INFORMATION TO USERS

Academic Writing Instruction in Disciplines Other Than English:
A Sociocultural Perspective.

by

Guillaume Gentil

Department of Second Language Education

Faculty of Education

McGill University

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in Second Language Education.

July 1998

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-43875-9

Canada

Abstract

This classroom-based interpretive inquiry investigates how two academic writing instructors with disciplinary backgrounds in English Literature and English Education teach writing to graduate students with other disciplinary backgrounds. The instructors' teaching practices are conceptualized within a Vygotskian socio-cultural framework. Relevant educational issues are situated within two fields of education, Second Language Education and L1 writing instruction. This inquiry challenges the polarized views of writing instruction reflected in the second language literature. The research participants were two writing instructors and two focal students in one class. Data collected and analyzed include 70 hours of classroom-based observations in two classes over a semester, 12 hours of interviews with the research participants over 16 months, and documents such as course handouts, the focal students' portfolios, teacher audio-taped and written feedback to student drafts. Findings indicate that the writing instructors provided writing instruction and writing opportunities both in the specific disciplinary discourses of their students and other discourses. The instructors' goal-directed teaching practices were informed by their own generalist and discipline-sensitive evaluative orientations toward academic writing instruction at postsecondary levels. The instructors' evolving individual beliefs, perceptions, and practices were shown to be related to embedding sets of nested institutional contexts, such as developments in composition and education theory, and the changing theoretical orientations of the instructors' teaching units. Despite the instructors' different emphases on discipline-specific and general features of writing, findings suggest that both instructors mediated the students' appropriation of disciplinary discourses.

Résumé

Cette étude interprétative, menée dans deux salles de classe, examine comment deux enseignants universitaires ayant une formation en littérature anglaise et en enseignement de l'anglais enseignent l'écriture à des étudiants poursuivant des études de deuxième et troisième cycles dans d'autres disciplines. L'auteur conceptualise les pratiques enseignantes dans le cadre de théories socio-culturelles Vygotskiennes. Il discute les questions de pédagogie que soulèvent le sujet de l'étude en situant sa problématique relativement à deux disciplines des sciences de l'éducation, la didactique des langues secondes et l'enseignement de la rédaction et de la composition en langue maternelle. Cette étude fait la critique des opinions polarisées qui sont exprimées sur l'enseignement de l'écriture à travers la littérature spécialisée de la didactique des langues secondes. Les principaux participants de recherche ayant pris part à l'étude étaient deux enseignants d'écriture ainsi que deux étudiants inscrits au cours de l'un des enseignants. Les données recueillies et analysées comprennent: (a) 70 heures d'observations dans deux salles de classe, échelonnées sur un trimestre; (b) 12 heures d'entretiens avec les participants de recherche, réparties sur une période de 16 mois; et (c) des documents tels que les polycopiés distribués pendant les cours, les portfolios des deux étudiants participants à l'étude, et les commentaires (enregistrements sonores et annotations manuscrites) des enseignants sur les écrits des étudiants. Les résultats indiquent que l'enseignement, autant formel que pratique, a porté à la fois sur les discours spécifiques aux disciplines des étudiants que sur d'autres discours. Les objectifs et les pratiques pédagogiques des enseignants traduisaient les conceptions et appréciations de ceux-ci sur le rôle et la nature de l'enseignement de l'écriture après le secondaire, y compris leurs orientations généralistes ou leur souci des spécificités disciplinaires. L'auteur établit une relation entre l'évolution individuelle des convictions, des perceptions et des pratiques enseignantes et les contextes institutionels emboîtés dans lesquels cette évolution s'inscrit; à savoir, il met en parallèle l'évolution des orientations et pratiques des enseignants, l'évolution des théories en pédagogie et en didactique de la composition, et l'évolution des orientations théoriques des unités d'enseignement auxquelles sont rattachés les enseignants. Bien que les deux enseignants diffèrent par leur insistence sur les aspects généraux ou discipline-spécifiques de la communication académique écrite, les résultats de l'étude suggèrent que chaque enseignant a aidé ses étudiants à s'approprier les discours de leurs disciplines d'études.

Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge:

Mary Maguire, my thesis advisor, whose dedication to teaching, inquiry, and students is unequalled among the professors and teachers who have participated in my education; her supportive and insightful comments spurred me on always to explore the frontiers of my reasoning, and comforted me when my morale was low.

Katherine and Peter, the two focal writing instructors of this study, Shiori and Pierre, two focal students, and the other research participants; they contributed greatly to my inquiry by sharing their understandings and resources, and in opening themselves to self- and other scrutiny.

Dominique and Véronique, my parents, whose love and liberal education fostered my varied aspirations in life and conduced to my social, cultural, and intellectual growth.

My friends, especially René and Serge, for their irreplaceable moral and material support; their common sense helped me interconnect my intellections with down-to-earth wisdom and everyday life; they assisted me with formatting, word-processing, and xerox-copying; and, most important, their enduring friendship gives meaning to my life.

McGill faculty, fellow students, and staff, including Joyce Gaule, Tia Habid, and professors within the Department of Second Language Education, for their material and intellectual support.

This thesis is dedicated to them.

There is no one truth, says the postmodernist voice. There is no single monological description of physical or human phenomena. To recognize this is to become awake to the processes of our own sense making in a radically different way: to question technical and specialized authorities, to engage with intensified awareness in acts of becoming different, acts of redescribing and redefining ourselves and our contacts with the world.

Maxine Greene, 1994, p. 440.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

PROLOGUE

> ...any 'power of abstraction' is thoroughly situated, in the lives of persons and in the culture that makes it possible. On the other hand, the world carries its own structure so that specificity always implies generality (and in this sense generality is not to be assimilated to abstractness): That is why stories can be so powerful in conveying ideas, often more so than an articulation of the idea itself.
>
> Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 34

Shiori[1] is a Japanese graduate student in Education at Belleview University,[1] a major English-medium university in Quebec. As part of her program of study, she took Sally's and Kim's courses in Second Language Education and Edith's course in Comparative Education. For each course, she submitted written assignments, including term papers and take-home exams. Here are some of the evaluative comments which she receives from her professors:

Sally's comments to Fall term paper, 1996.

Good beginning. Well-reasoned argument is apparent, although there are problems with English usage. A particular problem is the tendency to use 'dangling constructions.' [illegible] your proficiency with English improved, you should have no problems with your graduate program.

Kim's comments to Fall term paper, 1996.

You've summarized the research reported in the article Shiori but run into difficulty linking them and contextualizing the research within some of the broader issues/questions about pragmatic transfer and SLA. It appears that you're also having a great deal of difficulty expressing yourself in English. Have you taken or perhaps are considering taking a course on Advanced Written Communication? This may help you. [Sally, the program director] can tell you about how to register for these courses.

Kim's comments to take-home exam, Fall term, 1996.

This is an improvement from your last assignment although you're having difficulties linking the research findings to each other and determining how they are inter-related. You're beginning to develop an

---

[1] All the names used in this thesis are fictitious.

understanding of individual 'pieces' of the research in this area of SLA research and starting to see how they're connected, but you're having difficulty synthesizing work and seeing where the gaps and weaknesses are. Nonetheless, this is an improvement from your last paper. I still feel that you would benefit from a course in Advanced written communication.

Edith's comments to Fall term paper, 1997.

The paper needs better integration in logic and organization of materials.

These comments are evaluative recapitulations that appear on the last page of Shiori's term papers and take-home exams. They reveal mismatches between Shiori's intentions about her written texts and the expectations of her professors. Among subject-area professors, second language instructors, and writing teachers, mismatches between a reader's expectations and a writer's productions are often referred to as a writer's "writing problems" or a learner's "language problems." For instance, Sally draws Shiori's attention to "a particular problem" with "English usage," namely "dangling constructions." Kim and Edith seem to respond to "problems" with "logic," "organization," "synthesizing," and critiquing existing research.

Striking in the three professors' comments is that they alert Shiori to her writing problems without describing, specifying, illustrating, or explaining what these problems are. In particular, her professors do not point out her language errors, for instance by circling them or suggesting alternatives. Shiori's difficulties in writing term papers and Edith's response to them are illustrated in Appendix A. Edith made one correction to Shiori's text, namely the crossing out of an "s" in "As the examples mentioned above indicates." Apart from this editing comment, the paper looks spotless and free from written feedback until the final evaluation: "The paper needs better integration in logic and organization of materials." I do not know what Edith exactly meant by this remark. Nor does Shiori. She did not discuss her paper with Edith after she received her course grade of B.

A closer look at Shiori's text suggests that she may get readers sidetracked in the following ways:

- Her sentences regularly follow a topic/comment/(passive) verb structure instead of a subject/(active) verb/object structure, possibly because of a language interdependence (cf. Cummins, 1991) between Japanese and English (e.g., Hinds, 1987; Master, 1991). For example, she writes:

> First, in terms of the history of Japanese educational reforms [topic], starting from the Meiji Restoration, the pre- and postwar patterns and the recent pattern of reform [comment] are reflected [passive verb]. (p. 2, lines 13-15)

- Her textual coherence and cohesion are reduced following disjunctures in theme/rheme patterns (e.g., Halliday & Hasan, 1976), ineffective organizing sentences within paragraphs as well as ineffective linking sentences between paragraphs (e.g., Harris, 1990; about studies in contrastive rhetoric between Japanese and English, cf. Connor, 1996, pp. 41-45; Hinds, 1987, 1990). There is no evident link and a shift in topics between the first two sentences of the first paragraph (p. 1, lines 1-6).

In the light of Shiori's perceived "writing problems," the question arises whether Edith's succinct comment about the lack of "integration in logic and organization of materials" is helpful. Similarly, what help do Sally and Kim provide when they only mention to Shiori that she has "problems with English usage" or that she is "having a great deal of difficulty expressing [herself] in English"? It is noteworthy that Kim recommends that Shiori take a course in Advanced Written Communication (AWC). This course is offered by the Writing Centre, a unit within the Faculty of Education at Belleview University. This unit is devoted to the teaching and learning of writing. As for Sally, she advised Shiori to go the university's French and English Language Centre and register for Fundamentals of Academic Writing (FAW), a second language writing course (Shiori, personal communication). It seems that Sally, Kim, and Edith do not consider it their role to provide writing assistance with Shiori's term papers. Rather, they point out the linguistic and rhetorical inadequacies of her texts and refer her to second language courses and writing courses offered outside their own departments.

The written feedback and recommendations that Shiori receives on her course assignments suggest that her subject-area professors distinguish between teaching content and teaching form. They seem to accept

responsibility for the former and entrust writing instructors and second language teachers with the latter. That is, they seem to assume that one can divorce the teaching of form, language, the writing medium, from the teaching of content and knowledge, including discipline-specific knowledge. Russell (1990), a professor of English interested in social historical interpretations of academic writing instruction, challenges

> the convenient assumption that writing is a single, generalized skill, learned (or not learned) outside a disciplinary matrix—in secondary school or freshman composition—and not related in any discipline-specific way to the professional roles associated with a discipline (p. 53).

Russell's criticism seems directed to Shiori's subject-area professors. In his review of cross-curricular, post-secondary writing instruction, Russell argues that the assumption he challenges is prevalent within academia. Although he focuses on Northern American contexts, his arguments also apply to other educational contexts, e.g., in Europe.

As a language learner of English and German at the French *Institut National Agronomique Paris-Grignon* (INA PG), I never received formal language instruction in the scientific, engineering, and agricultural disciplines of my curriculum. Rather, my language teachers taught me "General English" or "General German" through selected news articles, literary texts, and video-taped materials showing the life and culture of the people who spoke the target language. Even though the class comprised *only* engineering students, my language teachers never specifically addressed engineering issues or dealt with engineering texts. They had been hired as educated native speakers of the target language and experienced language teachers. Most of them had earned degrees in literature and translation and none had received post-secondary education in the sciences. Thus, the language curriculum was separated from the subject-area curriculum. Language instructors taught "language, culture, literature," whereas subject-area professors taught agronomy, zootechnics, genetics, biochemistry, economics. As for writing instruction, it was included within the second language curriculum and, from what I recall, amounted to teacher's written feedback on school-type essays about a variety of subjects but engineering. It also was supplemented by grammatical instruction about tense, aspect,

prepositions, and other linguistic items known to be troublesome for foreign language learners.

Thus, as in Shiori's case, my subject-area professors did not provide any specific, explicit guidance about the French-medium or English-medium academic and professional discourses of their disciplines. Nor did my language teachers at INA PG, who taught me only an "all-purpose" variety of their language. As a scientific second language learner, I found this curriculum to be altogether unacceptable, as did many of my fellow students who expressed frustrations about their language courses. My realization that the learning needs of language learners in the disciplines other than literature are frequently not addressed in existing language and writing instruction programs is one reason that led me to enroll in a master's program in Second Language Education (SLE). When I began this program, I hoped that a combination of backgrounds in the sciences and applied linguistics would prepare me to teach language courses tailored for scientific and engineering students. I especially turned to English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for Science and Technology (EST), a teaching movement devoted to the analysis of scientific discourse, the assessment of language needs, and the design of language courses specifically designed for scientific language learners (for a review, cf. Johns & Dudley-Evans, 1991; Swales, 1988).

During my master's program (1996-1998), my interest in scientific language learners led me to investigate the two advanced university writing courses to which Shiori was referred, FAW and AWC. I joined the FAW class with Shiori and twenty other students from Engineering, Mathematics, Computer Science, Biology, Atmospheric and Oceanographic Science, Psychology. As for the AWC course, I sat in on a section for Engineering students in various subdisciplines of Mining and Metal Engineering. When I began my research project, I was most interested in the ways in which instructors with backgrounds in the Arts, Composition, and Education can teach writing to graduate students who specialize in other disciplines, especially scientific disciplines. The following questions piqued my interest in explaining biliteracy development among scientific language learners:

1) How can writing instructors and student writers with different disciplinary background knowledge bridge the knowledge gaps that separate them?;

2) Do writing instructors attempt to teach writing in the students' context-specific disciplines or do they teach "all-purpose," generic writing skills?;

3) If writing instructors attempt to teach writing in the students' disciplines, how do they deal with discipline-specific discourses that they may not have appropriated themselves?

During the data collection periods for this inquiry about academic writing instruction at postsecondary level, I began to realize the hidden assumptions underlying my initial research questions. Specifically, I began to realize that my questions were grounded in my belief that writing instruction in the students' disciplines was better than a generalist approach. I also realized that my hidden agenda was to promote the type of instruction which I thought to be best and that such attitude was attributable to my varied social identities as a scientist, engineer, second language learner, and prospective second language instructor. These realizations made me reframe my research questions within a more open, inclusive, sociocultural, Neo-Vygotskian perspective (e.g., Cobb, 1994; Daniels, 1996; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Moll, 1992; Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Wertsch, 1985a, 1985b).

Ethnographer Harry Wolcott (1987) helps explain the shift in perspective that I was experiencing. He defines "Ethnographic Intent" as the commitment "to employ cultural interpretation" (p. 54) and makes a distinction between educators using the descriptive tools of ethnography and educational ethnographers actually "*doing ethnography*" (p. 54):

> For the most part, the kind of information that ethnography is *not* well suited to provide is the kind of help educators most often seek; educational ethnography usually is undertaken with educator preoccupation for improvement (or at least "change") in mind. To paraphrase the late Solon T. Kimball, most so-called educational research is really reform in disguise. The ethnographic goal of understanding another way of life is not sufficient for the reform-oriented educator who expects "understanding" to be linked with efforts at improvement. (p. 53).

In the course of my inquiry, the nature of my intent evolved from educational to ethnographic. I no longer tried to impose my views about what instructors

should do but sought to understand what they do, what they say they do, and why they do it. More specifically, I tried to capture the socio-cultural basis of their goal-directed teaching practices in relating individual behaviors and perceptions to broader socio-cultural and institutional contexts.

In keeping with these changes in research perspectives, I refined my research questions as follows:
1) How do university writing instructors in an English-medium university position themselves within a complex web of varied orientations, traditions, methods, approaches to writing instruction when they are dealing with students whose disciplinary backgrounds are different from their own?
2) How does their positioning influence their teaching practices, especially their engagement in the activity of teaching writing in the students' disciplines?

To investigate these questions, in Chapter 1, I situate this study within two educational fields, First Language (L1) composition and Second Language (L2) education. Given the broad literature of these fields, I introduce relevant studies and issues by examining a *TESOL Quarterly* forum between second language writing instructors (Braine, 1988; Johns, 1988; Spack, 1988a, 1988b, 1988c). I also define and discuss: (a) key concepts, e.g., culture, community, cultural stance; (b) two research perspectives, i.e., socio-epistemic and mentalistic approaches to inquiry; (c) two relevant educational movements in L1 and L2 writing instruction, WAC, ESP; and (d) varied influences in composition theory, e.g., expressivist, cognitivist, and socio-constructivist influences. In Chapter 2, I locate this study within a Neo-Vygotskian theoretical framework and define the concept of "teaching writing in the disciplines" in terms of socio-cultural activity (Leont'ev, 1981), semiotic mediation (Vygotsky, 1978), and social practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In Chapter 3, I discuss my epistemological principles, provide background information about the research site, and describe my research methodology. I highlight my postmodern, socio-constructivist approach to inquiry and examine my use of the three tools of qualitative interpretive inquiry, observations, interviews, and documents Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). In Chapter 4, I analyze varied data sets and examine how two writing instructors' cultural stances toward academic writing instruction inform their goal-directed

teaching practices. In the Epilogue, I discuss my research findings, explore further research avenues, and retrospectively reflect on my inquiry and research intent.

CHAPTER 1
POSITIONING THIS STUDY WITHIN
FIELDS OF EDUCATION

De quoi sert-il que la raison nous éclaire quand la passion nous conduit?[2]

Rousseau, 1712-1778

The notion [of social investment] presupposes that when language learners speak, they are not only exchanging information with target language speakers but they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world.

Peirce, 1995, p. 18

During the Enlightenment, philosophers, including Rousseau, drew a distinction between the logic of passion and the logic of reason. The former meant a type of argumentation in which arguers first have passionate convictions about an issue, take positions accordingly, and then make up arguments to support their position in an apparently logical and rational manner. In the latter, the order is reversed, that is arguers consider arguments first, use their reason to weigh the arguments against one another, and only then derive their convictions or "passions" from such a rational appraisal. Rousseau's rhetorical question quoted above conveys a cautionary message that we might confuse the logic of reason with the logic of passion. Yet, can we do otherwise than first have convictions and then draw supportive arguments? Even with the best of intentions, no arguer is a *tabula rasa*; he or she has assumptions, pre-established schemata, and a set of convictions. Isn't it possible, then, that the hidden assumptions which underlie each and every argument allow the arguer's convictions to take precedence in the logic of his/her argumentation?

Two centuries after Rousseau, Peirce (1995) reviews the role of motivation and social identity in language learning from a poststructuralist perspective (e.g., Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977; Cherryhomes, 1988; Weedon,

---

[2] "Why should reason enlighten us when passion drives us?"

1987) and "foreground[s] the role of language as constitutive of and constituted by a language learner's social identity" (p. 13). Her argument about language learners can easily be transposed to any speakers, especially as they engage in polemical debates. Thus, "when [arguers] speak, they are not only exchanging information with target language speakers but they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world" (p. 18). This is why Rousseau's neat distinction between the logic of passion and the logic of reason breaks down, for even when speakers use their reason to argue ideas, they commit their sense of self to the argument—which give them enough strength and passion to support their convictions, assumptions, and positions. Ideational debates are sites of struggle where the contenders construct and negotiate their multiple social identities.

Academic debates offer interesting insights into the social construction of knowledge in a discipline (e.g., Bazerman, 1988; Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984; Myers, 1990). In this chapter, I analyze a debate surrounding Spack's (1988a) article about "Initiating ESL Students Into the Academic Discourse Community: How Far Should We Go?" This debate concerns the roles that writing instructors should play in the teaching of writing in the students' disciplines. Spack's question provides a useful frame to position my inquiry within two educational fields, L1 Composition Instruction and Second Language Education. Given that ideational debates are but the visible part of inner, hidden struggles involving the debaters' convictions, assumptions, positions, and sense of self, I analyze both Spack's arguments and presuppositions, her ideas and metaphors, her sense of theoretical self and socio-cultural self as gleaned from interrogating her texts.

Spack's (1988a) Position And Positioning

As an ESL college-level writing instructor, Spack (1988a, 1988b, 1988c) has engaged in a debate with Braine (1988) and Johns (1988) about the roles that writing instructors should assume in the teaching of writing in the students' disciplines. In the TESOL Quarterly, she defends the position that

> (a) the teaching of writing in the disciplines should be left to teachers of those disciplines and (b) L2 English composition teachers should focus

on general principles of inquiry and rhetoric, with emphasis on writing
from sources (p. 29).

To support her position, she reviews the "numerous approaches to the
teaching of writing in programs for ESL college students" since the late
seventies and identifies a "disturbing trend ... toward having teachers of
English, including teachers of freshman composition, teach students to write
in disciplines other than English" (p. 30). She objects to this trend on the
grounds that it "may lead many in the composition field to assign papers that
they are ill-equipped to handle." She further argues that since "the teaching
of rhetoric cannot be divorced from the teaching of content ... English faculty
who have little or no knowledge of a discipline cannot adequately teach or
respond to discipline-specific writing." In her words, her position is that "we
should be careful to match our concern for students' practical needs with a
concern for teachers' knowledge and abilities." (p. 708) Given these abilities,

> the best [English composition teachers] can accomplish is to create
> programs in which students can learn general inquiry strategies,
> rhetorical principles, and tasks that can transfer to other course work.
> (pp. 40-41)

While arguing for her ideational position, Spack positions herself
socially and culturally within academic discourse communities. She adopts
a cultural stance (Maguire, 1994a) or cultural posture (Bruner, 1986), i.e. a set
of socioculturally-defined evaluative orientations regarding the debate in
which she engages about writing instruction. As Maguire (1994a) explains,

> Jerome Bruner argues that through language we impose a perspective
> on a scene or situation. His notion of culture posture implies a view
> about symbolic environments and how language users presume to
> operate within them. He defines cultural posture as the "manner in
> which a theory relates the growing individual to the culture at large since
> language is the coin in which the relationship is effected." (p. 117)

Cultural stance is a *stance* in the sense that it is a person's way of standing,
looking, attending, engaging; it is *cultural* in the sense that the adoption of a
stance by an individual is negotiated with others in symbolic and experienced
socio-cultural activity settings, including academic forums such as the
TESOL Quarterly. Spack's cultural stance constitutes and is constituted by

her ways of positioning herself within theoretical, cultural, social, institutional and political contexts.[3]

A key evaluative orientation within Spack's (1988a) cultural stance toward academic writing instruction appears to be her allegiance to the humanities. First, it is noteworthy that at the time she published her article in the TESOL Quarterly, she was affiliated with English Departments as Adjunct Lecturer/Special Instructor for Foreign Students at Tufts University and as Lecturer in the English Department at Boston University (p. 47). In keeping with her affiliations within Faculties of Arts, Spack (1988) clearly adopts a belletristic approach, in Jacob's (1987) term "tradition," toward writing instruction. For instance, Spack concludes her argument with the following statements:

> It is ironic that the pressure on ESL/English teachers to teach in writing of other disciplines is manifesting itself at precisely the time when influential technological institutes ... are funding programs to increase student exposure to the humanities in an effort to produce more well-rounded, open-minded students. The English composition course is and should be a humanities course: a place where students are provided the enrichment of reading and writing that provoke thought and foster their intellectual and ethical development. (p. 46)

Spack expresses her belief in the formative value of humanities-based education. She even occasionally seems to imply that the humanities are somewhat superior to other academic fields, including the sciences. For instance, she (1988, p. 39) questions the quality of scientific writing by drawing on an extended satirical quotation from an editor of a scholarly scientific research journal, Woodford (1967):

---

[3] Maguire's (1994a) and Bruner's (1986) related notions of cultural stance, cultural posture, and cultural positioning can be compared with the feminist notion of "positionality." In *Knowledge, Difference, and Power* (Goldberg, Tarule, McVicker, Belenly, 1996), Goldberg (1996) defines positionality as "the larger cultural, social, and political context of individual lives" (p. 4). Maher and Tetreault elaborate on this definition and argue that "positionality... is the concept, articulated by feminist thinkers, that knowledge of any topic is valid only as it acknowledges the knowers' varying positions in any specific context, positions always defined by enactments of the dynamics of gender, race, class, and other signitificant dimensions of societal domination.... Positionality cannot be viewed solely through the lens of individual development, as the term itself signals that context is key to understanding." (p. 160). Central to the feminist notion of positionality is a focus on power relations and agency. Maguire (1994a) and Bruner (1986) place greater emphasis on the role of language and symbolic environments in socio-cultural positioning within specific contexts of situation.

The articles in our journals—even the journals with the highest standards—are, by and large, poorly written. Some of the worst are produced by the kind of author who consciously pretends to a "scientific scholarly" style. He takes what should be lively, inspiring, and beautiful and, in an attempt to make it seem dignified, chokes it to death with stately abstract nouns; next, in the name of scientific impartiality, he fits it with a complete set of passive constructions to drain away any remaining life's blood or excitement; then he embalms the remains in molasses of polysyllable, wraps the corpse in an impenetrable veil of vogue words, and buries the stiff old mummy with much pomp and circumstances in the most distinguished journal that will take it. (p. 173).

Spack (1988a) then endorses the editor's conclusion that since scientific texts may be exceedingly poorly written, having students read them "adversely affects students' ability to read, write, and think well" (p. 39). To wit, "English teachers, who traditionally have seen themselves as purveyors of effective prose might do well to wonder why they should present such poorly written texts to their students" (pp. 39-40).

In keeping with her belletristic, humanistic orientation toward writing instruction, Spack (1988a) positions herself in opposition to two teaching movements, namely the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) movement in L1 writing instruction and the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) movement in L2 instruction. In a review of both movements, she partly holds them responsible for the "disturbing trend ... toward having teachers of English, including teachers of freshman composition, teach students to write in disciplines other than English" (p. 30). Indeed, both movements have attempted curricular projects which Spack forcefully rejects, namely the design of instruction programs in L1 composition (WAC) and L2 education (ESP) that emphasized the discipline-specific features of the learners' target discourses.

The WAC and ESP movements have been reviewed elsewhere (Johns and Dudley-Evans, 1991; Russell, 1987, 1990; Spack, 1988a; Swales, 1988, 1990a, pp. 2-8). Although there have been many cross-curricular writing programs at many institutions since the turn of the century (Russell, 1990), today's WAC movement began in the early 1970s as a teaching innovation in Northern American universities. Modeled on a British program and inspired by the work of theorists like Britton, Burgess, Martin, and Rosen (1975) at the London

Institute of Education, the main purpose of WAC was to promote writing instruction "across the curriculum"[4] In response to faculty complaints about student writing, WAC practitioners designed freshman composition courses to prepare undergraduate students for the writing demands of their academic disciplines of study. WAC teachers also encouraged instructors in all disciplines to teach writing, occasionally collaborating with them to help them learn more about writing (Spack, 1988a).

As for ESP, according to Swales (1988, 1990a) the movement began in the 1960s with Barber's (1962) and Halliday, McIntosh, and Strevens' (1964) pioneering linguistic analyses of specific varieties of English, including English for Science and Technology (EST). These analyses were designed to identify and prioritize the language needs of specific groups of language learners, e.g., scientists, engineers, agriculturists, policemen. ESP-based research has since diversified and become more sophisticated. For instance, recent ESP studies (e.g., Brett, 1994; Gosden, 1992; Gunawardena, 1989; Hopkins and Dudley-Evans, 1988; Morrow, 1989) do not attempt to describe general features of ESP but focus on the communicative and rhetorical functions of specific linguistic choices (e.g., the use of the present perfect) in specific genres (e.g., the discussion sections of journal articles in chemistry). Despite a narrowing focus, ESP practitioners have continued to draw on learner needs assessment and discourse analysis[5] to design curricular materials specifically targeted for identifiable groups of learners within specific learning contexts (Johns and Dudley-Evans, 1991, pp. 298-299). One such context is the academic milieu; English for Academic Purposes (EAP) is the branch of ESP that deals with it.

In opposing WAC and ESP to humanistic approaches to writing instruction, Spack (1988a) considers the two movements together and blurs any differences between the two (p. 30). Yet, according to Swales (1990a), WAC and ESP serve different populations, have different historical roots, and

---

[4] The main difference between the initial British WAC program and American interpretations of it is that the fomer was motivated by an effort to elaborate and capitalize on a Vygotskian framework for educational purposes. American endeavors were focused on finding a pragmatic solution to an educational problem (Maguire, personal communication, 09/08/98).

[5] Johns & Dudley-Evans (1991) define discourse analysis in ESP as "the examination of written and oral language, generally for purposes of designing curricular materials" (p. 299).

belong to different disciplinary traditions. ESP caters to "non-native speakers (NNS) of English in a wide range of educational institutions spread across the world and varying in status from pre-college students to senior professors" (p. 30). It is rooted in applied linguistics, linguistics, and second language education, hence its focus on discourse analysis and language needs. WAC, on the other hand, serves "mostly native-speaker (NS) undergraduates concentrated in a single, extremely large college and university system [in North America]." It is rooted in L1 composition theory, rhetoric, and literature. Like composition theory, it has been marked by a succession of approaches, namely the expressivist (Britton et al., 1975; Coles, 1969; Elbow, 1973, 1981; Marcrorie, 1968; Murray, 1968), the cognitivist (Flower and Hayes, 1981; Kroll, 1978), the socio-cognitivist (Flower et al., 1990; Langer, 1987), socio-epistemic (Bizzell, 1982a, 1982b), and socio-constructivists or socio-constructionists (Bruffee, 1984; Moll, 1989; Vygotsky, 1986; Witte, 1992). These approaches have been reviewed by Faigley (1986) in L1 composition theory.[6]

Thus, Spack (1988a) seems to ignore important differences between ESP and WAC, many of which are attributable to what some scholars see as the broader disciplinary divide that separates L1 composition fields from second language education fields (cf. Matsuda, 1998; Santos, 1992; Silva, Leki, and Carson, 1997). Only recently have the two movements begun to converge, when, according to Swales (1990a), "influential groups of people in the composition field in the United States have been moving in a direction that brings them closer to the contemporary world of English for Academic Purposes" (p. 4). Namely, Swales (1990a) attributes the convergence in part to a move in the composition field from purely cognitivist approaches to socio-cognitivist and socio-constructivist approaches to writing.

> One relevant development has been a growing sense that cognitive models of the writing process, such as the influential Carnegie Mellon model (e.g. Flower and Hayes, 1981) lack a social dimension. Bizzell (1982) in a watershed paper argued that writing, especially student

---

[6] For introductions to teaching and research approaches in L1 composition and discussions about the varied influences of these approaches on L2 writing instruction , cf. Johns (1990), Raimes (1991), and Silva (1990). Expressivist and cognitivist approaches to writing both focus on the individual writer and his or her writing processes but differ in their emphasis on writing as creation and self-inquiry (expressivist) and writing as problem solving (cognitivist). Socio-cognitivist and socio-epistemic theorists add a social view to cognitivist approaches and concern themselves with audience, communicative purpose, and context of situation. Socio-constructivist or socioconstrucionist theorists focus on writers in particular settings and in embedding socio-cultural contexts.

writing in colleges and universities, should not be viewed solely as an individually-oriented, inner-directed cognitive process, but as much as an acquired response to the discourse conventions which arise from preferred ways of creating and communicating knowledge within particular communities. The view that writing is typically a socially-situated act has been reinforced by the aims and experiences of the recent Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) movement (Young and Fulwiler, 1986). (p. 4).

Following the 1980s move from cognitivist to socio-cognitivist and socio-constructivist models of writing, WAC researchers and practitioners began to direct their endeavors to the specific needs, target discourses, and learning contexts of their students. ESP has entertained these very research objectives since the beginning of the movement. One consequence of these now overlapping ESP-WAC research agendas is the great importance they both give to discipline-specific features in university writing instruction. As two WAC researchers, Faigley and Hansen (1985) argue:

If teachers of English are to offer courses that truly prepare students to write in other disciplines, they will have to explore why those disciplines study certain subjects, why certain methods of enquiry are sanctioned, how the conventions of a discipline shape a text in that discipline, how individual writers represent themselves in the text, how a text is read and disseminated, and how one text influences subsequent texts. In short, teachers will have to adopt a rhetorical approach to the study of writing in the disciplines, an approach that examines the negotiation of meaning among writers, readers and subject matters (p. 149).

Faigley and Hansen's (1985) recommendation is the very "disturbing trend in L2 writing instruction" which Spack (1988a) identifies and opposes (p. 30).

Not surprisingly, Spack's (1988a) arguments have antagonized major proponents of ESP, including Braine (1988) and Johns (1988). Braine reproaches Spack for having "espouse[d] a somewhat vague concept of 'general principles of inquiry and rhetoric'" (p. 700). He distinguishes between ESP and WAC (p. 701), argues for the necessity of integrating ESL and academic courses (pp. 701-702), and point out the achievements in ESP/EAP curricular programs (p. 701). One of his major arguments is that "the English teacher remains the language expert, but the students are the sources of information from the various disciplines" (p. 702). Johns (1988) takes issue with Spack's "conservative view" (1988, p. 706) and regrets her

"failure to distinguish among individual differences in student proficiency levels, learning environments, and majors" (p. 706). She maintains that "the most important contribution of the ESP movement is its insistence upon designing curricula specific to students and their target cultures" (p. 706). She contends that students need more than general reading and writing tasks. Rather, they need help to appropriate the discourses of their academic disciplines, e.g. by means of instruction in the methods of ethnography (p. 706). In her response to Johns and Braine, Spack (1888b, 1888c) re-examines their arguments and contends that they did not address the problem which she has raised in the first place, namely that writing instructors with disciplinary backgrounds in English are ill-equipped to teach writing in other disciplines (pp. 703-705 and pp. 707-708).

Thus, the debate surrounding Spack's argument (1988a) has sparked a polarized view of writing instruction in higher education. On the one hand, there are those, like Spack (1988a), who defend a Generalist, Humanist view toward university writing instruction. This view assumes that teachers of English should focus on "general principle of inquiry and rhetoric" (p. 29) and provide liberal education in the humanities. On the other hand, ESP practitioners, among others, adopt a discipline-specific, context-specific view, according to which writing instructors should endeavor to help learners appropriate the discourses of their disciplines. In Spack's terms, proponents of the second view seek to "teach writing in the disciplines" whereas proponents of the first view "leave the teaching of writing in the disciplines to the teachers of those disciplines" (p. 29). The latter group may therefore be said to teach writing "outside the disciplines."

Metaphors and Assumptions in Spack's (1988a) Argument

Metaphors and assumptions provide insights into someone's belief system. They help us to understand how speakers and writers construct their sense of self and interrelate within social networks through language. In this section, I examine two sets of related metaphors Spack (1988a) uses: (a) The "deficiency" and "gap" metaphors; (b) the metaphors of "the academic discourse community" and "the culture of the university", as well as her use

of the collective pronoun "we" to metaphorically refer to the community of college-level English teachers.

Spack (1988a) uses a "gap" and "deficiency" metaphor in the introduction to her main arguments about writing instruction in the disciplines (p. 30). She identifies "a large *gap* between what students bring to the academic community and what the academic community expects of them" (p. 30, my emphasis). She quotes Bizzell (1982b) to point out that such a gap exists "in the case of native English-speaking basic writers— academically disadvantaged students who have achieved only very modest standards of high school literacy." However, she argues that

> the *gap* is even wider for ESL students who can be classified as basic writers, for it includes L2 linguistic and cultural *deficiencies* . Even for ESL students who are highly literate in their native language, a similar *gap* exists: The students' *lack* of L2 linguistic cultural knowledge can stand in the way of academic success. (p. 30, my emphasis)

Considering this gap, she maintains that

> It is clearly the obligation of the ESL college-level writing teacher, whether teaching basic writers or highly literate students, to find a way to *narrow the gap*. (p. 30, my emphasis).

These related metaphors of "gap," "deficiencies," "lack," deserve two comments. First, it is paradoxical that Spack identifies a gap between academic expectations and student backgrounds but fails to identify a similar gap between student expectations and her own academic background. Indeed, her very point is that teachers of English are ill-advised to teach writing in the disciplines because they *lack* the ability to do so. ESP practitioners, on the other hand, believe that they must make every effort to address the specific student needs, including the effort of learning and teaching the discourses of the students' disciplines. Spack (1988a) herself admits that a few individual teachers, including ESP practitioner Swales, may succeed in appropriating scientific discourses (pp. 38-40). However, she does not seem inclined to give the effort a thought. This attitude may well be reflective of her Humanist, Generalist stance toward writing instruction and scientific writing.

Second, Spack's (1988a) references to "gaps" and "deficiencies" conjure up a host of debated issues in education and curriculum development, such as student empowerment, learner-centered vs. teacher-centered curricula, and mentalistic, deficit views vs. socio-cultural, socially-situated views of learning. A recent debate initiated by Firth and Wagner (1997) about a paradigmatic divide in SLA research provides a theoretical framework against which Spack's (1988a) deficiency/gap metaphors can be analyzed.

In a review of "discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research," Firth and Wagner (1997) identify and oppose two fundamental "perspectives" or "views" in SLA: The cognitive, individualistic, mentalistic orientations and the anthropological, contextual, interactional, social orientations. The authors contend that within the first view, the concepts of

> *nonnative speaker* (NNS), *learner*, and *interlanguage* ... prefigure as monolithic elements in SLA.... For the most part, they are applied and understood in an oversimplified manner, leading, among other things, to an analytic mindset that elevates an idealized "native" speaker above a stereotypicalized "nonnative," while viewing the latter as a defective communicator, limited by an underdeveloped communicative competence. (p. 285)

In contrast, within the social and contextual perspective,

> language is not only a cognitive phenomenon, the product of the individual's brain; it is also fundamentally a social phenomenon, acquired and used interactively, in a variety of contexts for myriad practical purposes. (p. 296)

For instance, the excerpt I used from Peirce (1995) in the introduction to this chapter suggests a social and contextual perspective on language learning. Important to this perspective is that language learning is a site where language learners construct and struggle with multiple social identities, such as "father, man, friend, local, guest, opponent, husband, colleague, teammate..." (Firth and Wagner, 1997, p. 292).

In using deficiency/gap metaphors to describe student writers, Spack (1988a) adopts a "cognitive" perspective as described by Firth and Wagner (1997). Yet, somewhat contradictorily, she also points out that the

> problems [of basic writers] with academic writing may not lie in a lack of innate ability but rather in the social and cultural factors that influence

> composing.... As Bizzell (1982[a]) suggests, we must help students master the language and culture of the university; the role of the university writing teacher is to initiate students into the academic writing community. (p. 30)

Spack's (1988a) insistence on culture and socio-cultural factors appears to be at odd with a cognitive perspective and more in tune with a socio-cultural perspective. Peirce (1995), however, helps unravel this paradox. She argues that (cognitive-oriented) SLA theorists have drawn "artificial distinctions... between the individual and the social, which lead to arbitrary mapping of particular factors on either the individual or the social, with little rigorous justification" (p. 11). This critique seems specifically relevant to Spack (1988a). A social contextual perspective, as adopted by Peirce (1995), deconstructs "dichotomous distinctions between the language learner and the social world" (p. 11) and construes language learners as having multiple and contested social identities within specific social, cultural, political, and institutional contexts. She sees language as a process of knowing and coming to know (Maguire, personal communication, 09/07/98).

Another set of metaphors that emerge from Spack's (1988a) discourse about writing instruction connect to the concepts of "the academic discourse community," "the culture of the university," as well as her use of the collective pronoun "we." These metaphors appear early in Spack (1988a), either in the title or in her introduction (pp. 29-30). Spack uses the collective pronoun "we" to address her potential readers, with whom she identifies herself as an L2 writing instructor. Her use of "the academic discourse community" metaphor refers to the community into which student writers must be "initiated" with the help of "the university writing teacher" (p. 30). Speaking in the name of the latter, Spack argues that "*we* must help students master *the* language and culture of *the* university" (p. 30, my emphasis). All these metaphors rest on the assumption that there are idealized, homogeneous communities of L2 writing instructors, students, and scholars. In particular, the academic discourse community can be identified by its unique and characteristic "language and culture" (p. 30).

These metaphors warrant critical commentary, including a discussion about such fundamental concepts as "community" and "culture." First,

current theorists within a socio-cultural perspective challenge the very notion of well-defined groups having well-identified cultures. Peirce (1995), for instance, challenges Schumann's (1976) concepts of "acculturation" and "social distance" because they lie on the assumption that there are "*group* differences between the language learner *group* and the target language *group*" (p. 11, my emphasis). Likewise, scholars such as Bizzell (1982b), Casanave (1995), and Russell (1990) question the apparently cohesive and unitary nature of disciplinary communities and the mythical notion of "the academic discourse community." For instance, Casanave[7] (1995) argues that

> Once applied to specific settings, the compelling "disciplinary community" metaphor tends to break down, as the meaningful units get smaller and smaller. We find subcommunities within communities, and multiple embeddings of microsocieties within subcommunities, and finally a great diversity of a small number of individuals in the innermost circle. (p. 88)

The question then arises whether the concept of community as shared understandings and ways of doings is an idealized construct with little bearing on the experienced, lived-in world of individual scholars. Indeed, the temptation is to adopt a relativistic position within which the only valid construct is that of idiosyncratic individuals interacting within specific settings. In adopting this extreme position, however, it becomes difficult to describe the shared understandings, representations, and ways of doing from which individuals derive their sense of belonging to particular groups and communities. On the other hand, an idealistic view of community assumes theoretical and ideal structures whose existence is not supported by empirical evidence from individual and social behaviors and perceptions.

Genre theorist Miller (1994) provides a definition of "community" that avoids both relativistic and idealistic extremes. Drawing on Gidden's (1984) structuration theory, she argues that structure is a "virtual order" that exists "only in instantiations in... practices and as memory traces orienting the conduct of knowledge agents" (p. 70). She then defines a "rhetorical community" as

---

[7] Geertz (1975) makes a similar argument in *Local Knowledge*.

a virtual entity, a discursive projection, a rhetorical construction. It is the community invoked, represented, presupposed, or developed in rhetorical discourse. It is constituted by attributions of characteristic joint rhetorical actions, genres of interaction, ways of getting things done, including reproducing itself. Like Giddens' structures, rhetorical communities 'exist' in human memories and in their specific instantiations in words: they are not invented anew but persist as structuring aspects of all forms of socio-rhetorical action. (p.73)

This definition can apply to the "academic discourse community" as invoked by Spack (1988a).[8] Hence, Spack's (1988a) metaphor of "academic discourse community" is relevant as long as it is not construed as a taxonomic and thing-in-itself collective but as the individual and social representation of one such collective among many. Similarly, culture is as much a group's way of knowing, behaving, believing as it is a group's way of *representing* this way of knowing, behaving, believing (Gertz, 1973)..[9] It is "a 'particular way of life' of a time and place, in all its complexity, *experienced* by a group that *understand itself as an identifiable group*. (Williams, 1976, p. 80, in Miller, 1994, p. 68, my emphasis).

Such definitions of culture and community eschew relativistic and idealistic views of human behavior. In emphasizing the mediating role of individual and shared representations, they allow emerging structures to be abstracted from complex, idiosyncratic, situation-specific behaviors. Through these structuring representations, individuals construct their social and cultural identities in particular contexts of situation (e.g., Ferdman, 1990). Bruner's (1986) and Maguire's (1994) related notions of cultural stance and cultural posture are useful concepts to capture the mediating role of language in social-cultural constructions of identity. As both authors argue, through language individuals impose on specific situations evaluative

---

[8] For other definitions and exegeses of the "discourse community" concept, cf. Swales (1990a), pp. 21-32, and Russell (1990), pp. 53-59. As for the term "academic," I apply it broadly in this thesis to designate any texts, contexts, interactions, situations that involve members of post-secondary institutions—whether they be students, faculty, staff—within post-secondary institutional settings.

[9] Compare Heller's definition of culture (1987), quoted in Ferdman (1990): "These [shared] ways of making sense of experience [as jointly constructed through interaction within a group], these beliefs, assumptions, and expectations about the world and how it works underlie what we think of as culture. However, culture is not only a set of beliefs and values that constitute our normal, everyday way view of the world; it also includes our normal, everyday ways of behaving." (p. 185).

perspectives from which they can position themselves within complex webs of cultures and communities.

In using the collective pronoun "we" and the metaphors of "the academic discourse community," "the culture and language of the university," Spack (1988a) imposes a perspective on academic contexts of situation. In using the definite article "the" in "the academic discourse community," she constructs and imposes her understanding that scholars form a single, identifiable, and homogeneous group. In her use of the pronoun "we," she identifies herself as a member of this group, and within it, the subgroup of "ESL college levels writing teacher" (p. 30). She further claims that ESL students must be "initiated" into the academic discourse community (pp. 29-30). She thereby invites them to become members of this community. Simultaneously, she implies that they are outsiders, as evidenced by her use of the pronoun "they" instead of "we" as she refers to them. In evoking a process of "entering," the "initiation" metaphor shares with the "community" metaphor the physical notion of boundary between an inside and an outside (e.g., Russell, 1990, p. 53). Both metaphors imply inclusion and exclusion, access and refusal. In the next chapter, I critique the assumptions underlying these metaphors from a socio-cultural perspective.

Positioning My Argument Relative to Spack's (1988a) Argument

When I first read the TESOL Quarterly forum surrounding Spack (1988a), I spontaneously identified myself with ESP practitioners and "sided with" them. Where Spack saw a gap between academic expectations and student backgrounds (p. 30), I saw a gap between teacher backgrounds and student expectations. Namely, I wondered how to bridge the gap between the disciplinary backgrounds of writing instructors in literature, composition, and education and the disciplinary backgrounds of student writers in the sciences and engineering. As a scientific language learner, I related to the latter group. As a prospective L2 writing instructor, I related to the ESP movement because it seemed committed to address the specific learning needs of scientific language learners that I experienced. Thus, in engaging in the polemical debate surrounding Spack (1988a) at an ideational level, I now see that I was constructing multiple socio-cultural identities and positioning

myself within varied academic and non-academic communities, cultures, disciplines, traditions. As I explained in the Prologue, these evaluative orientations informed my early research questions.

However, in the course of inquiry into these questions, I began to realize the often hidden assumptions underlying both Spack (1988a) and my own research questions. In reading Firth and Wagner (1997), I relocated this study from a cognitive, mentalistic perspective to a socio-cultural perspective. This shift in perspective led me to question my own gap metaphor with its implications of deficiencies to be remedied. Instead, I sought to understand why and how teachers position themselves and teach the way they do in specific contexts of situation. I continued to use Spack (1988a) as a framework for a discussion about the role of university writing instructors in the teaching of writing in the disciplines. However, I have rephrased her question to reflect my changing perspective.[10] Instead of asking "Initiating ESL Students Into the Academic Discourse Community: How Far Should We Go?", I now pose my original research problem in a Joshua Fishman-like manner: "Initiating ESL Graduate Students Into English-medium, Northern American Academic Discourse Communities: Who Teaches What, to Whom, How, in What Contexts, and Why?"

Summary

In this chapter, I examined a rather polarized debate about academic writing instruction to introduce the major issues and concepts of my interpretive inquiry and locate them within specific fields of education. This debate, a 1988 forum of the *TESOL Quarterly* , opposed Spack (1988a, 1988b, 1988b) and Braine (1988) and Johns (1988). Spack argued that writing instructors should teach writing in their own disciplines, i.e. English Literature and the humanities. ESP practitioners Braine and Johns, on the other hand, contended that writing instructors should endeavor to address the specific needs of their students, including the discipline-specific features

---

[10] To be fair to Ruth Spack, she also seems to have changed her perspective. In a recent publication about "the acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study," Spack (1997) does not use deficiency/gap metaphors. She also admits that her new "finding challenges assumptions [she] had previously held about 'general inquiry strategies, rhetorical principles, and tasks that can transfer to other course work" (p. 50).

of their target discourses. I discussed the arguers' views and tried to analyze the implicit assumptions and evaluations underlying their contended metaphors. I challenged Spack's (1988a) metaphors of deficiency and gap, and her reference to "the culture and language of the university" (p. 30) and "the academic discourse community." I related Spack's position to Firth and Wagner's (1997) and Peirce (1995) criticisms of a prevalent mentalistic paradigm in SLA research. I argued that the socio-epistemic perspective to language learning that they favor is relevant to my inquiry about academic writing instruction in the disciplines. Within this perspective, I suggested definitions for culture and community, and rephrased Spack's questions about what instructors "should do" into questions about the socio-cultural basis of what they do in particular contexts of situations and why they do it. Throughout this Chapter, I also argued that in engaging in ideational debates, debaters position themselves socially and culturally, and impose their evaluative perspectives, or cultural stances (Bruner, 1986; Maguire, 1994), on their arguments. I concluded this chapter by engaging in researcher's reflexivity and described how my own socio-cultural positioning and research perspective evolved in the course of my interpretive inquiry. In the next chapter, I elaborate my theoretical framework and socio-cultural perspective.

CHAPTER 2
THE ACTIVITY OF "TEACHING WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES": A SOCIO-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

There are several classical dualist oppositions that in many contexts are treated as synonymous, or nearly so: abstract-concrete; general-particular; theory about the world, and the world so described. Theory is assumed to be general and abstract, the world concrete and particular.... [Contrary to common belief] both of them offer points of departure for starting to explore and produce an understanding of multiply determined, diversely unified—that is, complexly concrete—historical processes, of which particularities (including initial theories) are the result.... The goal is, in Marx's memorable phrase, to "ascend (from the particular and the abstract) to the concrete."

Lave and Wenger, 1991, p. 38

In the previous chapters, I introduced the research questions of this study, situated them within a socio-cultural perspective, and located them within specific SLA debate about writing instruction. In this chapter, I further define my socio-cultural theoretical framework. Specifically, I reconsider Spack's (1988a) phrase "the teaching of writing in the disciplines" and reconceptualize this construct as mediated socio-cultural activity (Leont'ev, 1981; Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1981) and situated social practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991) within a Vygotskian perspective.

The Teaching of Writing in the Disciplines
From the Perspective of Activity Theory

Activity theory offers a theoretical framework from which Spack's (1988a) phrase "the teaching of writing in the disciplines" can be reconceptualized. The related concepts of activity and tool are central to Marxist social theory and Soviet developmental psychology (cf. Kozulin, 1996; Wertsch, 1981). The theory of activity per se was first formulated by Vygotsky (1978, 1981a, 1981b, 1981c) and then elaborated by his former student Leont'ev (1981).[11] Its main principles are that: (a) activities are mediated by

---

[11]For a discussion about differences and similarities between Vygotsky and Leont'ev, cf. Kozulin, 1986.

technical and semiotic tools; (b) activities must be construed from a historical, developmental, and "genetic" perspective; (c) activities must be analyzed at individual, "microgenetic" and societal, "macrogenetic" levels; (d) activities and their constitutive actions are motive-oriented, goal-directed, and operationalized within specific settings (for reviews of activity theory, cf. Kozulin, 1986, Lantolf and Appel, 1994, pp. 16-22, Wertsch, 1985b, pp. 199-216).

Sign and Tool Mediation

Vygotsky (1981b) borrowed the concept of tool from Marx and Engel's dialectical materialism. However, he made an important distinction between technical and mechanical tools on the one hand, and psychological and semiotic tools, i.e. signs, on the other.

> The most essential feature distinguishing the psychological tool from the technical tool, is that it directs the mind and behaviour whereas the technical tool, which is also inserted as an intermediate link between human activity and the external, is directed toward producing one or other set of changes in the object itself. (p. 140)

Technical tools mediate human physical activities and labor, and contribute to human increasing adaptation to and mastery over nature. For instance, a saw allows a lumberjack to fell trees for building or burning. Semiotic tools mediate human mental activities and, more importantly, allowed human beings to gain control over their physical and mental activities. Vygotsky (1981c) gives the example of mnemonic devices, by means of which we make a new, artificial connection between naturally unrelated phenomena, e.g., tying of a knot in a handkerchief and buying batteries (p. 138). By making such artificial connections, we gain control over the time when we want to perform certain actions, and our actions become motivated by the ends we want to achieve rather than driven by spontaneous impulses.

The concept of mediation helps explain technical progress and cognitive development. It is central to an understanding of human learning and becoming. From a developmental and historical perspective, technically-mediated and semiotically-mediated activities bring about change in nature and human beings. For instance, the development of farming and farming tools have allowed increasing domestication of natural resources, changed

forests into fields, and contributed to settling human population. In turn, these transformations have opened new possibilities for human praxis, for instance in urban development. Because tools are transmittable, they allow newer generations to capitalize on former technical achievements. Every time humans use socially-evolved technical tools, they have the potential of furthering a chain of human developments that begins with the Stone Age. Technical tools are mediating structures between the past and the future.

Whereas technical mediation helps explain technical development, semiotic mediation helps explain cognitive development. Semiotic mediation is a key concept in Vygotsky's (1978) work on the development of higher mental functions (e.g., memory, volition, attention) among children. For instance, Vygotsky's above argument about mnemonic devices illustrates how human ability to make (semiotic) connections that do not exist in the natural world mediates the development of our voluntary attention. As in the case of technical mediation, semiotic tools, including language, have developed over human history and are ever changing in form and function (Maguire, personal communication, 08/07/98). However, semiotic tools are not simply "transmitted" from one user to the next. They cannot be bequeathed to heirs as real estate and movable property. Rather, children develop mastery over semiotic systems through social interaction with more knowledgeable peers and adults.

To capture the process of peer and adult mediation in the development of higher mental functions, Vygotsky (1978) defines the "zone of proximal development" as

> the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under the guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers. (p. 86)

As they actualize their learning potentials, children develop increasing control over their problem solving and other mental activities. At first, they are "object-regulated," that is their activities are directly conditioned by their immediate environment (e.g., they want to grasp a cookie when they see it). Within their zone of proximal developments, they are "other-regulated," that is they learn to achieve their ends through the mediation of others. When they

have mastered independent problem solving, they have become "self-regulated."

Thus, central to Vygotsky's description of semiotically mediated cognitive development is his insistence on other regulation. That is, he insists on the interactive, social, and cultural basis of semiotic mediation and semiotically mediated development. For him, individual mental functions, including speech, are internalized social functions. He (1981a) refers to this internalization process as the "general law of cultural development," which he formulates as follows:

> Any function in the child's cultural development appears twice, or on two planes, first it appears on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane, first it appears between people as an interpsychological category, and then within the child as an intrapsychological category. This is equally true with regard to voluntary attention, logical memory, and the formation of concepts, and the development of volition. (p. 163)

Thus, Vygotsky construes thought as inner speech, i.e. internalized social, communicative speech.

Vygotsky's emphasis on the semiotic mediation of human activities raises important questions about the particular activity of teaching writing in the disciplines. For instance, what mediating structures do writing instructors provide to help their students progress through their zones of proximal development? Do they create a collaborative learning environment in their classrooms to allow peer-mediated learning? How do the instructors themselves use mediating resources, such as writing textbooks and colleague support? More importantly, what "mental functions" and concepts do instructors and students "internalize" or appropriate when they engage in semiotically-mediated teaching and learning activities?

Another important aspect of Vygotsky's (1978) concept of semiotic mediation concerns the socio-cultural dimension of mediation. In an analysis of Vygotsky's use of culture, Wertsch and Tulviste (1996) construe Vygotsky's notion of semiotic tools as "cultural tools" and explain that "Vygotsky understood culture in terms of sign systems" (p. 62). Thus, semiotic mediation not only helps explain the development of higher mental functions

that occurs in adult-child interaction. It also helps explain how children become socialized into a culture during their social interactions with adults and peers. For Vygotsky (1981b), "everything that is cultural is social. Culture is the product of social life and human social activity." (p. 61) Reciprocally, I would argue that everything that is social is cultural, that is semiotically-mediated local interactions between a child and an adult relate them to embedding cultures. When children appropriate cultural signs, they appropriate a culture; when they appropriate a culture, they appropriate cultural signs. Thus, the question arises as to what disciplinary cultures do students learn in the context of their academic writing classrooms?

Vygotsky's construal of human activities as socio-cultural and semiotically mediated processes also sheds new light on Maguire's (1994, 1998) and Bruner's (1986) notion of cultural stance. I quoted Bruner's (1986) definition in Chapter 1 as "the manner in which a theory relates the growing individual to the culture at large since language is the coin in which the relationship is effected." (p. 117) A cultural stance can be reconceptualized as an organized sign system of beliefs and perceptions which, much as Vygotsky's (1981b) psychological tool, "directs the mind and behavior" (p. 140). By adopting a cultural stance, an individual imposes her own perspective or evaluative orientation on a context of situation. At the same time, this perspective is embedded in a cultural semiotic system, language, that relates her to "the culture at large." A fundamental question of my inquiry is how the writing instructors' cultural stances, as evaluative sign systems, mediate their engagement in, or construction of their activity of teaching writing in the disciplines.

Thus far, I have argued that human activities are mediated by technical and semiotic tools and expanded on Vygotsky's notion of semiotic, socio-cultural mediation. His concept provides an explanation about how children develop higher mental functions such as memory, volition, and form concepts through their social interactions with adults and peers. Semiotic mediation also helps us relate local processes of individual learning and development with more global processes of socialization into embedding cultural contexts. It therefore provides theoretical insight into the learning and socialization processes that underlie academic writing instruction in

specific classrooms and at higher, institutional and societal levels. In the following sections, I further explain how Vygotsky's developmental perspective and Leont'ev's activity theory contributes to an understanding of the relationship between the social and cultural dimensions of human activities. I examine the relevance of their approaches to my classroom-based inquiry about academic writing instruction.

Microgenesis and Macrogenesis

Vygotsky (1978) valued developmental, historical, "genetic," and "genotypic" analyses rather than static, "phenotypic," and descriptive analyses. He argued for the

> ... need to concentrate not on the *product* of development but on the very *process* by which higher forms are established... To encompass in research the process of a given thing's development in all its phases and changes—from birth to death—fundamentally means to discover its nature, its essence, for "it is only in movement that a body shows what it is." (p. 64-65)

For instance, the notion of the zone of proximal development highlights Vygotsky's interest in the process by which children realize their learning potential rather than in the description of their actual levels of development. Similarly, his concept of semiotic mediation helps explain the mental and socio-cultural processes of human development.

Vygotsky (1978) distinguished between macrogenetic and microgenetic levels of analysis. By the former, he referred to phylogenesis and socio-cultural history; by the latter, he included ontogenesis and microgenesis *stricto sensu*. The main difference between ontogenesis and microgenesis is that the first describes the cognitive development of an individual during his or her lifetime; the second designates local forms of individual cognitive development that take place within short spans of time in adult-child and child-child dyads and small group interactions (Lantolf and Appel, 1994, pp. 22-27).

In this study, macrogenetic analysis refers to the study of the societal, political, and institutional contexts within which the focal writing instructors teach. Specifically, I consider the focal university classrooms of this study

within the "nested contexts" (Maguire, 1994a, 1994b, 1997) of the university, the teaching units, and the city and country where the university is located. I also situate these contexts from a historical, developmental perspective and consider current socio-cultural practices and artifacts as the surviving traces of former academic and nonacademic traditions, practices, and cultures. For instance, in Chapter 3, I try to analyze how the current theoretical orientations of the focal teaching units have evolved from former orientations. Put another way, I try to show how former evaluative orientations still exist in current ones.

By microgenesis, I refer to the developmental patterns that I have seen emerge from teacher-student and student-student interactions in the two focal university classrooms of this study. I also embed these local developmental patterns within the teachers' individual histories (ontogenesis). An important aspect of microgenetic analysis concerns the mediating role that symbolic and physical tools, such as course texts, course handouts, and student drafts can play in teacher-student and student-student interactions. For example, in Chapter 4, I analyze how course texts and teacher feedback on student drafts mediate teaching and learning practices. Similarly, in Chapter 3, I argue that documents such as articles about a broad range of issues in first and second language writing mediated my interactions with other research participants and helped us construct our own individual and shared understandings of writing instruction. I also discuss the role of research as collaborative, shared, and negotiated exchange.

Leont'ev's (1981) activity theory offers a way of relating macrogenetic and microgenetic perspectives on human socio-cognitive behavior. It aims at conceptualizing the relationship between individual psychological processes and socio-cultural institutional phenomena, in Wertsch's terms (1985a) "mind and society" (pp. 209-231). Specifically, Leont'ev's activity theory tries to capture the relationship between "what an individual or group is doing in a particular setting" (p. 211) and broader socio-cultural, institutional contexts. Leont'ev claims that

> human psychology is concerned with the activity of concrete individuals, which takes place either in a collective—that is, jointly with other people—or in a situation in which the subject deals directly with the surrounding world of objects—for example, the potter's wheel or the

writer's desk. However, if we removed human activity from the system of social relationships and social life, it would not exist and have no structure. With all its varied forms, the human individual's activity is a system in the system of social relations. It does not exist without these relations.... It turns out that the activity of separate individuals depends on their place in society, on the conditions that fall to their lot, and on idiosyncratic, individual factors. (in Wertsch, 1985a, pp. 211-212).

Leont'ev was interested in how specific, "concrete" activities relate to broader, societal segments of human activity, such as schooling or labor. His interest motivated his theoretical distinctions between motive, goal, and condition.

Motives and Goals

Leont'ev's activity theory distinguishes three levels of analysis: (1) that of activity (*stricto sensu*) and motive, (2) that of action and goal, and (3) that of operation and conditions (Wertsch, 1985b, p. 204). The first level focuses on the social institutional context or milieu in which concrete behavior takes place. The context of an activity is not geographically defined but individually, socially, and culturally constructed. As Wertsch (1985b) explains,

an activity is not determined or even strongly circumscribed by the physical or perceptual context in which humans function. Rather it is a sociocultural interpretation or creation that is imposed on the context by the participants.... It is grounded in a set of assumptions about appropriate roles, goals, means used by the participants in that setting. (pp. 203-212).

The motive of an activity is the "guiding and integrating force" (p. 212) of the assumptions that an activity setting evokes in individuals. It "specifies what is to be maximized in that setting" (p. 212). The levels of actions and operations describe how individuals actually engage in an activity: how they gauge the appropriate goals, means-ends relations, and conditions relative to the setting and how they attempt to fulfill them (pp. 203-216).

Hence, a way to relate individual activity to societal activity is to focus on how individuals "construct" the specific activities in which they engage within socio-culturally defined contexts. For instance, in the case of university writing instruction, a relevant research question is how writing instructors construct their teaching activities both within the specific settings of their classrooms and broader institutional contexts such as teaching units

and the university milieu (e.g., Parks and Maguire, in press). This question leads to another, namely how writing instructors define their teaching goals and execute goal-directed actions under the operational constraints (symbolic and physical resources) of their classrooms and particular contexts of situation.

The motive for university writing instruction is also worth investigating, although more difficult to assess. Werstch (1985a) suggests that the motive for formal schooling is "learning for learning's sake" (p. 213), whereas the motive of labor is productivity (p. 212). Lantolf and Appel (1994) agree with Wertsch on the latter but disagree on the former (p. 48). They argue that Wertsch's conceptualization of the motive of education is "too narrow":

> In a capitalist society, for instance, the motive for learning can be the capital into which the learning, or symbolic capital accumulated during educational activity (Bourdieu, 1990), can be converted at the conclusion of the process. (p. 48)

As seen in Chapter 1, Peirce (1995) adopts a similar view when she criticizes Gardner's (1989) traditional concept of learner motivation and puts forward Bourdieu and Passeron's (1977) notion of learner investment in cultural capital. Bourdieu (1993) defines linguistic habitus as the "production of utterances adapted to a situation, or rather adapted to a market or field" (p. 78). He uses habitus to conceptualize a process of socialization whereby the dominant modes of thought and experience inherent in the social world are internalized by social agents (Maguire, personal communication). Within the academic "market place," university writing instruction may be viewed as a supplier of symbolic and material resources that can be exchanged for other, more valuable cultural and learning "commodities."

Given these contentions about the motive of formal schooling, the question arises whether the motive for university writing instruction is "learning for learning's sake" (Wertsch, 1985b) or "social investment" in cultural capital (Peirce, 1995). The common frustrations among writing instructors that composition courses are too often assigned remedial, ancillary functions within academia may be interpreted in terms of conflicting motives for writing instruction and larger institutional agendas.

Whereas writing instructors may consider their courses as having intrinsic value, subject-area faculty and students may view the same courses from the perspective of their exchange value. For example, in the Prologue, I have shown that Shiori's subject-area professors referred her to second language composition courses so that she can write better term papers for their own courses. Thus, in their views, composition courses may well be symbolic means and mediating resources rather than ends in themselves. Of note, in many educational programs, ESL courses are non-credit courses and do not count toward the completion of degrees. Thus, they are not given intrinsic value within academia.

Discussion

Within Vygotsky's (1978) and Leont'ev's (1981) perspective of activity theory, the teaching of writing in the disciplines can be construed as an activity within the socio-culturally defined setting of a university writing classroom. This conceptual view of writing instruction attempts to capture how students and instructors engage in the teaching and learning of writing in academic disciplines as they negotiate goal-directed, tool-mediated teaching and learning activities in the context of their classroom. Important in this type of analysis is the mediating role that semiotic systems play in the social construction of activities (Vygotsky, 1978). Individual and shared representations, including understandings and beliefs, are "symbolic tools" (Vygotsky, 1978) that mediate and orient the social-construction of activities. As Bruner (1986) argues us, "language is the coin in which the relationship [between the growing individual and the culture at large] is effected" (p. 142).

The teaching of Writing in the Disciplines
From the Perspective of Social Theory

Social theory offers another, related perspective from which "the teaching of writing in the disciplines" can be conceptualized. Specifically, I draw on Lave and Wenger's (1981) *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Although the authors have focused their study on learning, their insightful analysis helps us to understand the relationships between learning and teaching, knowing and being.

The Concept of Legitimate Peripheral Participation

Central to Lave and Wenger's argument (1981) is a social-epistemic, "relational view of the person and knowing" (p. 53), meaning and being, learning and becoming. First, they reject "a folk epistemology of dichotomies, for instance between 'abstract' and 'concrete' knowledge." (p. 104) Rather, they claim that a concept derives "its theoretical meaning from the richness of its interconnections" (p. 39). It "obtains meaning, not in a concise definition of its boundaries, but in its multiple, theoretically generative interconnections with persons, activities, knowing, and world" (p. 121). By the same token, they argue that

> activities, tasks, and understandings do not exist in isolation; they are part of broader systems of relations among persons. The person is defined as well as defines these relations. Learning thus implies becoming a different person with respect to the possibilities enabled by these systems of relations. To ignore this aspect of learning is to overlook the fact that learning involves the construction of identities. (p. 53)

In keeping with this "relational view," Lave and Wenger (1981) reject mentalistic construals of learning as "internalization," "transmission," "absorption" (p. 47). Rather, they argue that "learning is an integral part of generative social practice in the lived-in world" (p. 35). Specifically, they view learning as "increasing participation" in structured social and cultural practices and "an evolving form of membership" in a "community of practice" (p. 49-53). To describe learner "engagement in social practice that entails learning as an integral component" (p. 35), Lave and Wenger (1981) propose "legitimate peripheral participation" both as a descriptor and metaphor of this lived social practice. "Legitimacy" implies that learners must be allowed access to a community of practice as recognized members, albeit "newcomers." "Peripherality" suggests that newcomers are not yet "full participants" in the community of practice but negotiate varied and evolving forms of engagement and membership. "Participation" emphasizes that learning is situated in social practice.

Lave and Wenger (1981) apply the concept of "legitimate peripheral participation" to studies of apprenticeship in a variety of contexts, i.e., apprentice butchers, Nondrinking alcoholics, and quartermasters in North America, and apprentice tailors and midwifes in Central America and West Africa (pp. 61-87). However, the authors argue that the relevance of their descriptor is not limited to situations of traditional apprenticeship. Rather, they claim that "legitimate peripheral participation" offers an analytical perspective that can apply to any learning context. In particular, they use the construct to reconsider formal schooling contexts and argue that schoolchildren in a physics course learn the practices of schooling, e.g., notetaking, grading, question-answer turns, rather than the practices of physics (pp. 99-100).

Talking About and Talking Within a Practice

Important to Lave and Wenger's (1981) argument are distinctions between discourse and practice, namely, "*talking about* and *talking within* a practice" (p. 109). For instance, they claim that schoolchildren talk about practices of physics rather than within them and, therefore, that children do not usually learn a social discourse of physics as much as a schooled discourse about physics. Lave and Wenger (1981) challenge the usefulness of learning schooled discourses and argue that

> For newcomers... the purpose is not to learn *from* talk as a substitute for legitimate peripheral participation; it is to learn *to* talk as a key to legitimate peripheral participation. (p. 109, original emphasis)

This criticism notwithstanding, Lave and Wenger (1981) conceive of discourses *about* a practice from *within* a practice.

> Talking within itself includes both talking within (e.g., exchanging information necessary to the progress of ongoing activities) and talking about (e.g., stories, community lore). (p. 109)

Thus, a physicist's metadiscourse about the social-cultural practices of a community of physicists is a discourse both about and within a practice.

For example, in the prologue, I have quoted excerpts from the evaluative comments that Shiori received from her professors upon her term papers. One professor, Kim, suggested to her that she has

summarized the research reported in the article ... but run[s] into difficulty linking them and contextualizing the research within some of the broader issues/questions about pragmatic transfer and SLA.

(DOC: Shiori's term paper after teacher evaluation, Fall 1996).

Kim's comments are elements of discourse both about and within academic practice. They draw Shiori's attention to a common academic practice in summarizing research, namely the contextualizing of specific studies and findings within broader issues relevant to the field of study. Genre theorist Swales (1990a) argues that in writing introductions to research articles, researchers try to show the significance of their research for their research field in part by contextualizing their own studies within their field (pp. 140-148). Kim's comments about "contextualizing the research within some of the broader issues/questions about pragmatic transfer and SLA" encourage Shiori to appropriate academic practices of contextualization. They are excerpts of discourse *about* academic practice and reveal Kim's expectations and evaluative orientations toward academic practice. Simultaneously, Kim's comments can be located *within* the academic practices surrounding the writing of term papers. They are part of an ongoing discourse between Kim and Shiori within the academic context of Kim's course in Second Language Education. They are elements of discourse within academic practice.

Relevance to Spack (1988a)

Lave and Wenger's (1981) approach to learning as situated "legitimate peripheral participation" calls for a reappraisal of Spack's (1988a) concept of "the teaching of writing in the disciplines." First, it sheds a new light on Spack's metaphor of student "initiation" into the academic discourse community. Like Lave and Wenger (1981), Spack (1988) argues that students must participate and "become immersed" in the discourse of a discipline to learn how to write in this discipline (p. 40). However, the "initiation" metaphor suggests an active process of enculturation through a series of initiation rituals, of which the freshman composition course is an exemplar. Casanave (1991) argues that the notion of enculturation presumes a one-way process in which a master mediates the socialization of a novice into a disciplinary discourse community (p. 87). Lave and Wenger's (1981) construct of "legitimate peripheral participation," on the other hand,

emphasizes the negotiated, reciprocal character of the master-novice relationship. Both master and novice redefine and evolve "skilled identities" through joint participation in a community of practice. Both contribute to the "histories and developmental cycles" of the community (p. 122).

Furthermore, Lave and Wenger (1991) challenge Spack's (1988a) assumption that students should learn "general inquiry strategies, rhetorical principles, and tasks that can transfer to other course work" (pp. 40-41). In stressing the situated nature of learning, Lave and Wenger (1991) question the notion of transferable skills as a reification. Rather, they argue that learners constantly redefine their varied, emerging "skilled identities" in their "learning trajectories" across specific contexts of situation. Within this view, skill transfer may describe a learner's flexibility to adapt to new situations and move within a complex network of disciplinary communities of practice.

To be fair to Spack (1988a), Lave and Wenger's (1991) views of learning, though insightful, leave a few unanswered questions. For example, who defines and what structures communities of practice? How can we describe and explain the newcomers' "learning trajectories" and their processes of adaptation to new situations and communities? Are there some "things" such as strategies and abilities that are transferable? What mediates newcomers' participation into communities of practice? Furthermore, Lave and Wenger's (1991) metaphor of the newcomers' *peripheral* participation as contrasted to the masters' *full* participation conveys connotations of a *gap* between *novices* and *experts*. These connotations evoke Spack's (1988a) own *gap* metaphor. They are also present in the *writing problems* which Shiori's subject-area professors identify in her texts. These metaphors suggest the difficulty in describing learners without resorting to dichotomous distinctions between initiated and non-initiated, socialized and non-yet-socialized, non (fully) capable and capable.

These caveats notwithstanding, Lave and Wenger (1991) lead me to important questions about the role of formal instruction in the teaching of writing in the disciplines. For instance, is formal instruction about the conventions of a given discipline (e.g., APA in psychology) discourse *about* a practice or *within* a practice? Is it discourse *about* academic practices within

academic practices, supposing that there is a level of generality at which "academic practices" can be defined? How "peripheral" is participation in graduate writing course practice from participation in subject-area graduate course practice? How do academic communities of practice in various fields, including writing instruction, relate to one another?

Discussion

Activity theorists (Vygotsky, Leont'ev, Marx, Engels) and social theorists (Lave and Wenger, Marx, Bourdieu) help us conceptualize the teaching of writing in the disciplines as socio-cultural activity and practice. The two theoretical perspectives are related and can be integrated, which I will illustrate in Chapter 4. For instance, the motive for the activity of teaching writing in the disciplines can be reconsidered in terms of teacher mediation toward student participation in academic communities of practice. Specifically, I argue that a motive for university writing instruction in the disciplines may be to facilitate the learning of writing in the disciplines, i.e., the legitimate peripheral participation of students as members of inquiring scholarly communities.

This facilitation can be: 1) to give students opportunities to actually engage in the writing practices of their disciplines; 2) to assist students in talking about and within the writing practices of their disciplines. For instance, a workshop-type writing course that assigns research papers in the student disciplines is potentially facilitative in the first sense of the term. On the other hand, a writing course that allows students to develop a metadiscourse about their disciplinary writing practices is potentially facilitative in another way. Both discourse and metadiscourse, writing practices and metacognition about these practices may be considered essential means to facilitate student engagement in academic communities of practice.

Thus, Spack (1988a) has raised an important epistemological, methodological, and theoretical question in her text, "Initiating ESL Students Into the Academic Discourse Community: How Far Should We Go?" From a socio-cultural, socio-epistemic, Neo-Vygotskian perspective, the question may become: Facilitating ESL graduate students' participation in English-

medium, Northern American academic discourse communities: Who mediates what, in what contexts, for whom, how, and why?[12]

Summary

Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that abstractions cannot be divorced from concrete particulars. Rather, abstractions derive meanings from the construction of multiple interconnections among theories and practices. Thus far, I have tried to construct theoretical meanings for the concept of "teaching writing in the disciplines" by exploring its interconnections with educational issues (cf. the debate surrounding Spack, 1988), epistemological issues in SLA (cf. the debate surrounding Firth and Wagner, 1997), Russian developmental psychology (Vygotsky, 1978; Leont'ev, 1981), social theory (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977; Lave and Wagner, 1981; Peirce, 1995), and my own learning experiences (cf. Prologue). In the next Chapters, I make new interconnections with methodological and epistemological issues (Chapter 3). I also explore interconnections between the concept of "teaching writing in the disciplines" and the teaching practices of two writing instructors, Peter and Katherine, in specific contexts of situation (Chapter 4).

---

[12] This is a question that Maguire (1994) poses in a study about biliteracy development among elementary children in a bilingual program.

CHAPTER 3
EPISTEMOLOGICAL ASSUMPTIONS
AND METHODOLOGY

> Et Foucault conclut sur cette confidence: "Vous savez à quoi je rêve? Ce serait créer une maison d'édition de recherche. Je suis éperdument en quête de ces possibilités de faire apparaître le travail dans son mouvement, dans sa forme problématique. Un lieu où la recherche pourrait se présenter dans son caractère hypothétique et provisoire."[13]
>
> Eribon, 1991a, p. 313

In this excerpt from *Michel Foucault et ses contemporains* (Eribon, 1991a), Foucault admitted that his theoretical work was composed of "autobiographic fragments" (in Eribon, 1991a, p. 46, my translation). He even dreamt about setting up a publishing house that would foreground the researcher and allow research "in the making" to be displayed. In this chapter, I try to disclose the "problematic, transient, in progress" nature of this research project. That is, I reflect on the epistemological assumptions that underlie my inquiry and provide relevant background information about the research site and the research process. I thus hope to make my own knowledge-making process more "transparent" to the reader. I realize, however, that such enterprise of disclosure is perilous and tentative. Indeed, one can mostly look from a perspective or within a framework; hardly can one look into it. As Polanyi (1962) explains:

> When we accept a certain set of pre-suppositions and use them as our interpretative framework, we may be said to dwell into them as we do in our body.... They are not asserted and cannot be asserted, for assertion can be only made *within* a framework with we have identified ourselves for the time being; as they are themselves our ultimate framework, they are essentially inarticulable. (p. 60)

---

[13] Foucault confided in conclusion: "Do you know what my dream is? It would be to start a publishing house for research. I am frantically in pursuit of these possibilities of showing work in motion, in its problematic form; of a place where research could be presented in its hypothetical, provisional aspect." (Eribon, 1991b, Betsy Wing, Trans., p. 295)

Epistemological Assumptions

In this section, I tentatively review my epistemological assumptions and principles about interpretive inquiry.

A Postmodern, Socio-Constructivist Perspective

Postmodern thinkers (e.g., Dewey, Derrida, Foucault, Merleau-Ponty) challenge monological views of truth, e.g., as unique, faithful representation of the "physical world" (cf. Greene, 1994, p. 440). Within postmodern thought, those of a socio-constructivist persuasion (e.g., Bakhtin, Fleck, Geertz, Kuhn, Rorty, Vygotsky) construe knowledge as dialogue and conversation within "interpretive communities" (Fish, 1980) or "thought collectives" (Fleck, 1979). As Bruffee (1986) explains in a review of social constructivism,[14]

> The social constructionist alternative to [the] foundational cognitive assumption is nonfoundational. It assumes that there is no such thing as universal foundation, ground, framework, or structure of knowledge. There is only an agreement, a consensus arrived at for the time being by communities of knowledgeable peers. Concepts, ideas, theories, the world, reality, and facts are all language constructs generated by knowledge communities and used by them to maintain community coherence. (p. 777)

These postmodern, socioconstructivist views call for a radical re-appraisal of the process of validation and the role of researcher in scientific endeavors. At first, socioconstructivists may appear to be fundamentally relativistic and view the validation of knowledge as entirely dependent on its acceptation by a given community. However, Fleck's (1979) distinction between active and passive constraints in the social construction of knowledge helps understand socioconstructivist arguments against such an extreme relativist position. As Bazerman (1988) explains, Fleck's active constraints refer to "the elements of the thought style of the thought collective [such as] habits, patterns, and available means of representation—through language, drawing, and other symbolic media" (p. 312). Passive constraints, on the other hand, stem from the empirical, physical world:

> Natural phenomena passively constrain the kinds of formulations you can make in the sense that once you begin formulating statements in whatever style of your thought collective, certain behaviors or features of nature will limit what you can properly say. (p. 312)

---

[14]Also referred to as "socio-constructionism."

As Rorty (1979) puts it, "we are shoved around by physical reality" (in Bruffee, 1986, p. 777). Hence, the social-construction of knowledge is not arbitrary or entirely dependent on the evaluative orientations of knowledge makers. Rather, it is validated by a community of knowledge makers with consideration to "passive" constraints such as factual, empirical data.

In this study, active constraints include the thinking modes, schemata, and interpretive windows of my knowledge community, narrowly defined as my thesis advisor, professors, and peers, and broadly defined as the collective of researchers and practitioners in second language education, composition studies, ethnography. Furthermore, my interpretations were, as Fleck (1979) would put it, also "passively constrained" by the documents I collected on the site, the behaviors I observed in the classrooms, the research participants' words which I recorded during interviews and in my field notes.

Another important aspect of a socioconstructivist approach to inquiry concerns the researcher's role. If knowledge is construed as dialogue and conversation, then it becomes important to know who engages in conversation, in Bakhtin's (1981) terms, whose voices are heard in the dialogic utterances comprising speech communication. As Greene (1994) puts it in a review of recent approaches to knowledge in epistemology and educational researcher, "Who speaks after all? Where is the point of departure when it comes to knowing? [Who is] the 'theorizing subject'?" (p. 450). Within a situated, socioconstructivist perspective, the researcher cannot remain "in the closet" as an invisible "puller of strings" hidden behind the passive voice and abstract nominalizations. Rather, as physicist Polanyi (1962) argues, research involves "the *personal participation* of the knower in all acts of understanding" (p. vii).

In keeping with a principal of transparency, I have tried to expose my personal participation in this study. For instance, in the prologue, I described how my own personal history as a second language learner and science student had initially led me to conceptualize my research questions by positing a "gap" between learner backgrounds and teacher backgrounds. In Chapters 1 and 2, I showed how my conversations with the work of Firth and

Wagner (1997), Lave and Wenger (1991), Vygotsky (1978), among others, then forced me to reconsider this mentalistic "deficiency" perspective.

Fundamentally, to view knowledge as conversation and dialogue undermines the positivist metaphor of "experimental subjects." Within a socioconstructivist perspective, a researcher converses with "research partners" or "research participants." From an ethical point of view, research partners are human beings with a right to consent to or decline participation in a research project. From an epistemological point of view, research partners are not only "informants" or providers of data about a culture, behavior, phenomenon. Rather, I view them as co-constructers of knowledge. These principles have two important consequences for this research project. First, I have tried to keep my research participants informed of emerging developments throughout the research process. Secondly, I have engaged in sustained conversations with my research participants. The continual response that they gave and shared on my written and oral interpretations has played a key role in the validation of my research claims.

Wholes and Meanings

In *Personal Knowledge: Toward a Post-Critical Philosophy*, Polanyi (1962) describes knowing as an active process by which humans extend themselves into their symbolic and physical environments. This extension movement is realized through acts of comprehension which relate parts to wholes:

> Skilful knowing and doing is performed by subordinating a set of particulars, as clues or tools, to the shaping of a skilful achievement, whether practical or theoretical. We may be said to become "subsidiarily aware" of these particulars within our "focal awareness" of the coherent entity we achieve. Clues and tools are things used as such and not observed in themselves. They are made to function as extensions of our bodily equipment and this involves a certain change in our own being. (p. vii)

Polanyi's (1962) related notions of "parts and wholes" and "focal awareness and subsidiary awareness" (pp. 55-58) are powerful constructs. They provide insight into the meaning-making process by analogy with Gestalt theory in psychology and the hermeneutic circle in literary criticism. Specifically, the construction of meaning is construed as a recursive movement in which concrete particulars gain meanings through abstraction of a pattern and

abstract patterns become "thicker" through increasing interconnections with particulars.

In this thesis, I use Bruner's (1988) and Maguire's (1994) notion of cultural stance to relate particulars (beliefs, actions, words, utterances) to a whole (an evaluative orientation or perspective). At a more general level, the sociocultural, Neo-Vygostkian framework that I adopt structures the data I report and interpret by imposing a perspective from which meaningful patterns can emerge. Within this framework, my focal and subsidiary awareness oscillates between microgenetic, classroom-based case studies (e.g, of two writing instructors) and macrogenetic analyses of institutional contexts (e.g., the instructors' teaching units). I thereby hope to initiate a hermeneutic circle in which microgenetic and macrogenetic interpretations inform each other as alternate wholes and parts.

Comparative and Deconstructivist Analysis

Comparative analysis is based on the assumption that meaning can be constructed by relating two phenomena of a comparable nature. For instance, in linguistics, "cat/rat" is a meaningful phonemic pair because the sound difference between the two words allows the speaker to distinguish among two classes of referents, the group of rats and the group of cats. Whereas neither "cat" or "rat" has intrinsic meaning, the relation that is made between the two sounds carries meaning. Similarly, in contrastive rhetoric (cf. Connor, 1996), comparative analysis of English and German academic texts not only uncovers differences in textual organization (Clyne, 1987), but also helps understand some features of English (or German) prose that may go unnoticed or unexplained without German (or English) as a foil. Likewise, ethnographers and anthropologists value comparative approaches. For instance, Heath (1983) has gained insight into home and school literacy practices in Northern American contexts by comparing three communities: A middle-class, mainstream community, a black mill community of rural origin, and a white mill community.

In this study, I use a comparative analytic approach and focus on two writing courses offered by two instructors, Peter and Katherine, who each

work in a different teaching unit within Belleview university. Peter works as program coordinator at the French and English Language Centre. He taught the focal graduate section of *Fundamentals for Academic Writing* (FAW) that I observed for this study. Katherine teaches at the Writing Centre. She let me monitor a graduate section of *Advanced Written Communication* (AWC) targeted for engineering students.

My comparative analyses led me to identify, and then to challenge, dichotomous distinctions between the two instructors, teaching units, and courses. While initially useful and illuminating, dichotomies turn out to be inadequate to capture the richness and complexity of discursive practices[15] and institutional contexts. In Hegelian terms, dichotomies between "thesis" and "antithesis" must be superseded (*aufgehoben*) by a "synthesis." In Derridean terms, dichotomies require "deconstruction."

Research Site as a Set of Nested Contexts

The research site of this study can be described as an embedded set of nested contexts (Maguire, 1994a, 1994b, 1997). At the broader levels of generality, there are institutional and societal contexts. At microlevels of analysis, there are two writing classrooms and instructors within two teaching units in different faculties of the same university.

The University

Belleview University is an English-medium university in a unilingual French province in Quebec. Located in the heart of a cosmopolitan city, it enrolls over 20,000 students in credit programs, including 3,100 international students and 5,000 graduate students. In addition to housing 12 faculties for research and study in the Arts, the Sciences, Engineering, Education, Music, Law, among other fields, it also serves nearly 10,000 students per semester in Continuing Education. The mother tongue of the student population is English (55%), French (20%), or another language (25%). Sixty-seven percent

---

[15] Swandt (1997) uses the phrase "discursive practice" to refer to particular ways of talking about and writing about or performing one's practice that are coupled with particular social settings in which those ways of talking are regarded as understandable and more or less valuable (Maguire, personal communication).

of the students come from Quebec, 21% from another Canadian province, and 12% from 138 foreign countries, including 3.5% from the United States. (DOC: Documents from the University Relations Office and the Undergraduate Admissions Office, 1998).

Research Participants

The main research participants, Peter and Katherine, are two writing instructors at Belleview university. Peter, an anglophone Canadian, has taught English as a Second Language (ESL) since 1976. He defended a dissertation on the metaphysics and semantics of a medieval poet and obtained a doctoral degree in English Literature in 1992. Although he is now program coordinator at the Language Centre, he has maintained strong ties with the English department and has sustained research interests in the philosophy of language. Katherine, an anglophone American, moved in the early eighties from the United States after completion of undergraduate studies in English Literature. She enrolled at Belleview University for graduate studies in English Education. Her master's monograph examined "The Role of Expressive Writing in a University Writing Course." She soon played a major role within the Writing Centre as a full-time faculty lecturer and is now considered as one of the founders of the Centre.

Teaching Units

The Writing Centre

The Writing Centre, as it is informally referred to by its members, is devoted to the study and teaching of writing. Within Belleview University, however, it is not an official centre but a teaching and research unit based in the Faculty of Education. It was first founded as a tutorial service in 1979-1980, when students and faculty in disciplines such as psychology and management called for writing assistance. This early tutoring experience proved successful and further calls for help quickly led the Centre to offer courses in effective written communication for undergraduate students in management and engineering. From 5 sections offered in 1980, the Centre grew to offer 75 sections in 1990, a level at which it has now stabilized. Most sections are required credit courses for management, engineering, and

education undergraduate students. More recently, however, the Centre has diversified its activities to open sections in Public Relations, Social Work, Health Sciences, Continuing Education, and Distance Education. It has also offered "open sections" for students from all disciplines, sections for graduate students, and consultant's services to professional bodies such as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Although the Centre initially began as a tutorial service, the teaching staff do not view themselves as providers of remedial aid for writing. As an instructor explained, when the Centre was founded:

> the writing courses were not compensating for the lack of writing experience among students preparing for professional careers. The problem was only superficially a call for remedial aid; it was more a need to help writers to generate, structure, analyze and present ideas adequately for the specialised kinds of writing they would be asked to do in the future. In other words, they needed rhetorical strategies, a confident writing "voice," and a great deal of practice in using both (DOC: "The First Ten Years," 1991).

This view still represents the opinion of the Centre members today.

Theoretical orientations

The founders of the Centre appropriated the 1970s shift in writing instruction from product-oriented to process-oriented methods. Theoretically, they drew on cognitivist (e.g., Flower and Hayes, 1981) and expressivist approaches (e.g., Britton, et al.,, 1975) to composition theory, and became interested in twentieth century interpretation of classical rhetoric (Freedman and Pringle, 1980). To put these theoretical perspectives into practice, the Centre's instructors focused the syllabus on writing strategies, context, and audience in an effort to help student writers make the transition between expressive, reader-based prose to transactional, writer-based prose. To foster expressive writing, instructors encouraged students to keep a journal and a writer's log so that they could explore "rhetorical strategies" and find a "confident writing voice" (DOC: "The First Ten Years," 1991). To foster transactional writing, the Centre's teaching staff demanded that their students be able to produce "polished" texts that met the expectations of specific audiences. Hence, the Centre attempted to strike a balance between a process

orientation and a product orientation by allowing opportunities for free explorations and transactional writing.

These early cognitivist and expressivist orientations have had a steady influence on the Writing Centre's curriculum, which still emphasizes the writing process. Yet, the Centre has also remained open to novel trends in composition theories (e.g., Faigley, 1986) and the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) movement (e.g., Russell, 1990; Swales, 1990a, pp. 2-6). In particular, the Centre's staff have taken account of recent developments in genre theory and social-epistemic approaches to writing (e.g., Freedman and Medway, 1994a and 1994b). These developments include a shift from a focus on the writing process to a focus on socially-situated acts of writing (e.g., Witte, 1992). One consequence of the Centre's shift from a process-product orientation to a process-genre orientation is the growing specialization of the course content and the teaching staff. In the eighties and early nineties, one course text (Dias *et. al*, 1992) was used for most sections and writing instructors frequently taught several course sections in different disciplines. In recent years,

> Effective written communication have become a set of discipline-specific courses, including Communication in Engineering. We have shifted from our 1992 textbook to a combination of course texts, reading packages, and on-line materials [specific to the students' disciplines]. (DOC, "Communication in Engineering," 1998).

Writing instructors have also tended to specialize in the teaching of sections in a given discipline, such as engineering, education, or management.

Staff and hiring policy

The teaching staff now comprises one director, one associate director, 6 faculty lecturers, and about 15 sessional lecturers. During conversational exchanges (e.g., 30/10/97), Katherine stressed the group spirit of the Writing Centre, and the support the group could give to individual instructors, for instance through the exchange of teaching ideas and collaborative projects. She also regularly used the collective pronoun "we" when referring to the Writing Centre, as in "We call ourselves the Writing Centre." To preserve the group culture and transmit the Centre's teaching philosophy, the Centre has set up a original system of apprenticeship, as in Lave and Wenger's terms

(1991), of "legitimate peripheral participation." Each prospective "newcomer" is thus required: 1) to attend all in-house meetings and seminars, thereby getting acquainted with "old-timers;" 2) to monitor a course from Day 1 to the final class by working closely with the instructor; 3) to appropriate the discourse of the Writing Centre by reading memos, handbooks, and curricular documents for teachers and instructors. This monitoring system allows the Centre to welcome new instructors with differing status (e.g., graduate students and professional editors) and a variety of backgrounds (e.g., literature, language, professional writing, librarian ship, drama) while preserving unity and cohesion in the syllabus offered.

The English and French Language Centre

The English and French Language Centre provides language and writing courses for credit in English and French. Formerly called the French Language Centre, it was created in 1970 when French language courses were transferred from the Department of French Language and Literature. Ten years later, it was the English Department's turn to delegate English language courses to the Language Centre, which then became the English and French Language Centre (henceforth, the "Language Centre"). The Language Centre has now gained "departmental status" within the Faculty of Arts and offers 17 five-level courses in French and 10 five-level courses in English, serving nearly 2000 students yearly. In French, the courses are offered to the non-francophone student population of Belleview university in four "streams": 1) oral French; 2) written French; 3) oral and written French; 4) and French grammar. One purpose of the French courses is to help students gain access to Canadian French and Quebec culture and literature. Although some students visit the Language Centre to prepare for a major or minor in the Department of French Language and Literature, most students learn French for other purposes, such as to adjust to their French-speaking urban environment.

On the English side, instructors "have been helping non-native speakers [of English] from Quebec and abroad integrate into the anglophone, academic milieu of [Belleview] University." (DOC: "Celebrating Our Twenty-fifth Anniversary," 1996, p. 17). Given this purpose, the English teaching staff have

chosen to offer English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses with special emphasis on academic writing. Of note, although most English language courses are destined for ESL students, a few sections are open for anglophone students wishing to "polish writing skills in the academic genre" (p. 18). These sections are "closely modeled on the ESL academic writing courses" (p. 18).

Theoretical orientations

The theoretical orientation and philosophy of the Language Centre intersect with two spheres of influences: the humanities, especially literature and civilization, and the social sciences, especially education, applied linguistics, and psychology. For the director of the Language Centre, Martine:

> Vue la plupart du temps comme une discipline carrefour qui se nourrit des recherches et des débats de disciplines connexes, la didactique des langues est depuis longtemps à la recherche de son identité.... Nous ne sommes pas des linguistes ni des psychologues, mais nous sommes au fait des théories élaborées par ces disciplines. Nous n'enseignons pas la littérature, mais elle est au coeur de notre enseignement de la langue."
> (DOC: "Celebrating" 1996, p. 6)

For Martine, second language teaching must draw on literature, linguistics, and psychology, and yet must find its own, distinctive identity. In the same twenty fifth anniversary review of the Centre's activities, another teacher, Françoise, recounts how the Language Centre has striven throughout its existence to establish itself as an autonomous unit with a "specific identity" (p. 10). In particular, she stresses that the Language Centre is not ancillary to the Department of French Language and Literature or the Department of English. Rather, she thinks that like instruction in literature, language instruction has a formative role to play in the "cultivation of the mind" and the fostering of critical thinking among students. She also advises against entrusting "pure arts scholars or pure linguists" with language instruction and puts forward the view that good language instructors must have a background in linguistics, literature and civilization, and language learning.

Although the members of the Language Centre claim that language instruction cannot consist only of literature instruction, literature seems to

play a central role within their teaching practices. Located "at the heart of our language teaching course" (DOC: "Celebrating," 1996, p. 6), literature is construed as the necessary gateway to the target culture (p. 12) and the appropriate medium through which language learning skills, metacognitive skills, and critical thinking skills can be developed (pp. 25-27). On the other hand, applied linguistics is viewed as a necessary component of a language instructor's background to ensure a good understanding of the target language (p. 11). As for educational research, it should provide language instructors with sound, research-informed teaching methods (e.g., p. 11). For instance, members (e.g., pp. 24-27) of the Language Centre have used collaborative learning methods based on Neo-Vygotskian education research (cf. Bruffee, 1984) to promote language learning. Psychology also seems to contribute to the training of a language instructor at the Language Centre. For instance, one instructor (pp. 29-31) has drawn on Vygotsky's (1986) notion of inner speech to use journal writing as a mediating tool for language learning.

In summary, the philosophy of the Language Centre is to draw on related disciplines such as literature and linguistics, and yet to develop a specific expertise in language teaching. Rather than aiming for an eclectic patchwork, the Centre seeks to establish a distinct "identity" by bringing cohesion to varied theoretical, disciplinary, and methodological influences. One important organizing principle appears to reside in the Centre's objective to reach out to its student clientele by addressing their specific language needs (e.g., Celebrating our twenty fifth anniversary," 1996, pp. 10, 15, 18). Thus, literature, education, linguistics, psychology, and even computer science (as in the use of innovative teaching methods based on electronic communication) go "into the service" of language courses geared at post-secondary students within Belleview University. Within each of these disciplines, it is possible, though complex, to trace the instructors' theoretical orientations (e.g. Neo-Vygotskian) that underlie specific teaching choices. In Chapter 4, I examine Peter's disciplinary affiliations and theoretical orientations.

Staff and hiring policy

The Language Centre now comprises ten full-time faculty lecturers and about fifteen sessional and part-time lecturers. Noteworthy, the French unit hires mostly full-time faculty lecturers whereas the English unit hires mostly part-time teachers. Thus, Peter is the only full-time faculty lecturer in the English unit. Other English instructors comprise 10 part-timers and one sessional lecturer on a 8-month contract.

In accordance with the Centre's teaching orientation at the crossroads between the humanities and the social sciences (including second language education), the Centre usually hires instructors with a dual background in literature/civilization/culture and second language education. For instance, it recently posted an offer for a full-time, permanent stream lecturer position that included the following hiring criteria:

> Ph.D. preferred. Research potential and experience in FSL and/or ESL didactics, and in computer-assisted language learning (CALL); other qualifications: effective language teaching at the university level; a strong background in culture (Canadian and foreign); expertise in various pedagogical approaches; interest and experience in the development of innovative instructional programs at all levels and in research on SL pedagogy and language testing.... strong commitment to scholarship and research.

For part-timers, the Centre looks for candidates with either: 1) a master's degree in applied linguistics (usually English or French as a second language); or 2) a master's degree in literature, linguistics, and language studies *and* ESL teaching qualifications such as ESL teaching certificates (Peter, personal communication, 1998).

Similarities and Differences Between the Writing Centre and the Language Centre

Table 3.1 contrasts the differing agendas and features of the Language Centre and the Writing Centre. Important differences between the Language Centre and the Writing Centre concern: 1) the location and mission of the teaching units within Belleview University; 2) the role which language proficiency level, type of language

Table 3.1

<u>**Overview of the Language Centre and the Writing Centre**</u>

	Language Centre (English sub-unit)	Writing Centre
Mission	• To provide credit courses in English for academic purposes, especially academic writing courses.	• To provide credit courses in "effective written communication" in a variety of professional and academic contexts.
Supervising unit	• Faculty of Arts	• Faculty of Education
Student population	• (mostly) Second language learners from across the University, especially the Faculties of Science, Arts, Engineering, and Education.	• (mostly) Students with native or near-native fluency in English. • Many students come from Engineering, Education, and Management.
Student placement in courses.	• Standardized placement tests determine course selection. • Student department of origin is not relevant. • Students with low proficiency sent to Continuing Education or Writing Centre	• Student department determine course selection. • Instructor screens students with limited English proficiency; discourages students from taking the course if appropriate.
Structure of curriculum	• By level of language proficiency (e.g., high intermediate, advanced) • By type of language skills (in English, focus on writing skills)	• By disciplines (e.g., management, engineering) • By year of study (freshmen vs. senior, undergraduate vs. graduate)
Instructors' backgrounds	• Applied linguistics, second language teaching (e.g., communication/pronunciation specialists) • Literature, civilization and language	• Literature and language, as well as teaching, professional writing (e.g., editors, translators, poets), librarianship, acting.
Theoretical orientations toward writing instruction	<u>Within L2 education:</u> • EAP and genre theory (e.g. Swales); also cognitivist influences (writing as a process). <u>Within the humanities:</u> • Classical rhetoric, humanist orientation favoring "the cultivation of the mind."	<u>Within L1 composition theory and WAC movement:</u> • Cognitivist, process-based approach with focus on strategies, context, audience. • Also expressivist and socio-epistemic influences.

skills, and the students' disciplines of study play in the structure of the curriculum and the course selection process; 3) the instructors' backgrounds and theoretical orientations. With regard to the teaching of writing in the disciplines, these differences raise a host of questions. For example, what is the influence of the curricular structure (discipline-based as in the case of the Writing Centre or language-based as in the case of the Language Centre) and the institutional contexts (Faculty of Education or Faculty of Arts) on the teachers' engagement in the teaching of writing in the disciplines? Similarly, what is the influence of the instructors' backgrounds and theoretical orientations on their attitudes toward teaching writing in the students' disciplines? Can we predict, for instance, that the Writing Centre staff will be more sensitive to the discipline-specific needs of their students than the

Language Centre since it offers writing courses in discipline-specific
sections?

Writing Courses Offered by the Language Centre and the Writing Centre

This section provides background information about the courses
offered by each unit. This information is gleaned from classroom-based
observations and collected documents, e.g., course outline handouts. It
specifically bears on the two focal courses of this study and is not necessarily
representative of other courses offered by the Language Centre and the
Writing Centre. Furthermore, this course information is not assumed to
reflect the other courses that Peter and Katherine have taught before and after
the classroom-observation stage of this study was undertaken.

Table 3.2

Overview of the FAW and AWC courses

Course Title	Fundamentals of Academic Writing for Graduate Students	Advanced Written Communication
Teaching unit	Language Centre	Writing Centre
Instructor	Peter	Katherine
Course objectives as given on course outline handout.	"The course is designed to help graduate students who are non-native speakers of English, develop their academic writing skills."	"Your goal in this course is to produce a portfolio of writing that shows your ability to handle a range of academic and professional writing tasks."
Course texts (cf. bibliography for references)	• *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: A course for Nonnative Speakers of English*, by Swales and Feak. •*Simon and Schuster handbook for writers: First Canadian Edition.*	• *Writing for Ourselves/Writing for Others*, by Dias et al. • (recommended for consultation): Shipley Associates' *Style Guide* ; Day's *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper*; Hacker's *A Canadian Writer's Reference.*
Student evaluation	• Seven short writing assignments: 50%; • Research Paper: 30%; • General Portfolio: 20%	• Holistic, portfolio-based. • Portfolio contains four pieces of writing totaling 20 pages and includes a paper of at least 10-12 pages.
Assignments	1. Problem-solution task 2. General-specific task 3. Problem Solution-Process Description task 4. Data Commentary task 5. Article Summary 6. Article Response 7. Article Critique	1. Letter or essay of application 2. Essay for a non-technical audience 3. Technical paper 4. Oral presentation
Main topics covered in class	Discourse analysis: • Academic genres (cf. above list of assignments) • Contrastive rhetoric (position of thesis statement) Critical thinking and analysis: • Discussion and critique of journalistic and academic essays • Assessing reasoning processes (logical fallacies) • Assessing evidence (e.g. sources) Grammar, usage, and formats: • Articles, tense, gerunds • Punctuation and mechanics • APA/MLA, documentation • Sentence connectors	Writing Strategies: • For generating, planning, and organizing ideas • For composing text • For revising, editing, and proofreading text Cohesion: • Topic sentences, transitions • Old/new patterns, previews • Abstraction ladder. Effective sentences: • Voice, stressed positions • Latin/Saxon and Verb/Noun ratios • Effective punctuation Strategies and tools for oral presentations: • Visuals, Pronunciation, body movement, delivery.
Typical student-teacher and student-student interactions	• Small groups discuss answers to "awareness-raising" tasks, then report back to class for peer- and teacher-response. Teacher recaps main points. • No writing done in class but students occasionally share their texts for peer-response.	"Workshop" method: • Instructor briefs students, who then do some writing in class and share their texts for peer-response. • Instructor occasionally arranges one-to-one conferences with students during class writing activities.
Homework	• To work on the course written assignments. • To do assigned reading and assigned tasks in Swales and Feak and *Simon and Schuster Handbook.*	• To work on the course written assignments. • To write log entries about writing process, work in progress, and evaluation of finished work.

Noticeable differences between the two courses concern their objectives and focal topics. Thus, FAW was aimed at academic writing and focused on genre-based discourse analysis, critical thinking skills, mechanics, and ESL language problems. AWC, on the other hand, offered opportunities to practice professional and academic writing and emphasized the writing process as well as oral communication strategies. As for the student-teacher and student-student interactions, both courses were interactive in their own ways. Both Peter and Katherine assigned class tasks involving small group discussions, reports back to class, and teacher-feedback and student-feedback. Both instructors assumed a "teacher's role" and "taught lessons" as they introduced or recapped the topics covered during the class activities. However, an important difference emerges from the content of the class activities. In Peter's case, class tasks were often derived from a writing textbook, Swales and Feak (1994a), student texts, and a few articles. They engaged students in discourse and rhetorical analyses of texts in given genres. Less frequently, Peter also assigned exercises from *Simon & Schuster handbook for writers* by Troyka, Buckley, and Gates (1995). Many of these exercises concern punctuation and mechanics and encouraged students to apply and explain the rules laid out in the handbook. Occasionally, students also brought drafts of their own texts for peer-response during class time. In Katherine's case, class tasks were derived from a miscellany handouts such as drafts of texts that needed re-writing or editing, rhetorical cases to be analyzed, and articles about "tips for technical speakers." These class tasks often engaged the students in free-writing, revising, and editing activities. Occasionally, they also invited them to prepare for a short oral group presentation to the class.

These similarities and differences between the FAW and AWC university writing courses raise questions about underlying similarities and differences in the instructors' evaluative orientations toward and theoretical assumptions about writing instruction. The fact that each course is housed in a different teaching unit of the same university may also offer interesting avenues into the role that embedded institutional contexts play in the social construction of teaching activities and practices. For instance, what is the degree of congruence between the theoretical orientations advocated within

the teaching units and Peter's and Katherine's own evaluative orientations toward university writing instruction?

Student Populations in the FAW and AWC Courses

The enrollment of FAW is double that of AWC. Both classes have students from several language groups (e.g., Indo-European, Semitic, Sino-Tibetan) and language families (e.g., Romance, Slavic, Greek). Table 3.3 provides statistical information about the student populations of the FAW and AWC courses.

Table 3.3

Overview of the student populations

Course title	FAW	AWC
Number of students	• 22, all graduates but one • 11 in Ph.D. programs.	• 12, all graduates.
First language	• Chinese: 7 • French: 5 • Arabic: 3 (including one bilingual French/Arabic) • Russian, Japanese: Each 2 • Farsi, Portug., Greek: Each 1	• Spanish: 5 • Chinese: 4 • Farsi: 2 • Korean: 1.
Female/male ratio	• 8/14	• 2/10
Area of specialization	• Sciences: 14 • Social Studies, Management, and Law: 5 • Humanities: 3	• All in Engineering
Discipline of specialization	• Engineering, Biology, Computer Sciences: 4 of each • Humanities: 3 • Education: 2 • Atmospheric and Oceanographic Sciences, Mathematics, Psychology, Management, Law: 1 of each	• Subdisciplines of mining and metal engineering

While the FAW class comprise a wide range of disciplines, the AWC students have seemingly more homogeneous disciplinary backgrounds. A noticeable difference between both student populations that emerged during classroom-based observations concerns the students' levels of fluency in spoken English. While most FAW students were fluent in English, AWC students' spoke English with stronger accents and more haltingly. Sometimes, I could hardly understand them. Concerning English proficiency, the Language Centre's policy is to ensure through placement testing that all students enrolled in the graduate section of FAW are advanced ESL learners. The Writing Centre's usual policy is also to require minimum

experience writing and speaking in English since the courses it offers are designed to provide writing instruction, not language instruction or "remedial" instruction in English. Usually, instructors are encouraged

> to be on the alert for students who come to the first class but lack enough English proficiency to succeed in the course. Early on, during the first or second meeting, these students should be made aware of the likelihood that they will fail or barely pass. [The instructors] may suggest that they transfer into a language course to improve before attempting a writing strategy course [as offered by the Writing Centre.] Language courses are available at the English and French Language Centre... ("Effective Written Communication: Handbook for Teachers and Monitors," 1993).

Nevertheless, the Writing Centre made one exception for the section of the AWC course which has been the focus of this study. Namely, this section was open for graduate students and post-doctoral scholars regardless of their levels of proficiency in English. In fact, most students enrolled in this section had been in a Canadian, English- speaking and French-speaking environment for less than six months. The course was tailored to their specific language and communication needs.

Peter's and Katherine's perceptions of their student clienteles are assumed to play a significant role in the instructors' evaluative orientations toward writing instruction and their engagement in the teaching of writing in the students' disciplines. Because teaching orientations and practices are negotiated between students and instructors, they cannot be interpreted independently of the context of a specific class and classroom. Thus, microgenetic analyses of the interactions between students and instructors are necessary in addition to macrolevel analyses of the socio-cultural contexts (e.g., the teaching units, Belleview University) in which these classroom interactions are embedded. For instance, what is the impact of the unusually high proportion of ESL students with limited English proficiency on Katherine's teaching practices? To what extent does the relative homogeneity (AWC) or heterogeneity (FAW) of the students' disciplinary backgrounds influence Peter's and Katherine's engagement in the teaching of writing in the students' disciplines?

Research Chronology

Table 3.4 summarizes the main phases or "cycles" of the research process as well as the main data sets that were collected during each phase. Data collection methods are further discussed in the next section.

Table 3.4

Overview of data collection activities

Cycle 1 : Winter and Spring 1997---Classroom-based research		
Date and phase	**FAW course**	**AWC course**
January 1997 Student's informed consent	• Presented research project in class and suggested types of student participation. All students but one signed consent form (cf. Appendix B)	• Explained my research project to students individually.
January-April 1997 Classroom-based observations (About 70 hours)	• Attended all classes: actively participated in group tasks as a student ; passively recorded class interaction as an observer for all other activities (teacher-lessons, class discussions).	• Attended most classes as a monitor. Recorded class interaction. Occasionally worked with students on teacher-assigned tasks.
January-April 1997 Other data sets: student interviews and documents analysis.	• Interviewed three students, including Shiori. Audio-taped interviews. (Total recording time: About 4 hours) • Collected three student portfolios (all drafts) and course documents • Had informal talks with instructors after class • Attended and recorded three student-teacher conferences (Total recording time: About 90 minutes)	• Collected course documents • Had informal talks with instructor after class
May 1997-July 1997 Preliminary Report	• Shared preliminary report with two key participants (Peter and one student). • Received feedback.	
Cycle 2---Fall 1997 through Spring 1998 : Interview-based and document-based research.		
February 1998 Renewing informed consent	• Kept participants informed of evolution of research project. In February 1998, submitted updated informed consent forms to reflect changes in research project. Katherine, Pierre, and Shiori signed.	
October 1997-February 1998 Conversations with instructors (For about 10 hours)	• Conducted informal, open-ended, and semi-focused interviews with Peter: 3 interviews, and Katherine: 6 interviews. Each interviews typically lasted from 1 hour to 1.5 hour. Interviews were not taped but recorded in field-notes. They were conversations and exchanges of views rather than interviewer-interviewed interactions.	
October 1997-February 1998 Documents sharing and document analysis	• Submitted to instructors research materials about writing instruction and self-designed course syllabus. • Received and analyzed teaching materials. • cf. Tables 3.6-3.8 for a list of documents exchanged.	
February-June 1998	• Analyzed data and wrote research report	
May-July 1998	• Shared and negotiated report with Peter and Katherine. • Altered report as Peter and Katherine saw fit.	
July 1998	• Submission of thesis	

There were two cycles in my research process. Each cycle began with the negotiation of the participants' informed consent to the project and ended with the submission of a written research report. Cycle 1 was carried out in the winter and spring of 1997 and consisted mostly of classroom-based observations. My research interactions with instructors were then limited to short informal talks during and after class. However, I interviewed three students of the FAW class and analyzed their written texts. Cycle 2 was carried out in the fall of 1997 and the winter of 1998. During this cycle, I solicited the instructors' views during informal, open-ended, and semi-focused interviews and analyzed a miscellany of curricular documents. During both cycles, I gained insight into the institutional, nested contexts of the research site through my own increasing legitimate peripheral participation (Lave and Wenger, 1991) in the Writing Centre, the Language Centre, and Belleview University. For instance, I began to attend the Writing Centre's staff meetings as a prospective instructor and was invited to be a monitor in writing classes. I thus developed an insider-outsider, emic-etic[16] (Geertz, 1975) perspective of the Writing Centre as a researcher (outsider) and an instructor in training (insider or "newcomer," Lave and Wenger, 1991).

An important aspect of the research process has been the negotiation of informed choice and the building of rapport with research participants. In accordance with Neo-Kantian principles of ethic,[17] I endeavored to inform the potential research participants of the choices they could make regarding their participation in my research project. For instance, I explained my research questions, methods, and agenda both orally and in writing (cf. ethical consent forms and letters, Appendix B). However, my growing acquaintance with the research participants sometimes blurred the line between research-oriented conversational exchanges and friendly, non-research-related chats.

---

[16] Ethnographer Geertz (1975) defines an etic perspective as researcher-based or "experience-distant;" it is an outsider's viewpoint taken in theoretical language on a culture. In contrast, he defines an emic perspective as research-participant-based or "experience-near;" it is an insider's viewpoint taken in vernacular language on a culture. I further define and discuss the etic/emic distinction in the Epilogue.

[17] "The first basic principle is **respect for persons**. This has two fundamental aspects: first, there must be respect for the autonomy of those individuals or groups who are capable of making informed choices and for their capacity for self-determination; second, there must be protection of persons with impaired or diminished autonomy, that is, those who are incompetent or whose voluntariness is serioulsy compromised. Those who are dependent or vulnerable must be protected against abuse." ("Code of Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans," 1997, p. 12, emphasis in the original)

It therefore become difficult to ensure that my researcher participants be fully aware that even informal chats that were not explicitly relevant to my research questions could still give me glimpses into their views and beliefs. As Akeroyd (1984) pointed out, a common ethical problem in ethnographic research is that

> participants... may be unaware that they are communicating information which may be recorded, have temporarily forgotten the researcher's role or be unaware that an ethnographer is never 'off-duty'.... These issues are frequently discussed in relation to the field role of 'friend', since the instrumental use of an intimate relationship is felt to be immoral or a betrayal by one or both parties.... They are acute for insider researchers... and especially for those who are kin, affine or colleague of their informants.... (p. 145)

Thus, maintaining *informed* consent is dependent on the participants' alertness to their participation in research. I therefore tried to frequently remind my participants of my inquiry and to build trust with them. I also agreed with them that they could review and alter the final, published research report as they saw fit.

Data Collection Methods

I used the three tools of qualitative interpretive inquiry: observations, interviews, and documents. Drawing on different sources of information, they allowed opportunities for methodological triangulation (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994).

Classroom Observations and Field Notes

I attended both university writing courses, AWC and FAW, as a participant observer. My participation ranged from being an active student to being a mere recorder of classroom interactions in field notes (FN). Generally, I took an active part in group tasks but limited my interventions during class discussions and teacher lessons. These types of participation affected my role as a researcher as follows. When I actively took part in the class activities, I interacted as a peer to other graduate students in the class. When I limited my student involvement in the course, I was no longer acting as a student but as a field-worker. These various roles can be in part

explained by the fact that, like all other students in the class, I was a graduate student and also a non-native speaker. I therefore felt that it would have been inappropriate not to participate in the class activities that demanded "peer's" help. Contrary to my expectations, these instances of active participation as student/researcher did not significantly alter student behaviors. Indeed, it was a most natural course of action to take; my passive note-taking, on the other hand, did sometimes influence the classroom interaction by making one instructor more self-conscious of his teacher practice (Peter, personal communication).

For classroom observations, I did not follow any pre-conceived observational scales so as not to impose etic, pre-defined categories onto participants' behaviors and beliefs; instead, a holistic, open stance allowed consideration of emerging patterns and serendipitous discoveries during the investigation. I took notes about course content, class activities, seating patterns, use of class space, and discursive practices as well as student-teacher interactional practices.[18] I wrote down teacher and student discourse verbatim whenever possible. When I could not take notes during class time (e.g., when I actively took part in class activities), I completed and revised them after class (cf. Appendix C). In a few cases, I also wrote retrospective accounts of class interactions immediately after class to analyze emerging patterns or further examine revealing cases (cf. Appendix C). I then scanned these recorded observations for emerging patterns, such as routines and dominant structures. I also made synoptic charts for data reduction and summarized my main findings in a preliminary report, which I submitted for participant's feedback.

Interviews

In this study, I gained insight into the research participants' beliefs systems and evaluative orientations toward university writing instruction during a number of informal conversational exchanges (CE). Such exchanges

---

[18] I drew on an observational profile used for Montréal school in Maguire's SSHRC-funded project, grant 410-92-097, "Biliteracy and School Success of a Selected Group of Minority Language Children in Different Bilingual Organization in Montréal and Ottawa." Some of the categories I used were: use of declarative and imperative sentences, questions, answers, invitational bids, forms of address, attitudes, tone of voice, body language.

were "interViews" (Kvale, 1996) insofar as the research participants and I shared views and constructed a discourse and dialogue together. On the other hand, these exchanges were not "interviews" insofar as the interactants had clearly-defined and stable roles as either interviewer or interviewee throughout the interaction. Indeed, the interviewer/interviewed dynamic that traditionally obtains between the researcher and the researched participants was occasionally reversed. For instance, instructors sometimes probed me with questions about my research project, thereby negotiating their informed consent to participate; or they probed me with questions about my views as a *stagiaire*. In yet other cases, my conversational exchanges with research participants resembled symmetrical, peer-to-peer interactions, occasionally having only a tangential bearing to the research project. Therefore, in this study, the word "interview" designates both an instance of view-sharing and the text that unfolded from it. As for the term "conversational exchange" (Maguire, personal exchange), it emphasizes that my oral interactions with the research participants were construed as dialogues and, as I put it to them, "two-way-streets" (CE, 23/10/97). My objective was to equitably distribute the benefits of the research effort among research participants and myself, in virtue of ethical principles of justice and beneficence as defined in Canada's *TriCouncil's Code of Ethical conduct* , (1997, pp. 12-13).

Thematizing and Designing

Some conversational exchanges were prepared and recorded (cf. Table 3.5), while others were off-the-record impromptu exchanges which spontaneously developed on the research site. In the most structured situations, I drew a list of questions prior to the conversational exchange (cf. Appendix D). This list included the topics to be covered, such as "prior writing experience," "academic background and interests." Some topics were broad themes (e.g. instructor's positioning relative to writing instruction and teaching writing in the disciplines) while other were more specific (e.g. "How do you respond to a student's text?, How have you come to teach English as a second language?"). The topics were ordered in a logical sequence, for instance from general questions about discipline-specific writing instruction to more specific questions about Spack's position on this issue.

In the sequencing of questions, I also adopted Kvale's (1996) distinctions between introducing questions, follow-up questions, probing questions, and structuring questions (pp. 133-135). For instance, I prepared a list of possible openers (introducing questions) by searching for zones of convergence between the participants' interests on the one hand and my own pursuits as a researcher on the other. This search resulted in questions such as "I've heard you're writing a book, do you want to tell me about it?" or "I've noticed/You've said you were interested in X. Can you elaborate on this?" This sequenced list of questions was more a blueprint of the conversational exchange than a set agenda to be strictly followed. Its main purpose was to ensure the coherence of my train of thought and to structure the exchange around a few running threads. As it turned out, conversational exchanges never followed the blueprint sequence as planned, but they remained focused on the research questions despite digressions, disjunctures, and non-elicited ideas.

Table 3.5

Recorded conversational exchanges

Participants	Date-Duration	Main Issues addressed
Shiori	27 Feb. 97	Education background and former writing experience
Pierre (a graduate student)	28 Feb 97	Education background and former writing experience
Katherine	23 Oct 97-15 min.	The research project/questions; Arranging meeting times.
Katherine	30 Oct 97-1 hr	Belcher and Braine (1995); Writing Centre; Katherine's teaching experience; Course texts
Katherine	20 Nov. 97-30 min.	Textbooks; Katherine's views about writing, writing instruction, and student needs assessment.
Katherine	27 Nov. 97-1hr15 min.	Collaboration with engineering department; student needs assessment; Katherine's view about writing/writing instruction; Textbooks
Katherine	9 Dec. 97-15 min.	Swales and Giltrow's models for introductions; biologist's format.
Peter	22 Oct. 97-1 hr.	Textbook; my course syllabus proposal; Peter's views about ESL writing instruction
Peter	28 Nov. 97-1hr	The research project; Peter's academic interests and background; Coe's textbook.
Peter	11 Dec. 97-1 hr	The language Centre; Peter's views about writing instruction, writers, and engineers.

Documents Trading

My research participants and I often shared and exchanged documents. Katherine aptly referred to our barter of documents (DOC) as "trading" (NS/CE, 30/10/97). This metaphor captures the "two-way-street," reciprocal

dynamic which I hoped to establish. I rarely came empty-handed to meetings with research participants. Instead, I brought along a folder of articles and books which I deemed of potential interest to them (cf. Table 3.6). In return, participants shared with me textbooks and teaching materials that they had used (cf. Tables 3.7 and 3.8). These texts represent a broad range of issues and topic in first and second language writing. They mediated our conversations as we responded to them.

Table 3.6

Documents gathered for instructors

Author(s)	Date	Title and Source
Anonymous	1995	Instructions to authors, *Journal of Bacteriology*
Belcher, D.	1994	The apprenticeship approach to advanced academic literacy: Graduate students and their mentors, *English for Specific Purposes, 13*, 23-34.
Belcher, D, & Braine, G.	1995	*Academic writing in a second language: essays on research and pedagogy.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
Bracewell, R. & Breuleux, A.	in press	Cognitive diagnosis in writing (Table 3, p. 22, example of revision of student text)
Freedman, A.	1987	Learning to write again: Discipline specific writing at University. *Carleton Papers in Applied Language Studies, 4*, 95-116.
Frodesen, J.	1995	Negotiating the syllabus: A learning-centered, interactive approach to ESL graduate writing course design. In Belcher and Braine.
Halliday, M. A. K, & Martin, J. R.	1993	*Writing Science: Literacy and discursive power* (excerpts). London: Falmer Press.
Johns, A.	1995	Teaching classroom and authentic genres: Initiating students into academic cultures and discourses. In Belcher & Braine.
Master, P.	1987	Generic *The* in *Scientific American. English for Specific Purposes, 6*, 165-186.
Master, P.	1991	Active verbs with inanimate subjects in scientific prose. *English for Specific Purposes, 10*, 15-33.
Master, P.	1995	Consciousness raising and article pedagogy. In Belcher & Braine.
Myers, G.	1990	The social construction of popular science: The narrative of science and the narrative of nature. In *Writing Biology* (chapter 5). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
Parkhurst, C.	1990	The composition process of science writers. *English for Specific Purposes, 9*, 169-179.
Casanave, P.	1995	Local interactions: Constructing Contexts for Composing in a Graduate Sociology Program. In Belcher & Braine.
Ramani, E.	1988	Developing a course in research writing for advanced ESP learners, *ELT Documents: ESP in the Classrooms, 128*, 45-53.
Shaw, P.	1991	Science research students' composing processes. *English for Specific Purposes, 10*, 189-206.
Spack, R.	1988	Initiating graduate students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go?*TESOL Quarterly, 22*(1), 29-51.
Swales, J. & Feak, C.	1994	*Academic writing for graduate students: A Commentary.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Swales, J.	1990 a	Nonnative speaker graduate engineering students and their introductions: Global coherence and local management. In Connor, U., & Johns, A. M. (Eds). *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 187-208). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
Swales, J.	1990 b	Research articles in English, in *Genre analysis* (chapter 7), Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Ventola, E., & Mauranen, A.	1991	Non-native writing and native revising of scientific articles. In Ventola (Ed.). *Functional and systemic linguistics.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

I selected Spack's article (1988a) since I believed that it addresses the main research questions of this study. I chose most other documents in the course of the research as I identified subjects of interest to the participants. For instance, when I realized Katherine's interest in writing processes and scientific editing, I gathered Parkhurst's (1990) and Shaw's (1991) studies as well as the *Journal of Bacteriology's* Instructions to authors. When she mentioned discourse analysis and Giltrow's knowledge deficit model for introductions (1995), I shared Swales' CARS model (1990a, Chapter 7) with her. Likewise, when I sensed Peter's interest in the pedagogy of the English article system, I gave him Master's (1987, 1995) studies. Because Swales has co-authored the textbook which Peter used, *Academic writing for graduate students.* I selected publications by Swales (1990a, 1990b), including a copy of Swales and Feak's (1994b) commentary to the textbook. Whereas I hoped to interest the research participants by my choice of documents, I also hoped that such interest would solicit, and even question, their views. For instance, Parkhurst's (1990) and Shaw's (1991) studies proved helpful to spark a discussion about the role of discovery in the composing processes of engineering and humanities writers. When I showed a copy of these studies to Katherine, I wondered whether the authors' claims could pose a challenge to an assumption I saw present in the Writing Centre's approach to writing instruction, namely that the same writing processes and strategies hold across the curriculum. By discussing Parkhurst's (1990) and Shaw's (1991) studies, it became apparent that, contrary to my presumption, Katherine was well-aware of disciplinary variations in composing processes.

Not all documents listed in Table 3.6 were shared. Nor were they all intended to be shared. Rather, they were intended to be shared only if and when they became relevant to the issues being raised during a conversational exchange. As it turned out, however, Katherine was so interested in the articles that she photocopied most of them.

Transcribing, Recording, and Analyzing Data

With the exception of three early interviews with graduate students in February 1997, conversational exchanges were not audio-taped. Rather, I took a few notes during the exchange, such as an ordered list of the topics covered

and a few verbatim transcriptions of the participants' words and sentences. I built on these notes to write up a detailed retrospective report immediately after the exchange. One advantage of the method was that it allowed immediate recording of insights, thoughts, and non-verbal behavior; it also allowed me to monitor the dynamic of the exchange, to engage in researcher reflexivity, to begin the analysis of the information, and to prepare follow-up questions that naturally unfolded from the exchange. In addition, it was a non-intrusive method that could capture spontaneous, un-rehearsed, and informal exchanges especially as they took place in corridors and other informal venues. It was time-efficient and not expensive. On the other hand, its main drawback was that some verbal information was irretrievably lost since the interactants' words could not be recorded in full and with guaranteed accuracy. To overcome this drawback, I coded my transcription of conversational exchanges as follows. Inverted commas signaled exact transcriptions of the participant's words. Square brackets signaled that the gist of a phrase was transcribed, but not the participant's words. Sometimes, comments were also added in square brackets: "[not the participants' word];" "[participant's words]."

Despite such coding, verbal information was lost. Such a loss has significant epistemological consequences since, as Bruner (1986) and Maguire (1994, p. 117) argue it is "through language that we impose...a view about symbolic environments and how language users presume to operate within them." Therefore, the very words that the participants use to describe their own views and practices convey and construct the symbolic environments within which they operate. To analyze the participants' views and practices from their perspectives requires that the researcher pay close attention to the participants' words (Geertz, 1975). Such scrutiny was contingent on the capacity of my memory. When I could not remember the participant words with accuracy, I had to supply my own words to report the views that they had shared during the conversational exchange. Instead of recording the participants' views from their perspectives, I was already re-constructing these views from my own perspective as narrative segments (NS, cf. example in Appendix D). Consequently, in my field notes the distinction between the views of the research participants and my interpretations of them is sometimes blurred.

Such an early reconstruction of the research participants' perceptions at the data collection stage may be problematic within a phenomenological approach to interviews. Indeed, this approach purports to elucidate "both that which appears and the manner in which it appears" by focusing "on the experienced meanings of the subjects' life world" (Kvale, 1996, p. 53). However, from a socio-constructivist perspective, "validation is conceptualized as a social construction of knowledge, with a communal negotiation of its meaning." (pp. 268-271) Within this perspective, I considered the initial perceptions of the research participants prior to the research project to be less important than the negotiated interpretations of the evolving perspectives of the researcher and the researcher participants. Whereas I did attempt to understand the participants' views, beliefs, doings from their perspectives, I did not withhold my views lest I should influence the research participants. Rather, in keeping with a socio-constructivist principle of research validation, I shared and discussed my views with the research participants until we either agreed on these views or identified our different ways of perceiving. Thus, I deemed the communal revision of the research report at the end of each "research cycle" to be more important for the validation of the research process than the initial transcription of the conversational exchanges.

Analysis of Documents

Table 3.7 lists the main documents that I collected and analyzed as cultural artefacts and sustained segments of conversation. Some of them have been written by Katherine and Peter. They proved useful as first-hand, permanent records of the instructors' perceptions.

Table 3.7

Documents relevant to the Writing Centre and Katherine's discursive practices

Source	Date	Title and nature of document
Associate Director of the Writing Centre	1991	"Effective Written Communication: The First Ten years," *Belleview University Journal of Education*, 9 pp.
Former Director of the Writing Centre	1981	"EWC Principles for Discussion," 2 type-written pages about
Former Director of the Writing Centre and Katherine	1981	"Some Recent Research in Writing," 9 type-written pages about "some fundamental notions about writing."
Instructors at the Writing Centre (collective work)	July 1993	"Effective Written Communication: Handbook for Teachers and Monitors," 30 pp.
Instructors at the Writing Centre	Winter 1998	Memos, Course Outlines, Course Handouts.
Katherine	November 96	"Sourcebook: Communication in Engineering & Advanced Written Communication, Science Section." Includes: • "Sample Course Outline for Engineering Students" • "Rhetorical Cases for Teaching Writing Strategies" • "Revision and Editing Exercises" • "Writing Strategies" • "Assignments and Exercises" Over 100 pp.
Katherine	Spring 1997	"Advanced Written Communication," a Course Outline for an Education Section: 2 pp.
Katherine	27/11/97	Memo to Instructors of Communication in Engineering, 19 pp.
Katherine	Winter 1997	"Advanced Written Communication," a Course Outline for an Engineering Section (the focal section of this study), 5 pages
Katherine	Winter 1997	Courses Handouts from collected the during classroom-based observations of the focal section of the AWC course. Include: • Student Writing Samples from former years • Editing and revising exercises • Copies of several articles about "making an effective technical presentation" and "tips for Technical Speakers" taken from varied journals such as *Cost Engineering*, *Research & Technology Management*, *Chemical Engineering*.
Katherine	Winter 1998	"Communication in Engineering," a Course Outline for an Engineering Section, 4 pages.
Katherine	13/02/98	"Communication in Engineering" Includes a "Course History," "Course Description," and "Theoretical Principles," 5 pages
Professor of Chemical Engineering/Writing Centre	28/02/98	"Proposed Concept for an Integrated Technical Report Writing and Communications Course in Engineering," 1 table.

Table 3.8

<u>Documents relevant to the Language Centre and Peter's discursive practices</u>

Source	Date	Title and nature of document
Belleview University	1996	Course calendar: Undergraduate programs.
Language Centre (collective work)	March 1996	"Celebrating our twenty-fifth anniversary," a review of the Centre's activities by 15 instructors and one student, Belleview University publication, 59 pp.
Language Centre	Spring 1998	Posted Advertisement for a Faculty Lecturer Position.
Peter	Winter 1997	Class Handouts, including • Instructions of "How to Write Critiques" (Xerox-copied from *Writing Across the Curriculum*). • Samples of student critiques • Grammatical and punctuation exercises, • Grammatical and punctuation notes, • Diagnostic tests • Two essays: "The Grandiose Claims of Geneticists, " by Dorothy Nelkin, and "The Human Genome Project: A Personal View," by James D. Watson. Both essays were excerpt from *Writing Across the Curriculum*. REF.
Three focal students	Winter 1997	All drafts of course assignments.
Focal students and Peter	Winter 1997	Peter's audio-taped feedback to focal students' texts and the focal students' written revisions of their drafts.
Troyka, L., Buckley, J., & Gates, D.	1996	*Simon & Schuster handbook for writers: First Canadian Edition*, Scaborough, ON: Prentice Hall Canada Inc.
Swales, J., & Feak, C.	1994	*Academic writing for graduate students: A course for nonnative speakers of English.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press,
Swales, J., & Feak. C.	1994	*Academic writing for graduate students: A commentary.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Summary

In this chapter, I discussed the epistemological assumptions that underlie my inquiry, located my research questions within embedded institutional and educational contexts, and analyzed my research methodology. I put forward my postmodern views of research as a social construction and knowledge as conversation. I argued that concepts and theories about natural and social phenomena are language constructs negotiated within communities of knowledge. Within scientific communities, these negotiated constructions are constrained by a social consensus to satisfy criteria of accountability to factual and experimental data about social behavior and natural phenomena. From my socioconstructivist research

perspective, I reviewed relevant epistemological principles which I see guided my interpretive and linguistc constructions, namely the recursivity of focal and subsidiary awareness on parts and wholes (Polanyi, 1962) and my use of comparative analysis. I then provided background contextual information about the research site, including descriptions about Belleview University, the Writing Centre and the Language Centre, the FAW and the AWC courses. Last, in keeping with my emphasis on the transparency of interpretive inquiry, I described the main phases of my classroom-based inquiry and examined my use of the three tools of qualitative interpretive inquiry, observations, interviews, and documents (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). In the next chapter, I analyze data sets to interpret the teaching practices, perceptions, and beliefs of two writing instructors, Peter and Katherine.

Table 3.9 summarizes the codes I defined in this chapter and use in subsequent chapters.

Table 3.9

List of codes

Code	Description
CE	Conversational Exchange
DOC	Document
FN	Field Notes
OC	Observatory Comment
NS	Narrative Segment
NS/CE	Narrative Segment based on a Conversational Exchange

CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS OF DATA SETS

Peter

Peter clearly favors a "generalist" approach based on a good background in the humanities—and he says half-jokingly : "And I happen to have that background!" (NS/CE, 11/12/97)

... At one point in this discussion, Peter draws what appears to be for him important distinctions—between ESL and writing problems, between non-native and native speakers [of English],

On another occasion, Peter will add: "They give a new [high-flown] name to an old teaching method..." (NS/CE, 11/12/98)

Katherine

"I fell into English by accident!" (NS/CE, 30/10/97).

Writing is a complex cognitive skill, not a set of simplified mechanical abilities. Therefore, writers need to practise whole pieces of writing in context, that is, practise meeting the needs of specific readers in specific situations. (DOC: "Communication in Engineering," 1998).

Writers who understand and respect the discovery aspects of the writing process are far more likely to develop those critical skills involved in using writing as a creative tool." (DOC: "Some recent research in writing," 1981).

These excerpts from varied conversational exchanges with and documents by Peter and Katherine provide glimpses into two writing instructors' ways of engaging in the activity of teaching writing in the disciplines. In this Chapter, I adopt a socio-cultural perspective and examine how the instructors' cultural stances towards writing instruction may inform their belief systems and goal directed practices. Peter's cultural stance is interpreted as a complex interplay between three evaluative orientations—that of a Humanist, Generalist, Man of Letters; that of an EAP Second Language Instructor; and that of an experienced, pragmatic teacher. Likewise, Katherine's cultural stance is construed as a combination of three orientations, namely a cognitivist, L1 composition instructor's view, a socio-cognitivist, WAC, discipline-specific instructor's view, and an expressivist,

inclusive coach's view. I argue that the complex interplay between and among the different components of Peter's and Katherine's cultural stances inform their manifold ways of teaching writing *in and outside the students' disciplines.*

My interpretations of the instructors' cultural stance and discursive practices draw on the three tools of qualitative inquiry. The instructors shared their beliefs, values and goals with me during informal, semi-focused conversational exchanges and I observed their goal-directed actions during classroom participant observations. Document analysis of course outlines and course texts also contributed to my perception of their beliefs, values, goals, and actions. Last, I shared my emerging perceptions and interpretations for feedback. I thus aimed to triangulate my interpretations from more than one perspective and used varied tools of analysis (interviews, observations, and document analysis).

Given the complexity of the instructors' cultural stance, it helps to draw a few contrasts between Peter's and Katherine's cultural stances toward writing instruction, as summarized in Table 4.1. The main differences concern: 1) the way they position themselves as a second language instructor or a first language instructor; 2) their overall teaching goals, i.e. help students adjust to the academic milieu vs. prepare students for professional communication in non-academic settings; 3) their theoretical and academic backgrounds; 4) and their appreciation of literary, technical, and scientific texts.

Table 4.1

Overview of Peter's and Katherine's cultural stances and identities

Teacher	Peter	Katherine
Identity	• Member of Second Language Centre	• Member of Writing Centre
Identity	• Second language instructor, whose goal is to help ESL students with academic writing in a second language	• L1-communication facilitator, whose goal is to help students with professional and academic communication
Stance	• Generalist, humanities orientation valuing "well-rounded" scholars	• Discipline-specific focus on engineering communication
Stance	• Peter values literary texts as "dense," "aesthetic," rhetorically complex, unlike "light" scientific texts.	• Katherine values engineering writing as "the art of creating unambiguous language"
Back-ground	• Background in literary criticism, English literature, and the philosophy of language: Affinity with Neo-Aristotelian rhetorical approaches to writing instruction.	• Background in L1 composition theories and English literature: Affinity with socio-cognitive and expressivist approaches to writing instruction

In the next sections, however, I argue that some of these binary oppositions warrant qualifications.

A Generalist, Humanist, Second Language Instructor's View of Writing

In Table 4.2, I provide an interpretation of Peter's complex cultural stance toward academic writing instruction and suggest ways in which Peter's cultural stance may inform his teaching views, beliefs, values, and goal-directed practices. I also suggest that Peter's cultural stance may be influenced by his professional and social identities.

The Humanist, Generalist View

Following is an excerpt of a narrative segment based on a conversational exchange with Peter.

What it takes to be a good academic writing instructor

[Peter] explains that not every instructor can teach academic writing to graduate students. First of all, you need to be a "practitioner," i.e. you need to have written a dissertation yourself, so that you gain respect [credibility] from your students. If you're still writing and publishing articles, it's even better, ideally you need to be a practicing practitioner. But you must also be able to handle "dense texts" not only "light weight" ones. You must have "highly developed critical reading skills" and "cultural roundedness" and you must be "highly grounded in the world." Peter clearly favors a **"generalist"** approach based on a

Table 4.2

Peter's cultural stance toward writing instruction and goal-directed teaching practices

Social and professional identity	Cultural Stance	Beliefs and values	Goals	Actions
Doctor in English, with speciality in comparative medieval and modern metaphysics and semiotics.	Humanist, Generalist View	• Values humanities writing/writers over scientific/technical counterpart. • Values well-roundedness, critical thinking skills. • Views texts as works of arts in which form and content are effectively and aesthetically interwoven. • Has affinity with literary and rhetorical approaches like Coe's (1990): "I teach my students that all writing is rhetoric." • Distances himself from SLA field, its passing trends and "charlatans" (e.g. Krashen).	• To stimulate and sharpen students' critical thinking skills. • To develop their abilities to "handle dense texts," to write and reason from textual sources. Students must see the rhetorical relationships between "form and content."	Choice of tasks: • Article summary • Article reaction • Article critique Choice of texts: • "Female Math Anxiety on the Wane" (Holden, 1987); • "The Grandiose Claims of Geneticists" (Nelkin, 1995) Class interactions: • Class discussions around texts.

Table 4.2

<u>Peter's cultural stance toward writing instruction and goal-directed teaching practices</u> (continued)

Social and professional identity	Cultural Stance	Beliefs and values	Goals	Actions
Associate director of Second Language Centre; native speaker of English.	Second Language Instructor View	• Stresses distinction between ESL and writing problems. Non-native speakers of English, esp. graduate students have "fossilization" problems. They have reached high levels of specialization and cognitive development, yet they still have considerable language difficulties in English and with writing.	• To provide grammar and academic writing instruction; "the course is designed to help graduate students who are non-native of English, develop their academic writing skills...there will be ongoing diagnosis and correction of ESL as well as general writing problems" (cf. course outline).	<u>Choice of text:</u> • "You have to do Swales [&Feak, 1994]" • *Understanding and using English grammar* (Azar, 1989), *Simon & Schuster* (Troyka et a., 1996). • NOT: Coe's (1990) or Giltrow's (1995) writing textbook. <u>Choice of tasks:</u> • Grammatical exercices + discourse analysis tasks (cf. Swales & Feak, 1994) <u>Choice of items:</u> • Articles, tense, gerunds vs. infinitives, punctuation; research paper genre and subgenres.
Experienced second language instructor and teacher as continual learner	Open, pragmatic stance, integrating multiple influences (cognitive, behavorist, communicative, humanist) NB. Behaviorism had currency when Peter started his teaching career.	• Has seen a succession of approaches, e.g. behaviorist, communicative, humanitist, eclectic. Skeptic about these passing trends, yet has been influenced by them. • Values teacher experience. • Views his class "as a testing ground." • Open to novel ideas, e.g. from colleagues and graduate students. • Believes that to be a writing instructor, you need to be a practicing "practioner" of writing yourself.	<u>Cognitive influence & belief in value of metacognition:</u> • Wants to raise the students' "awareness" on their ESL/writing problems. • Plans to use logbook for this purpose. <u>Behaviorist influence:</u> • "you can drill out gerund and infinitive problems from students."	<u>Class interactions:</u> • Variety of collaborative and individual activities, communicative and form-focused activities. <u>Tasks:</u> • Awareness raising tasks, e.g. diagnostic tests, group discussions around fill-in-he blank. • Deductive tasks: e.g. grammatical rules introduced, applied, and discussed.

good background in the humanities—and he says half-jokingly : "And I happen to have that background!" (OC: Incidentally, he says: "I used to be at the **English Department**" to explain why he is recruiting markers from this department, markers in which he has total confidence). Peter's view is that scientists and even linguists and those who do the "semi-sciences" can be so narrowly focused that they hardly can make good writing instructors and even good writers. True, there are, among scientists, very good writers, but these usually have broad interests and with a solid, well-rounded culture....

Peter is not "impressed" by writing instructors with a scientific background. They do their experiments at the lab but then they are perplexed when confronted to "dense texts" containing "reflections." They can't respond to them, they're lost, whereas people in the humanities have a broader outlook which allows them to handle such texts and also scientific, specialized ones—because the last type of text doesn't present much difficulty.... Instructors in the humanities, they have this "textual" capacity, this ability to handle dense texts, and to see the relation between "**Form and content**", to look at a text from different perspectives, to see whether it "reads well", i.e. whether the form is invisible because it is flawless, when "everything fits together." And I explain to my students, P elaborates, that two texts with the same argument can either convincingly gain the reader's support or simply a mitigated response—all depending on the effectiveness of the rhetoric, "because I teach my students that all writing is rhetoric." (NS/CE, 11/12/97)

What surfaces in this narrative segment is what I call Peter's "humanist, generalist view" of writing instruction. This view is evinced in Peter's evaluative orientations toward scientific writers and humanities scholars and in his identification with the latter group. It is "humanist" because it stems from a scholar with an academic background in the humanities. It is "generalist" because it foregrounds general education in the liberal arts, society, and culture and backgrounds specialized vocational training in a given field. Thus, Peter values humanities-based training, which fosters "well-roundedness" and develops a student's ability to handle "dense texts" with complex, non-linear arguments. Scientific writing, on the other hand, seems to him to be excessively narrow in focus and not very rhetorically formative.

Peter's "humanities orientation" also emerged in other segments of conversational exchanges. For instance, he expressed his aesthetic views of

"text as work of arts" and the "composition process as art and as discovery" (NS/CE, 11/12/98). These views are consonant with literary and rhetorical approaches to composition, which emphasize the aesthetic, creative, and formal features of texts. Peter's affinity for these approaches was confirmed when he explained (NS/CE, 28/11/97) that he "felt closer" to Coe's (1990) approach to writing instruction, as adopted in his book *Process, Form, and Substance: A rhetoric for advanced writers* than to Giltrow's (1995) in *Academic writing: Writing and reading across the disciplines (AWGS)*. Such a preference offers an interesting insight into Peter's positioning relative to the complex traditions within academic writing instruction. Coe's (1990) approach is rooted in literary and humanities studies (especially Burke, 1966). As the author explains, the "textbook is based on the most up-to-date theory and research, and also on a venerable 2500-year tradition of [Aristotelian] rhetoric and humanism" (p. xiii). In contrast, Giltrow's textbook seems more akin to fields of language education, applied and socio-linguistics, drawing as it does on genre theory (Miller, 1984; Swales, 1990a; Freedman and Medway, 1994a, 1994b) and cognitive psychology (e.g., Flower and Hayes, 1981). Peter, himself, attributed his preference for Coe to his own background in the humanities and literary studies: "Thomas [a doctoral candidate recently hired by the Language Centre as a teaching assistant] feels closer to Coe's book than to Giltrow's, and I do too, because of my background in literature, I guess." (NS/CE, 28/11/97).

Peter's greater affinity for Coe rather than Giltrow is noteworthy because it suggests the existence of disciplinary tensions underlyingly his "humanities orientation." Such tensions also surface in Peter's ambivalent attitude toward SLA research. One the one hand, as an ESL teacher, Peter turned to SLA research when he designed academic writing courses mostly for non-native speakers of English. Indeed, part of Peter's mandate when he was hired as the coordinator of the English language unit by the Language Centre was to survey the SLA literature, recruit ESL specialists with formal training in SLA, and design language courses informed by SLA research (Peter, personal oral communication, 21/05/98). Peter's own teaching practices also appear to build on SLA research. For instance, he uses audio-taped feedback to draw the attention of his students on the specific grammatical errors which they have made in their texts (DOC: Recording of

Peter's audio-taped feedback to student texts). This practice seems inspired by current recommendations in SLA research (e.g., Lyster, 1997; Spada and Lightbown, 1993), namely that grammar instruction promotes learning when it focuses on form in meaningful communicative events rather than the prescription of general grammatical rules.

Although Peter turns to the SLA field to fulfill his role as a second language instructor, he also challenges SLA research. For instance, he ridiculed the passing trends he saw in Second Language Education during his 30-year long teaching career, as in the following narrative segment from a conversational exchange:

"New" methods, passing trends, and charlatans in SLA

When [Peter] started teaching, second language education was not as developed as today. Peter alludes to the different trends which have marked this new research area and how many of its practitioners were "—not charlatans but [quite!, lacking rigor]." P questions the validity of much second language education research. "Oh, for instance, what's his name..." "Krashen" I say, amused. P reviews the history of SL research, from the "behaviorist" approach—that's when he started; with the "drills". Boring perhaps but it worked to some degree in some areas, he seems to imply.... Then there was the "communicative" approach. Then we added a "humanistic" concern. And the buzz word becomes "Eclectic." On another occasion, Peter will add: "They give a new [high-flown] name to an old teaching method..." (NS/CE, 11/12/98)

Peter's ambivalent, occasionally skeptical attitude toward SLA research contrasts with his strong allegiance to the humanities and the study of English literature and the philosophy of language.

In summary, Peter's beliefs and values toward composition and texts seem to be informed by a humanist, generalist, literary, and philosophical orientation. In turn, the influence of these beliefs and values can be traced to his teaching goals and goal-directed practices. For instance, in keeping with the humanist ideal to foster "well-rounded," "critical" thinkers and writers, Peter had his students respond to and critique essays on varied topics such as "Female Math Anxiety on the Wane" (Holden, 1987) or "The Grandiose Claims of Geneticists" (Nelkin, 1995, cf. Table 4.2). These texts invited the students to engage in critical reflection beyond their scientific and engineering fields of specialization. Thus, Peter chose the article about genetic research because a

few students in the class were conducting experiments involving genetic and microbiological manipulations. Given its subject, this article was appropriate not only to interest the students but also to invite them to reflect on the societal consequences of their own research. It thereby had the potential to contribute to the students' training as "well-rounded," responsible citizens.

Classroom-based observations revealed that the issues raised by "Female Math Anxiety On the Wane" (Holden, 1987) and "The Grandiose Claims of the Geneticists" (Nelkin, 1995) did lead to lively discussions that continued even after class time. For instance, the following excerpt of class field notes shows how the latter article engaged the class in a debate about the shared responsibilities of the media and the scientists in misrepresenting research findings to general audiences:

Excerpt from the class of March 03, 1997:

Rachid: In a sense you're right but in other ways scientists do oversimplify and explain their ideas in catchy ways.

Peter to Tamara, a student of biology: What about the biologist's viewpoint?

Tamara: I think the author's putting more blame on the scientists than the media and it should be the opposite. Good, honest scientists would never say such things or use such metaphors.

...

Tamara: I agree that you cannot blame your behavior on your gene.

Peter to class: Those who want to go can leave. [It's 1.00 p.m., end of class]

...

Antonio: I think the example of the CD is good—except that you need a good CD player.

Kendo: You need a good recording as well.

Peter: Did anyone agree with this article?

...

Michèle: I didn't get the feeling she blamed the scientists but rather the media.

...

1.11 p.m. People start leaving but the discussion continues. (FN/Class, 03/03/97).

Noteworthy is the fact that Peter encouraged the students not only to debate the articles' contentious issues but also to examine the rhetoric used by the authors to argue their points.

> <u>Peter to class:</u> "The point of this course is to separate form from content, to choose the appropriate persona: a summary is not a critique.... We usually read for content. I want you to read also for form.... Separate what is said from how it is said.... Has the author used and interpreted information fairly?... Has the author argued logically?" (FN/Class, 17/02/97).

Thus, in keeping with Peter's goal to teach his students that "all writing is rhetoric," the class discussions aimed at engaging the students in critical examinations of the rhetorical and textual interweaving of "form and content." Furthermore, class discussions prepared the ground for written assignments based on the articles, namely the article summary, the article reaction, and the article critique. Both the class discussions and text-based assignments were designed to further students' ability to "handle dense texts" and write and reason from textual sources. Clearly, these teaching practices are congruent with Peter's humanist and belletrist view to writing instruction giving importance to the formative role of textual analysis, rhetoric, and text-based composition.

Thus far, I have tried to describe Peter's teaching beliefs, values, goals, and actions as expressions of a humanist, generalist, literary evaluative orientation to writing instruction. Such an orientation may in turn be accounted for by Peter's education in English literature, which earned him a doctoral degree. Since the defense of his dissertation, Peter has maintained ties with the English Department and has continued research activities in comparative medieval and modern metaphysics and linguistic theories. These past and present affiliations with the Faculty of Arts may help explain, in part, Peter's affinity with rhetorical and literary approaches to writing instruction.

A Second Language Instructor's View

Many conversational exchanges reflect a tension between embracing a second language instructor's view and a writing instructor's view to academic writing instruction, as illustrated in the next two narrative segments:

An important distinction: ESL and writing problems

> ... At one point in this discussion, Peter draws what appears to be for him important distinctions—between ESL and writing problems, between non-native and native speakers [of English], and to a lesser extent, between graduate and undergraduate students. Non-native speakers of English have fossilization problems and "heterogeneous" [my word] competencies, that is they have reached advanced cognitive and academic levels and at the same time they still have [serious] language problems. The gap is even wider for graduate than undergraduate students. This term, he is teaching both sections (for grads and undergrads) and grad students have more ESL difficulties this year than last....
>
> Peter then asks me a series of questions about how I would tackle ESL problems ...

(NS/CE, 22/10/97)

Teaching writing or teaching a second language.

> ... P asks me where I am heading to, the teaching of writing... or the teaching of second language. I say: "It's interesting you've raised this question. During this research project I've noticed how a line is drawn between the two. I hadn't realized that before." Then I explain I don't see such a line and intend to address both types clienteles. P: "You're right. There shouldn't be a line" but he re-stresses that with second language learners, writing problems are combined with ESL problems. Coe's book is for advanced writers in rhetoric programs, he explains....

(NS/CE, 11/12/97)

In the course outline, Peter also explained that:

> ...the course is designed to help graduate students who are non-native of English, develop their academic writing skills...there will be ongoing diagnosis and correction of ESL as well as general problems.... (DOC: Course outline, 06/01/97)

As an associate director and instructor at the Second Language Centre, Peter is sensitive to the needs of his students, all non-native speakers of English. For him, ESL students need help both with "ESL problems," i.e. "fossilized" language errors, and "general writing problems," e.g. rhetorical and stylistic infelicities which can be found in native and non-native writing alike. Peter's concern about the needs of ESL students helps explain the emphasis in his course on grammar instruction, especially on linguistic items such as articles, tense, and verbal constructions (gerunds and infinitives). His

concern also results in the choice and use of actual course texts. For instance Swales and Feak (1994a) *Academic writing for graduate students* is targeted for ESL students. The authors genre-based approach requires students to analyze academic discourse for both language and argumentation while covering "areas of academic grammar and vocabulary found to be troublesome for nonnative speakers of English" (back cover page). Peter also used *Simon & Schuster handbook for writers* (Troyka, et al., 1996), primarily for punctuation, mechanics, and the grammatical sections about ESL writing (pp. 779-820). When he thought that his students needed supplementary explanations and practice with English, he used excerpts of *Understanding and using English grammar* (Azar, 1989) as well as "diagnostic tests" and cloze tests.

Peter's concern for the particular needs of his ESL students also led him not to use Coe's (1990) textbook for the course, even though he may have found it more interesting than Swales & Feak's (1994). As he once exclaimed, in a second language academic writing class, "you have to do Swales!" (NS/CE, 22/10/97). Such a *cri de coeur* may be interpreted as a sign of a tension between a humanist, generalist view and a second language instructor's view. Thus, despite his affinities with Coe's literary and rhetorical approach, Peter considers it his first and foremost mandate to address the needs of his ESL graduate students. For Peter, these needs comprise the "polish[ing]" of "ESL skills and writing skills" and the "practice" of "academic form." (DOC: Belleview University Undergraduate Course Calendar, 1996-1997). Since Swales & Feak (1994) specifically address these needs in *Academic writing for graduate students*, this textbook appears to be tailored for an ESL academic writing course. Coe's text (1990), on the other hand, is an L1 composition textbook for advanced writers. Even though the latter text may be more congruent with Peter's humanist, generalist view to academic writing instruction, as a second language instructor, Peter feels inclined to use Swales and Feak (1994a), an English for Academic Purposes (EAP), ESL textbook. An interesting question then arises as to whether he feels obligated to use this text, and if he does, where this feeling of obligation may stem from.

An Open, Integrative, Pragmatic Stance

A last component of Peter's cultural stance toward academic writing instruction consists of his pragmatic, open attitude toward educational approaches. Thus, through his long teaching career, he maintains that he has seen a succession of trends, which he identified as "behaviorist," "communicative," "humanist," and "eclectic" (NS/CE, 11/12/98). Whereas he kept a critical stand toward each of them, he also sought to capitalize on their contributions. It is therefore not surprising that his teaching practices show signs of varied influences from educational research.

Evident in Peter's multiple, integrative approach is his questioning of a behaviorist influence

> We can drill students out of gerund and infinitive problems if we really
> want to but, unfortunately, we do not have the time. (NS/CE, 22/10/97)

Peter explained that behaviorism had currency when he started his teaching career and he even used the audio-lingual method to train military personal. However, given that class time is limited, Peter prefers to help students diagnose their language difficulties. For instance, he used diagnostic tests to raise students' awareness on their ESL weaknesses (DOC/Class handouts, 13/01/97, 05/02/97, 19/02/97) and he repeatedly insisted that the students be able to explain their mistakes by saying which rules they had infringed:

> Peter to class, when returning assignments: "You should be able to tell
> me why you've used five articles [wrongly] in your last assignment."
> FN/Class, 20/01/97).

Peter insisted that students assume responsibility for working on their "ESL weaknesses" once they have diagnosed them. His emphasis on awareness raising and metacognition can be attributed to a cognitivist influence, as much as to his value of linguistic accuracy.

A third influence that is perceivable in Peter's teaching practices seems to originate from socio-constructivist approaches to language learning. For instance, many group tasks that Peter assigned are built on socio-constructivist principles of collaborative learning (e.g., Bruffee, 1984; Tudge, 1990), namely that collaboration with peers may help learners realize their full potential of development (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86). These collaborative tasks included the "peer-editing" of summaries, article critiques, and research

papers (FN/Class, 10/02/97, 03/03/97, 17/03/97). They also consisted of many small group discussions during which the students completed assigned tasks in Swales and Feak (1994a) and argued for the rhetorical, linguistic, and stylistic choices they had made in their answers.

Example of a task that students did collaboratively

Here again is the summary of the Suzuki passage in Task Three. Would it be improved by adding a reminder phrase? Where would you insert it? (DOC: *AWGS*, 1994, Task Seven, p. 123).

The combination of behaviorist, cognitivist, socio-constructivist influences reflects Peter's open, integrative stance to writing and language instruction. Turning to educational and SLA research with a pragmatic interest, his best criteria for the validity of an educational method appears to be whether or not it works in his classroom. Whereas he remains open to new methods and new ideas, especially as they come from younger instructors with formal training in second language education, he adopts them only after he has successfully "tried them out" for himself. His class then becomes "a testing ground" for experimenting with different language and teaching method.

"My class is a testing ground"

About second language education research and practice, he says: "my class is a testing ground." Unlike [younger, newly recruited language instructors at the Centre] and me, he did not start with a theoretical perspective and then tried it out on the field. That may be a difference of generation too, he says. When he started in 1976, second language education was not as developed a field as it is today. Plus, it was dominated by the behaviorist, audiolingual approach. (NS/CE, 11/12/97).

Peter is willing to collaborate with the younger instructors that the Language Centre has recently hired. Whereas they can benefit from his many years of teaching experience, he can benefit from their fresh ideas and up-to-date formal knowledge about SLA, composition theory, and applied linguistics.

I can use you as I have used Thomas [a language instructor finishing his doctoral degree in English]. I have used Thomas but he has also used me [so we break even]. (NS/CE, 28/11/97)

In summary, Peter's cultural stance toward writing instruction is interpreted as a complex interplay between three evaluative orientations---

that of the Humanist, Generalist, Man of Letters; that of the Second Language Instructor; and that of the experienced, pragmatic teacher. There are certainly more than three dimensions to Peter's cultural stance but these three dimensions do some justice to seeing and understanding the richness and complexity of Peter's discursive practices. A cultural stance is not necessarily linear or uniform but can contain tensions and contradictions. For instance, Peter oscillates between adopting a Man of Letters stance and a Second Language Instructor stance. Expressions of the first stance are reflected in his open skepticism toward SLA research and his affinity toward rhetoric and literature. Manifestations of the second stance can be found in Peter's attempt to build on EAP research and ESL textbooks to meet the learning needs of his students. In the third section of this chapter, I attempt to show possible ways in which Peter's cultural stance, in its complexity, tensions, and contradictions, may inform how he approaches and engages in the teaching of writing in the disciplines. In the next section, I compare his cultural stance with Katherine's orientation.

A First-Language, Discipline-Sensitive, Communication-Facilitator's View

Katherine's view, like Peter's, is construed as three-fold—an L1 composition instructor's view, a WAC, discipline-sensitive instructor's view, a coach's view (cf. Table 4.3).

An L1 Composition Instructor's View

Katherine defines herself as an L1 composition instructor, specifically a teacher of "effective written communication" in the Writing Centre's terminology.[19] An underlying assumption of this position is that the students must be proficient in English to benefit from the writing course. In accordance with the guidelines of the Writing Centre described in Chapter 3, Katherine makes it clear on her course outlines that her course in engineering

---

[19] The Writing Centre's terminology distinguishes between undergraduate writing courses, which are referred to as "Effective Written Communication" (EWC), and graduate writing courses, which are referred to as "Advanced Written Communication" (AWC). Although this study focuses on one section of an AWC course, it sometimes refers to other sections, especially EWC sections. Most of the Centre's course offerings are EWC sections. The unusual features of the focal, AWC section of this study in comparison to the other, mostly EWC sections are discussed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4.

Table 4.3

Katherine 's cultural stance toward writing instruction and goal-directed teaching practices

Social and profesional identity	Cultural Stance	Beliefs and values	Goals	Actions
Faculty lecturer, Mainstay of the Writing Centre	L1 composition instructor's view (cognitivist view)	Teaching effective written communication (EWC), not ESL: "We teach style rather than grammar...Teaching grammar does not improve writing...Writing is learned by writing and not by talking about it..." "grammar should be taught to each individual in the context of his or her writing." Cognitivist influences: "Writing is a process. It proceeds in stages. It is problem-solving." Writing must "meet the reader's needs and the writer's goals....Form follows function."	1) To "minimize rules... maximize strategies." 2) To "give timely, accurate feedback" 3) To "reward performance," i.e. "finished, polished pieces of writing" and "writing strategies" used.	Workshop method: Students practice and share writing in class. Use of logbook: To raise student metacognitive skills and awareness of learning needs, writer's goals, and writing strategies. Teaching and practice of writing strategies: For idea-generation, audience analysis, planning, revising, editing. Students are trained to "analyze writing problems and experiment with approapriate problem-solving heuristics." Choice of assignments: Problem-solving paper. Students who lack fluency in English are advised to transfer into a language course.

Table 4.3

Katherine 's cultural stance toward writing instruction and goal-directed teaching practices (continued)

Social and profesional identity	Cultural Stance	Beliefs and values	Goals	Actions
Faculty lecturer, Mainstay of the Writing Centre, and "Science buff."	WAC instructor's view with concerns about discipline specificities (cognitivist and social view)	Variations across disciplines and contexts: "EWC has become a set of discipline-specific courses." One writes for an audience; audience expectations vary across disciplines. Writers must "practise meeting the needs of specific readers in specific situations." Genre-based approach: "Writing is learned by reading the kinds of text one wants to write, and then by trying to produce similar texts." Professional, Technical, and Academic writing: "Usually, we do not teach academic writing...[We] provide...support for oral and written communication skills across the [university] community and beyond." "Writing in engineering must be comprehensive, clear, and logical as possible."	1) To "guide [students] to good reading in their disciplines." 2) To consult with the Engineering Faculty for consistency with engineering courses. 3) To have students "handle a range of academic and professional writing tasks" in a variety of audiences and genres. 4) To make an effort to understand technical and scientific texts, even if discourse is highly-specialized.	Choice of course texts: Rhetorical cases and writing samples from the students' disciplines. Textbooks: *Technical Communication* (Markel); *Writing in Engineering* (Mavrow); *How to write and publish a scientific paper* (Day) Choice of assignments: Technical paper, essay for non-technical audience, application package. Consultations with the engineering department: Within the Writing Centre, Katherine fosters collaboration and consultation with the Engineering Faculty. Course emphasis on new, computer-assisted communication technologies as practiced in the engineering workplace. Personal resources and continual training: Consults *Science handbook: for students, writers, and science buffs* to best understand technical text.

Table 4.3

Katherine 's cultural stance toward writing instruction and goal-directed teaching practices (continued)

Social and profesional identity	Cultural Stance	Beliefs and values	Goals	Actions
As a former graduate student of the Writing Centre, wrote monograph about "the role of expressive writing in university writing course."	Coach's view (inclusive, expressivist view).	<u>Expressivist influences:</u> "Writing is a discovery process." "Students need to...take pride of ownership in their work." <u>"A big tutoring class":</u> The student population is unlike that of other writing courses. It consists of mature foreign graduate students and professors who resist classic ESL instruction used with younger students. This class is "a big tutoring class' for them.	"Empower writers... Give them authentic writing assignments... Assign whole texts." "Respect writers' ownership of their writing." "Build trust." Have students, i.e. professors and doctoral candidates, speak and practice English for non-technical purposes.	<u>Use of student's journal</u> for expressive writing and understanding student needs. <u>Use of free-writing</u> to remove the constraints of audience and function. <u>Teacher's role in class:</u> A facilitator, a coach, a tutor. Gives instruction and lets students work in groups or individually. Then gives feedback, if necessary. <u>Choice of assignments:</u> Oral presentations to provide speaking opportunities

communication is "*not* a remedial course in grammar or other basics of the English language. If you have limited experience writing and speaking in English, you may take a remedial course before you take this one" (DOC/Course outline: "Communication in Engineering," 1998). Her stance can be compared with the stance assumed by Peter, who does not teach remedial English but positions himself as a Second Language Instructor dealing with "ESL as well as general writing problems," (DOC/Course outline: "Fundamental of Academic writing," 06/01/97). Thus, Peter's and Katherine's positioning as an L2 or an L1 writing instructor can be related to the different emphases they place on language, including grammar, and writing strategies in their respective writing courses.

Katherine does not explicitly teach grammar, because in her view "teaching grammar does not improve writing" (DOC: "Some recent research in writing," 1981). Instead, she "teaches style rather than grammar" and focuses on the writing strategies that will help students "solve" their "writing problems" (NS/CE, 30/10/97). In contrast, Peter balances writing instruction with grammar instruction to assist in "the diagnosis and correction of ESL as well as general problems...." (DOC/Course outline: "Fundamental of Academic writing," 06/01/97)). It is noteworthy that both Katherine and Peter use a "problem" metaphor. However, they do not use it in the same way. For Katherine, in the lines of cognitivists like Flower and Hayes (1981) and Bruer (1993), writing tasks are ill-defined problems that need to be solved. For instance, writing a technical paper involves the solving of a technical and rhetorical problem involving such constraining parameters as research questions, audience needs, and deadlines for submission. In contrast, for Peter, general and ESL writing problems are the linguistic and rhetorical difficulties that student writers encounter when composing in academic genres.

A WAC, Discipline-Sensitive, Socio-Cognitivists Instructor's Stance

During conversational exchanges, Katherine recounted how in her twenty-year-long career at the Writing Centre she has taught many sections of written communication courses for students in various disciplines (e.g. Engineering and Education) and at various levels (e.g. undergraduates and

graduates). In this respect, she can be said to have taught "Writing Across the Curriculum" (WAC). She also made it clear that she believes that she could teach any section in any discipline if she were asked to (NS/CE, 30/10/97). However, she also admitted having over the years developed a predilection for and special expertise with engineering sections. For instance, she likes technical communication, which she understands as "the art of creating unambiguous language" and she appreciates "that writing in engineering must be as comprehensive, clear, and logical as possible" (DOC: "Communication in engineering," 13/02/98). She does not mind having to make the effort to understand technical and scientific texts, for instance by consulting *Science handbook: for students, writers, and science buffs*, a reference book which defines, explains, and illustrates technical terms. She considers herself to be "a science buff," occasionally reading *Scientific American* and *The New England Journal of Medicine*. As she once exclaimed "I fell into English by accident." Katherine's positive attitude toward Engineering communication led her gradually to include more discipline-specific texts and tasks into her course. Initially a WAC instructor teaching the same writing strategies across the curriculum, she has become more discipline-sensitive over many years of experience and interaction with Engineering students.

A comparative document analysis of Katherine's theoretical perspectives in 1981 (DOC: "Some recent research in writing") and 1998 (DOC: "Communication in engineering") confirms that she has become more sensitive to discipline particularities in recent years. In 1981, her "fundamental theoretical notions about writing" drew heavily on cognitivist researchers such as Flower (*Problem-solving strategies for writing* , 1985) and Murray (*Writing as process*, 1980). From these authors, she argued that writing instructors must develop "a repertoire of teachable techniques (heuristics) to assist writers in all stages of the writing process." She then seemed to believe that these heuristics hold across the curriculum. Admittedly, she recognized that "one writes for a reader" and that "awareness of function and of audience shape the effectiveness of writing, particularly in business and professional settings." Implicit in her recognition was that if reader expectations and purposes of writing vary across academic disciplines, professions, and settings, then good writers must know how to adapt to these varying contexts of writing.

This caveat notwithstanding, in 1981, Katherine's "theoretical notions about writing" did not include any comments upon discipline-specific or profession-specific variations in audience needs and functions and forms of writing. Nor did Katherine's theoretical principles address the role of socio-cultural contexts in the multiple stages of writing. To be fair, not many theorists were addressing socio-cultural issues in the early eighties. Consistent with her cognitivist writing views of her time, she used the same textbook across her curriculum, *Writing for Ourselves, Writing for Others*, by Dias, Beer, Ledwell-Brown, Paré, and Pittenger (1992). This textbook contains a repertoire of heuristics to solve writing problems across the curriculum, regardless of discipline particularities. For instance, freewriting is presented as useful strategy to unblock writers, whether they write literary novels or scientific research reports.

In contrast to the early 1980s, in the late 1990s Katherine's theoretical principles and teaching practices evince a greater awareness of discipline-specific variations in writing products, contexts, and even processes. As she writes in a recent historical and theoretical review of the Writing Centre, "Effective Written Communication has become a set of discipline-specific courses, including Communication in Engineering" (DOC: "Communication in Engineering," 1998). Such an evolution toward discipline-specific writing instruction is reflected in the choice of textbooks, now specifically geared to Engineering students, e.g. Markel's (1998)*Technical Communication* . While this textbook does contain sections about the stages and heuristics of the writing process, it also treats text types that are specific to Engineering communication, such as Technical Reports, Instructions and Manuals, and Usability Tests of Instructions and Manuals. Moreover, while *Writing for Ourselves, Writing for Others* gave general, discipline a-specific heuristics to solve writing problems across the curriculum, *Technical Communication* aims

> to prepare students for the various writing tasks they will face in the working world.... Accordingly, the text includes numerous samples of technical communication along with dozens of writing and revising exercises that let students apply what they have learned in realistic technical-communication situations.

In keeping with this objective, the text encourages student writers to develop heuristics adapted to specific genres of Technical Communication. Take for

example Markel's (1996) directions for writing a proposal in the Engineering workplace:

> In writing a proposal, you use the same basic techniques of prewriting, drafting, and revising that you use in any other kind of writing. However, a proposal can be such a big project that two aspects of the writing process—resource planning and collaboration—assume greater importance than they do in smaller documents. (DOC: *Technical Communication*, Markel, 1996, p. 588).

Thus, *Technical Communication* efficiently combines a cognitivist, process-based approach to writing instruction with a socio-epistemic, discipline-sensitive and genre-based approach. Katherine strongly advocated the use of *Technical Communication* to the instructors of the Writing Centre. Such advocacy is not surprising when one considers how the textbook reflects and reinforces the recent evolution of her writing views that now incorporates and combines elements of a socio-epistemic perspective to cognitivist assumptions.

To further illustrate the interweaving of cognitivist and socio-epistemic influences in Katherine's evolving theoretical and practical approach to writing instruction, let us examine Katherine's first two theoretical principles as set forth in a 1998 document about "Communication in Engineering":

> 1. Writing is learned by reading the kinds of text one wants to write, and then by trying to reproduce similar texts. Writing is learned by doing much writing and rewriting, and by reflecting on thoughtful and timely feedback and correction.

> 2. Writing is a complex cognitive skill, not a set of simplified mechanical abilities. Therefore, writers need to practise whole pieces of writing in context, that is, practise meeting the needs of specific readers in specific situations.

Her emphasis on reflection, feedback and writing as a complex cognitive skill reflects a cognitivist view of writing. However, her insistence on "the *kinds* of text "and "*specific* readers in *specific* situations" (emphasis added) reveals a socio-epistemic influence. Theorists from a socio-epistemic perspective (e.g., Witte, 1992) view writing as situated within specific social contexts and as a process of constructing knowledge. They argue that specific contexts of situation call for specific text types or *genres*, which Katherine defined in a

conversational exchange as "genre = form + situation" (cf. Giltrow, 1995, p. 21). By insisting on contexts of situation, audiences, genres, and discourse communities, genre theorists (e.g. Freedman and Medway, 1994a, 1994b; Miller, 1984; Swales 1990a) have exhorted composition theorists to pay greater attention to variations across discourse communities, including those variations that obtain along disciplinary lines. Katherine's appropriation of socio-epistemic, genre-based research may therefore account for one of her teaching maxims: "Guide [student writers] to good reading in their discipline" (DOC: "Communication in Engineering," 1998).

Katherine's positioning as a WAC instructor committed to engineering communication has consequences for her goal-directed teaching practices. For instance, she gives "authentic writing assignments" that require students to write technical papers or to explain technical matters to non-specialist audiences (DOC: "Communication in Engineering," 1998). By "authentic" she means "whole pieces of writing in context" that call on students to "handle a range of academic and professional writing tasks" in their discipline. Another example of Katherine's concern about making her course relevant to engineering students is the active role she has taken within the Writing Centre to promote consultation and collaboration with various departments within the Faculty of Engineering. She has met with professors of this Faculty to discuss ways to harmonize curricular objectives, course evaluation, and the format of course outlines between the Faculty of Engineering and the Writing Centre. These collaborative efforts have recently resulted in sustained exchanges of documents and ideas between the two units. The Writing Centre is now considering the Faculty of Engineering's call for teaching new, computer-assisted communication technologies (DOC: Katherine's memo to instructors of Communication in Engineering, 27/11/97). Furthermore, the two units are planning to share teaching responsibilities by working on a "concept for an integrated technical report writing and communication course in engineering" (DOC, 1998). While such a "proposed concept" is still preliminary and tentative, its very existence is significant of a recent trend toward collaborative curriculum design between the Writing Centre and subject-area departments.

Thus far, we have seen two components of Katherine's evaluative orientation toward writing instruction: a cognitivist, L1 composition instructor's view and a socio-cognitivist, discipline-sensitive WAC instructor's view. In adopting the first view, Katherine endeavors to teach "effective written communication" by assisting writers in the writing process with "appropriate problem-solving heuristics." In adopting the second view, Katherine seeks to help her engineering students to complete the professional, technical, and academic writing tasks in their discipline.

An Inclusive, Expressivist, Coach's View

Katherine does not consider herself to be "an instructor" or "teacher", but rather a "facilitator" who coaches students and helps them "take pride of ownership in their work." Evident in this view is an expressivist influence. When she joined the Writing Centre as a graduate student, she worked on a monograph about "the role of expressive writing in a university writing course." Since then, she has continued to value what she refers to as "writer-based prose" (Flower, 1985) or "expressive writing" (Britton, et al., 1975). She explains this view point in her 1981 review of "some fundamental theoretical notions about writing":

> This isn't to say that writer-based prose is not to be valued for its own sake. "Expressive" writing is the term used by the British scholar, James Britton, to describe language that is close to talk, 'relatively unstructured...fully comprehensible only to one who knows the speaker and shares his context.' It is 'the mode in which, speaking generally, we frame the tentative first drafts of ideas.'
>
> The expressive function is important as a 'kind of matrix from which differentiated forms of muture [sic] writing are developed.' Naturally, we want writers to be able to create good transactional or reader-based prose. But knowing that expressive or writer-based prose is a natural medium of thinking gives writers one more tool with which to be able to create good transactional pieces. Linda Flower advises writers who become 'blocked' for any one of a number of reasons to 'turn off the editor and write.' Peter Elbow in *Writing Without Teachers* also prescribes freewriting—not as an exercise in undisciplined thinking, but as a way of putting the writer in touch with what he knows and feels...." (DOC, p. 4)

Katherine's expressivist view manifests and realizes itself in her goal-directed teaching practices. For instance, among the ten teaching maxims that

she lists for a course in "Communication in Engineering" (DOC, 1998), one finds:

> Empower writers...
>
> Give them authentic writing assignments...
>
> Assign whole texts...
>
> Respect writers' ownership of their writing...
>
> Build trust.

Katherine also encourages students to make extensive use of freewriting both in class and at home, for instance to draft their assignments and write entries in their writer's journal and logbook. She wants her students to find their voice and free themselves from the mind-blocking constraints of writer-based prose. She also believes that by writing about their own writing experiences and strategies in a logbook, her students should be able to realize by themselves what their own learning needs and goals are or should be. To articulate such a belief, she referred me to Linda Flower's (1985) *Problem solving-strategies for writing*, chapter 2, "Understanding your own writing process," especially pp. 39-41. Flower lists "projects and exercises" for "a self-appraisal of your own writing process." Katherine explained that she used this textbook early on in her teaching career, and although it has not been used for the last ten years, she can still teach from it "with her eyes closed" (NS/CE, 27/11/97).

Another aspect of Katherine's inclusive, expressivist stance affects the way in which she views her students, especially those who are non-native speakers of English. As seen above, Katherine first and foremost positions herself as a L1 instructor, who does not teach ESL grammar but written communication and who recommends that students with "limited experience writing and speaking in English... take a remedial course before [they] take [her course]" (DOC/Course outline: Effective Written Communication, 1997). Nonetheless, Katherine also recognized during several conversational exchanges (23/10/97; 30/10/97; 20/11/97) that the Advanced Written Communication class I have observed was an a-typical section of the written communication courses offered by the Writing Centre because the students were foreign professors, scholars, and mature students who resist regular ESL university instruction. As she explained:

> I feel so bad when they sit in my writing class as students. They don't need scoring or testing. They need to practice their English, they need support, coaching, one-to-one conferencing.... They do not want to attend ESL language courses with young students... They are "English experts" in their own countries but they have been taught English "second-hand." (NS/CE, 20/11/97)

Thus, on the one hand, Katherine positions herself as a First Language Instructor teaching written communication to English-proficient students. On the other hand, her inclusive, coach's view makes allowances for an "atypical class" of mature foreign scholars. Of note, in her course outline for this class, unlike course outlines for "regular classes," she did not include the recommendation for students with limited proficiency in English to opt out from the course.

Cultural Stances and Ways of Engaging in the Teaching of Writing in the Disciplines: Who Sides With Spack (1988a)?

The apparent contrast between Peter's Generalist, Humanist's orientation toward writing instruction and Katherine's increasing commitment to the teaching of Engineering Communication connects with the debate between Spack (1988a) and her opponents, Braine (1988) and Johns (1988). Tables 4.4 and 4.5 summarize the main commonalities and differences between Spack (1988a), Katherine, and Peter.

Table 4.4

Convergence between Spack (1988a) and Peter

Topics	Spack (1988a)	Peter
Beliefs about the formative value of the humanities	• The humanities are apt to "produce more well-rounded, open-minded students" (p. 46) • "the English composition courses is and should be a humanities course: a place where students are provided the enrichment of reading and writing that provoke thought and foster their intellectual and ethical development" (p. 46).	• The humanities foster "cultural roundedness" and the ability to "handle dense texts." (NS/CE, 11/12/97) • Writing courses should foster "critical thinking skills" among the students. (NS/CE, 11/12/97)
Views about scientific writing	• Spack (1988a) cites Woodford (1967) to claim that "the articles in our [scientific] journals... are, by and large, poorly written." (p. 39)	• Peter compares scientific experimental research reports to essays in the humanities and generally finds the former "light[er]", less "dense," with fewer "reflections," and narrower in focus than the latter. (NS/CE, 11/12/97)
Teaching principles	• "L2 English composition teachers should focus on general principles of inquiry and rhetoric, with emphasis on writing from sources" (p. 29)	• Peter's three text-based assignments, the article summary, the article reaction paper, and the article critique[20] require students to write from a textual source and focus on the rhetoric of the source text. • "I teach my students that all writing is rhetoric." (NS/CE, 11/12/97)

Table 4.5.

Divergence between Spack (1988) and Katherine

Topics	Spack	Katherine
Teaching approaches	• Spack opposes "a disturbing trend" in ESP and WAC writing programs "toward having teachers of English, including teachers of freshman composition, teach students to write in disciplines other than English" (p. 30).	• In the course of her teaching career, Katherine has become increasingly committed to the teaching of "Communication in Engineering."
Responsibility for teaching writing	• "the teaching of writing should be left to the teachers of those disciplines." (p. 29).	• Katherine believes that professors in Engineering generally do not want to and do not feel competent to teach writing since they are not expert in rhetoric or composition processes. They know how to write but cannot necessarily articulate the strategies they use in order to guide their students to good writing in their discipline. The Writing Centre, on the other hand, has competence in writing instruction. (NS/CE, 30/10/97)
Humanist, generalist, and discipline-sensitive views of writing instruction	• "the English composition course is and should be a humanities course" (p. 46) • "The best [English teachers] can accomplish is to create programs in which students can learn general inquiry strategies, rhetorical principles, and tasks than can transfer to other course work." (pp. 40-41)	• "I've seen too many professional engineering completely baffled by their writing tasks because they were taught writing only with a humanities approach and cannot understand how to reapply old learning to new situations." (DOC: Katherine's written feedback in the margin of my manuscript to this report, 17/06/98)

---

[20] Whereas the reaction paper is intended as a short, spontaneous, and informal response to an article, the article critique is a longer, more formal writing assignment. It must include a brief summary and a critical appraisal of the author's main argument.

Topics	Spack	Katherine
Views about scientific writing	• Spack (p. 39) believes that scientific texts are "by and large poorly written." (quoting Woodford, 1967).	• Katherine values engineering writing as "the art of creating unambiguous language" (DOC: "Communication in Engineering," 13/02/98).
Relevant backgrounds for teaching writing in the disciplines	• Spack argues that "only the rare individual teacher can learn another discipline." (p. 38) She does "not deny that programs that instruct students to write in other disciplines can work. But a review of the L1 literature ... and the L2 literature... on successful programs reveals that the teachers are themselves immersed in the discipline. For example... Swales's list of publications reveals a background in scientific discourse dating back at least to 1970." (p. 40)	• Katherine may be one these "rare individual teacher[s]" who, according to Spack (1988a), can learn another discipline." (p. 38) She has dealt with the discourse of Engineering for twenty years, actively seeking to understand as much as she can from the texts that her engineering student produce. For instance, she consults *Science handbook: for students, writers, and science buffs* in an effort to assimilate the scientific terminology used by her students.
Dealing with texts from disciplines other than English	• Teaching writing in disciplines other than English "may lead many in the composition field to assign papers that they are ill-equipped to handle" (p. 30) • "English [composition teachers] who have little or no knowledge of a discipline cannot adequately teach or respond to discipline-specific writing...even when [they] collaborate with subject-area teachers" (p. 703).	• Katherine made no pretense to be fully literate in Engineering. She explained that beyond a certain level of technicality, it becomes more difficult for her to help students with their arguments. Ideally, she would like to be able to respond to arguments, organization, and language, but she admits that her knowledge of Engineering does not always permit her to do so. (Personal Oral communication, February 1998). Interestingly, however, she observed that "the students do not see this as a problem since their technical papers are always reviewed by members of their own faculty." (DOC: Katherine's written comment in the margin of my manuscript to this report, 17/06/98).
Attitude toward collaboration with subject-area faculty	• In her review of studies of writing programs in the disciplines (pp. 36-40), Spack seeks to show that collaborative programs between subject-area faculty and composition teachers "raise false expectations among the faculty as well as among the students" (p. 37).	• Katherine promotes collaboration between the Writing Centre and Faculty of Engineering. In a memo about "pending changes in communication in engineering" (DOC: 27/11/97), she suggested the importance of "understand[ing] more about the perspective of the Engineering Faculty." She was also open, although tentatively, about the possibility of "far-reaching changes that might [her emphasis] be made two or three years from now" in the light of sustained consultation with the Faculty of Engineering.

There appear to be marked differences in the ways Katherine and Peter engage in the teaching of writing in the disciplines. In keeping with his humanities orientation, Peter, like Spack, believes in the formative influence of the humanities and thinks it best to train well-rounded, open-minded students by exposing them to dense, rich texts with complex rhetoric. To achieve this curricular objective, Peter invites students to write *outside their disciplines*, for instance by assigning them to critique and respond to articles about societal issues such as "Female Math Anxiety" (Holden, 1987). Contrary to Spack (1988a) and Peter, Katherine values written engineering communication and seeks to guide students to good reading and good

writing *in their disciplines*. While she is aware that she may be, as Spack (1988a) puts it, "ill-equipped to handle" assignments in the students' disciplines, she believes that collaborative endeavors with the Faculty of Engineering may improve the Writing Centre's ability to best address the discipline-specific needs of engineering students. Bluntly put, Katherine and Peter can be positioned on opposing sides of Spack's (1988a) debate about who should teach writing in the disciplines.

Going Beyond Dichotomies

The apparently straightforward opposition between teaching writing *outside* and *in the disciplines* must be qualified. It may even collapse altogether when one examines how Katherine and Peter actually engage in the teaching of writing in the disciplines. Recall that the generalist vs. the discipline-specific opposition reflects but one component of Peter's and Katherine's complex cultural stances toward writing instruction. Other components were: 1) a Second Language Instructor's view (Peter) in contrast to an L1 composition instructor's view (Katherine); 2) Peter's open, pragmatic stance and Katherine's inclusive, expressivist coach's view. These components interrelate, and sometimes compete with one another in complex ways. The following discussion examines how such a complex interplay affects how Peter and Katherine engage in the teaching of writing in their students' disciplines. I conclude that both Peter and Katherine engage in the teaching of writing *in* and *outside the students' disciplines.*

Peter's Engagement in the Teaching of Writing in the Disciplines

In my analysis of the complexity of Peter's cultural stance, I have alluded to tensions between a second language instructor's view and a humanities-oriented writing instructor's view to academic writing instruction. In keeping with the latter view, Peter feels inclined to teach critical thinking skills and classical rhetoric, for instance by using Coe's text (1990). In keeping with the former view, he feels it his duty to address the specific needs of his ESL students. For Peter, these needs include: 1) the "diagnosis and correction of ESL as well as general writing problems" (DOC/Course Outline, 06/01/96); 2) to foster among students "an awareness

of, and competence in academic writing as a genre..." (DOC: "Celebrating our twenty-fifth anniversary," 1996). Since the Swales and Feak (1994a) text is specifically designed to address these needs, it appears to be tailored for the academic writing course that Peter wants to teach. Recall his earlier exclamation, "with ESL graduate students, you have to do Swales!" (NS/CE, 22/10/97). Indeed, Peter used the textbook as a major course text of FAW. This teaching choice had major implications for Peter's engagement in the teaching of writing in the disciplines; namely, as an ESP/EAP, genre-based textbook, Swales and Feak (1994a) played a central role in mediating this engagement.

To explain the mediating role of Swales and Feak's *Academic Writing for Graduate Students* (*AWGS*) in Peter's engagement in the activity of teaching writing in the students' disciplines, the marked ESP orientation of the textbook must be highlighted and analyzed. First, *AWGS* is published by the University of Michigan Press as part of an ESP series co-edited by Carolyn Madden and John Swales. Second, Swales himself is a major contributor to the ESP movement, as evidenced by his publications (e.g., 1984, 1988, 1990a, 1990b) and his role as co-founder and co-editor of the *ESP journal*. Third, Swales and Feak, like other ESP practitioners, believe that learners of English have specific language needs. That is, they must be taught the specific varieties of English and specific discourse types that they need to use in the particular contexts of their disciplines, occupations, and activities. Hence, *AWGS* adopts a genre-based approach with focus on the text types (e.g. the research paper) and the variety of English (i.e. academic discourse) that must be learned to function in academic contexts. In ESP terminology, *AWGS* is an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) textbook.

Fourth, Swales and Feak share with other ESP practitioners the belief that discourse analysis in specific fields should be a major component of an ESP-based approach to writing instruction. In a review of ESP, Johns and Dudley-Evans (1991, pp. 300-301) highlight the influence of Swales in ESP research in discourse analysis:

> Swales (1984, 1990b) has been a leader in encouraging the examination of sections of texts (e.g., introductions) in a number of disciplines in order to determine the required steps. Swales (1990b) defines steps as 'elements that make a paper coherent to genre-experienced readers' (p.

190). Most of Swales' work in this area has been devoted to introductions in research papers, in which he has found four prototypical steps: establishment of the field, description of previous research, gap indication, and introduction of the present research (1990a, p. 192).

Swales and Feak (1994a) draw on Swales' models for introductions in research papers (Unit 8) and describe the three prototypical "steps" or "moves" of introductions (pp. 173-217). The authors apparently aim to raise the students' rhetorical awareness of the purposes, means, and outcomes of introductions. As they argue on the cover jacket, *AWGS* "builds on the high-level analytic skills typical of its target audience. It helps students learn to scrutinize texts from their own chosen fields so that they can come to recognize the discourse conventions operating in that field."

Pervasive in Swales and Feak's (1994a) ESP approach to graduate writing instruction is the emphasis on guiding students to good reading and good writing in their disciplines. After providing explanations about and examples of academic texts in disciplines such as Second Language Education (p. 96), Engineering (pp. 99-103), Food Science (pp. 74-75), Geography (p. 62, pp. 107-109), Law (p. 110-116),*AWGS* invites the students to analyze and practice the academic genres as used in their disciplines. For instance, typical tasks include the following two examples:

<u>Inviting students to good reading in their disciplines</u>

Find a recent journal from your field of interest. Look at the openings of up to six articles. All the articles should come from the same journal. How many, if any, begin with Move 1a? If any do, photocopy the openings or write them down and bring them to class... (Task Three, p. 179)

<u>Inviting students to good writing in their disciplines</u>

Write either a short review of the citation literature or a short review of at least five papers from your own field. Use the reference system that you are most comfortable with. If you review papers from your field, also hand in a rough diagram showing how you have imposed order on the material. (Tasks Five, p. 182).

These tasks are integrated to the main text of *AWGS* as invitations for the students to further explore, in writing and in reading, the discourse of their academic fields.

Given the textbook's emphasis on guiding students through the written discourses of their disciplines, the question arises about how *AWGS* mediated Peter's engagement in the teaching of writing in the disciplines. Peter used FAW as a major course text. First, the course followed the order of subjects treated in the book and students were required to read all chapters at home. In addition, most course assignments (cf. Table 3.2) and many in-class activities were derived from textbook tasks. Since many of these tasks invited students to engage in writing and reading in their disciplines, they mediated Peter's own engagement in the teaching of writing in the disciplines. For instance, the following two assignments were based on Swales and Feak (1994a).

General Specific text assignment

Write a GS paragraph on your first language or on a topic from your field of study. Begin with either a definition or a generalization (p. 55, Task 14).

Data commentary assignment

Write a data commentary from your own field of study based on data that you select (p. 104, Task 16).

By giving the same instructions to students, Peter assigned a text type (i.e., a general-specific text or a data commentary) but left them to choose topics directly relevant to their subject-area courses. He therefore gave students the opportunity to practice writing in their own disciplines.

Likewise, Peter used Swales and Feak (1994a) for the last and major course assignment, a 1000-2000 word research paper. The authors introduce the last two units of the textbook by providing the following explanations to students:

The purpose of these units ... is to prepare you for and help you with writing up your own research. In order to do this, we have made two further assumptions:

You will be using a typical organizational pattern for your paper---in other words, the IMRD format (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion) or some variant of it;

You hope that your paper might be published (p. 155).

As for shorter assignments, Swales and Feak (1994a) assign a text type, the research paper, and give guidance about the typical rhetorical patterns of the

genre. On the other hand, they invite students to write up their own research in their own disciplines. Peter followed the textbook and did exactly the same, thereby allowing for writing opportunities in the disciplines.

Allowing students to practice writing in their disciplines is one way to engage in the teaching of writing in these disciplines. As Lave and Wenger (1991) argue,

> learning is an integral part of a generative social practice in the lived-in world.... Legitimate peripheral participation is proposed as a descriptor of engagement in social practice that entails learning as an integral constituent (p. 35).

In giving students writing opportunities in their academic disciplines, Peter opens for them possibilities to engage in "legitimate peripheral participation" as writers in those disciplines. By assuming such a mediating role in student learning, he acts as a teacher of writing in the disciplines.

However, Peter's engagement in the teaching of writing in the disciplines was not limited to inviting students to practice writing in the disciplines. Neither was it limited to assigning writing tasks in *AWGS* or to using the textbook as a guide into the academic discourses of varied disciplines. Rather, Peter also assumed a direct, explicit role in the formal teaching of writing in the disciplines. First, he stressed in his course that the students should identify and apply the discourse preferences of their fields, such as the APA and MLA styles of documentation.

> Peter to class: "You should know the format used in your disciplines."
> See Simon & Schuster handbook, p. 707 APA; p. 678, MLA."
> (FN/Class, 22/01/97).

Peter thus shared Swales and Feak (1994a) objective to "help... students learn to scrutinize texts from their own chosen fields so that they can come to recognize the discourse conventions operating in that field" (back cover jacket).

Another aspect of Peter's engagement in the teaching of writing in the disciplines is the help he offered as the students drafted their assignments. He provided much feedback on the assignments, including audio taped-feedback, written feedback, and one-to-one conferences. For instance, he

helped Shiori, a Japanese graduate student in second language education, with a term paper for a course in curriculum development (cf. Appendix E for an excerpt). He helped her work through half a dozen drafts, covering the pages with his red pen. He commented mostly on language (sentence structure, word choice, usage and grammar), although he also gave advice about textual organization (connectors, breaking of paragraphs, numberings of section). He occasionally re-wrote extensive passages and full sentences, but did not change the gist of Shiori's text. For instance,

Shiori's original text

And, the pleasant way of display would keep them motivated.

Peter's revision

The attractive displays may also serve to maintain motivation.

(DOC/Student text and Peter's written feedback, Winter 1997).

In his commitment to give comprehensive feedback, Peter helped Shiori and other students with the texts that they had written in their disciplines.

The question arises whether, while providing such writing guidance in the students' disciplines, Peter may have been led to respond to texts which, in Spack's term, he may have been "ill-equipped to handle." Indeed, most of his students did not share his background in the Arts and English literature but were specializing in the Experimental Sciences, Engineering, Computer Science, and Mathematics. Peter is aware of the difficulties that these differences in disciplinary backgrounds may occasion. For instance, Peter

admits that [because he has not appropriated the many discourses of the students' disciplines] "10% of the times I'm wrong," that is I "my corrections" [Peter gestures quotation marks] mislead the students whereas they were right. (NS/CE, 11/12/97).

Despite the recognition that in a few cases he may be "ill-equipped" to handle the students' texts, Peter remains confident that the help he can provide to the students while writing in their disciplines can prove useful. In particular, he values the tutoring opportunities of the one-to-one conferences that were scheduled during the FAW course. These conferences allowed the students to meet with Peter on an one-to-one basis for twenty minutes in order to discuss a draft to the major course assignment, the research paper. Peter articulates the help he can give during these conferences as follows:

<u>Peter's views about the individual conferences</u>

About the **individual conferences,** Peter explains that since the course I have observed, he has made "progress." ... Now he clearly emphasizes three points during individual conferences. First, he discusses **conventions** with regard to format and punctuation. He encourages students to get to know the conventions of their field. For instance, about the comma before the final "and" in a series—he systematically adds it but he realizes that in many fields—the biological sciences?/engineering?[I can't remember] this comma is left out. This is the type of variation that he and his students need to become aware of—this is the type of field-dependent conventions he may wrongly correct in his students' texts. Second, there are also **discipline-specific** variations with regard to **"content"**—**"vocabulary"** in particular. For instance, the "unusual use of words", when a word from non-countable becomes countable. On this too he must sensitize himself and his students. The third case, however, is "when you're wrong," he says to his students. Regardless of variations in content and conventions, there are cases "when you're wrong." For example, his students "often mess up with the audience," he comments. (NS/CE, 11/12/97)

The above narrative segment of a conversational exchange provides insight into how Peter may seek to deal with those texts which, in Spack's term, he may be "ill-equipped to handle." Namely, while he recognizes that he cannot know the conventions of the students' fields or discipline-specific variations in word usage, he maintains that he can play a role as an awareness raiser. He believes that through questioning he can invite and help his students to identify the discourse preferences of their fields.

Peter's views about his role as a teacher of writing in the disciplines can now be compared with Spack's (1988a). Like Spack, Peter believes in the formative value of humanities training. However, unlike Spack, he thinks that humanities-trained language instructors have a role to play in the teaching of writing in disciplines other than English because scientific professors may not have the "talents" needed to be good writing instructors, including enough experience dealing with dense texts (NS/CE, 11/12/97).

Only somewhat reluctantly does Peter concede that familiarity with the discourses of the students' disciplines is an asset when responding to student texts:

Familiarity with the discourses of the students' disciplines helps

Peter elaborates and explains his views [about what it takes to be a good writing instructor] in long stretches. When he comes to a hush, I keep probing him about how he deals with specialized texts, playing the devil's advocate. In the end, he concedes: "Of course, Guillaume," if you are familiar with the specialized content/discourse of the discipline, it is better; and I concede: "But of course it's not always possible. But I see your point. I can connect it with an interview I heard on Radio Canada about the intellectuals, their role [within society], and the fact that so many academics are so narrowly focused on their subjects that they cannot take positions on broader, societal issues." (NS/CE, 11/12/97).

The guests of the radio show argued that an intellectual was a politically engaged scholar. They deplored that today there are too few intellectuals among scholars. (Contextual note, 06/06/98)

Hence, although Peter concedes that having appropriated the discourses of the students' disciplines is "of course" better when providing feedback to the student texts, he remains convinced that a "well-rounded" background in the Arts and literary "talent" is more important than expertise in the students' fields to be a good academic writing instructor.

In summary, I have explored the ways in which Peter engages in the teaching of writing *in the disciplines*. As a second language instructor, he seeks to address the specific language needs of his ESL graduate students in order to help them adjust to their English-speaking academic milieu. This objective leads him to choose an ESP, EAP, genre-based textbook, *AWGS*, as a major course text. The textbook mediates his engagement in the teaching of writing in the students' disciplines. Namely, Peter uses the textbook to assign reading and writing tasks that invite students to explore and practice the academic discourses of their fields. In addition, Peter provides guidance to good writing and good reading in the disciplines. For instance, he gives feedback about student texts and draws student attention to the conventions of the disciplines. By engaging in the teaching of writing in the students' disciplines, Peter runs counter to Spack's (1988a) recommendation that teachers of English "should leave the teaching of writing in the disciplines to the teachers of those disciplines (p. 30)." Although he recognizes being occasionally "wrong," he feels equal to giving feedback on the texts that his students have written in their disciplines.

Peter's differences and similarities with Spack's (1988a) position about who should teach writing in the disciplines provide glimpses into the complexity of Peter's cultural stance toward writing instruction. He differs from Spack (1988a) in two ways: (a) as a second language instructor and EAP practitioner, he adopts an ESP approach and willingly engages in the teaching of writing *in the disciplines*; (b) as a Ph.D. in English Literature, he maintains that he qualifies as a teacher of writing in the disciplines. Nevertheless, like Spack (1988a), he believes in the value of teaching writing *outside the students' disciplines.* Hence, he appears to have an ambivalent approach toward the teaching of writing in the disciplines. In Bakhtinian terms (1981), tensions and contradictions in Peter's cultural stance and teaching practices result in "centrifugal" and "centripetal" forces being wielded on his engagement in the teaching of writing in the disciplines.[21]

Thus, I question a binary opposition between a generalist, belletrist view and an ESP second language instructor view, as much as I questioned Spack's (1988a) binary opposition between a generalist, belletrist view and an ESP/WAC view in Chapter 1. Earlier, I accounted for Peter's cultural stance and goal-directed practices by considering a third dimension: a pragmatic, open stance. The latter attitude may help explain how and why Peter seems to steer a middle course between a generalist, belletrist view and an ESP second language instructor view. For instance, an important teaching principle that may be attributed to Peter's pragmatic view is his belief that successful teachers should address the perceived learning needs of the students. As he put it, "you must have them tell you what their objectives are" (NS/CE, 11/12/97). Hence, if students feel that they need drills on ESL trouble spots to improve their English, Peter believes that the instructor must address the students' wants by supplying relevant exercises. By the same token, if the purpose of students in taking Peter's course is to practice academic writing in their disciplines and obtain help with their term papers and theses, then Peter makes it his duty and principle to meet these purposes.

---

[21] Bakhtin sees two forces at work in the creation of narrative discourse: The centrifugal force which pulls the author away from the normative centre and invites discontinuity between the actual and the alternative including the violation of rules and conventions; and centripetal forces, which pulls the author towards a set of rules, genre conventions, and discourse behavior, including emphasis on centralized verbal idealized thought (Maguire, personal communication).

As he eloquently said, with a multidisciplinary class of ESL graduate students, "you have to do Swales" even if you would rather do Coe (1990). The question, however, is whether it is always helpful to cater to the students' immediately perceived needs.

Katherine's Teaching of Writing Outside the Students' Disciplines

Thus far, I have contrasted Katherine's WAC, discipline-oriented view to writing instruction with Spack's (1988a) position toward having composition instructors teach humanities courses. I have argued that Katherine values written engineering communication and seeks to guide students to good reading and good writing *in their disciplines*. However, as in Peter's case, Katherine's evaluative orientation toward writing instruction is complex. In addition to the WAC, discipline-oriented socio-cognitive view, Katherine's cultural stance toward writing instruction has been described from two other dimensions: The inclusive, expressivist coach's view and the L1 instructor cognitivist view. In this section, I examine how both latter views exert centrifugal forces on Katherine's engagement in the teaching of writing in the disciplines, counterbalancing the centripetal effect of the WAC, discipline-oriented view.

As seen earlier in the analysis of Katherine's coach's view of writing instruction, she stressed the fact that the advanced written communication course which she gives to engineering graduate students is an a-typical section of the writing course offered at the Writing Centre. What is unusual is the student population, which comprises foreign professors, scholars, and mature students with limited English fluency. Normally, students with limited experience writing and speaking in English are referred to language courses. In this case, however, Katherine feels that the students may resist regular ESL university instruction at junior levels because they are graduate students or even full-fledged scholars. As Katherine put it, this class is less a writing course in Engineering Communication than "a big tutoring class" (NS/CE, 23/10/97). For Katherine, these students have had opportunities to practice English mostly within academic contexts and in their disciplines. What they need is practice and support in "everyday English" (NS/CE, 23/10/97), i.e. practice and support for English oral and spoken

communication in nonacademic contexts. Clearly, this perception of students' needs implies that Katherine "coaches" her students writing and speaking *outside their disciplines.*

Even for other, "more typical" sections of the course in engineering communication, Katherine considers that the primary objective of the Writing Centre is not to teach academic writing but to prepare students for written and oral communication in the engineering workplace (NS/CE, 30/10/97). That is, Katherine's goal is not to teach the research article or the dissertation but to train students in communicating for the multiple audiences and in the multiple genres which Engineers encounter. These genres include application letters, engineering reports, and oral presentations to non-specialist audiences such as managers and investors. For Katherine, scholars often have difficulty adjusting to non-academic workplaces in part because they are too specialized and cannot adapt to the demands of non-academic audiences and genres. Hence, she believes that her engineering students need support and practice in both written and oral communication skills *beyond and outside their academic disciplines.*

Another aspect of Katherine's engagement in the teaching of writing outside the students' disciplines is related to her cognitivist view of writing instruction. As seen earlier (cf. Table 4.3), this view emphasizes the writing process, i.e. the strategies which writers use during pre-writing, writing, and re-writing. Pre-writing, for instance, involves appropriate heuristics for generating, planning, and organizing ideas. Recall that cognitivists generally assume that good writing strategies hold across disciplines. For example, free-writing can be an effective composing strategy for both a biologist and an electrical engineer. The principle of the flexibility of writing and thinking strategies is fundamental for the WAC teaching movement since it can be put forward to justify why writing instructors can teach the writing process across the curriculum. Building on WAC tenets, the Writing Centre staff, including Katherine, teach the same core of writing strategies to student writers in Management, Education, and Engineering. Whereas the topics and audiences of the assignments change across sections, the same types of assignment (e.g., the application letter and the problem-solving paper) are given and the same writing strategies are taught. The question that remains to be addressed,

however, is to what extent physical scientists, social scientists, and humanities writers actually use the same basic writing strategies. If disciplinary contexts play a key role in the use and choice of strategies, then teaching a strategy used by expert writers in the humanities to a student writers in the sciences may turn out to be teaching writing *outside the students' disciplines.*

A case in point is Katherine's expressivist belief that good writers view "writing as a discovery process." As she explains in "Some recent research in writing," (1981)

> As explained by Donald Murray, professor of English at the University of New Hampshire, novelist, and Pulitzer prize winner, 'writing is a significant kind of thinking in which the symbols of language assume a purpose of their own and instruct the writer during the composing process' (*Writing as process* , 1980).... Writers who understand and respect the discovery aspects of the writing process are far more likely to develop those critical skills involved in using writing as a creative tool." (p. 5)

In keeping with Murray, Katherine argues that student writers must be encouraged to view writing as a discovery process. Important, however, is that Murray is a novelist and professor of English. The question then arises whether the role of discovery in the writing process is as important in the writing of an experimental research article as it is purported to be for the composition of a novel. Recent studies of scientists' composing processes (St John, 1987; Parkhurst, 1990; Shaw, 1991) cast some doubt on the role of discovery in scientific composing processes. In a comparison of process-oriented composition classes and scientific writing, Parkhurst (1990) argues that expert science writers start writing "only when [they] have a clear idea of what they have to say." (p. 170) And when they write their initial drafts, they do not use freewriting "to discover meaning through writing." Rather,

> Science writers, especially nonnative speakers, seem to use a more methodical approach even for first and early drafts. Some do extensive mental planning before writing, and most do extensive revision before soliciting any feedback. Meaning is defined prior to writing, although meaning may be refined during writing. (p. 170)

Katherine and I discussed the role that discovery plays in the writing processes of engineering and science writers.

"Writing is a discovery process"

Katherine walks me through the document ["Some recent research in writing," 1991]. Her comments show that she still fully embraces the content.... We stop at "5. Writing is a discovery process" for a while. She articulates the difference between "people in Education," who fully support this view, and students in Engineering, who often fail to see its pertinence to their own writing. The problem, we both seem to agree in the end, is to strike a balance. At first, there seems to be a slight discrepancy between our views, although it soon evaporates. Katherine argues that even Engineering students discover as they write, "the problem, she adds, is that they should not discover too much" to stray from their original course. Engineering writers value planning—sometimes excessively sticking to their original plans....

The only slight disagreement, quickly resolved, between Katherine and me is whether scientists still discover anything during the writing stage. I put forward the view that for scientific writers, the pre-writing stage is extremely long since it starts from the very early stages of the design of the research project. Katherine heartily agrees on this: "Yes, all the thinking which has come before" is part of the writing process, and most students fail to realize this. However, where we seem to disagree is that I imply that since this pre-writing stage has been so long, there is almost no discovery at all during the writing process; whereas for Katherine, there still may be some discovery, although not too much because there is no more time for a complete reconception of the paper. In the end, however, I fall in with Katherine's position.... (NS/CE, 27/11/97)

In this exchange, Katherine recognized that discovery plays a lesser role in the writing processes of engineering and science writers. More precisely, she agreed with Parkhurst (1990) that in scientific writing "the prewriting stage may take months, or years, as the work on which the writing is based is carried out and discussed." Hence, in scientific writing, most discoveries occur during the protracted, experimental pre-writing stage rather than during the actual composing process when pen is put to paper. Nevertheless, despite the recognition that scientific writing is less of a discovery process than other types of writing, Katherine still believes in the formative value of discovery in writing. In particular, in her engineering composition class she makes extensive use of free-writing to have students "understand and respect the discovery aspects of the writing process." (Murray, quoted in DOC: "Some recent research in writing," 1981). According to Parkhurst (1990), expert writers of Scientific Communication do not use free-writing when they begin drafting research articles. Hence, when Katherine instructs her

engineering students to use this writing strategy, she may be said to be teaching writing strategies that are *outside the students' disciplines, routines, and norms.*

Parkhurst's (1990) description of the composition processes of science writers raises a number of questions. For instance, to what extent does the daily keeping of research logs serve the same functions as freewriting and help scientists generate ideas? What realizations and discoveries do scientists make in the drafting stages of their research reports? If expert science writers do wait until they have a clear idea of what they want to say before they write, how have they been socialized into adopting these writing strategies? Did they just imitate their professors? Could they benefit from exploring other writing strategies? What strategies do expert writers in scientific and non scientific disciplines, academic and nonacademic use in particular contexts of situation, and more importantly, how do they adapt to new contexts and new fields? Moreover, who defines how "expert" and how "novice" a writer is? Vygotsky (1978) argues that the level of a child's mental development is best assessed as a set of potential rather than actual cognitive abilities. Similarly, expert writers may not have developed efficient routinized strategies in given writing contexts and disciplinary discourses. Rather, they may have the potential to adapt to new contexts and fields. Thus, Katherine wrote that her main teaching goal is:

> not preparing students to know how to write in the field, but how to deconstruct situations and learn quickly when they actually enter the field. (DOC: Katherine's written comment in the margin to my original manuscript, 17/06/98).

Her position fundamentally challenges the dichotomous distinction between "in" and "outside" the disciplines and raises new questions about how one can teach "from," "into," "between," and "across" disciplines.

Interestingly, Katherine was not aware that St John (1987), Parkhurst (1987), and Shaw (1991) had published studies about scientists' composing processes. Since these studies were published in *English for Specific Purposes*, a journal devoted to issues in Second Language Education (SLE), this is not surprising. Indeed, as an L1 composition instructor, Katherine does not read SLE journals but *College English, Research in the Teaching of English, College*

Composition and Communication, and *the Writing Center Journal.* Such selective reading exemplifies the relations between a teacher's cultural stance and his or her teaching practices. In the specific case of Katherine's engagement in the teaching of writing in the disciplines, Katherine's positioning as an L1 writing instructor reduced her exposure to the influence of the ESP (L2) movement since she does not read the literature of this field. On the other hand, as an L1 writing instructor she is more likely to encounter the WAC literature since WAC is a teaching movement in L1 writing instruction. This is noteworthy because WAC's concern about the study and teaching of writing in the disciplines (e.g. Faigley and Hansen, 1985, in Swales, 1990a, pp. 4-5) is more recent than in ESP. As Swales argues (1990, pp. 2-6), historically, ESP began with linguistic analyses of specific registers and discipline-specific discourses. On the other hand, WAC started with cognitive models of writing, which assumed that writing processes held "across the curriculum." By stigmatizing both movements as "having teachers of English teach in disciplines other than English," Spack (1988a) blurs the differences in history and traditions between the two. Yet, these differences exist and they influence the teaching approaches and evaluative orientations of writing instructors. In Katherine's case, for instance, one can wonder whether her view of the role of "discovery" in the writing process may have taken a different turn if she has had formal teaching experience in ESP and ESL.

In summary, Katherine's understandings of the role of discovery in the writing process instantiate an aspect of her L1, WAC writing instructor view. From a cognitivist perspective, she seems to assume that good writing processes hold across the disciplines. From an expressivist perspective, she believes that effective writing processes allow for discovery in the pre-writing, writing, and re-writing stages. In Bakhtinian terms (1981 ??), these views seem to exert "centrifugal" forces on her engagement in the teaching of writing in the disciplines. Namely, they inform teaching practices that foster the practice and learning of writing *"outside the disciplines."* However, this physical metaphor has turned out to be inadequate to describe the real educational intent of Katherine's, which is to help students adapt to varied and yet unknown writing contexts, including academic and nonacademic settings, professional and nonprofessional milieux.

Summary

During the analysis of Peter's and Katherine's cultural stances toward writing instruction, a few binary oppositions have become apparent. The first opposition concerns the instructors' positioning as L1 and L2 writing instructors. The second opposition centres on the focus of instruction, namely well-rounded, humanities-based training and discipline-sensitive, context-specific training. The latter opposition interconnects with the rather polarized debate surrounding Spack (1988a). However, further analyses have challenged these dichotomies and Spack's opposition between discipline-specific ESP/EAP/WAC practitioners and generalists, humanist writing instructors. Rather, I have argued that both Peter and Katherine engage in the teaching of writing *in and outside the disciplines*, albeit in different ways. Furthermore, I have challenged the very distinction between "in" and "outside" the disciplines and suggested less dichotomic prepositions such as "from," "into," "between," and "across."

EPILOGUE

Shiori's original draft to a term paper

And, the pleasant way of display would keep them motivated.

Peter's revision

The attractive displays may also serve to maintain motivation.

Elizabeth's (Ph.D., Second Language Education) suggestion in the margin

making the classroom an invitational learning environment

(DOC/Student text and Peter's written feedback, Winter 1997).

In the Prologue, I introduced Shiori and argued that her subject-area professors seem more inclined to respond to the content rather than the form of her term papers. In advising Shiori to take writing courses, they entrusted writing instructors with the task of teaching her English academic written communication. The question then arose whether writing instructors can, and should, teach writing in the disciplines of their students, especially in situations where they do not have themselves the relevant disciplinary background knowledge. To answer this apparently straightforward question, I examined how Peter's and Katherine's cultural stances toward writing instruction inform their engagement, or social investment (Peirce, 1995), in the activity of teaching in and outside the disciplines. I have attempted to illustrate that both instructors have their own goals and motives for teaching writing both in and outside the disciplines of their students. In Chapter 1, I rejected Spack's (1988a) rather polarized and mentalistic views on academic writing instruction. I argued that trying to answer "why" questions and examining particular discursive practices from a socio-cultural, "genetic" perspective lead to more useful understandings than engaging in polemical

debates about what one "should" do and "how" it should be done.[22] In this Epilogue, I further question the dichotomous distinction I have drawn between teaching *in and outside* the disciplines. I discuss the embedding of Peter's and Katherine's teaching practices within institutional and disciplinary contexts, and I reflect on my own stance and personal engagement as a researcher during this inquiry.

Teaching Writing from Emic and Etic Perspectives

In a reflection about the "Nature of Anthropological Understanding," Geertz (1980) raises a central methodological question in anthropology, namely whether anthropologists should prefer

> "inside" versus "outside," or "first person" versus "third person" descriptions; "phenomenological" versus "objectivist"... theories; ... "emic" versus "etic" analyses, this last [formulation] deriving from the distinction in linguistics between phonemics and phonetics, phonemics classifying sounds according to their internal function in language, phonetics classifying them according to their acoustic properties as such." (p. 222-223).

In adopting an etic, "experience-distant" perspective, ethnographers position themselves as observers and outsiders. From an emic, "experience-near" perspective, they try to "see things from the native's point of view" (p. 222). Etic concepts are abstractions derived from varied academic theories. Emic concepts are based on the vernacular spoken in the focal community of study. For instance, in the Prologue, I have reformulated the emic formulations of Shiori's subject-area professors (e.g., "the paper needs better integration in logic and organization of materials") within an etic perspective derived from Halliday and Hasan's (1976) systemic linguistic (e.g., the "textual coherence and cohesion [of Shiori's paper] are reduced by disjunctures in theme/rheme patterns").

Geertz's (1980) distinction between emic and etic perspectives provides a new perspective on the distinction I have drawn between teaching writing *in and outside* the disciplines. To introduce this epilogue, I have quoted an excerpt from a term paper that Shiori wrote for a course in Second Language

---

[22] For other work within socio-cultural perspectives motivated by an interest in why questions, cf. Connor (1998), Maguire (1994b, 1994b, 1997), and Parks (1995).

Education. Although her text is destined for Elizabeth, her subject-area professor, she also submitted it to Peter. Both instructors responded to the same draft of the quoted excerpt, but did so in a very different way. Peter re-wrote Shiori's sentence in standard plain English, preserving the original meaning.

Shiori's original draft to a term paper

And, the pleasant way of display would keep them motivated.

Peter's revision

The attractive displays may also serve to maintain motivation.

Elizabeth, on the other hand, suggests ways of using the terminology of educational fields.

Elizabeth's (Ph.D., Second Language Education) suggestion in the margin

making the classroom an invitational learning environment

In abstracting the concept of "an invitational learning environment" from Shiori's example, she invites Shiori to explore possible theoretical frameworks within educational discourses and mediates her appropriation of those discourses. The differences between Peter's and Elizabeth's response may be described in terms of emic and etic perspectives. As an educational researcher, Elizabeth responds to Shiori's text in second language education from an emic, experience-near perspective; she teaches *in* her disciplines, applied linguistics and second language research. As a Ph.D. in English, Peter responds to the same text from an etic, experience-distant perspective; he teaches *outside* his disciplines, English literature and the philosophy of language. Spack's (1988a) question about whether academic writing instructors should teaching writing in or outside the disciplines can then be rephrased as follows: Is it better to teach writing from an emic or an etic perspective?

Geertz (1980) argues that anthropologists should strike a balance between etic and emic understandings, so that they are neither "awash in immediacies" nor "stranded in abstractions" (p. 223). His nuanced view is relevant to academic writing instruction. For example, Katherine wrote in the margin of my initial draft to this thesis:

> Not knowing the discipline can be an asset: instead of concentrating on
> content which leads to taking over ownership of student's text, the
> instructor plays the role of the unenlightened outsider—the intelligent
> lay reader—[and] teaches students to consider wider range of audiences.
> (DOC: Katherine's response to my draft, 17/06/98)

Much as emic and etic perspectives contribute to complementary and richer
understandings, teaching and learning writing in and outside one's
disciplines can help both students and teachers appropriate varied
discourses. In accordance with their Humanist, Generalist and WAC,
discipline-sensitive views of writing instruction, Peter and Katherine placed
different emphases on discipline-specific and general features of writing.
However, in their own ways they each mediated the students' approapriation
of disciplinary discourses.

Geertz (1980) argues that the question is not so much to decide which of
the emic or etic perspective is preferable. Rather,

> The real question, and the one that [an famous ethnographer] raised by
> demonstrating that, in the case of "natives," you don't have to be one to
> know one, is what roles the two sorts of concepts play in
> anthropological analysis. (p. 223)

Thus, the question is not whether it is better to teach writing from an emic or
an etic perspective. Rather, more interesting questions can be the following:
(a) What understandings do the teaching of writing from emic and etic
perspectives provide?, and (b) how do these understandings mediate the
learning of writing in a discipline?

These questions offer interesting avenues for further research about etic
and emic mediation within a Vygotskian perspective.[23] However, one caveat
is in order. That is, the distinction between emic and etic perspectives may
lead to the misleading assumption that there is a clear-cut boundary between
an insider and an outsider. In many situations, this boundary is fuzzy. For
instance, over the course of my inquiry I became "less of an
outsider/observer" and "more of an insider" within the Language Centre and
the Writing Centre. In Chapter 3, I recounted how my growing acquaintance
with Peter and Katherine occasionally blurred the line between research-

---

[23] Compare Geertz's distinction between emic and etic concepts and Vygotky's (1986)
distinction between scientific and everyday concepts.

oriented conversational exchanges and non-research-related chats, thus confronting me to ethical issues relative to informed consent.

The distinction between emic and etic, inside and outside are not absolute; rather, they are fluid and dependent on the context. Thus, as a Ph. D. in English Literature, Peter responds to Shiori's term paper in second language education as an outsider. However, as a second language teacher, he can relate to Shiori's text from an emic perspective. Furthermore, a comparison of his response to Shiori's texts and Pierre's texts, a doctoral candidate in Mining and Metal Engineering, suggests that Peter may be "more of an outsider" with Pierre's discipline than with Shiori's. Indeed, whereas Shiori writes in plain English and studies educational issues with which Peter may be familiar, Pierre uses many technical concepts and describes engineering processes (cf. Appendix E). Noteworthy is the fact that Peter's feedback to Pierre's texts is more limited and less varied than to Shiori's text. In particular, he does not re-write Pierre's sentences in full, as he did for Shiori. It is probable that Peter finds it more difficult to respond to Peter's writing than to Shiori's. Yet, he is not as "immersed" in Shiori's target discipline as is Elizabeth, the intended audience of her term paper.[24] Thus, teaching "outside" or "inside" a discipline is a matter of degree, not of polar opposition.

The question also arises as to how the relative "distance" or "closeness" between and among disciplines and cultures can be defined and understood. In Lave and Wenger's (1991) terms, how can we describe "learning trajectories, developing identities, and forms of membership"? (p. 36). If learning is peripheral participation in a community of practice, then to what extent can different communities overlap or be distanced from one another? Who defines the boundaries and distances? When students and instructors change disciplinary communities, for instance as they move from English Literature and the Philosophy of Language to Engineering and Education, what former "skilled identities" (p. 122) do they draw on to facilitate their appropriation of new discourses? In other words, the question that remains to be answered is: What (or who) transfers? How? In what context? and Why? (Maguire, 1994b)

---

[24] Parks and Maguire (in press) also raise this issue in a study about a nurse's on-the-job training in ESL professional writing.

Cultural Stance, Institutional Contexts, and Power Struggles

An important finding of this study is that Katherine's and Peter's personal histories as writing instructors are both reflected and refracted in the histories of their respective teaching units, disciplines, and particular situations. For instance, Peter's changing identities from a B.A. and Ph.D. in English Literature to a second language writing instructor and ESL specialist find a parallel in the Language Centre's history. Namely, as seen in Chapter 3, the Language Centre also began as an offspring of departments devoted to English and French literature. Like Peter, most other members of the Language Centre recognize their allegiance to and the formative value of literature and humanistic studies. Yet, like Peter, they want second language education to be recognized as a distinct, full-fledged, autonomous discipline at the crossroads between literature, the humanities, applied linguistics, psychology, and other related disciplines. At a broader level, the "coming of age" of second language education relative to fields of literary and humanistic studies appears to be quite common in many educational contexts, in North America and elsewhere (cf. Matsuda, 1998; Silva, Leki, and Carson, 1997).

In Chapter 4, I described the evolution of Katherine's evaluative orientation toward writing instruction from a cognitivist, generalist view to a socio-cognitivist, discipline-sensitive view. This evolution finds a parallel in the evolving theoretical and practical orientation of the Writing Centre, as described in Chapter 3. It also reflects deeper changes in the field of composition, where socio-epistemic and socio-cultural views of the writing process now compete with expressivist and cognitivist views (cf. Faigley, 1986). Likewise, in Second Language Acquisition and Education, Firth and Wagner (1997) also argue for a shift from a mentalistic, cognitive perspective to a socio-epistemic one, as I explained in Chapter 1. Similar moves can be found in ethnography and across the social sciences. In the era of postpositivist, postmodern, socio-constructivist thought, socio-culturally situated and negotiated construals of knowing, becoming, and believing are now preferred to monolithic views of truth, being, and mind (cf. Greene, 1994, and Chapter 2). It is therefore possible to relate individual changes to

broader, institutional, cultural, and theoretical shifts. In Kuhn's (1962) terms, "paradigmatic shifts" reverberate throughout nested contexts, from institutional and "disciplinary matrices" to the individuals immersed in them. As described in the Prologue and Chapter 1, I myself changed perspectives in the course of my inquiry as I began to appropriate the discourses of ethnography, education, and epistemology of educational research (Greene, 1994).

Such a striking congruence between individual, disciplinary, and institutional histories—in Vygotskian terms, between microgenesis and macrogenesis, ontogenesis and socio-cultural history—deserves further inquiry. An important question is to what extent institutional and disciplinary contexts coerce individual choices and development and reify institutional cultures (Maguire, 1994a, 1994b). The notion of power and agency is central to socio-epistemic, postmodern, and feminist theories (e.g., Firth and Wagner, 1997; Goldberg et al., 1996; Lave and Wenger, 1991; Peirce, 1995). For instance, in her discussion of language learning as social investment, Peirce (1995) rejects Gardner's (1972) traditional notion of motivation because in her view it does not capture the power struggles that underlie language learning. In this study, I have quoted Peter's exclamations: "With ESL language learners, you have to do Swales!" The modal phrase "you have to" is strong and suggests a feeling of obligation. An interesting question concerns the origin of this feeling. Does it stem from preferred choice or stylistic teaching orientation? Peter's humanistic, generalist orientation seems in part contradictory with EAP discipline-specific, vocational-oriented pedagogy. His choice of an EAP textbook can be related to his commitment to address the academic learning needs of his ESL students. However, he could have chosen other pedagogies and textbooks to address student needs in academic milieux, such as those suggested by Spack (1988a). Where does his apparent sense of duty to use EAP pedagogy come from? Can it be partly attributed to internalized institutional pressure?

I do not have an answer to these questions. Neither may Peter. Vygotsky (1978) argues that inner speech is internalized social speech and that the development of higher mental functions, including voluntary attention, is socio-culturally mediated by agents, tools, and structures. Therefore, the

extent to which our thinking, doing, and being are determined by our own volition or conditioned by our socio-cultural environment is difficult, if not impossible to assess. Nevertheless, Vygotsky's distinction between task and activity may help us locate sites of individual resistance to social, cultural, political, and institutional forces. As Coughlan and Duff (1994) explain, a task is a "behavioral blueprint" whereas an activity "comprises the behavior that is actually produced when an individual (or group) performs a task" (p. 175). In other words, individuals construct their own activities based on the tasks they are assigned (e.g., cf. Colpitts, 1997). Between an intended task and an actual activity, there is room for personal construction, even resistance. In Peter's case, for instance, there are differences between the writing tasks that Swales and Feak (1994a) assign, the writing tasks that Peter derives from the textbook, and the students' actual writing activities.

A striking difference concerns the use of Swales and Feak's move-based approach to academic genres. As seen in Chapter 4, Swales and Feak tasks invite students and instructors to be aware of the different moves, or rhetorical moments, that compose introductions to research articles and other text-types. For example, they describe the second move as "establishing a niche by indicating a gap in the previous research, raising a question about it, or extending previous knowledge in some way." A study of a small corpus of student texts, of Peter's feedback to them, and interview data suggest that neither Peter nor his students paid such a close, analytical attention to moves. Rather, it seems that Peter responded to student assignments holistically and by answering such questions as "Does this flow? Is this rhetorically effective?" rather than "Does the first move establish a research territory? Is the choice of moves and submoves effective?" This discrepancy between Swales and Feak's and Peter's approach to texts may well be indicative of the ways in which Peter constructs his sense of self as he engages in varied activities.

The Nature of My Intent as Researcher

In the Prologue, I quoted Wolcott (1987) and explained that the nature of my research intent has evolved from an educational focus to an ethnographic curiosity in the course of my inquiry. That is, I now realize that

I may have first sought to identify and solve an educational problem, e.g., the needs of graduate students are not addressed by current writing instruction programs. At a later stage, however, I re-directed my research efforts toward understanding the socio-cultural basis of academic writing instruction in the students' and the instructors' disciplines and considered the various cultures within academia. In Wolcott's (1987) term, I have become committed to "employ[ing] cultural interpretation... rather [than] linking descriptive research to short-term efforts at change and improvement." (p. 54) In keeping with my ethnographic intent, I do not discuss the implications, even less so the "recommendations," that may be derived from my research findings. Rather, I let the readers decide for themselves what teaching and learning practices they want to promote in their classrooms.

My hope is that in reading this study, teachers and students may find new ways of interpreting and informing their teaching and learning experiences. I realize that some readers may be left unsatisfied with my decision not to address research implications and applications. As Wolcott (1987) explains:

> The educator typically wants to swing into action at that very point where the ethnographer may regard his or her word as finished. To the ethnographer's careful rendering of the status quo, a critical insider rightfully may be expected to react, "Of course this is what we do, but, so what?" (p. 53).

Arguably, even the most "careful rendering of the status quo" may have unforeseen consequences within and beyond the research site, for knowledge cannot be divorced from power, action, and change. Researchers certainly have moral and ethical responsibilities regarding such consequences. For instance, in a context where the Language Centre and the Writing Centre compete for resources and students, I occasionally found it difficult not to be led into "turf wars." In the course of my inquiry, I endeavored not to divulge the information that I was gathering about one unit to the other unit. In the present final report, I released specific information with the consent of the focal research participants, for any circulated item of information has the potential of changing the "status quo."

My dilemma is the following. On the one hand, I do not aim for educational change but for cultural understanding of learning and teaching

practices in academic writing instruction. In particular, I consider that suggesting recommendations to experienced teachers would be patronizing and unwise, given that I have no teaching experience. Rather, I feel deeply indebted to Katherine and Peter for having contributed to my teacher training in giving me access to their classrooms and discussing their teaching practices. On the other hand, I also realize that any research effort may bring about change; even a mere description of the status quo can be construed as an ideological act, since a description without a call for change may provide implicit assent to current ideologies and practices. I see no ready solution to this dilemma.

Whereas I cannot say what writing instructors "should" do, I can say what I would like to do in a given context of situation. In Appendix F, I have included the description of a course that I have designed for the FAW class that I observed. This description reflects my views about writing instruction as negotiated curriculum, dialogic writing, and collaborative learning. It emphasizes three orientations in writing: (a) social-cognitivist (writing as problem solving with audience, goals, strategies, and social contexts as parameters), (b) socio-constructivist (writing as a socially and culturally embedded activity), and (c) linguistic (writing as the global and local management of textual structures). Given my interest in the teaching of writing in the disciplines, my course description also includes time for discussions about the issues raised by Spack (1988a). In eliciting student perceptions about their needs and wants regarding writing instruction in order, I hope both to promote learning within the classroom and to contribute to a neglected area of educational research in writing instruction (cf. Leki and Carson, 1994).

Proposing a course description is one way in which I hope to solve Wolcott's (1987) dichotomous distinction between educational and ethnographic intent. As a prospective instructor, I apply my understanding of the socio-cultural basis of teaching practices to consider possible designs for writing courses. In this way I see educational intent interconnecting with ethnographic intent. I also entertain other types of intent, including epistemological and philosophical intent. In adopting the former, I aim to further investigate interdisciplinary differences in the "shaping or written

knowledge" (Bazerman, 1988). For instance, epistemologist and physicist Polanyi (1962) provides avenues for a cross-disciplinary characterization of the construction of knowledge in mathematics, physics, biology, psychology, and philosophy. He maintains that experimental and social sciences differ in the degree in which they use formal language and inarticulate knowledge such as connoisseurship. His analysis may help explain how and why some writers can participate in apparently unrelated disciplinary communities of practice. For example, biology and linguistics may both require balanced skills in the use of formal and analogic language, whereas mathematics and logic both rely heavily on formal symbol. As a biologist and applied linguist, I interpret my relative ease to "cross-over" from biology to linguistics and my unproductiveness with mathematical reasoning in terms of my ability to manipulate interpretive concepts rather than formal symbols.

Epistemological intent is related to philosophical intent, for a study on the construction of knowledge easily lends itself to questions about the relationship between knowing and being, the person and the world, agency and power, teaching and learning. Greene (1994) reviews educational research from an epistemological and philosophical perspective. In the introduction to this report, I quote her postmodern views on truth (p. 440) to acknowledge her influence on my own *Weltanshauung*. Educational and philosophical issues which I would like to further explore concern the socio-cultural construction of the self in given contexts of situation, especially the interplay between individual volition and societal forces. What processes and tools mediate and shape individual beliefs, understandings, and perceptions? How do cultural stances emerge within individuals? In other words, who and what controls the meanings that we give to our life, how and why?

These questions may sound abstract. However, as Lave and Wenger (1991) argue, the oppositions between abstract and concrete, general and particular, theory and practice, are misconstrued. Meanings and understandings are constructed by weaving rich and dense interconnections between and among these poles. Similarly, the dichotomy between the subjective and the objective is misleading. Polanyi (1962) argues that as they

establish contact with the objective world and make claims to universal validity, knowers transcend their own subjectivity.

> ... the *personal participation* of the knower in all acts of understanding ... does not make our understanding *subjective*. Comprehension is neither an arbitrary act claiming universal validity. Such knowing is indeed *objective* in the sense of establishing contact with a hidden reality; a contact that is defined as the condition for anticipating an indeterminate range of yet unknown (and perhaps yet inconceivable) implications. It seems reasonable to describe this fusion of the personal and the objective as Personal Knowledge. (p. vii-viii, emphasis in the original).

In this thesis, I have tried to interconnect educational theories with concrete perceptions, general concepts and particular examples, objective facts with subjective experiences, including my own. My inquiry into academic writing instruction turned out to be an inquiry into Self—a personal, engaged, invested (Peirce, 1995), committed inquiry. I hope that in this process of personal participation I have made a few claims to universal validity, realizing Polanyi's (1962) "fusion of the personal and the objective as Personal Knowledge." The British physicist argues:

> ... into every act of knowing there enters a passionate contribution of the person knowing what is being known, and ... this coefficient is no mere imperfection but a vital component of this knowledge. (p. viii)

Foucault shared with Polanyi the belief that theoretical work is rooted in personal experience. His biographer, Eribon (1991), quotes him:

> Chaque fois que j'ai essayé de faire un travail théorique, ça a été à partir d'éléments de ma propre expérience : toujours en rapport avec des processus que je voyais se dérouler auprès de moi. (p. 46)

> J'ai tenu à ce que chacun de mes livres soit, en un sens, des fragments d'autobiographie. Mes livres ont toujours été mes problèmes personels avec la folie, la prison, la sexualité. (p. 61)

Greene (1994) echoes Foucault and Polanyi. She warns against themes that "erode the 'theorizing subjects'" in postmodern thought and asks the following questions about theoretical texts: "Who speaks, after all? Where is the point of departure when it comes to knowing?" I hope that in reading my text, my reader has found answers to Greene's questions.

REFERENCES

Akeroyd, A. V. (1984). Ethics in relation to informants, the profession and governments. In Ellen, R. F. (Ed.), *Ethnographic research: A guide to general conduct* (pp. 133-154). New York: Academic Press.

Azar, B. S. (1989). *Understanding and using English grammar*. Englewoods Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Azar, B. S. (1992). *Fundamentals of English grammar*. Englewoods Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination* . Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barber, C. L. (1962). Some measurable characteristics of modern scientific prose. In Swales (Ed.). (1988). *Episodes in ESP: A source and reference book for the development of English for science and technology*, (pp. 1-16), New York: Prentice Hall.

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

Belcher, D. D., & Braine, G. (1995). *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Bizzell, P. (1982a). Cognition, convention, and certainty: What we need to know about writing. *PRE/TEXT, 3*, 213-243.

Bizzell, P. (1982b). College composition: Initiation into the academic discourse community. *Curriculum Inquiry, 12*, 191-207.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Braine, G. (1988). A reader reacts... *TESOL Quarterly, 22*(4), 700-702.

Brett, P. (1994). A genre analysis of the results section of sociology articles. *English for Scientific Purposes, 13*(1), 47-59.

Britton, J., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H. (1975). *The development of writing abilities*, 11-18. London: Macmillan.

Bruer, J. T. (1993). *Schools for thought: A science of learning in the Classroom.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind." *College English, 46*, 635-652.

Bruffee, K. A. (1986). Social construction, language, and the authority of knowledge: A bibliographical essay. *College English, 48*, 773-790.

Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds and possible words.* Cambridge, MA: Havard University Press.

Burke, K. (1966). *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and method.* Cambridge, MA: Havard University Press.

Casanave, C. P. (1995). Local interactions: Constructing contexts for composing in a graduate sociology program. In Belcher, D. D., & Braine, G. (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 83-111). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Cherryhomes, C. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructuralist investigations in education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Clyne, M. (1987). Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts. *Journal of Pragmatics, 11*, 211-247.

Cobb, P. (1994). Where is the mind? Constructivist and sociocultural perspectives on mathematical development. *Educational researcher, 23*(7), 13-20.

Code of ethical conduct for research involving humans. (1997). Medical Research Council of Canada, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, & Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Coe, R. M. (1990). *Process, form, and substance: A rhetoric for advanced writers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Coleman, G., & Dumas, D. (1996). *Science handbook: for students, writers, and science buffs* . Don Mills, ON: Addison-Wesley Publishers Ltd.

Coles, W. (1969). Freshman composition: The circle of unbelief. *College English, 31*, 134-142.

Colpitts, C. (1997). *Student perceptions of coherence in their written texts*. Unpublished master's thesis, McGill University, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Coughlan, P., & Duff, P. A. (1994). Same task, different activities: A Vygotskian perspective on dialogic communication. In Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 173-194). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Cummins, J. (1991). Interdependence of first- and second-language proficiency in bilingual children. In Bialystok, E. (Ed.), *Language processing in bilingual children* (pp. 70-89). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Daniels, H. (Ed.). (1996). *An introduction to Vygotsky* . London: Routledge.

Day, R. A. (1994). *How to Write and Publish a Scientific Paper*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dias, P., Beer, A., Ledwell-Brown, J., Paré, A., & Pittenger, C. (1992).*Writing for ourselves/Writing for others*. Scarborough, ON: Nelson Canada.

Elbow, P. (1973). *Writing without teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing with power* . New York: Oxford University Press.

Eribon, D. (1991a). *Michel Foucault (1926-1984)* (2nd edition). Paris: Flamarion.

Eribon, D. (1991b). *Michel Foucault* (B. Wing, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Havard University Press. (Original work [1st edition] published in 1989)

Faigley, L. (1986). Competing theories of process: A critique and a proposal. *College English, 48*(6), 527-542.

Faigley, L., & Hansen, K. (1985). Learning to write in the social sciences. *College Composition and Communication, 136,* 527-542.

Ferdman, B. M. (1990). Literacy and cultural identity. *Havard Educational Review, 60* (2), 181-204.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81* (3), 285-300.

Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in the class?* Havard, MA: Havard University Press.

Fleck, L. (1979). *Genesis and development of a scientific fact.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Flower, L. (1985). *Problem-solving startegies for writing.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanich, Publishers.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32,* 365-387.

Freedman, A., & Medway, P. (Eds.). (1994a). *Genre and the new rhetoric.* Basingstoke, UK: Burgess Science Press.

Freedman, A., & Medway, P. (Eds.). (1994b). *Learning and teaching genre.* Porstmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Freedman, A., & Pringle, I. (Eds.). (1980) *Reinventing the Rhetorical tradition.* Ottawa, ON: Canadian Council of Teachers of English.

Freeman, L. H. (1990). *Style guide.* Bountiful, UT: Shipley Associates.

Gardner, R. C. (1989). Attitudes and motivation. *Annual review of applied linguistics, 1988, 9,* 135-148.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays. New York: Basic Books.

Geertz, C. (1975). *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology.* New York: Basic Books.

Geertz, C. (1980). "From the native's point of view": On the nature of anthropological understanding. In Basso, K. H., & Selby, H. A. (Eds.), *Meaning in anthropology* (pp. 221-237). University of New Mexico Press: Albuquerque.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration,* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gilbert, G. N., & Mulkay, M. (1984). *Opening pandora's box.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Giltrow, J. (1995). *Academic writing: Writing and reading across the disciplines.* Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Goldberg, N. R., Tarule, J. M., McVicker Clinchy, B., & Belenky, M. F. (Eds.), *Knowledge, difference, and power.* (1996). New York, NY: Basic Books, a division of HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Gosden, H. Discourse functions of marked theme in scientific research articles. *English for Specific Purposes, 11 ,* 207-224.

Greene, M. (1994). Epistemological and educational research: The influence of recent approaches to knowledge. In Darling, Hammond, Linda (Eds.) *Review of Educational Research, 20,* AERA, 423-464.

Gunawardena, C. N. (1989). The present perfect in the rhetorical divisions of biology and biochemistry journal articles. *English for Specific Purposes, 8,* 265-273.

Hacker, D. (1995). *A Canadian writer's reference.* Scarborough, ON: Nelson Canada.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K., McIntosh, A., & Strevens, P. D. (1964). *The linguistic sciences and language teaching.* London: Longman.

Harris, D. P. (1990) The use of "organizing sentences" in the structure of paragraphs in science textbooks. In Connor, U., & Johns, A. M. (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and Pedagogical perspectives,* (pp. 69-84).

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Heller, M. (1987). The role of language in the formation of ethnic identity. In Phinney, J. S., & Rotheram, M. J. (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Plurarilism and development* (pp. 180-200). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader vs. writer responsability: A new typology. In Connor, U., & Kaplan, R. (Eds) *Writing across languages* (pp. 141-152).

Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In Connor, U., & Johns, A. M. (Eds), *Coherence in writing: Research and Pedagogical perspectives,* (pp. 89-102).

Holden, C. (1987, May 8). Female math anxiety on the wane. *Science, 236.*

Hopkins, A., & Dudley-Evans, T. (1988). A genre-based investigation of the discussion sections in articles and dissertations. *English for Specific Purposes, 7,* 113-121.

Jacob, E. (1987). Qualitative research traditions: A review. *Review of Educational research, 57*(1), 1-50.

Johns, A. M. (1988) Another reader reacts...*TESOL Quarterly, 22*(4), 705-707.

Johns, A. M. (1990). L1 composition theories: implications for developing theories of L2 composition. In Kroll, B. (Ed.) *Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 24-36). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Johns, A. M., & Dudley-Evans, T. (1991). English for specific purposes: International in scope, specific in purpose. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(2), 297-314.

Kozulin, A. (1996). The concept of activity in Soviet psychology: Vygotsky, his disciples and critics. In Daniels, H. (Ed.), *An introduction to Vygotsky* (pp. 99-122). London, UK: Routledge.

Kroll, B. M. (1978). Cognitive egocentrism and the problem of audience awareness in written discourse. *Research in the teaching of English, 12,* 269-281.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lantolf, J. P., & Appel, G. (Eds). (1994). *Vygotskian approaches to second language research.* Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I., & Carson, J. G. (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly, 28* (1), 81-101.

Leont'ev, A. N. (1981). The problem of activity in psychology. In Wertsch, J. V. (Ed.). *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 37-71). Armonk, NY: Shape.

Lyster, R. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 37-66.

Maguire, M. H. (1994a). Cultural stances informing storytelling among bilingual children in Quebec. *Comparative Education Review, 38,* 115-123

Maguire, M. H. (1994b). Getting beyond programmes and instructional time in second-language teaching and learning: Who is mediating what? For whom? In what context? *Journal of the CAAL, 16*(1), 105-123.

Maguire, M. H. (1997). Shared and negotiated territories: The sociocultural embeddedness of minority language children's acts of meaning. In

Pollard, A., Filer, A., & Thiessen, D. (Eds). (pp. 51-80). *Children and their curriculum*. London, UK: Falmer Press.

Marcrorie, K. (1968). To be read. *English Journal, 57*, 686-692.

Markel, M. (1998). *Technical communication: Situations and strategies*. New York: St Martin's Press.

Master, P. (1987). Generic *The* in *Scientific American*. *English for Specific Purposes, 6*, 165-186.

Master, P. (1991). Active verbs with inanimate subjects in scientific prose. *English for Specific Purposes, 10*, 15-33.

Master, P. (1995). Consciousness raising and article pedagogy. In Belcher, D. D., & Braine, G. *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Matsuda, P. K. (1998). Situating ESL writing in a cross-disciplinary context. *Written Communication, 15*(1), 99-121.

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

Miller, C. (1994). Rhetorical community: The cultural basis of genre. In Freedman, A., & Medway, P. (Eds). *Genre and the new rhetoric* (pp. 67-78). Basingstoke, UK: Burgess Science Press.

Moll, L. C. (1989). Teaching second language students: A Vygotskian perspetive. In Johnson, D. M., & Roen, D. H. (Eds.), *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 55-69). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Moll, L. C. (1992). *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology*. Cambridge, UK.: Cambridge University Press.

Morrow, P. R. (1989). Conjunct use in business news stories and academic journal articles: A comparative study. *English for Specific Purposes, 8*, 239-254.

Murray, D. (1968). *A writer teaches writing*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Murray, D. (1980). *Writing as process.* [Quoted in a personal written communication by Katherine, "Some recent research in writing," 1981. Murray's original document is not retrievable].

Myers, G. (1990). *Writing biology: Texts in the social construction of scientific knowledge.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Nelkin, D. (1995). The grandiose claims of the geneticists. In Sheridan, J. (Ed.), *Writing across the curriculum: A guide for librarians, instructors, and writing program instructors* (pp. 584-589). Wesport, CT: Greenwood Press.

O'Connor, P. A. (1998). *Construction of mathematical meaning in a 6th grade classroom: An analysis of modal auxiliaries in teacher interrogatives across the teaching of fractions and geometry.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, McGill University, Quebec, Canada.

Parks, S. (1995). *Development of professional writing skills by French-speaking nurses in an English-medium hospital: A constructivist semiotic perspective.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université de Montréal, Quebec, Canada.

Parks, S., & Maguire, M. H. (in press). Coping with on-the-job writing in ESL: A constructivist semiotic perspective.

Parkhurst, C. (1990). The composition process of science writers. *English for Specific Purposes, 9,* 169-179.

Peirce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 9-31.

Polanyi, M. (1962). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Raimes, A. (1991). Out in the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 25(3),* 407-430.

Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Russell, D. R. (1987). Writing across the curriculum and the communications movement: Some lessons from the past. *College Composition and Communications, 38,* 184-194.

Russell, D. R. (1990). Writing across the curriculum in historical perspective: Toward a social interpretation. *College English, 52*(1), 52-73.

St. John, M. J. (1987). The composition process of science writers. *English for Specific Purposes, 6,* 113-120.

Santos, T. (1992). Ideology in composition: L1 and ESL. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1,* 1-15.

Shaw, P. (1991). Science research students' composing processes. *English for Specific Purposes, 10,* 189-206.

Schumann, J. (1976). Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 26,* 135-143.

Schwandt, T. A. (1997). *Qualitative inquiry: A dictionary of terms.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In Kroll, B. (Ed.), *Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Silva, T., Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). Broadening the perspective of mainstream composition studies: Some thoughts from the disciplinary margins. *Written Communication, 14,* 398-428.

Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should go? *TESOL Quarterly, 22*(1), 29-51.

Spack, R. (1988b). The author respond to Braine. *TESOL Quarterly, 22*(4), 703-705.

Spack, R. (1988c). The author responds to Johns. *TESOL Quarterly, 22*(4), 707-708.

Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study. *Written Communication, 3-62.*

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15,* 205-224.

Swales, J. (1984). Research into the structure of introductions to journal articles and its application to the teaching of academic writing. In Williams, R, & Swales, J. (Eds.), *Common ground: Shared interests in ESP and communication studies* (ELT Documents No. 117, pp. 77-86) Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Swales, J. (Ed.). (1988). *Episodes in ESP: A source and reference book for the development of English for science and technology.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Swales, J. (1990a). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (1990b). Nonnative speaker graduate writing engineering students and their introductions: Global coherence and local management. In Connor, U., & Johns, A. M. (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspectives* (pp. 187-208). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Swales, J, & Feak, C. B. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: A course for nonnative speakers of English.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Swales, J, & Feak, C. B. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: A commentary.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Troyka, L. Q., Buckley, J., & Gates, D. (1996). *Simon & Schuster Handbook for writers: First Canadian edition.* Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall.

Tudge, J. (1990). Vygotsky, the zone of proximal development, and peer collaboration: Implications for classroom practice. In Moll, L. C. (Ed.), *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (pp. 155-172). Cambridge, UK., Cambridge University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1981a). The development of higher forms of attention in childhoo. In Wertsch, J. V. (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 189-239). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharp.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1981b). The genesis of higher mental functions. In Wertsch, J. V. (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 144-188). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharp.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1981c). The instrumental method in psychology. In Wertsch, J. V. (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 143-184). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharp.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory.* London: Blackwell.

Wertsch, J. V. (Ed.) (1981). *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology.* Armonk, NY: Shape.

Wertsch, J. V. (Ed.) (1985a). *Culture, Communication, and cognition: Vygostkian perspectives.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (Ed.). (1985b). *Vygotsky and the social formation of the mind.* Cambridge, MA: Havard University Press.

Werstch, J. V., & Tulviste, P. (1996). L.S. Vygostky and contemporary developmental psychology. In Daniels, H. (Ed.), *An introduction to Vygotsky* (pp. 53-74). London: Routledge.

Williams, R. (1976). *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Witte, S. (1992). Context, text, intertext: Toward a constructivist semiotic of writing. *Written Communication, 9,* 237-308.

Wolcott, H. F. (1987). On ethnographic intent. In Spindler, G, & Spindler, L. (Eds.), *Interpretive ethnography of education.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Woodford, F. P. (1967). Sounder thinking through clearer writing. *Science, 156,* 743-745.

Young, A., & Fulwiler, T. (Eds.) *Writing across the disciplines: Research into practice.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boyton/Crook.

APPENDIX A

Excerpts from Shiori's term paper for Edith's course in comparative education

An Educational Issue in Japan : A Personal View of the Unsuccessful Recent Reform

Through this course, East Asian educational issues were considered in terms of the systems, history, cultures, and contemporary problems in relation to politics and economics. While working as an English teacher at a prefectural academic senior high school in Japan, I often felt a number of contradictions between the recent educational policy guidelines introduced by the Ministry of Education (Monbusho) and the actual situation at school. For example, while expanding the range of choice of subjects is encouraged by Monbusho in order to accommodate various abilities, aptitudes, and courses of students and to respect the originality of each school, at the academic high school contrarily the number of subjects and the time allocated to some subjects (particularly arts) are reduced and students are sorted out according to the selected subjects, so that learning and teaching are more efficiently focused on preparing for university entrance examinations. As another case, corresponding to internationalization, in English classes, teaching with native speakers has been introduced at both junior and senior high schools, but after the first school year at each level, teachers, students, and even parents become quite conscious of either a high school or a university entrance examination and then the team teaching tends to be thought as just waste of time.

As the examples mentioned above indicates, the existence of entrance examinations appears to cause the major contradictions between the ideal and the reality at school. However, learning Japanese education in the historical, cultural, and social contexts during this term, I have recognized that there is a more complicated mechanism existing behind the influential entrance examination system.

The social structure of Japan and the lifestyle of the people have been apparently westernized since the Meiji Restoration in 1868, when the nation opened its door to the world. Then, until now Japan has experienced various changes and developments in the society, and now it has come to take an important role in the global community politically and economically. Through each transitional stage, education has played a significant role

in facilitating the social movements in Japan. Lately, however, serious disparity has been revealed between the aimed educational system and the real situation. Then, teachers, parents, and other people who are engaged in educating the next generation feel dilemmas between their ideal and actual conduct, and children are struggling in the contradictory circumstances.

Considering the circumstances, this paper looks into the causes of the contradictions that the present Japanese education has been undergoing, based on what I have learned, experienced, and thought over. First the paper traces the history of Japanese educational reforms since the Meiji period in order to understand the roots and the characteristic of the modern education in the country. Then, it reflects the causes which prevent successful implementation of the recent reform, considering the mechanism behind the entrance examination system as well.

First, in terms of the history of Japanese educational reforms, starting from the Meiji Restoration, the pre- and postwar patterns and the recent pattern of reform are reflected.

Maintaining the imperial throne, the nation in the Meiji era, which was transformed from the country divided into many separate feudal authorities, looked to education as a means for social integration and modernization. For fear of losing the independence as a state under threat of the American military technology, the new government attempted to produce loyal subjects who could generate national wealth and strength. They put the primary importance on universal compulsory education, through which Western science and technology were introduced to common people and at the same time Japanese morality and values were emphasized. The Imperial Rescript issued in 1890 stressed the importance of teaching loyalty and filial piety to students at school. Rohlen defines that

[r]everence for both western learning and eastern morality were combined around the ultimate concerns of ordering and strengthening the young nation (1983, p.54). According to him, by 1935 all students were attending school for at least eight years.

APPENDIX B

Ethical forms and informed consent letters

CONSENT FORM: INSTRUCTOR PARTICIPATION
UPDATE---February 1998

Dear Peter/Katherine,

In January 1997, I came to you with a request for participation in a research project that I was initiating in preparation of my master's thesis. Following this request, you kindly gave me access to your classroom, your students, and a miscellany of documents pertaining to my research, such as teaching materials. We then spent much time in conversation, sharing our points of view and exchanging more documents. In the process, I have developed a new understanding of writing instruction as experienced by instructors and students in the context of their classrooms---and for this alone I already feel much indebted to you.

At the early stages of the research project, my research questions and research methods were still tentative and open to change. This is why I have tried to keep you informed of the way I saw them evolving and emerging as we progressed. Over the year, however, I have seen patterns emerge, my research questions have become more focused, and I have developed some expertise in qualitative research methods. I thus now think it appropriate to move on to the next step of the research project---the drafting, writing, and re-writing of my thesis.

Before I do so, however, I think it important that we reach a common understanding of the new course which the research project is taking. This is why I want to explain how I now conceive the research project and to suggest what participation you may agree to have in it.

First, I have now to name the project "Initiating ESL graduate students into English-speaking academic discourse communities: Who teaches what to whom and in what context?" This title, whose exact wording may still change, is based on an article published in TESOL Quarterly (vol. 22 (1), 1988), "Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go." The author, Ruth Spack, taking a stand against "a trend ... influenced both by the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) movement in L1 writing instruction and the English for specific purposes (ESP) movement in L2 instruction," argues that "(a) the teaching of writing in the disciplines should be left to the teachers of those disciplines and (b) L2 English composition teachers should focus on general principles of inquiry and rhetoric, with emphasis on writing from sources." By taking such a stance, Spack has "hoped to provide a thought-provoking discussion that would lead to a reexamination of certain practices in the composition field," and, indeed, her article has renewed the debate about who should teach writing in the disciplines.

This debate immediatly aroused my attention. As a former scientific language learner, I could easily identify with the problem. In fact, I conceived of my graduate studies in second language education as an attempt to bridge the gap between literature-oriented second language instructors and their scientific and engineering students. The question, then, of who should teach writing in the disciplines, has informed my thesis' research from the onset throughout. For this reason, I have decided to name this research project in response to the article which has inspired it. Notice, however, how I have altered the wording. For instance, I have referred to the "academic discourse communities" as a plural entity. I have also added a qualifier to it, "English-speaking," because I do not take for granted that all academic discourse communities use English. In fact, in Québec, they often don't, or only alternatively with French. A still more drastic change in wording comes in the subsequent clause, where "How far should we go" has become "Who teaches what to whom and in what context?"

These changes are not neutral stylistic variants. To the contrary, they reflect the evolution of my thinking, as I have come to realize that the complexity of the issue does not call for polemics and ready-made solutions but, rather, for an understanding of how and why instructors and students in a given institutional setting teach, learn, write, position themselves, and interact with one another the way they do. The question of who should teach writing in the disciplines then becomes a question of knowing how writing instructors draw on their backgrounds, interests, experiences, and readings both to elaborate their views about writing instruction and to position themselves within the web of academic discourse communities along and across disciplines (e.g., L1

composition theory, ESL writing, ESP). From this perspective, it is then possible to consider how instructors' views and positions inform teaching practices and teacher-student interaction—hence the question "Who teaches what to whom and in what context?"

Given this reconceptualization of my focal questions and the drafting stage of my thesis which I have now reached, I would like to suggest new ways in which we could continue co-participation in this research project:

1. I will give you the opportunity to review my research report (thesis), to assess the interpretation of the findings, and to provide an alternative version if you do not agree with the findings.

2. Although I have gathered most of the data I need for writing a research report, I expect, during the writing process, to uncover a few points which need further clarification and further discussion in order to make legitimate claims. In these cases, I will solicit your views through informal conversations at a time and frequency which fit us both. Likewise, if you have comments, suggestions, and questions regarding the research project, I will make myself available to discuss them.

If you agree to the above, please print your name and sign below. Furthermore, notwithstanding your consent to the above, I should make it clear that you can still withdraw from this project at any time during its duration.

Name of Instructor Participant   Date

Signature of Instructor Participant   Date

Signature of Researcher   Date

CONSENT FORM: STUDENT PARTICIPATION
UPDATE---February 1998

Dear Shiori,

In January 1997, I came to you with a request for your co-participation in a research project that I was initiating in preparation of my master's thesis. Following this request, you kindly accepted to share your writing experience with me. You also allowed me to copy the course assignments which had been returned to you after evaluation. I thank you for your help, which has been instrumental for my research.

Since that initial phase of my research project, my questions have become more focused and my methods better defined. I have reached the drafting stage of my thesis and I have been able to give the project a name---"Initiating ESL graduate students into English-speaking academic discourse communities: Who teaches what to whom and in what context?"

Considering how the research project has developed, I have thought of new, more specific ways in which we could continue co-participation in the research effort. I explain these ways below.

1. I will give you the opportunity to review my research report (thesis), to assess the interpretation of the findings, and to provide an alternative version if you do not agree with the findings.

2. I will give you the opportunity to decide what excerpts (if any) from your assignments (including the teacher's comments to them) you judge appropriate to include in the research report.

3. We will discuss, and you will ultimately decide, the ways of ensuring that (a) your identity will be concealed and (b) the information you will give will remain confidential (e.g. choice and use of a fictitious name).

4. To make the research effort mutually beneficial, I will not only share the findings but also make myself available to offer you peer-response to your winter course assignments (e.g., we could meet one hour a week).

If you agree to the above, please print your name and sign below. Furthermore, notwithstanding your consent to the above, I should make it clear that you can still withdraw from this project at any time during its duration.

Name of Student Participant   Date

Signature of Student Participant   Date

Signature of Researcher   Date

ASKING FOR YOUR COLLABORATION!

Hi!
For those of you who do not know me yet, my name is Guillaume. I am a graduate student in Second Language Education and am doing preliminary research on the teaching and learning of academic writing in preparation of a master's thesis or even a doctoral dissertation. Knowing your viewpoint as writers and learners of English as a Second Language is essential to my research, and I am therefore asking for your help.

Because I know how precious your time is, I will appreciate your collaboration all the more; I will also suggest that you choose the extent and form of the help (if any) that you are willing to give among the three following options:
i) if you have no time at all but do not object to my study, you can allow me to access the questionnaires in which you gave or will give personal background information e.g. on your first language, current study program, and reasons for taking this course;
ii) if you have half an hour to spare, you could show me how you use instructor feedback to revise your writing from one assignment to the next;
iii) if you are motivated in taking a greater part in the study, you may want to become one of my (3 or 4) "key informants". That would mean meeting once a month from February to April, either in small groups or individually, to informally talk about our prior writing experience, our attitude toward writing, our needs as language learners, our use of this course, or any topics we may think to be relevant. I would also like to analyze your portfolio with you. From this we could move on to a discussion about two key questions of my research, namely: i) whether and how a general writing course can address the specific and possibly divergent needs of language learners in the sciences and the humanities (I am a former graduate student in biology myself); ii) whether and how cultural (e.g. Canada/Quebec-France) and language (e.g. French-English) differences affect biliteracy development.

Before you make a decision regarding your collaboration, I want to stress the following points. First, my goal in this study is to understand---not to judge. Second, your name will not be used. Third, I will keep all participants informed of my findings e.g. by giving them a copy of my research report(s).

If you agree to at least one form of collaboration, **please print your name and sign below or overleaf.** If you are unsure or have any questions, please feel free to come to me.

FIRST NAME   **LAST NAME**   **SIGNATURE**

APPENDIX C

Excerpt from class field notes

This excerpt is reproduced from a section of the handwritten notes I took during the class of March 8, 1997. TC means "Teacher comments" and T means "Teacher." Figures, as in 12.00, refer to the time of observation. Names have been altered.

12.00-12.58: peer-editing
12.58: T recaps (declarative mode: "I just want you to remind you that is it worth 30%)
comments on the subject/topic.
TC: main point: summary: one paragraph should be fine.
New task: Class discussion about Holden's article.
Antonio: "I think she's [the author] harmful." Explains his point, giving personal experience (3 minutes).
Comments on Hollywood films.
Rachid: In a sense you're right but in other ways scientists do oversimplify and explain their ideas in catchy ways.
Peter to Tamara, a student of biology: What about the biologist's viewpoint?
Tamara: I think the author's putting more blame on the scientists than the media and it should be the opposite. Good, honest scientists would never say such things or use such metaphors.
...
Tamara: I agree that you cannot blame your behavior on your gene.
Peter to class: Those who want to go can leave. [It's 1.00 p.m., end of class]
...
Antonio: I think the example of the CD is good---except that you need a good CD player.
Kendo: You need a good recording as well.
Peter: Did anyone agree with this article?
...
Michèle: I didn't get the feeling she blamed the scientists but rather the media.
...
1.11 p.m. People start leaving but the discussion continues.

Excerpt from a retrospective account of a class

Feb 19, Robert
Main activities: Writing summaries/critiques, comments on schedule, volunteers wanted for testing two
editing software, and gerunds/infinitives.

Lesson outline:
11.50 to 12.17: group work on tasks of units 5 and 6 on writing summaries and critiques. Teacher first talks
with me about tape feedback, and then passes around groups to listen, comment and answer questions.
12.17 to 12.31: in class discussion on group work, based on students' requests, i.e. tasks on which
disagreement within and between groups (e.g. task 7, p. 123, brought up by Shiori; task 3, p. 138, brought up
by Teacher). Also question brought up by Lib. on square quotes, p. 149. Lib.: "OK, they're used to distance
oneself".

12.31 to 12.40: procedural comments on revised schedule and coming up assignments and individual
conferences. Form circulates so that each std chooses a time slot for an individual conference with T
(individual conferences will take place in lieu of classes, see schedule).

12.40 to 13.00: gerunds/infinitives handout; first page done individually, then corrected (@12.45) in class,
then picked up by T. (a surprise to me, since I do not remember T telling us he would collect this exercise).
Volunteers (Kenji, Louis (chosen rather than volunteer), and Russian guy) read a few sentences, and T stops
them if they got them wrong, which they often do.

After class talk: With one Chinese. student, then with Louis.

What struck me:
After group work, explicit critical self-evaluation of teacher practice: TQ: How many of you did find this
task useful ?(four raise their hands), so-so ?(a few raise their hands), not interesting at all (no hands raised,
but obviously many students did not manifest themselves and Ph. comments on how impossible it is to be
overtly critical).
Confusion as to tasks to be done: at least one group moved directly to unit 6, assuming that unit 5 had to be
finished at home.
Exercise on gerunds and infinitives was well-received and done with humor, jokes. Example of joke (by
Ioannis), commenting on T's joking on a student failure: "Did you use square quotes? [when you said that x
was 100% wrong, or the equivalent]". All three volunteers who read aloud their (often wrong) sentences
accepted teacher criticism good-naturedly.
Explicit testing of methodology (for gerund and infinitive troublespots): TQ: Who did it [choose between a
gerund or an infinitive] correctly today and wrongly last time ? (asked the Q twice or thrice). Shiori raised
hands, is asked whether did three sentences per troublesome verbs as recommended, is praised for doing so,
while T. stressed how important it is for improving on this. T mentioned that these sentences should be
included in the portfolio [I do not remember him saying that last week].
Asking for volunteers to test two editing softwares. Interested students are to give to T two diskettes, and
they ask jokingly whether they could keep the software after testing it. T jokes about students always
discarding unauthorized copies of software. Ioannis asks whether on PC or Mac. TA: on PC but will enquire
about Mac format.
Giving some leeway: TC: Next class, we're going to peer review your critiques and you can turn them in the
following class if you want to take advantage of your peers' comments.

APPENDIX D

Conversational exchanges: Excerpts from a question list to Peter, 12/97

1) "First of all, just out of the blue, what do you think about who should teach writing in the disciplines? What are your gut feelings about this debate?"

2a) How do you plan a course, a class?
2b) How did you plan/design the writing course I sat on?
2c) How do you plan the undergrad section compared to the grad section?
2d) Have you reformulated the course objectives, activities, assignments since the section I sat on? If yes, how and why?

3a) What do you think about Swales and Feak's book and its commentary?
3b) Have heard about students' comments about the book and the commentary?

4) How do you view yourself as a writing instructor?

5) How do you respond to a student's text?
(Top-down? Bottom-up? A little bit of both? Dealing with content-related readability problems.)

6) You said that there are some items in the course project I have given you which you may be interested to use in your own teaching. Can you tell me which ones and why?

7) How have you come to teach English as a second language?

Conversational exchanges: Excerpts from a question list to Katherine, 11/97

Questions/domains I would like to cover with Katherine (over the course of the fall):

Briefing:
Follow-up to my inquiry into your classroom.
Thank you again for granting me access to your classroom.
I'd like to see you to ask you a few follow-up questions and to share/discuss our views about writing instruction.
Let me just first tell you a little bit about myself and my research interests. There are wide and many, I'm a very curious person, we won't have time to review them all ! But I'm thinking you may want to know where I am coming from and where I'm going—or where I would like to go.

My scientific background: my interest in scientific language learners and writing instruction for AWC involving content-specific, discipline-specific, specialized discourse.

To be studied from two lenses/perspectives/interpretive windows:
       1) Relationship between instructors/research:
a) instructors' positioning within and use of the wealth of research in writing instruction and wealth of competing theories/opinions/movements e.g. WAC/ESP cf Spack, Johns, Swales. Instructors' views of writing/writing instruction. [Related issues: positioning to Spack's article; Choice and intended use of textbook (and course materials)].
b) instructors' views about learning and teaching (esp. writing, second language learners). [Related issues: views about writing instruction e.g. in relation to Frodesen's learning centered approach]
       2) Relationship between instructors/students: How are the instructors' views reflected in their practice and how are they negotiated with students? [Related issues: course design, formulation of course objectives, assessment of student needs, establishment of student-instructor rapport, negotiation of status as buddy/mentor/expert/coach/tutor/provider of knowledge. Use of textbook (and other course materials) by students and in the classroom.]

Excerpts from a narrative segment based on a conversational exchange

Meeting Oct 30, 1997 with Katherine.
In her office.
16.00-17.00
Reported on the following morning.

(...)

Meeting:
How we got started:
    I have left my coat and backpack in my research office. I have come with two folders, Braine & Belcher's book, a slim fastener binder, and a pencil. Kate greets me in her office. She is sitting, I'm standing. While she has her back turned to me and puts stuff away on her desk, she gently taps on the right-hand side of her desk to bid me sit. Our chairs are placed in front of the desk and are parallel to each other, although mine is slightly directed toward her. Hers is in the middle, mine is on the right and slightly pulled out to allow for legroom in front of the desk chest of drawers. I put my stuff down on the table ahead of me. The table is rather uncluttered, all documents being piled or filed in boxes. Yet a few times Kate will say humorously: "I need to clean my home [meaning her office and her address book]."
    While Kate is still busy sorting out and putting away materials, I see on the table an interesting book, *Writing in engineering: A Guide to communicating*, by Cecilia Mavrow. "Oh you've got an interesting book," I say.
"Yes, It's new, I'm using this year for a class."
"May I have a look at it?"
"Sure!"
I open the book, jot down the title and the author's name.
She explains that she likes the book because it contains nice diagrams. Diagrams and pictures are frequent in engineering writing and she is not very good at it [i.e. equipped with relevant teaching materials].
"So what can I do for you today," she asks.
"First I wanted to tell you that I was very happy last time when you offered to give me course outlines and suggested I could go to a few classes."
"Oh, right, I need to jot down what I need to get for you. Course outline" She jots down "course outline" on a blank sheet of paper. "Yeah, I'm interested to know more about the history of AWC courses."

    This is how we got started. The conversation then continued along two main threads: The writing centre and Kate's interest in engineering students and science. These threads were intertwined. At first I found myself asking a series of short questions and our dialogue was a little interview-like. I think it's OK because she had an expectation that I would ask her questions. During our quick organizational/introduction meeting, she had said: "Just come with specific questions next time." Nearly every time she spoke she suggested to me small boxes to be further opened through further questioning. All the topics I was interested in—her interest in engineering students, about the book she had co-authored, how she tries to make student texts readable, the history of the writing centre, who should teach writing in the disciplines, etc.—naturally unfolded as she spoke, but they were only touched upon. Sometimes I would have liked to probe them some more, sometimes I though it best to wait until more appropriate (maybe another time). What I liked was the impression that I only have to bounce on her words to continue the conversation. What become crucial in our conversation also was the "trading of documents." She said herself at the end: "So we have traded our [documents]." What first was a teacher-student conference and instructor-research interview soon became a conversation and ended up being an exchange. The tone was cordial, sometimes humorous, as when I said: "I'm going back to primary school next week." I remember I was tired that afternoon, having had sleeping problems throughout the week. But I still had enough presence and excitement about the project.

APPENDIX E

Excerpts from Shiori's term paper for curriculum development class

Excerpt from the draft with Peter's comments

APPENDIX F

<u>A description for an academic writing course</u>

Fundamentals of Academic Writing. Section for Graduate students.

Course Description:
This course is designed to help you with academic writing in two, related ways. It offers you opportunities to develop your understanding and perception of the tasks, demands, and documents of academic writing. It also provides many writing opportunities. The assumption underlying the syllabus is that learning how to write is a recursive process between practicing writing and reflecting on this practice. In taking this course, you may not solve all your writing problems overnight, or even over the course of a term, but you should find for yourself the means of achieving your learning goals.

To stimulate reflection, this course will encourage you to expand your views of writing along several dimensions. We will first look at academic texts: How are they organized in sections, paragraphs, sentences and how each of these levels combine into a coherent whole?; what levels offer most difficulty for you and other second language writers? We will also explore writing processes: What strategies do novice and expert writers use to produce texts and what strategies do you use? Last, we will examine how texts are socially and culturally negotiated within academic contexts: How does the interaction between students, advisors, peers, instructors, and reviewers shape texts and writing processes, and how can you negotiate this interaction to make it work for you and your own academic circle?

To experiment with academic writing, you will be asked to write four texts of varying length. For each text, you will write several drafts and receive feedback from other students and the instructor. Some of this feedback will be taped-feedback. Specific instruction on grammar and writing mechanics will be provided as needed. There will be a few constraints on the texts which you will have to work on. For instance, you will have to choose among a limited number of frequent academic text-types, as listed below. However, you will be highly encouraged to construct and negotiate assignments so that they can best serve your own academic pursuits. The last assignment in particular should give you an opportunity for sustained work on a piece of writing which directly pertains to your dissertation, thesis, or a term paper for another course.

Course texts:
Swales, J, & Feak, C. B. (1994). *Academic writing for graduate students: A course for nonnative speakers of English.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
Troyka, L. Q., Buckley, J., & Gates, D. (1996). *Simon & Schuster Handbook for writers: First Canadian edition.* Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall.

Evaluation:
1) Assignments: 60%
(Page and task numbers refer to Swales and Feak's textbook).
<u>Assignment 1</u>: (5%) PS, Problem solution, task 11, p. 20
<u>Assignment 2</u>: (10%) Choose between GS: General Specific, task 14, p. 55; PS/PD: Problem. Solution/Problem Description, task 11, p76; and DC: Data Commentary, task 16, p.104;
<u>Assignment 3</u>: (15%) Choose between AS: Article Summary or Abstract, task 11, p. 127; AR: Article Reaction, task 11, p. 150; AC: Article Critique, task 9, p. 145. OR, oral presentation and one-page handout distributed to the class.
<u>Assignment 4</u>: (30%) Research paper, or research proposal, or other genre with instructor's consent, 1000-2000 words.

The criteria used for evaluation will be discussed in class. They will include consideration of your sense of audience, the organization of the text, in addition to textual flow, sentence structure, word choice, and format. For each assignment, you will have the opportunities to write several drafts and only the last draft will be marked.

2) Logbook and Portfolio: 40%

This component of your final grade will consist of a holistic evaluation of your efforts at reflecting on academic writing and at experimenting with it from drafts to drafts. This evaluation will consider your commitment to reporting in your logbook your observations regarding the texts you have studied, the tasks you have done, the ways you write, and what you think you have learned from particular tasks. Evaluation will also consider how you have dealt with your writing weaknesses and capitalized on your writing strengths. For instance, if you have looked up a grammar on a particular point, you should specify and show what you have read, done, and learned, and what you think you need to do next to achieve your learning goals. Since you will be evaluated on it, it is important that you document your personal investment in the course. Moreover, the philosophy of this course is that documenting and evaluating our ways of learning improves our learning itself because it forces us to become aware and alert.

Course design project. Academic Writing. Schedule as a working document: Abridged version, revised once. October 1997.

Date

Week 1 a   Multiple perceptions of academic writing: (addressed during the first two weeks and the last week of class)
        Understanding our learner's needs and beliefs; talking about the design, objectives, and philosophy of the writing course; becoming aware of the multiple conceptions of writing.

        For next class:
        1) Logbook assignment: Reflect on writing practices, needs, and beliefs (more details will be given in class).
        2) Reading: Unit 1 in AWGS.

Week 1 b   Reading for content and form: application to the textbook.

        Due: Questionnaires (time will be allotted for completion in class).
        For next class: Logbook assignment: about your "favorite" article and reading strategies.

Week 2 a   Diversity in the classroom: Discussing questionnaires about perceptions of academic writing.
        (also: Discussing reading strategies and elaborating on the model of writing adopted by the class).

        Due: Reflections/analyses about the "favorite" article.
        For next class:
        1) Reading: Spack, 1988.
        2) Responding to Spack's article in your writing log: give your gut feelings, compare your favorite article with Spack's (using Swales &Feak approach), and reflect on your reading strategies.

Week 2b   Spack's debate about "Initiating ESL students into the Academic Discourse Community: How far should we go?"

        Due (but collected only at the end of the class): Responses to Spack's article.
        For next class: Reading: Unit 3 (problem-process-solution).

Week 3 a   Genre analysis: Problem-solution text (the Classical model);
        Writing processes and strategies: brainstorming and freewriting (the Romantic model).

        For next class:
        First draft of Problem-solution text (topic: Spack's issue or other).

Week 3 b   Sense of audience; writer/reader relations; lay/peer audiences. Science popularization: becoming aware of audiences by changing audiences.

        Due: Pb-solution text, first draft.

For next class:
1) Reading: Unit about GS, PS/PD, or DC in textbook. If PS/PD, also relevant pages about definition (see Index and unit 2).
2) Logbook assignment: About former assignments from other courses.

Week 4 a   Writing processes: Reviewing, revising, and editing.
The native speaker's authority and discourse-level reviewing.
Cultural differences in rhetorical patterns: The Finnish/American case.

Returned: PS, first draft, and taped feedback.
For next class: Second draft of PS."

Week 4 b   Genre analysis: GS, PS/PD, or DC; Popularization and definitions.

Due: Second draft of PS.
For next class: First draft of your chosen genre (GS, PS/PD, or DC). Popularize your writing if necessary.

Week 5 a   Collaborative learning: Peer-response and peer-editing.

Due: GS, PS/PD, or DC: First draft.
Returned: PS, second draft.
For next class:
1) GS, PS/PD, or DC: Second draft (after peer-editing).
2) Choose second genre: Abstract/Summary, Article Critique/Article Reaction, OR Article introduction.

Week 5 b   Oral presentations: a genre in itself?

Due: GS, PS/PD, or DC: First and Second drafts, i.e. original peer-edited draft.
For next class:
Reading: Relevant units in textbook for the genre which you have chosen (Article introductions: Unit 7, pp. 155-159, and unit 8, pp. 173-194; Abstract/Summary: Unit 5, plus pp. 80-81, 210-217 + cf. index; Article critique: Unit 6 + cf. index + class handout). EVERYBODY MUST READ PP. 155-159.
Bring relevant samples (incl. Spack's and your favorite article).

Week 6 a   Reviewing strategies; <now or when most appropriate> contrastive rhetoric.

Returned: GS, PS/PD, or DC: Second draft (with instructor's feedback).
For next class (or tolerance for week 7a):
Third draft GS, PS/PD, or DC.

Week 6 b   Genre analysis and critical analysis of genre analysis.

Due: Third draft GS, PS/PD, or DC.
For next class:
1) Write first draft in your chosen genre:
NB. Group representatives will prepare for oral talks and draft class handouts instead.
2) Read abstract of Spack's article and John's reaction to Spack's article.
3) Think about your final assignment (research paper or negotiated). Submit short proposal specifying topic, genre, course for which it could be useful (incl. research courses).

Week 7 a   Peer-response/peer-editing; Critical genre analysis: article introductions; oral presentation by student.

Due:
1) First draft of chosen genre (AC/AR, AS, AI, or short report and/or outline of oral presentation).

2) Short proposal for last assignment.
For next class: Rewrite first draft based on peer's feedback.

Week 7 b   Critical genre analysis: abstract; oral presentation by student.

          Due: Second draft (after peer-editing, before instructor's editing).

Week 8 a   Class focus: Article critique/article reaction, as exemplified by Johns' reaction to Spack's article.

          Returned: Second draft: AC/AR, AI, or Abstract.
          For next class :
          Rewrite second draft (tolerance for week 9a).
          Open-ended questionnaire about social/discursive practices/routines with advisors and peers.

Week 8 b   Writing as a socially-mediated activity: during prewriting, writing, and rewriting. Role of peers, advisors, referees and external agencies (cf. Belcher and Myers).

          Due: Third draft; questionnaires about social/discursive practices.
          For next class: Start working on last assignment: prewriting, writing...

Week 9 a   Writing as a socially-mediated activity: during writing and during revising.

          For next classes: Continue work on your last assignment.

Week 9 b   How genres are appropriated?: On the role of explicit teaching in the learning of new genres (cf. Freedman); the textbook's assumptions about writing instruction.

Week 10 a   Peer-response: last assignment.

          Due: Last assignment, first draft.

Week 10 b   Individual conferences

Week 11 a   Individual conferences

Week 11 b   Individual conferences

Week 12 a   Comment on last assignments based on individual conferences; instruction on writing mechanics as needed.

Week 12 b   Multiple perceptions of academic writing: A new look.

          Due: Portfolio; for last assignment, may be returned at a later date with instructor's consent (no later than end of first exam week).

Week 13 a   Continuing on our multiple perceptions of academic writing.
Week 13 b   Course wrap-up.