensive English Program**

Stephen Kopec, University of Pennsylvania, English Language Programs, United States

The presenter will discuss findings from informal, open-ended interviews with five (5) L1 Arabic ESL learners that can give L2 writing instructors valuable information for creating lesson plans that are targeted to respond to L1 transfer issues in the ESL classroom, particularly in L2 writing assignments. The presenter will share ideas and tips for improving feedback on L2 writing assignments, especially using online technology so that L2 writers have a greater awareness of their L1/L2 repertoires.

**English Writing Instruction in College Level in Algeria**

Ibtissem Belmihoub, North Dakota State University, United States

Composition Studies is paying closer attention to English writing instruction in foreign contexts. My research builds on this focus through data analysis that codes and categorizes Algerian government policies. The results demonstrate an obvious relation between foreign writing policies and political history. This analysis uncovers that policies reinforce important realities.

**Linguistic and Cognitive Obstacles Encountered by L2 Writers in UAE**

Hadi Riad Banat, University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

This paper is an exploratory study of the obstacles second language writers encountered in first-year writing course at a university in the United Arab Emirates. The results indicated that obstacles included lack of knowledge about the writing prompt, limited knowledge of L2 lexis and grammar structures, and erroneous translations.

**Exploring Local Conditions that Affect L2 Writing Instruction in Korean Secondary School Contexts**

Hae Sung Yang, Georgia State University, United States

This study explores how top-down government mandates to teach writing in Korea are implemented at the local level. Analyses of government documents, textbooks and teaching practices show that top-down government mandates to teach writing are not easily enforced at the local level without taking into account local factors.
D.9 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-14:45, Gold  
Chair: Susan Davis, Arizona State University, United States

**Individual Differences and Written Corrective Feedback: Exploring the Differential Effects of Direct and Indirect CF on Students’ Writing Development**  
Li Yingying, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong

This paper reports on a study investigating L2 learners’ responses to and utilization of direct and indirect WCF from a sociocognitive perspective in a Chinese EFL context. It focuses on the individual and contextual factors that influence their writing development using a mixed-method design.

D.9.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:55-14:20, Gold  
**Exploring Student Engagement with Written Corrective Feedback in First-Year Composition Courses**  
Izabela Uscinski, Arizona State University, United States

This case study, which was conducted in the context of the first-year composition (FYC) courses, attempts to provide a better understanding of how students utilize written corrective feedback (WCF) and it focuses on how various factors, such as individual, social and pedagogical, influence their engagement with it.

D.9.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 14:20-14:45, Gold  
**“Revising” L2 Feedback and Revision Research: Looking to the Future**  
Lynn Goldstein, The Monterey Institute of International Studies, United States

This presentation will argue for and describe an L2 research agenda that allows for an understanding of teacher written feedback and student revision processes using research methodologies that will allow us to soundly address the complex and situated nature of L2 feedback and revision.

D.10 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-14:45, Copper  
Chair: Claire Renaud, Arizona State University, United States

D.10.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-13:55, Copper  
**Multilingual Students’ Use of Their Linguistic Repertoires When Writing in a Non-Native Language**  
Tina Gunnarsson, Lund University, Sweden  
Marie Källkvist, Lund University, Sweden

The study uses think aloud and retrospective interview data from bi- and multilingual students age 15-16 in Swedish compulsory school, in order to study a) the extent to which they use their entire linguistic repertoires, and b) whether the participants prefer to think aloud in L1 or L2 while writing.
Gee’s Discourse analysis is used to explore World Language (WL) writers’ identities’ capital in writing processes under ecological theory framework. Especially, writing system is highlighted because different writing systems affect WL writers’ motivations, identities, and learning aptitude. Thus, writing system should be significantly addressed in WL writing pedagogy.

Language has been used by higher academic institutions to set both standard and expectations of “Academic English” and the convention keeps perpetuated through the exclusion of variations of other languages. Critical reflection is required to rethink the established practice of mainstreaming non-native English writers’ writings as it interferes the process and progress of language learning.

This study compares the perceptions of L1 and L2 writers in terms of teacher feedback. Approximately three-hundred students enrolled in First-Year Composition were asked to rate different kinds of teacher feedback. Results of the pilot study show significant differences between the two groups of students.

While several studies have examined L2 assessment and alternative placement methods, not many focus on students’ opinions on placement tests. This presentation shares the results of a survey of students who took the English Placement Exam at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville in 2013 and proposes the implementation of directed self-placement.
D.11.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 14:20-14:45, Chrysocolla
Reexamining Perception of L2 Writing
Yuching Yang, Arizona State University, United States

The purpose of this presentation is to rearticulate the notion of student perception in ways that can facilitate the implementation of this rich and complex concept into L2 writing research and instruction.

D.12 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-14:45, Plata
Chair: Deborah Crusan, Wright State University, United States

D.12.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:30-13:55, Plata
Examining Preparation of Mainstream Composition Teachers Working with Multilingual Writers
Elena Shvidko, Purdue University, United States

This session focuses on professional preparation of mainstream composition instructors working with multilingual writers. A survey administered at a large research university among composition teachers with no formal training in L2 writing pedagogy provided the data. Results indicate a need to develop adequate training for teachers working with multilingual writers.

D.12.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 13:55-14:20, Plata
Taking a Stance: Normalizing L2 Needs in Mainstream Composition Classes
Norah Fahim, University of Washington, United States

This study explores one university’s reinvention of their first-year composition teacher training program and development of a statement on error correction for writers. By normalizing the presence of L2 writers, non-TESOL trained instructors reported better satisfaction with their ability to meet the needs of linguistically diverse students in their classrooms.

D.12.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 14:20-14:45, Plata
Narrative Analysis of a Multilingual Writer’s L2 Writing Experience
Junghwa Kim, Arizona State University, United States

In this presentation, I analyze how a multilingual student makes sense of his learning experiences of L2 writing and how the multilingual writer makes connections to his current writing with a narrative framework. In the interview data, the participant’s psychological burdens and fears in L2 writing were analyzed.
Invited Colloquium
E.1.C Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:45, Arizona
Organizer: Melinda Reichelt, University of Toledo, United States

L2 Writing in Non-English L2s
Yukiko Hatasa, Hiroshima University, Japan
Marcela Ruiz-Funes, Georgia Southern University, United States
Nur Yigitoglu, Middle East Technical University Northern Cyprus Campus, Turkey
Melinda Reichelt, University of Toledo, United States

This panel presentation addresses writing in L2 Japanese, Spanish, Arabic, Russian, and Chinese in the panelists’ teaching contexts, which include Japan, the U.S., and Turkey. Panel members describe how writing and writing instruction in these L2s differs from ESL writing and ESL writing instruction. They also discuss how sociolinguistic factors influence writing and writing instruction in these languages and contexts. Panel members describe the role that writing may play in the overall curriculum for teaching these L2s, as well as the various purposes and motivations students have for writing in these L2s.

The presentation provides a brief description of Japanese writing and its difficulty for L2 learners of different orthographic backgrounds. It includes discussion of the similarities and differences in the college-level Japanese writing instruction between Japan and the US, focusing on learner population and needs. The session also provides an overview of the role of writing in Spanish in the foreign language curriculum at the university level in the USA. It examines writing in FL Spanish as a means to learn the language, to learn content, and to develop composing and critical thinking skills. In addition, it explores the purposes—social, academic, and professional—for students to write in FL Spanish, taking into account sociolinguistic factors that affect their interest and motivation. Additionally, this panel includes a report of a study of Turkish students learning Arabic, Russian and Chinese as foreign language. The report includes contextual information about the teaching of these FLs in Turkey. It also reports on the students’ perceptions and goals regarding FL writing, as well as information about how FL writing influences the students’ language learning in general.
Invited Colloquium
E.2.C Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:45, Turquoise
Organizer: Wang Junju, Shandong University, China

Teaching of EFL Writing in the Chinese Higher Educational Institutions: Curriculum, Textbook, Instruction, and Assessment
Wang Ying, Shandong University, China
Zhang Cong, Purdue University, United States
Shao Chunyan, Shandong University, China
Wang Junju, Shandong University, China

EFL Writing Curricula in the Chinese Universities: Situation and Reform
WANG Ying, Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics, Professor, Dean of English Department, School of Foreign Languages and Literature, Shandong University, China

English writing course is one of the most important core curricula for Chinese EFL learners in Chinese higher education. This presentation will first talk about the current situation of EFL writing curricula in different types of universities by focusing on time allocation, titles of writing courses, levels of writing courses, teaching objectives, as well as problems related to writing curricula. Then changes and reforms in the area of EFL writing teaching and curriculum design will be introduced and discussed. Suggestions are also offered for developing a new EFL writing curriculum that could accommodate university variety, discipline-specific courses, the overall English proficiency, and students’ needs.

A Sketch of English Writing Textbooks in Chinese Universities
ZHANG Cong, Ph.D. Candidate in English Department at Purdue University, USA

Despite the important role textbooks play in English writing teaching, there is a dearth of research on English writing textbooks used in Chinese universities. What is worse, for the already limited studies, most of them are published in Chinese and therefore, cannot be accessed by the majority of SLW scholars. Therefore, in this colloquium, I will present a sketch of the textbooks for English writing teaching that are used in Chinese universities. This will be done through the introduction and description of some textbooks as well as presenting the results of related studies conducted by other scholars.

Teaching of EFL Writing to English Majors: Course design and Implementation
SHAO Chunyan, Ph.D. in Linguistics, Lecturer, Department of Applied English Studies, School of Foreign Languages and Literature, Shandong University

This presentation reports on a writing course design and its implementation for English majors. The course entails a progressive curriculum, an integrative design, a multi-lateral participation and a critical-thinking-oriented practice. This presentation first introduces the school context and curriculum guidelines, describes the course organization by specifying its class activities and evaluation process. Then it provides a case analysis to explore the effectiveness of the course in the overall improvement of students’ writing ability and reports students’ feedback on the course
design. Finally, the issues and challenges related to the course design are discussed, together with its implications for both curriculum design and the teaching of writing in other contexts.

**A Review of Writing Tests for EFL Students in Chinese Universities**  
WANG Junju, Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics, Professor, Dean of the School of Foreign Languages and Literature, Shandong University, China.

Numerous English tests are available to Chinese university students and these tests have been playing a key role in Chinese higher education. This presentation will focus on domestically designed English writing tests administered to EFL students in Chinese universities. First, it introduces the design and format of six nation-wide tests for English writing. Then it summarizes the shared features and variations in the requirements of the tests, followed by a discussion of the backwash effects of these tests on the teaching and learning English writing. Suggestions tackling the current problems are finally provided.

---

**E.3.W Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:30, Gila (Workshop)**  
Chair: Margaret S. Morris, Arizona State University, United States  
**How to Review a Paper**  
Christopher Tancock, Elsevier, United Kingdom

**E.4 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:30, Graham**  
Chair: Jeannie Waller, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, United States

**E.4.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-15:40, Graham**  
“My (Non-Native) Teacher Is My Inspiration”: A Case Study of L2 Writing Teachers’ Awareness of Students’ Needs & Practices  
Lee Jung Huang, Purdue University, United States

This study investigated 2 ESL writing instructors and 4 international students in freshmen composition in the US to examine teachers’ awareness of students’ needs. Results showed that without rigid institutional constraints and with strong peer support, teachers beliefs and practices match and students’ needs were met.

**E.4.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:40-16:05, Graham**  
CANCELED

**E.4.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 16:05-16:30, Graham**  
Teaching Writing in a Second Language: The Experiences of NNES Instructors in Composition Programs  
Mariya Tseptsura, University of New Mexico, United States  
Stefan Frazier, San Jose State University, United States  
Todd Ruecker, University of New Mexico, United States

Universities across the country employ large numbers of faculty to teach hundreds of first-year composition courses, and many of the faculty are NNESTs. This presentation reports on an interview- and survey-based study that investigates NNESTs’ experiences
Symposium on Second Language Writing – Day 2

with teaching mainstream composition courses, focusing on perceptions and attitudes surrounding their work environment.

E.5 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:30, Yuma
Chair: Maureen Daly Goggin, Arizona State University, United States

E.5.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-15:40, Yuma
**Examining Second Language Writing Development over Time: A Case Study of a Frequent User of Writing Center Online Tutoring**
Carol Severino, University of Iowa, United States
Shih-Ni Sun Prim, University of Iowa, United States

This case study analyzes the L2 writing development of a Chinese student’s English writing over the 2+ years she received feedback from online tutors. We classify tutors’ feedback points, writing issues they address, and track revisions; we compare complexity, accuracy, and fluency figures; and triangulate these two analyses with self-assessments.

E.5.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:40-16:05, Yuma
**Multiple Applications of “We Don’t Proofread Your Paper”: An Examination into the Educational Transfer of Writing Centers in Japan**
Tomoyo Okuda, University of British Columbia, Canada

This paper examines the spread of writing centers in an era of university competition and internationalization. Through an analysis of websites and articles, it specifically focuses on the situation in Japan to see how the writing center philosophy is used to support the goals and missions of universities.

E.5.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 16:05-16:30, Yuma
**Encouraging OWLs to Grow: An Examination of Content Development Best Practices**
Joshua Paiz, Purdue University, United States

This presentation will examine possible content development best practices for online writing labs (OWLs). This will be done by reporting on a research project that examined the development practices of four teams working on the Purdue OWL. The possible transferability of these practices will also be discussed.

E.6 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:30, Pinal
Chair: Gregg Fields, Arizona State University, United States

E.6.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-15:40, Pinal
**Bridging the Home-School Literacies of ELLs: Toward Positive Change in Teacher Education**
Sarah Henderson Lee, Minnesota State University, Mankato, United States

Framed by concepts of biliteracy, this presentation details a case study of pre- and in-service teachers’ knowledge construction and application of postmethod pedagogy in
Friday, November 14, 2014

TESOL. In highlighting areas of positive change in TESOL and general teacher education programs, this research aims to help bridge the home-school literacies of K-12 ELLs.

E.6.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:40-16:05, Pinal
A Multiple-Case Study of EL Adolescents’ Successful Socialization into the Written Discourse in Science
Fang Yu, University at Albany, United States
Kristen Wilcox, University at Albany, United States

This study investigated adolescent English learners’ socialization into science writing discourse. Rooted in language socialization theory, classroom observation, student and teacher interview data, and researchers’ memos were analyzed to reveal that the ELs were engaged in multimodal discourse, a set of writing related activities, as well as teacher- and peer-interactions.

E.6.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 16:05-16:30, Pinal
Engaging Multilingual Adolescents’ in Disciplinary Writing: Issues, Theory, and Research
Kristen Wilcox, University at Albany, United States
Jill Jeffery, CUNY-Brooklyn, United States

This paper draws from a five-state study of adolescent writers to theorize a multilingual writing pedagogy that problematizes the implementation of the Common Core State Standards Initiative and the paucity of attention being paid in its implementation to student engagement and agency.

E.7 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:30, Santa Cruz
Chair: Heejung Kwon, Purdue University, United States

E.7.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-15:40, Santa Cruz
Attitudes of Native and Non-Native English Speaking Students in Freshman Composition Towards Academic Writing and Writing in General
Mariam Alamyar, Purdue University, United States

The presenter will begin with the explanation of how the native and non native speaking students join the university with different attitudes towards academic writing and how these attitudes affect their academic performances. She will address the questions being explored and the methodology used to gather data. Finally, she will discuss the results and possible pedagogical implications

E.7.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:40-16:05, Santa Cruz
ESL Composition Student Participation in a Mainstream Composition Course
Tony Cimasko, Miami University, United States

When opportunities for ESL university student participation are limited, chances for success are also constrained. This presentation will describe a qualitative study of a
mainstream writing course and ways that the instructor and students alike adapt or fail to adapt to their setting, and how to increase and enrich participation.

E.7.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 16:05-16:30, Santa Cruz
Curriculum Shift: Promoting Content-Based Instruction in Second-Language College Composition Courses
Patricia Kilroe, Western New Mexico University, United States

With objectives focused on process and product, the content of standard college composition courses for second-language writers often appears random and disconnected. The benefits of content-based instruction are revisited, several models are proposed for widespread implementation, and the subjects of art history and literature are used to illustrate course design.

E.8 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:30, Yavapai
Chair: Eduardo Vila López, Kroton Educacional, Brazil

E.8.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-15:40, Yavapai
A Dynamic Usage-Based Approach to Korean EFL Students’ Writing: A Corpus-Based Study
Jongbong Lee, Georgetown University, United States

This study takes a dynamic usage-based approach to explore variability in L2 writing. Employing several textual measures that have been regarded as useful to understand different trajectories of language development, the study examines key differences in writings of L1 Korean EFL learners at three different proficiency levels.

E.8.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:40-16:05, Yavapai
Reformulation in Second Language Writing: A Learner Corpus-Based Investigation
Alfredo Urzua, San Diego State University, United States

The presenter reports on a corpus-based analysis of reformulation markers (e.g., in other words, this means that) and their discourse functions in texts generated by English language learners enrolled in college-level ESL/EAP courses. The texts analyzed reflect different writing tasks, including problem-based writing and research reports.

E.8.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 16:05-16:30, Yavapai
The Contribution of Collocation Tools to Collocation Production in L2 Writing
Ulugbek Nurmukhamedov, Northern Arizona University, United States

Second language (L2) writers are challenged to produce lexical collocations. To address this issue, the presenter explores whether corpus-based learner-friendly collocation tools in addition to collocation training assist L2 writers in producing accurate collocations and promoting learner autonomy in collocation correction in their compositions.
Friday, November 14, 2014

E.9 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:30, Gold
Chair: Mark Hannah, Arizona State University, United States

E.9.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-15:40, Gold
The State of L2 Graduate Student Writing Support
Nigel Caplan, University of Delaware, United States
Michelle Cox, Cornell University, United States

This session reports on a Consortium on Graduate Communication survey (n = 163, representing 25 countries). Results reveal that writing support for L2 graduate students is highly diverse: offered in a variety of forms, by a variety of campus units, and by professionals in a variety of disciplines.

E.9.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:40-16:05, Gold
Feedback Network and Multidirectionality of Second Language Socialization: Academic Writing Development in Graduate Education
Kyung Min Kim, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, United States

This presentation reports a study about multiple sources of feedback on writing in the initial years of doctoral education, thereby exploring how negotiation of feedback influences academic writing development. Data were collected from four L2 writers over a semester: texts with feedback, interviews with students and professors, and observation.

E.9.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 16:05-16:30, Gold
“My Writing Sounds Unnatural!”: Addressing International Graduate Students’ Concerns About Academic Writing
Hyojung Keira Park, Purdue University, United States
Suneeta Thomas, Purdue University, United States

This study revisits the writing course for graduate students at Purdue 20 years after Silva et al. (1994) raised issues with its predecessor. It scrutinizes how the current course facilitates the needs of the enrolled graduate students and what we need to improve to assist them better.

E.10 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:30, Copper
Chair: Steve Graham, Arizona State University, United States

E.10.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-15:40, Copper
Building a Support System for English Language Learners at a Career College
Diane Sperger, Ed.D., Goodwin College, United States
John Kania, Ed.D., Goodwin College, United States

An influx of ELLs at Goodwin College has presented pedagogical challenges. A two phase plan was developed on how best to build background information. Writing skills were addressed by a study group in grammar and mechanics. The second phase included
study groups for college majors that included writing and test taking/study skills. This presentation will present an overview and review effective strategies.

E.10.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:40-16:05, Copper
**On the Fringe and in the Thick of It: Inhabiting Whitchurch’s Third Space as SLW Professionals**
Lisa Russell-Pinson, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, United States
Susan Barone, Vanderbilt University, United States

This presentation focuses on two SLW specialists who inhabit Whitchurch’s (2008) third space, a workspace that spans both academic and professional terrains. We focus on the necessary collaborations, coping strategies, and professional opportunities offered in this shifting environment and propose areas for additional research in this SLW domain.

E.10.3 Friday, November 14, 2014, 16:05-16:30, Copper
**Who Will Read Your Textbook: A Need for a New Audience Analysis**
Matthew Duncan, Wasatch Academy, United States

With increasing immigrant and minority student populations, are our textbooks adequate? The audience for textbooks 20 years ago was 84% white, and 99% native speaker. What needs to change?

E.11 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-16:30, Chrysocolla
Chair: Brandon Whiting, Arizona State University, United States

E.11.1 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:15-15:40, Chrysocolla
**What Ever Happened to Post-Process in Second Language Writing?**
Kyle McIntosh, University of Tampa, United States

I begin by reviewing a 2003 special issue of Journal of Second Language Writing and the articles that followed to gauge the impact of post-process theory on L2 writing. I then make the case for reconsidering post-process theory in light of recent developments in composition studies and second language acquisition.

E.11.2 Friday, November 14, 2014, 15:40-16:05, Chrysocolla
**Visualization of Focuses in Second Language Writing Research**
Jinfen Xu, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China
Rui Nie, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, China

This study used Knowledge Mapping Software Citeseer, drew the knowledge mapping domains, and looked for research focuses based on 262 articles form WOS database. Analysis reveals that focuses in the field include: grammar correction, corrective feedback, process-based writing, corpus-based and genre analysis, revision, collaborative writing, peer feedback, writer identity. This study provides insights for further research.
Emergence and professionalization of a scientific field are correlated with publications in distinguished citation indices. The study examines Second Language Writing publications in the Web of Science Indices. 50% of the 266 publications appeared between 2009-2013. We discuss what our findings signify for the field of second language writing.

As writing becomes increasingly multimodal, the field of SLW has to adapt to include digital literacies to its repertoire. Through examples, this presentation discusses the implications for the profession of ESL Composition as well as the advantages that digitally mediated tasks can bring to both teachers and students.

In our presentation we aim to provide a theoretical background on blogging and Quadblogging and provide examples of how blogging can be incorporated into ESL writing classes. Providing students an opportunity to blog with an authentic audience increases learner motivation and makes writing more relevant.

This presents a study of how digital media helps college L2 writers to be competent knowledge providers not only as receivers in online community. In particular, it reports and discusses the process of their engagement in producing a digital storytelling regarding its pedagogical implication for fostering professional L2 users.
Plenary IV
Friday, November 14, 2014, 17:00-18:00, Arizona
Chair: Paul Kei Matsuda, Arizona State University, United States

Doctoral Studies as Professional Development in Second Language Writing
Dwight Atkinson, Purdue University, United States

Students undertake doctoral studies in second language writing and other fields for a wide variety of reasons. This itself could be a significant reason why only about half of all doctoral students in the U.S. complete their degrees (Council of Graduate Schools, 2014). That doctoral students come to the U.S. academy with different and perhaps divergent goals and expectations does not excuse their professors from preparing them to be competent researchers. Without accruing this form of cultural capital, our students are severely disadvantaged as professional academics. The two realities—1) that students may arrive without intending to become serious researchers; and 2) that our job is primarily to educate researchers—may appear to conflict. This conflict may be more apparent than real because:

1) Education at the doctoral level is primarily professional education, in which students learn specialized knowledge/skills that distinguish them demonstrably from all others.

2) Education is becoming—learning how to go beyond. Do most students have a clear, well-articulated idea of why they’re doing a doctorate, or its future consequences? I certainly didn’t—I wonder how many practicing second language writing scholars did.

3) What is most distinctive and powerful about U.S. universities is their ability to support serious, dedicated research, and learning how to do such research.

4) At the same time as the research focus of U.S. universities is under threat from within, other countries are giving research a much more important role in academic matters, including job security and promotion.

5) It is too late for students to learn how to do research after graduation. This is one of the traditional purposes of the dissertation: a site where serious and effortful learning-by-doing can take place. Yet some institutions are turning the dissertation into glorified master’s theses.

6) Doctoral studies is a unique site for academic socialization. Where else are working conditions so explicitly designed for intensive reading, writing, and academic collaboration? Gladwell (2011) claimed that a minimum of 10,000 hours is needed to become competent at complex human behaviors such as playing a musical instrument, team sports, and computer programming—academic writing should be included in this list (see Dortier, in Duranti & Black, 2012, p. 446). Isn’t doctoral studies our golden opportunity to develop such competences in the professional realm?

In sum, U.S. doctoral education should focus on what it does best and is primarily designed for: producing competent researchers. The best-developed professional will be one whose
professional credentials were planted deeply, effortfully, and seriously from the start of their doctoral career.

Dwight Atkinson is an applied linguist and second language educator who specializes in writing (first and second language), qualitative research approaches, and second language acquisition. Current projects include an attempt to establish a view of second language acquisition on “sociocognitive” principles, research in India on the experiences of vernacular language-schooled students in English-language universities, and a booklength study of different theories of culture impacting TESOL and applied linguistics. Past work has covered a wide variety of topics, from the history of medical and scientific research writing in English, to critiques of commonly used concepts in university writing instruction such as critical thinking and voice, to explorations of the concept of culture, to writings on qualitative research methods. Atkinson teaches courses in qualitative research, postmodernism, and second language acquisition at Purdue, where he is an assistant professor of English. He will be moving to the University of Arizona in 2015.
The Benefits of Genre-Based Pedagogy for Second Language Writing Development
Silvia Pessoa, Carnegie Mellon University in Qatar, Qatar
Maria Estela Brisk, Boston College, United States
Nigel Caplan, University of Delaware, United States
Luciana de Oliveira, Columbia University, United States

The goal of this colloquium is to demonstrate the benefits of genre-based pedagogy for second language writing development. Genre-based pedagogy (Rose & Martin, 2012) draws on Systemic Functional Linguistics in order to make the structural elements and linguistic features of school and professional genres explicit for students (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). Genre-based literacy programs invest heavily in front-loaded pedagogy through intensive scaffolding using the Teaching and Learning Cycle (TLC) where learners and teachers work with texts in three stages: Deconstruction, Join Construction, and Independent Construction of texts. Research has demonstrated the potential of genre-based pedagogy in enhancing literacy development.

By sharing the findings of four research projects that employed genre-based methodologies, the presenters aim to answer the following question: Does genre-based pedagogy lead to second language writing development in classroom contexts? The presenters will first provide an introduction to genre-based pedagogy and the TLC highlighting their benefits for enhancing literacy development. Two research projects that focus on writing at the elementary school level will be discussed emphasizing the role of genre-based pedagogy in enhancing the writing of science and the writing of narratives and expository texts. At the university level, the presenters will discuss the benefits of collaborating with faculty across the curriculum in the Text Deconstruction phase of the TLC in order to understand the linguistic demands of academic texts in various disciplines and then make those explicit to students. Using data from student writing after being exposed to the Joint Construction phase of the TLC, the benefits of Joint Construction for helping students develop their writing skills will also be discussed.

Ultimately, the attendees will develop new ways of thinking and talking about language to enhance the teaching of writing to linguistically and culturally diverse students.
Saturday, November 15, 2014

F.4.W Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Graham (Workshop)
Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and Assessments: Implications for Multi-Lingual Writers
Rhea Faeldonea-Walker, Sweetwater Union High School District, CA, United States
Ann Johns, San Diego State University, United States

After sharing the motivations behind the CCSS, now adopted by 45 US states, the speakers briefly discuss the importance of close reading and then provide examples of writing prompt types (performance & constructed response). They point out other challenges for teachers of multi-lingual students.

F.5 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Yuma
Chair: Amy Dawn Shinabarger, Arizona State University, United States

F.5.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Yuma
Paraphrasing and Content Knowledge in Second Language Graduate Students’ Writing
Ling Shi, University of British Columbia, Canada
Nasrin Kowkabi, University of British Columbia, Canada
Ismaeil Fazel, University of British Columbia, Canada

This presentation reports a study on L2 graduate students’ understandings and practices of paraphrasing in their research paper writing across disciplines. Analysis of 133 paraphrasing examples and students’ comments on their practices illustrates connections between students’ paraphrasing strategies and their learning and constructing of disciplinary knowledge.

F.5.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:25-9:50, Yuma
Negotiating Identities Through Participation in L2 Writing and L2 Writing Research
Youngjoo Yi, The Ohio State University, United States
Tuba Angay-Crowder, Georgia State University, United States

Presenters will report findings from a longitudinal qualitative study in which we explored ways in which a multilingual doctoral student in TESOL negotiated her identities (imagined and practiced) through her participation in L2 writing practices and L2 writing research.

F.5.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Yuma
Singing “My Way” in Developing Second Language Writing: Graduate Students’ Own Experiences with Restricted Opportunities
Ilkem Kayican, Sabancı University, Turkey

This study will explore the methods that ESL graduate student writers use to develop their writing at times when they cannot get adequate mentoring and guidance in their institutions. Through focus group meetings and interviews the research aims to find out, if any, some particular strategies which are not taught but used by student writers in order to professionalize in their writing.
F.6 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Pinal
Chair: Ruby Macksoud, Arizona State University, United States

F.6.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Pinal
**Saudi Students’ Adaptation to Writing Instruction in the U.S.**
Melinda Reichelt, English Department, University of Toledo, United States

Little research exists on Saudi students’ experiences with English-language writing instruction in the U.S. although they make up an increasingly large percentage of students in writing classes. Through nearly 20 interviews with Saudi students, this research explores the challenges that these students face and the coping strategies they employ.

F.6.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:25-9:50, Pinal
**A Comprehensive Examination of Chinese Students’ Pathways to FYC Courses**
Jianing Liu, Arizona State University, United States

The purpose of this study is to document the background of Chinese students and pathways through which they arrive at FYC courses. The study also explores Chinese students’ collective experience with FYC courses, as well as to compare and contrast these experiences with their previous English learning experiences in China.

F.6.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Pinal
**A Needs Analysis for Chinese Students in Mainstream Composition Courses**
Aylin Baris Atilgan, Purdue University, United States

Although the number of Chinese students keeps increasing in US higher education, their needs are often neglected in mainstream composition classes. To remedy this situation, I conducted a needs analysis to identify the specific needs of Chinese undergraduates in mainstream composition classes based on interviews, surveys, and textual analysis.

F.7 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Santa Cruz
Chair: Mark A. James, Arizona State University, United States

F.7.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Santa Cruz
**Taiwanese College Students’ Online Collaboration in L2: A Consensus-Building Process**
Yun-yin Huang, New York University, United States

This study investigates online collaboration of Taiwanese college students using English to negotiate, construct knowledge, and make decisions for group writing projects. Chat log of English online discussion will be coded and interpreted in the teacher-researcher’s perspectives in order to shed light on collaborative writing instruction in L2 classrooms.
The aim of this presentation is to explore, anecdotally, the effects of writing tools such as grammar- and spell-checkers, formatting, and thesauri in second language writing. While Li (2005) found research on word-processor assisted writing inconsistent, students are showing unfamiliarity with software such as Microsoft Word when drafting compositions.

In recent years, ecology and composition have increasingly interfaced through the emergence of ecocomposition. This presentation aims to extend this dialogue to L2 writing theory and practice through the reporting of an ecology-informed genre and corpus approach for a first year L2 writing course.

This presentation focuses on the use of “referential chains”, or patterns of noun phrases often used by writers of academic English to create cohesion. Presenters will address areas of weakness in ELL student writing and offer suggestions for classroom-based activities that can be used to raise awareness of referential chains.

This presentation reports on a study that compares the extent to which vocabulary size, lexical diversity, and lexical sophistication contribute to academic writing proficiency. Results suggest that lexical diversity has a greater impact on writing score over vocabulary size and lexical sophistication. Implications for practice and further analysis are discussed.
F.10.W Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Copper (Workshop)

**Professionalizing and Americanizing Second Language Learners’ Business Writing: When the Second Language Learner Wants to Assimilate**
Jeannie Waller, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, United States

In this presentation, we explain our strategy for professionalizing a group of second language learners writing from their World English to an American English and from an academic to professional writing. We offer a panel in which three presenters will discuss our approach through language, rhetoric, and assessment.

F.11 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:00-10:15, Chrysocolla
Chair: Lupco Spasovski, Arizona State University, United States

F.11.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:00-9:25, Chrysocolla

**Expectations and Experiences of Undergraduate L2 Writers Conducting Research**
Lindsay Hansen, University of Utah, United States

This presentation discusses the results of a qualitative study examining undergraduate L2 writer perceptions of their own academic research needs and abilities. Focus is on the role of student input in the development of an information literacy curriculum embedded in an L2 composition program.

F.11.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:25-9:50, Chrysocolla

**The Role of Qi-Cheng-Zhuan-He Rhetorical Structure as a Strategy in Genre Learning: Developing EFL Writers’ Genre Awareness and Writing Competence in Argumentative Essays**
Tzu-Shan Chang, Wenzao Ursuline University of Languages, Taiwan

This ongoing project aims to investigate whether EFL Taiwanese students develop genre awareness when Qi-Cheng-Zhuan-He rhetorical structure is used as a strategy in genre learning, whether their genre awareness can be observed in their argumentative essays, and whether they have made any changes or progress in their argumentative writing.

F.11.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 9:50-10:15, Chrysocolla

**An Examination of Students’ Perceptions of the Role of Prior Genre Knowledge in the English for Academic Purposes Classroom**
Donald Myles, Carleton University, Canada
Natasha Artemeva, Carleton University, Canada

The study explores English for Academic Purposes (EAP) students’ perceptions of the relationship between their prior L1 & English academic genre awareness and knowledge, and their current EAP and disciplinary writing. A discussion of the implications for genre-based EAP pedagogy is included.
Invited Colloquium
G.1.C Saturday, November 15, 2014, 10:45-12:15, Arizona
Organizer: Todd Ruecker, University of New Mexico, United States

The Future of SLW at CCCC: Why CCCC and SLW Need Each Other
Christine Pearson Casanave, Temple University, United States
Dana Ferris, University of California, Davis, United States
Maria Jerskey, LaGuardia Community College, United States
Julia Kiernan, Michigan State University, United States
Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, University of New Hampshire, United States

Over the past few decades, the SLW community at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) has grown dramatically thanks to the work of a variety of individuals involved in the creation of the CCCC Statement on L2 Writers, annual workshops and panels, as well sub-organizations like the SLW Special Interest Group, Committee on SLW, and the new SLW Standing Group. Interest in language diversity at CCCC has exploded in recent years with the creation of the Transnational SIG in 2009 and the emergence of translingual pedagogies advocated for by writing studies and SLW scholars alike (e.g., Canagarajah, 2013; Horner et al, 2011). In light of the heightened interest in language diversity among writing studies colleagues, this colloquium seeks to clarify and reinvigorate SLW’s role within CCCC.

The interest in transnational perspectives on writing has provided more entry points into the CCCCs organization for international students graduating with PhDs in composition, domestic graduate students, and international scholars who are coming to the discipline. It has brought both opportunities and challenges, drawing in many not previously focused on working with linguistically diverse student populations while raising the concerns of prominent scholars like Matsuda (2013; 2014). Several SLW scholars have noted that while translingual pedagogies are theoretically attractive, their practical implications/applications are much less clear (Crusan, 2014; Ortmeier-Hooper, 2014), causing concern among some as universities hire translingual scholars to help them design programs and curricula to serve increasingly diverse student populations. The members of this colloquium, involved at various times to various degrees with the SLW community at CCCC, will open with short position statements followed by a guided discussion in which they will explore what it means to be a SLW professional at CCCCs as well as their thoughts on the future of SLW at CCCCs.

G.3.W Saturday, November 15, 2014, 10:45-12:00, Gila (Workshop)
Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy in Teaching Second Language Writing to Middle and High School Long-Term English Learners
Julie Goldman, San Diego County Office of Education, United States

This presentation will discuss the results from a dissertation study, Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy in Teaching Second Language Writing to Middle and High School Long-term English Learners, and identify possible factors that influence the effective teaching of second language writing to long-term English learners.
Service Learning and Relevance for the IEP Writing Student: Connecting Communities
Linda Henriksen, Kansas State University, United States

For the IEP writing student, service learning is an ideal medium for melding learning outcomes, community needs, and a raised sense of social awareness while providing real world application of classroom-based concepts and experiences. This presentation provides teaching techniques and suggestions for incorporating service learning in an IEP writing course.

From Novice Writer to Writing Instructor: An Autoethnography of an International Teaching Assistant’s Professional Development
Yue Chen, Purdue University, United States

The increasing number of international teaching assistants (ITAs) in composition programs in the United States inspires substantial research on these students’ professional development. This autoethnographic study provides an insider’s perspective to explain an ITA’s professional development, which is a discursive process influenced by the interplay of three major factors.

Teacher Study Group: Teachers’ Views Before and After
Elena Andrei, Coastal Carolina University, United States
Marcie Ellerbe, Coastal Carolina University, United States
Todd Cherner, Coastal Carolina University, United States

This study examined how engaging in a book club changed a small group of English Language Arts and English as a Second Language teachers’ understandings about teaching writing to English Learners (ELs). Emerging findings are based on before and after study group questionnaires and after study group interviews.
Best Student Paper
G.5.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 11:35-12:00, Yuma

Becoming Second Language Writing Specialists: A Self-Reflective Study of a TESOL Graduate Student Writing Group
Rae-Ping Lin, University of British Columbia, Canada
Joel Heng Hartse, University of British Columbia, Canada
Nasrin Kowkabi, University of British Columbia, Canada
Ismaeil Fazel, University of British Columbia, Canada
Tomoyo Okuda, University of British Columbia, Canada
Bong-gi Sohn, University of British Columbia, Canada
Junghyun Hwag, University of British Columbia, Canada
Klara Abdi, University of British Columbia, Canada

Using communities of practice and academic language socialization frameworks, this study examines how eight doctoral students in a writing group created their own scholarly network in an attempt to be the agents of their own socialization into the second language writing profession.

G.6 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 10:45-12:00, Pinal
Chair: Andrea Janelle Dickens, Arizona State University, United States

G.6.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 10:45-11:10, Pinal
The Development of Using Citations: Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Evidence from BA, MA and PhD Theses by Chinese EFL Learners
Fang Xu, Nanjing University, China

Drawing on both cross-sectional and longitudinal data, the present study examines how Chinese EFL learners of applied linguistics develop in their BA, MA and PhD theses in terms of using citations for achieving rhetorical functions in different sections of the theses.

G.6.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 11:10-11:35, Pinal
What Lies Behind the Mirror: A Socio-Cognitive Approach to Citation Practices in EFL Academic Writing
Liyin Zhang, Northwest University, China
Yue Chen, Purdue University, United States

This study investigates EFL students’ citation acquisition in academic writing. A socio-cognitive approach is adopted to examine three Chinese first-year PhD students’ citation practices in their writing for international publication. This interview-based case study shows that the interplay of social and cognitive factors tend to affect EFL students’ citation practice.
An Investigation into the Test Takers’ Source Use Strategies in Reading-to-Write Integrated Tasks
Jun Zhang, Shanghai Second Polytechnic University, China
Yue Wu, Shanghai Second Polytechnic University, China

This paper investigated 300 students in Shanghai Second Polytechnic Universities by using source texts in the completion of an integrated reading-writing task through think-aloud verbal protocols, interviews, and the resulting written products and aimed to study the writing strategy improving the writing level for the L2 students.

Language and Topic Variations in Establishing a Niche in Journal Articles of Applied Linguistics
Yeon Hee Choi, Ewha Womans University, Korea

This study has examined the frequency and strategies of niche establishments (NEs) in Applied Linguistics journal articles written in English and Korean in terms of two research topic areas: policy and non-policy. The results illustrate similarities and differences of NEs in the two topic areas and the two languages.

Evaluation and Narrativity in Stand-Alone Literature Reviews and Research Articles: A Register Analysis
Heidi Wright, Northern Arizona University, United States

This paper presents an interdisciplinary register analysis of evaluation and narrativity in modern, stand-alone literature reviews and research articles. Findings reveal a set of shared grammatical features and seem to conflict with earlier studies that labelled stand-alone reviews as heavily narrative or evaluative. Reasons for this apparent conflict are suggested.

A Comparative Analysis of Turkish Second Language Writers’ Sentence Structure Preferences: An Investigation of Journal Articles
Mehmet Karaca, Gazi University, Turkey
Serhat İnan, Gazi University, Turkey

This study investigates Turkish authors’ from six different educational disciplines sentence structure preference while writing in second language. The data gathered from Gazi University Journal of Gazi Educational Faculty. The extended summaries of the articles are analyzed in terms of the number of sentence structures as simple sentences, complex sentences, compound sentences, compound-complex sentences.
Saturday, November 15, 2014

G.8 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 10:45-12:00, Yavapai
Chair: Lindsay Hansen, University of Arizona, United States

G.8.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 10:45-11:10, Yavapai
Bridge over Troubled Paragraphs: Promoting Critical Thinking and Connecting Ideas
LuAnn Sorenson, Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States
Lisa Chason, Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States
Dianne Loyet, Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, United States
Anastasia Stoops, Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, United States

Writing textbooks tend not to provide enough schema building for paragraphs, leading to student writing that is limited in development and meaning. To address this problem, the presenters will demonstrate TBSIR, an approach to paragraph organization that can be adapted for teaching academic paragraph writing for intermediate to advanced students.

G.8.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 11:10-11:35, Yavapai
The Effects of Prewriting Strategy Training on Argumentative Writing of Chinese EFL Non-English Freshmen
Aiping Xiao, Shanghai Dianji University, China

This empirical study employs a five-step training procedure to explore the effects of explicit prewriting strategy training on Chinese EFL freshmen’s use of strategies while composing argumentative essays. The statistical results showed that the training had positive impacts on content, organization, and vocabulary of their essays, but no effects on syntax and mechanics.

G.8.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 11:35-12:00, Yavapai
Investigating the Argumentation in Research Question Justification by L2 Novice Researchers
Yuanhua Xie, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, China

The present study aims to explore whether the types of information needed for the justification of research questions are provided, and logically related to one another in the L2 novice researchers’ proposals.

G.10 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 10:45-12:00, Copper
Chair: Trevor Duston, Arizona State University, United States

G.10.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 10:45-11:10, Copper
Prepositional Verbs in L2 Emergent Academic Writing
Elizabeth Wilcoxon, New Mexico State University, United States
This presentation reports on a corpus study of prepositional verbs in ESL/EAP writing. Data from a local learner corpus is analyzed to determine patterns of occurrence and distribution of prepositional verbs. The presenter discusses findings and also compares and contrasts prepositional verb usage in course essays versus final exams.

G.10.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 11:10-11:35, Copper
**Syntactic Discourse Analysis: Tools for Graduate Student Independence**
Marla Perkins, Northern Arizona University, United States

Discourse analysis is difficult for both students and teachers to handle. However, tools derived from syntactic discourse analysis can provide students with strategies for analyzing new writing tasks and can provide teachers with ways to present discourse considerations that can be used for any type of academic writing.

G.10.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 11:35-12:00, Copper
**A Comparative Study of Hedging Usages Between American and Chinese Students’ Writings**
Genghan Lu, Northern Arizona University, United States
Chenxu Fu, Northern Arizona University, United States

In L1 and L2 English writings, hedges are critical for a successful argument. The study investigates five different types of hedges in both American students’ and Chinese students’ academic writing projects from the freshman critical thinking and writing class. Mann-Whitney-U tests were used to test the differences.

G.11 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 10:45-12:00, Chrysocolla
Chair: Patricia Boyd, Arizona State University, United States

G.11.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 10:45-11:10, Chrysocolla
**Collaborative Writing in Two Thai EFL Classrooms**
Ai Oyama, University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States
Pamela Stacey, University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States

This paper describes the effects of collaborative writing projects with Thai EFL university students enrolled in an intensive English writing course. The presenters will show how a collaborative writing curriculum was carried out and will argue that collaborative writing activities have a positive impact on students’ writing confidence and enjoyment.

G.11.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 11:10-11:35, Chrysocolla
**Is There a Role of the First Language in Collaborative L2 Writing?**
Meixiu Zhang, Northern Arizona University, United States

The role of learners’ L1 in ESL classroom has been a controversial issue. When employing collaborative writing tasks, should teachers pair students who share the same
L1s together to perform the tasks? This paper examines how learners’ shared L1s in collaborative writing may affect the text quality and linguistic features of their writing.

Saturday, November 15, 2014, 12:30-13:45, Engrained (Ticketed Event)
**Saturday Lunch Seminar**
Chair: Paul Kei Matsuda, Arizona State University, United States

Session H

H.1.D Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-15:30, Arizona (Discussion)
**L2 Writing Apocalypse and the Future of the Field**
Paul Kei Matsuda, Arizona State University, United States

H.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-15:15, Gila
Chair: Youngwha Lee, Arizona State University, United States

H.3.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-14:25, Gila
**How ESL Teachers’ Argumentative Epistemologies Shape Instructional Conversations in High School “Sheltered Instruction” Classrooms**
Hyun Jung Joo, The Ohio State University, United States
George Newell, The Ohio State University, United States

ESL teachers are expected to prepare ELLs for eventual participation in mainstream classes, while attending to their linguistic and cultural needs. As a result, the choices ESL teachers make with respect to argumentative writing are shaped in ways not faced by mainstream teachers. Their argumentative epistemologies were derived from various and competing influences.

H.3.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:25-14:50, Gila
**From Scaffolding to Autonomy: The Role of a Teacher in Adolescent ELLs’ Development of Second Language Writing**
Oksana Vorobel, Borough of Manhattan Community College, CUNY, United States
Deoksoon Kim, University of South Florida, United States

Adopting an ecological perspective, this multiple case study explores the role of a teacher in adolescent ELLs’ development of second language writing. Specifically, the research focuses on how a teacher’s scaffolding of collaborative writing tasks in the classroom allowed ELLs to become independent collaborators and writers in an online context.
H.4 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-15:15, Graham
Chair: Christina Grant, University of Alberta, Canada

H.4.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-14:25, Graham
**Unique or Not?: An Analysis of Error Patterns in the Writings of Generation 1.5 Students**
Christa de Kleine, Notre Dame of Maryland University, United States
Rachele Lawton, The Community College of Baltimore County, United States
Minah Woo, Howard Community College, United States

This study provides a qualitative and quantitative analysis of error patterns in the essays of 150 community college students at two suburban colleges on the East Coast, comparing Generation 1.5 students to L2 and L1 writers. Our discussion will also include important curricular implications of our findings.

H.4.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:25-14:50, Graham
**Linking Literacy Practices and Academic Writing: A Study of Haitian Generation 1.5 College Students**
Lindsay Vecchio, University of Florida, United States

What are generation 1.5 students’ literacy practices in and out of school? How can these existing practices form the foundation for proficiency in college writing? This talk presents findings from a study exploring the literacy practices of a group of Haitian generation 1.5 students enrolled in a college composition course.

H.4.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:50-15:15, Graham
**International and Immigrant Students: Differing Needs When Writing One-on-One**
Grant Eckstein, University of California, Davis, United States

Because of their different educational backgrounds, international, immigrant, and native-English speaking students may benefit from different kinds of writing support in writing-center tutorials. This paper presents data that illustrates these differences and explains what writing teachers and tutors should know when working one-on-one with diverse multilingual writers.

H.5 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-15:15, Yuma
Chair: Patricia Friedrich, Arizona State University, United States

H.5.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-14:25, Yuma
**Faculty from Across the Curriculum’s Perceptions of ELL Writing Students**
Nathan Lindberg, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, United States

For a case study, I interviewed 30 professors from 16 departments to gain a more complete understanding of ELL university students’ experience in writing classes. Evidence indicates professors with little experience teaching ELLs can view ELLs as problematic, while teachers with more experience have integrated ELLs into their pedagogy.
L2 Students’ Perception of Why They Gain or Lose Points in Their Disciplinary Writing Tasks
Jing Xia, University of Michigan, United States

This study presents the results of a survey of L2 university students, asking them to analyze their sense of 1) which aspects of writing are valued and undervalued by their disciplinary instructors; 2) which aspects of their writing that they perceive conducive to their grades in their disciplinary writing tasks.

Best Student Paper

Understanding Peer Response in an EAP Course: An Activity Theory Perspective
Qi Zhang, University of South Florida, United States

Framed in Engeström’s (1999) cultural-historical activity theory (CHAT) framework, this study views peer response as an activity system, and aims to understand the dynamics of peer interaction and trace readers’ and writers’ learning when participating in peer response over the course of a semester.

Second Language Writers’ Experiences and Strategies in a First-Year Writing Course
Bethany Reichen, University at Albany, SUNY, United States

This study investigates second language writers’ perceptions of their experiences and writing strategies in a first-year college composition course. An activity theory framework is used to analyze and understand how students understand their experiences in these courses and how their instructors perceive them as writers and their written work.

Growing L2 Writing Profession Beyond Its Hobbit Holes: In Search of a Promised Land
Shizhou Yang, Yunnan Minzu University, China

This narrative and participatory research attempts to locate the “promised land” for L2 writing as a profession and facilitate the imagining of future possibilities for the continued growth of (pre)professionals. It may provide important understanding about both the profession and those growing it from their various career and disciplinary positions.
H.7 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-15:15, Santa Cruz  
Chair: Lisa Russell-Pinson, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, United States

H.7.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-14:25, Santa Cruz  
**First Steps in Becoming Professionals in Teaching EFL Writing: The Impact of Reading-Writing Tasks on Turkish Pre-Service Writing Teachers**  
Dan J. Tannacito, University for Arizona, United States  
Alev Ozbilgin Gezgin, Middle East Technical University Northern Cyprus Campus, Turkey

The presenters share the impact of reading-writing tasks on the academic literacy of Turkish pre-service EFL writing teachers at a university in northern Cyprus. We discuss the importance of tasks on pre-service teachers to be in order to become more competent professionals in teaching academic writing in a foreign language.

H.7.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:25-14:50, Santa Cruz  
**Consciousness-Raising Tools in an Advanced Composition French Course**  
Christiane Rey, Northwestern University, United States

In an advanced composition French class, the author developed several tools for raising consciousness about grammatical and lexical aspects of the language as well as features of various genres.

H.7.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:50-15:15, Santa Cruz  
**Examining Communities of Practice and the Effects of Distributed Cognition in a Foreign Language Writing Space**  
Amanda Abrahams, California State University, Chico, United States

At the intersection of Composition and Second Language Acquisition theory, I have recorded a series of writing workshops at California State University, Chico’s Student Learning Center. Examining the tutoring space as a Community of Practice, the data suggests that language learners greatly benefit from discussion based workshops and peer review.

H.8 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-15:15, Yavapai  
Chair: Abigail Oakley, Arizona State University, United States

H.8.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-14:25, Yavapai  
**An Exploration of Teaching EAP Writing in a Content-Based Curriculum**  
Dongmei Cheng, Southern Illinois University, United States

This presentation introduces a series of pedagogical activities in teaching EAP writing to intermediate-advanced level L2 learners in an IEP program adopting a content-based curriculum. Sample instructional materials of academic writing in the area of astronomy, business, and fine arts will be shared, followed by discussions on opportunities and challenges.
Saturday, November 15, 2014

H.8.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:25-14:50, Yavapai
Metacognitive Transformation: Enacting Pedagogical Memory at Times of Academic and Linguistic Transition
Jennifer Eidum Zinchuk, University of Washington, United States

This presentation analyzes a writing course set at the transition between high school and college and between language learning and language use. By inviting students to reflect on past learning through narrative writing, students enact their pedagogical memory, recontextualizing past learning experiences, fostering metacognition, and building confidence as writers.

H.8.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:50-15:15, Yavapai
A Dialectical Approach to Critical Thinking in EAP Writing
Jay Tanaka, University of Hawaii at Manoa, United States

This study examines the effect of a new model of critical thinking instruction in an English for academic purposes writing course. The approach used in the current study is based on Paul’s (1995) concept of dialectical thinking, and aids students in considering and understanding social issues and controversy.

H.10.W Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-15:15, Copper (Workshop)
Chair: Suneeta Thomas, Purdue University, United States
From Personal Experiences in L1 Culture to Scholarly Topics in L2 Writing
Rijasoa Andriamanana, University of New Mexico, United States

This session aims at encouraging international doctoral students to use their personal experiences as sources to determine their scholarly topics in academia. It provides practical steps on how to transform passion, belief, and experiences in L1 culture into unique and legitimate L2 writing pieces.

H.11 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-15:15, Chrysocolla
Chair: Norah Fahim, University of Washington, United States

H.11.1 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:00-14:25, Chrysocolla
Group and Individual L2 Writing Conferences: Instructor and Student Perspectives
Veronika Maliborska, Purdue University, United States
Yunjung You, Purdue University, United States

This study examines expectations of multilingual writers and their instructors toward individual and group conferences in freshman composition. Data was collected from 100 students and eight instructors from the same set of courses. Results and implications for conferencing strategies, instructor training, and further research directions are discussed.

(47)

H.11.2 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:25-14:50, Chrysocolla
CANCELED
Symposium on Second Language Writing – Day 3

H.11.3 Saturday, November 15, 2014, 14:50-15:15, Chrysocolla

Digitizing Writing as a Developmental Continuum to Professionalization: The Nigerian Experience
Esther Anyanwu, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

The presentation will report on a study of CMC and writing at five tertiary institutions located in Anambra state of Nigeria. A total of 100 Igbo-speaking first-year students responded to a questionnaire—20 from each school. Two English language lecturers from each school were also interviewed.

Plenary V
Saturday, November 15, 2014, 15:45-16:45, Arizona
Chair: Edward M. White, University of Arizona, United States

Fake It ‘Til You Make It: The Imposter Syndrome—the Dilemma of (Women) Academics
Deborah Crusan, Wright State University, United States

The Imposter Syndrome, also known as the Impostor Phenomenon or Fraud Syndrome, is a term used to describe baseless feelings of inadequacy. Even with evidence to the contrary, those who exhibit syndrome traits are convinced that they are fakes; that they will be found out; that they are truly undeserving of the success they have had. Early research (Clance & Imes, 1978) claimed that the Imposter Syndrome was more prevalent in high achieving women. Generally, that notion has been debunked (Young, 2011); however, some anecdotal evidence still illustrates women’s proclivity for the syndrome. Despite their academic and professional achievements, many women attribute their success to luck, timing, or deception of others. In fact, of the 66 dissertations on the Imposter Syndrome, 90% are authored by women (Young, 2011).

Academia is the breeding ground for imposter feelings (Young, 2011). In the field of second language writing, in order to respond to the rapidly changing demands for professional activities related to second language writing, it might be quite common to feel overwhelmed, unworthy of the task, and unsure of what to do. Because of the dynamic and unstable nature of what it means to be an L2 writing specialist, those who suffer under the burden of the Imposter Syndrome might see themselves as unequal to the task of contributing to the field in any real way or taking on the mantle of professionalizing second language writing.

In this presentation, I will discuss the results of a survey that asked academics at several institutions about the Imposter Syndrome; I will then delineate factors furthering the preservation of imposter feelings. I will also examine my own battle with the Imposter Syndrome. Coming to the field of second language writing relatively late, and exacerbated by other variables such as age, gender, upbringing, expectations of colleagues, and relational issues, I struggled to believe that I could acquire the skills I needed to develop professionally and to think of myself as a specialist. I will disclose ways in which I was plagued by self-perceived shortcomings and how those beliefs might have impacted my career but for the remarkable fact that I sought mentorship.

Her book, Assessment in the Second Language Writing Classroom, was published by University of Michigan Press. Currently she is development officer for the Second Language Writing Interest Section (SLWIS) at TESOL. It is in that role that she has promoted an Evening with the SLWIS, which has been held each year at TESOL since 2007. She developed the event as a way to help others overcome imposter feelings, and in the hopes of fostering collegiality and collaborations, encourages established scholars to attend and meet new scholars.
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Though the categorization of second language writing as a “field” or “discipline” is not uncontroversial, there is a growing sense among many second language writing scholars that the area of inquiry is entering a more mature era of its existence. In a recent “Disciplinary Dialogue” in the Journal of Second Language Writing, for example, established scholars described L2 writing as “coming of age” (Zhang, 2013, p. 466), as “a legitimate area of graduate study” (Silva, 2013, p. 433), and as a term that has “been important in helping to professionalise teachers of writing and in raising the status of writing as a key part of the curriculum” (Hyland, 2013, p. 427). If the field of study has matured, we would expect to find some changes in our discourses—for example, in the ways that we describe and situate our research, and the ways that gatekeepers evaluate L2 writing scholarship. In this talk, I will examine these discursive changes as indexed in the field’s flagship journal, the Journal of Second Language Writing (JSLW).

I will begin by reviewing various frameworks for understanding disciplinary development and professionalization, including the work of social theorist Max Weber (1968), English studies scholar Richard Ohmann (1990), and biomedical researcher Alexander Shneider (2009). These perspectives highlight, for example, the development of specialized jargon, the establishment of doctrine or a general system of knowledge, and the use of field-specific research methodologies. Using these frameworks as a springboard, I will then trace representations of professionalization in second language writing as indexed in published papers and in recent peer reviews of submitted JSLW manuscripts. I will also share perspectives from established scholars who have published in and/or served on the editorial board during all or most of the 22-year lifespan of the
journal and from graduate students who are newer readers of *JSLW*. Based on the patterns I identify, I will consider the benefits and potential cautions of a maturing field and a specialized journal.

**Christine M. Tardy** is an Associate Professor of English Language and Linguistics in the Department of English at University of Arizona. She teaches and mentors students in the M.A. in English as a Second Language and the interdisciplinary Ph.D. program in Second Language Acquisition and Teaching (SLAT), and she serves as the Associate Director of the Writing Program. Her research has focused primarily on second language writing, genre theory and pedagogy, and academic writing development. Her recent work has appeared in *College Composition and Communication, English for Specific Purposes, Research in the Teaching of English, TESOL Quarterly*, and *Written Communication*, as well as numerous edited volumes and a book-length study of genre knowledge development (*Building Genre Knowledge*, Parlor Press). She is currently completing a co-authored book (with Brian Paltridge and Sue Starfield) on ethnographic research of academic writing and a monograph exploring genre innovation and creativity in academic writing. Since 2011, she has served as co-editor of *Journal of Second Language Writing*.
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CONGRATULATIONS TO THESE AWARD WINNERS!

GenAdmin: Theorizing WPA Identities in the Twenty-First Century
Colin Charlton, Jonikka Charlton, Tarez Samra Graban, Kathleen J. Ryan, & Amy Ferdinandt Stolley
Winner of the Best Book Award, Council of Writing Program Administrators (July, 2014)

Mics, Cameras, Symbolic Action: Audio-Visual Rhetoric for Writing Teachers
Bump Halbritter
Winner of the Distinguished Book Award from Computers and Composition (May, 2014)

SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING SERIES

Scientific Writing in a Second Language
David Ian Hanauer and Karen Englander

Foreign Language Writing Instruction
Edited by Tony Cimasko and Melinda Reichelt

Practicing Theory in Second Language Writing
Edited by Tony Silva and Paul Kei Matsuda

Building Genre Knowledge
Christine M. Tardy

The Politics of Second Language Writing: In Search of the Promised Land
Edited by Paul Kei Matsuda, Christina Ortmeier-Hooper, and Xiaoye You

NEW RELEASES OF INTEREST

WAC and Second Language Writers: Research Towards Linguistically and Culturally Inclusive Programs and Practices
Edited by Terry Myers Zawacki and Michelle Cox. 490 pages.
The editors and contributors pursue the ambitious goal of including within WAC theory, research, and practice the differing perspectives, educational experiences, and voices of second-language writers.

First-Year Composition: From Theory to Practice
Edited by Deborah Coxwell-Teague & Ronald F. Lunsford. 420 pages.
Twelve of the leading theorists in composition studies answer, in their own voices, the key question about what they hope to accomplish in a first-year composition course. Each chapter, and the accompanying syllabi, provides rich insights into the classroom practices of these theorists.

A Rhetoric for Writing Program Administrators
Edited by Rita Malenczyk. 471 pages.
Thirty-two contributors delineate the major issues and questions in the field of writing program administration.
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