

EATAW Conference 2023



book of
abstracts

12th Conference
of the
European Association
for the Teaching
of Academic Writing

June 5–7, 2023

Winterthur, Switzerland

WELCOME TO EATAW 2023

The development of artificial intelligence has fundamentally changed digital writing and literacy - and this has implications for all of us as writing teachers, writing researchers, writing developers, writing centre practitioners and, of course, for our students. Compared to the introduction of word processors and the internet, we are now facing a more fundamental change. Not only do we have machines that facilitate our work, but these machines and programmes also generate ideas for us, and we use them as a source of inspiration.

This kind of interaction has not yet been considered in writing models. We therefore need to find out what this interaction means for the writing process, the writing context and the writing product, and what it means for the teaching and learning of academic writing. Current key skills, such as summarising or paraphrasing, may be outdated, but new ones are emerging - such as the ability to critically evaluate texts produced by artificial intelligence, or to prompt intelligently so that the machine produces exactly what we want.

At the same time, we will need to redefine the role of writing consultants and coaches, and rethink the concept of authorship. We will also need to identify which tasks can be performed by machines and where the added value of humans lies.

This conference is an opportunity to reflect, rethink and perhaps even reinvent academic writing in the age of artificial intelligence.

On behalf of the EATAW Board and the Organizing Committee

Dr. Christian Rapp

ZHAW School of Management and Law, ZID Zentrum für innovative Didaktik

Prof. Dr. Marlies Whitehouse

ZHAW School of Applied Linguistics, ILC Institute of Language Competence

Elena Messerknecht

ZHAW School of Applied Linguistics



Citation recommendation: Rapp, C., Whitehouse, M., & Messerknecht, E. (Eds.). (2023). *Writing technology, thinking, and learning*. Book of abstracts of the 12th Conference of the European Association for the Teaching of Academic Writing, ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences, <https://doi.org/10.21256/zhaw-2463>.



This work is licenced under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence. For details go to <https://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/>.

© 2023 the authors, collection © 2023 EATAW Organizing Committee, published by ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Winterthur, Switzerland.

WRITING TECHNOLOGY, THINKING, AND LEARNING

WHAT TUTORING, TEACHING, AND LEARNING OF WRITING MEAN IN A DIGITALIZED UNIVERSITY

Within a few decades, digital writing has changed literacy fundamentally, and this impacts all of us as writing teachers, writing researchers, writing developers, writing centre practitioners, and, of course, our students.

Writing technology has become a favourite playground for tech giants such as Microsoft, Google, and Apple for whom word processors are key products that make PCs, laptops, and tablets attractive for users. Along with the internet, new technologies for communication and knowledge exchange have upended the foundations of our discourses and disciplines. More recently, further developments enhanced by artificial intelligence technologies move on to connect word processors with mindenhancing software, thus shifting intellectual development in new, still uncharted territories.

We suggest using the next EATAW conference to share, propose and critically discuss concepts that will help us cope with the avalanche of new technologies currently pouring into our lives and into the practice, teaching, and tutoring of writing. As a pivotal theme for the conference, we suggest a focus on the development of word processing and its fusion with the internet which removes all established borders of text production and rearranges the contexts, workflows, and practices of writing. Particularly, the cross-over from writing to thinking and learning is of prime interest for writing centres and writing programs in higher education.

We are convinced that it is necessary to rewrite the story of word processing and create a new consistent perspective that adds literacy and culture to the predominantly technological plot lines told in the computer sciences. We need to carve out places for our own disciplines - rhetoric and composition, writing sciences, writing studies, second language learning, applied linguistics – whatever they may be. We believe that our voices are not loud or clear enough yet to influence the future of digital writing. It is our view that we have yet to become real players in the field that can enter the discussion on the next generation of writing and thinking tools.

We expect conceptually and methodologically well-founded contributions that will lead to a better understanding of technology use in writing and in the teaching of writing. We also encourage critical contributions that question or problematize digital writing. We use the term “technology” in a broad sense to include such issues as user experiences and attitudes, usability and functionality, conceptional and educational issues, skills and competences, as well as its integration into teaching and practice. Examples of potential contributions are as follows:

- New genres, assignments, and formats for academic writing
 - New forms of thesis writing and thesis supervision
 - Collaborative writing, collective papers
 - Wikis, learning platforms, and portfolios

- Technological developments
 - New functions, tools, technologies
 - Networked thinking and connected thought
 - Uses and affordances of word processors
- Writing Centres and writing programs
 - Writing centre policies on using digital tools
 - Teaching technology in writing courses
 - Technology implementation issues in HE institutions
 - Changing roles of and opportunities for writing centres
 - Digital tutors: Automatic feedback and intelligent tutoring
 - Feedback management tools for peers, tutors, and supervisors
 - Using technology as a means of the teaching of writing
- Research on the digitalization of academic writing
 - Collaboration in interdisciplinary tech projects
 - Technology mapping and technology reviews
 - Tool development and testing as a part of writing research
 - In-depth studies on specific writing tools
 - tool comparisons and testing
 - Legal and ethical aspects to be considered
- Critical aspects of digitalization
 - Digitalisation for its own sake?
 - Limits to technology in academic writing and its supervision.
 - Where will humans still beat the machine(s)?
 - A praise for analogue tools, techniques, and procedures.
 - Understanding a generation of writers who grew up with digital technology

In addition to these topics, the conference is open to contributions on other fields of study relevant to the EATAW community.

Session formats:

- Paper presentations: Research-based presentations of 15 minutes (plus 10 minutes for questions and discussion). Research-based presentations are expected to be results-oriented and based on data collection and robust methodology.
- Teaching-oriented presentations: 10-minute presentations on teaching-related designs, development or experience followed by 5 minutes for questions and discussion.
- Symposia: 90-minute sessions, typically with 3–4 papers totalling a maximum of 60 minutes followed by a 30-minute discussion moderated by a chairperson. One abstract is to be submitted per symposium. Chairperson should be first author, other paper presenters of symposium coauthors.
- Workshops: A workshop (90 minutes) should actively involve participants in activities, discussions or exchange of knowledge and experiences. Proposals should clearly indicate the types of activities planned and the types of questions to be discussed.

- Roundtable: Each session is 60 minutes and is focused on one topic with one presenter or presenting group. The aim for these sessions is to stimulate discussion and networking on an issue central to the development of the field or an ongoing project or a project to be launched. Proposals should clearly indicate why this is an urgent topic and include a couple of key questions to be discussed. Presenters give a five-minute introduction to the topic, followed by 50 minutes of discussion, leaving five minutes for the chair and roundtable convener to summarise the discussion.
- Poster, Demo: Posters will be on display throughout the conference, and presenters will discuss and explain their posters, demo in an allocated poster session. For demos, please bring your own device.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SYMPOSIA	14
The effects of advanced technologies on academic writing pedagogy: innovations and risks	14
Christopher Martin Anson ¹ , Kalliopi Benetos ² , Tracey Bowen ³ , Montserrat Castelló ⁴ , Elena Cotos ⁵ , Otto Kruse ⁶ , Susan Lang ⁷ , Christian Rapp ⁸	14
“Designing support for English-language research in the age of AI”	16
Ben Carver ¹ , Mary Greenshields ¹ , Jonathan Fitchett ² , Nicki Hargreaves ¹ , Fergal Treanor ¹	16
Teachers, TAs, and Technology: Collaborative, Participatory Design in Data Science Courses	17
Allison Hutchison ¹ , Michael Laudенbach ² , Mena Attia ¹ , Danielle Xu ¹	17
Promises and pitfalls – how to handle and to use digital technology in academic writing. Three perspectives on digital writing from a Swiss project	18
Liana Konstantinidou ¹ , Caroline Lehr ¹ , Alice Delorme Benites ¹ , Sara Cotelli Kureth ² , Elizabeth Steele ³ , Romina Schaub-Torsello ¹ , Curtis Gautschi ¹ , Malgorzata Anna Ulasik ¹ , Maren Runte ¹ , Cerstin Mahlow ¹ , Laura Stahlhut ⁴	18
Supervision, Academic Writing and Literacies in European Higher Education - f2f and online	19
Karl-Heinz Pogner ¹ , Vibeke Ankersborg ¹ , Anne Bang-Larsen ² , Mira Bekar ³ , Claudia Ioana Doroholschi ⁴	19
WORKSHOPS	20
Booksprints for students - teaching and learning collaborative writing	20
Sarah Brommer ³ , Katrin Girgensohn ¹ , Kirsten Schindler ² , Nadja Sennewald ¹ , Silka Rödl ¹ , Anja Voigt ¹ , Lea-Liane Winkler ¹	20
Machine translation literacy for academic writing	21
Sara Cotelli Kureth ¹ , Alice Delorme Benites ² , Caroline Lehr ³ , Elana Summers ⁴ , Elizabeth Steele ⁵	21
Creating Guidance for the Appropriate Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools by Student Writers	23
Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams, Irene Glendinning, Julie McCall	23
Corpus Linguistics and Academic Writing	24
Christian Krekeler	24
How to Write in A Science Fictional Universe	25
Tom Muir	25
Technology doesn’t know your audience: Guiding EAP and ESP students to focus on their audience in writing	26
Lisa Nazarenko	26
Didactic benefits from the use of plagiarism-detection software. A workshop exploring possible types of text-matching-software application in universities based on case studies from HTWG Konstanz University for Applied Sciences	27
Monika Oertner, Ansgar Schäfer	27
Digital Academic Writing Retreats for Doctoral Candidates: Sharing experiences and developing action plans	28

Ute Reimers	28
PAPER BASED PRESENTATIONS	29
Titles, abstracts and keywords: The choices that emerge in the elements that present the texts	29
Luís Filipe Barbeiro ¹ , José Brandão Carvalho ² , Célia Barbeiro ³	29
Plagiarism in the era of hypercommunication: how do we assess academic writing?	30
Mari Mar Boillos	30
Students' attitudes towards using AI in writing – an explorative study	31
Melanie Brinkschulte, Ella Grieshammer, Annett Mudoh, Lefkothea Sinjari	31
Using data visualization for text analysis	32
Monica Broido, Bibiana Jou	32
International Writing Centers: A Chronicle of Change	33
Pamela Bromley ¹ , Shareen Grogan ²	33
Exploring Refugee-background Adolescents' Writing in a U.S. Community-based After-school Program: An Assemblage Analysis of Making Digital Scrapbooks	34
Xia Chao	34
Corpus integration into L2 discipline specific writing courses: a cross-linguistic intervention study	35
Karla Csürös, Claudiu Gherasim, Madalina Chitez	35
Monolingual norms in a multilingual educational setting	36
Maria Eklund Heinonen	36
Education in style with SSPArC: An online tutorial	37
Aliza Glasbergen-Plas, Tyche Grijns	37
Watch your jargon – using the 'Half-Life Your Message' task and interactive, AI-based feedback in writing a research summary for lay audiences	38
Tzipora Rakedzon ¹ , Ayelet Baram-Tsabari ¹ , Roy Yosef ²	38
Disciplinary literacy vs translingual access - what does technology or AI support mean?	39
Magnus Karl Hugo Gustafsson	39
"It's hard to read, but at least it's personal": Investigating student preference for handwritten feedback over electronic—even if the handwriting is "like, really bad"	40
Sarah Sue Haas	40
Blogs at the cutting edge, or as a blunt tool?	41
John Harbord	41
Teaching referencing guided by variation theory – exploring critical aspects of learning	42
Josefin Hellman	42

Social Annotation Technologies at Scale: Insights on the Patterns and Characteristics of Student Annotations	43
Justin Hodgson, Remi Kalir, Chris Andrews	43
Retooling AI Language-Generation Technologies for Improved Academic Writing	44
Adeiza Isiaka	44
Is The Essay Dead in Higher Education? Exploring the skills & scope of ChatGPT in writing assessment	45
Ilkem Kayican Dipcin	45
Grammarly vs. Writing Center: Assessing Students' Perceptions of the Uses of Grammarly and the Writing Center	46
Sona Khachatryan	46
Mid-Project Results of a National (United States) Survey on STEM Writing Instruction	47
Susan Lang ¹ , Roger Yallop ^{1,2}	47
Building a database of academic text: challenges and solutions	48
Djuddah Leijen, Helen Hint, Helena Lemendik, Marleen Kirsipuu	48
The lonely supervisor? Collective aspects of supervision of degree projects within higher education	49
Jenny Magnusson	49
First Insights into Post-Feedback Revision Strategies based on Writing Process and Product Data	50
Cerstin Mahlow, Malgorzata Anna Ulasik, Igor Matic	50
"See you in a week!" Building regularity and community in a virtual writing room	51
Jenny Mattsson, Emma Karin Brandin, Ann-Kristin Hult	51
Team projects through Google Drive: From research proposal to poster presentation in a professional writing course	52
Zsuzsanna Mikecz Munday	52
Did you note that? Tracing the way from conflicting multiple documents towards coherent discourse syntheses	53
Aleksandra Opacic, David Romero, Maik Philipp	53
Coordinating writing courses in the digital age: A reflection	54
Ha Thi Phuong Pham ^{1,2}	54
Technology-assisted collaborative writing in Vietnamese tertiary context: A comparative study between product vs. product-and-process assessment methods	55
Ha Thi Phuong Pham ¹ , Lan Thi Thu Nguyen ²	55
Is what you had planned really what you did? Task models and intertextual integration strategies when synthesizing multiple documents	56
David Romero, Aleksandra Opacic, Maik Philipp	56
What is Originality in Academic Writing	57
Ira {Irina} Rupp	57

Toward a phenomenology of academic writing under electronic surveillance	58
David R. Russell	58
Writing (and communication) of PhD holders working beyond academia	60
Anna Sala-Bubaré, Montserrat Castelló	60
Valorising social interaction for student thinking and intellectual growth: refocusing writing for assessment on process rather than product	61
Britta Schneider ¹ , Stefanie Everke Buchanan ² , Shem Macdonald ³	61
Politicizing writing support: agency and big tech	62
Ingerid Straume	62
How academic writing practices have changed in 14 years: a follow-up survey from a university in Estonia	63
Ilona Tragel, Kati Käpp, Marri-Mariska Tammepõld, Djuddah Leijen	63
Creating a shared knowledge base for a language and content-integrated approach to writing- and language development	64
Jacqueline van Kruiningen, Mariska Okkinga, Evelyne van der Neut	64
Noticing unpredictable encounters in multilingual writing on the move	65
Xiqiao Wang	65
Writing grant proposal summaries: How can a combined manual and digital approach help?	66
Karin Whiteside ¹ , Maggie Charles ² , Ahmed Halil ³ , Michael Jenkins ⁴	66
Digital materials for disciplinary writing: Piloting online writing resources for undergraduate Psychology and doctoral Education	67
Karin Whiteside, Sarah Mattin	67
Students' Remaking of Learning, Locations, and Digital Media During the Pandemic	68
Bronwyn Williams	68
Wiping away the stain: From "plagiarism checkers" to AI-assisted "plagiarism removers" and the implications for students' understanding of academic writing	69
Tine Wirefeldt Jensen	69
AI literacy in the context of working with sources: Pitfalls and possibilities of AI-based natural language production systems in academic writing	70
Tine Wirefeldt Jensen ¹ , Søren Wirefeldt Jensen ²	70
Developing a pedagogical framework to support the long-term academic writing skills of university students in Estonia and the US; current status	71
Roger Yallop ^{1,2} , Djuddah Leijen ¹ , Susan Lang ²	71
Overcoming Writing Blocks With a Chatbot and Open Learner Models	72
Libor Zchoval, Daire O'Broin, Oisín Cawley	72
Self-monitoring: Writing More with Writing Analytics	73

Libor Zachoval, Daire O'Broin, Oisin Cawley	73
TEACHING-ORIENTED PRESENTATIONS	74
High-Road Transfer and Nature Writing in Scientific and Technical Writing	74
Bradley Cole Bennett	74
What AI can do and what we can do about it – guiding students to the road of ownership	75
Fia Christina Börjeson, Carl Johan Carlsson	75
Creating a new Centre for Academic Writing: how much digitalisation?	76
Graham Burton, Maria Cristina Gatti	76
Teaching & Learning Across Continents: The Virtual Collaboration & Global Teamwork Project	77
Barbara L. Ciccarelli ¹ , Heidi A McKee ²	77
Computer-mediated collaborative writing: Google Docs in the online writing classroom	78
Claudia Ioana Doroholschi	78
ChatGPT as a tool for teaching academic writing	79
Gea Dreschler	79
Navigating the Challenges of Collaborative Student Writing and Learning: A Workshop for Faculty	80
Micha Gerrit Philipp Edlich, Dagmar Knorr	80
A Constructive Alignment approach to the topic of Automated Paraphrasing Tools (APTs) in a university writing course.	81
Anna Ekert-Centowska	81
Integrating Concordance Software into an Academic Writing Course	82
Katie Lynn Fry	82
Projects in Digital Literacy and Composition	83
Justin Hodgson	83
Using corpus tools to teach academic writing: Practical use of concordancers in teaching rhetorical functions	84
Tatyana Karpenko-Seccombe	84
The role of writing developers at the times of AI tools: Czech Academic Phrasebank project	85
Alena Kasparkova ¹ , Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolova ²	85
Building subject teachers' knowledge of academic literacies	86
Ingrid Lennartson-Hokkanen, Ingela Norberg	86
The online academic poster as a step towards essay writing	87
Katy Jones	87
Technologies of Revision	88

Jennifer Beth Lewin	88
Transitioning From Emergency Remote Instruction to Inverted Classroom Practices in L2 (English and German) Writing Across the Department of Foreign Languages	89
Tetyana Müller-Lyaskovets, Meni Syrou	89
Seamless reflection through e-portfolios	90
Lukas Musumeci, Susannah Parker Ewing	90
A Digital Tool to Support Deliberate Practice in Academic Writing	91
Daire O Broin, Niamh McCrea	91
Globalization and its effects on the genre of resumes	92
Zsuzsanna Palmer	92
In-person, online or asynchronous? Factors impacting student choice of study mode in a hybrid-flexible academic writing course	93
Gayle Pringle Barnes	93
The travel metaphor: an approach to teaching essay structure and understanding the reader–writer relationship	94
David Schönthal	94
Identifying the shortcomings of available resources for implementing feedback in process writing	95
Iлона Tragel, Liisa-Maria Komissarov, Nele Karolin Teiva, Kati Käpp	95
Getting a grip on academic writing processes with the Writing Machine	96
Janneke van der Loo ¹ , Renske Bouwer ²	96
"Finer Spirit of All Knowledge": Doctoral Students Writing Poems about Their Research	97
Nadya Yakovchuk, Mike Rose	97
POSTERS	98
The KTH Guide to scientific writing: shaping an online resource for students and supervisors	98
Susanna Lyne, Jane Bottomley, Jamie Rinder	98
Organizing, reflecting and evaluating writing consultations with an open-source, web-based application	99
Alexander Kaib	99
Are we teaching the right things? How to prepare students for future writing tasks in the engineering proficiency	100
Ida Pinho, Linda Söderlindh	100
Teaching Academic Writing through Flipped Classroom and Gamification	101
Madona Giorgadze	101
Knowledge Creation Mediated by Different Writing Tools	102
Isabella Ollinger	102

SKILL: A social science lab for inquiry-based learning with AI	103
Katrin Girgensohn ¹ , Dorothea Horst ²	103
ROUNDTABLE	104
OpenAI ChatGPT– friend or foe? A critical discussion about the pedagogical challenges and ways forward	104
Susanna Lyne, Ida Pinho, Linda Söderlindh	104
Don't Panic! Potential Implications of Writing AI for Academic Writing Development	105
Erika Unterpertinger, Brigitte Römmel-Nosseck, Frano Rismondo, Klara Dreo, Marcela Hubert	105

SYMPOSIA

The effects of advanced technologies on academic writing pedagogy: innovations and risks

Christopher Martin Anson¹, Kalliopi Benetos², Tracey Bowen³, Montserrat Castelló⁴, Elena Cotos⁵, Otto Kruse⁶, Susan Lang⁷, Christian Rapp⁸

¹North Carolina State University US, United States of America; ²University of Geneva, Switzerland.; ³University of Toronto, Canada.; ⁴Universitat Ramon Llull ES, Spain; ⁵Iowa State University, United States of America; ⁶Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland; ⁷The Ohio State University, United States of America; ⁸Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

Current technological advancements continue to change the landscape of literacy practice and literacy learning, sometimes significantly enhancing them (such as through the advent of word processing and editing programs), sometimes subverting them (such as through the advent of AI-based text production systems), and sometimes altering them with as yet little-explored consequences (such as replacing face-to-face peer conversations of drafts with anonymous digital peer review).

Informed by their contributions to a new publication on the digitalization of academic writing (*Digital Writing Technologies: Impact on Theory, Research, and Practice in Higher Education*, Springer, in press), presenters in this symposium will address the positive or negative consequences—cognitive, social, disciplinary, strategic, textual, analytic, environmental, or ethical—of a particular technological innovation in writing pedagogy. In some cases, consequences can be those already derived from research; in other cases, they can be anticipated consequences that are yet to be experienced or studied. Each presenter will speak for approximately 7 minutes, sharply focusing on one or more consequences of their chosen technological innovation(s). Specific technology platforms, tools, or apps will be briefly described for the audience on a single handout and digitally accessed document. Following the brief presentations, the floor will open for participants to engage in discussion of the nature and implications of the technologies and their respective effects on the teaching and learning of writing.

Presenter 1 will focus on the consequences of genre-based automated writing evaluation and virtual reality environments.

Presenter 2 will focus on consequences resulting from innovations in word processors.

Presenter 3 will focus on the new opportunities and continuing hurdles of integration and appropriation of writing technology in teaching practice.

Presenter 4 will focus on demonstrated and anticipated impacts on writing instruction of ChatGPT and other AI applications.

Presenter 5 will focus on the effects of synchronous and asynchronous digital tools on collaborative writing, tracing what collaboration through writing means and then looking at the new opportunities and affordances of collaborative writing software.

Presenter 6 will focus on the concept of “copresence” in relation to writing with others through the support of socially networked systems and apps. Copresence can facilitate collaboration, however questions arise when the copresent other is an AI chatbot.

Presenter 7 will consider the implications of natural language processing systems for both positive automation of routine writing tasks and for the effects—cognitive and performative—of altered or bypassed composing processes on student’ written literacy attainment.

Presenter 8 will consider whether technological support for formulation processes enriches or impoverishes the relationship between writing and thinking.

“Designing support for English-language research in the age of AI”

Ben Carver¹, Mary Greenshields¹, Jonathan Fitchett², Nicki Hargreaves¹, Fergal Treanor¹

¹European University Institute, Italy; ²University of Kent

These four papers examine the changing nature of individualized support at a time when data-rich and user-optimized digital tools encroach on the roles of the writing instructor and specialist librarian.

One discursive paper establishes a frame for the symposium by asking whether the ability of GPT-3 (and similar Large Language Models) to produce passable student essays reveals a non-technological problem: the standardization of writing outcomes (Chokshi, 2021). If academic writing programmes are to have a future, they need to maintain the *sociability* of writing: discussion, revision, explanation. **Another** reviews the perceived threat to librarianship (Hervieux & Wheatley, 2021), how librarians have assessed the utility and incorporation of AI research tools such as Elicit.org and researchrabbit.ai (Boston, 2019; Omame & Alex-Nmecha, 2020). **A third** draws on research and practice in the role of Artificial Intelligence in writing for theatre and post-humanist thought to establish a wider set of parameters by which to assess the merit and standing of AI-produced texts than simply their *similarity* to human writing (Mathewson & Mirowski, 2018; McConachie, 2011), and considers how embodied and environmental cognition serves to better understand the role of AI in writer/audience (Clark, 2001, 2004; Kelso, 1999). **The final paper** refers to the normative nature of the online writing guides that dominate the global field of writing advice for academic English (Purdue and others). These conflict directly with learner-driven teaching that aims to empower students to choose between lexicogrammatical alternatives to express *ideational*, *interpersonal* and *textual* meanings (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004). The resulting *Orthopraxy* (Blommaert, 2005) is the antithesis of a student-centred process of discovery.

Speakers (in order of presentation):

Ben Carver, European University Institute (Italy)

Mary Clare Greenshields, European University Institute (Italy)

Jonathan Fitchett, University of Kent (UK)

Fergal Treanor, European University Institute (Italy)

Works cited:

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Boston, A. “A. J. .” (2019). What do you mean? Research in the Age of Machines. *College & Research Libraries News*, 80(10), 565. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.80.10.565>

Chokshi, C. (2021). In Other Words: Smart Compose and the Consequences of Writing in the Age of AI. *Culture Machine*, 20, 1–21.

Clark, A. (2001). *Being There: Putting Brain, Body, and World Together Again*. MIT Press.

Clark, A. (2004). *Natural-Born Cyborgs: Minds, Technologies, and the Future of Human Intelligence*. OUP USA.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed). Arnold ; Distributed in the United States of America by Oxford University Press.

Hervieux, S., & Wheatley, A. (2021). Perceptions of artificial intelligence: A survey of academic librarians in Canada and the United States. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47(1), 102270. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102270>

Kelso, J. A. S. (1999). *Dynamic patterns: The self-organization of brain and behavior* (3.print). MIT Press.

Mathewson, K., & Mirowski, P. (2018). *Improbatics: Exploring the Imitation Game using Machine Intelligence in Improvised Theatre*.

McConachie, B. (2011). [{ *ENGAGING AUDIENCES: A COGNITIVE APPROACH TO SPECTATING IN THE THEATRE* }] by McConachie, Bruce. Palgrave MacMillan Jun-15-2011.

Omame, I., & Alex-Nmecha, J. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence in Libraries* (pp. 120–144). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-1116-9.ch008>

Teachers, TAs, and Technology: Collaborative, Participatory Design in Data Science Courses

Allison Hutchison¹, Michael Laudenbach², Mena Attia¹, Danielle Xu¹

¹Cornell University, United States of America; ²Carnegie Mellon University, United States of America

This symposia highlights *Write & Audit*, a technology designed by writing instructors to outline specific genre features, allowing students to more easily identify them in their own writing. *Write & Audit* integrates with a learning management system (LMS), a frequent pedagogical obstruction to teachers, students, and tutors because it often leaves them out of the design process (Hutchison, 2019). We present a model for introducing genre-based writing instruction that is founded upon 1) a technological intervention in the LMS and 2) participatory course design.

Collaborating with engineering and data science departments, our approach endorses Gere et al.'s (2015) suggestion that explicit naming of disciplinary genre features helps students grasp and implement technical concepts. Additionally, our model design draws upon evidence that specialized rather than generalized writing feedback is more effective (Dinitz & Harrington, 2013; Mackiewicz, 2004; Thompson et al., 2009; Weissbach & Pflueger, 2018; Wolfe, 2009). Therefore, the presenters developed workshops and a communication course centered around disciplinary genre conventions.

In the course and workshops, collaboration is *interactionist*, where writing and content knowledge are intertwined, creating a shifting and shared "locus of expertise" (Kaufers & Young 1993). We do this in two ways. In the engineering course, teaching assistant (TA) consultants researched communication theories and pedagogies in order to activate participatory course design. In both the engineering course and the statistics workshops, students use *Write & Audit* to identify salient rhetorical features of data analysis writing genres.

The presenters share survey results and genre-based coding of reports. Overall, both studies show that the course and workshops have positively affected students' learning in several areas. In addition, presenters will demonstrate how their course materials are implemented in the LMS. The presenters contend that this collaborative, participatory course design functions as a methodology in which "design is research" (Spinuzzi, 2005, p. 164).

References

- Dinitz, S., & Harrington, S. (2013). The Role of Disciplinary Expertise in Shaping Writing Tutorials. *Writing Center Journal*, 33(2), 73–98.
- Gere, A. R., Swofford, S. C., Silver, N., & Pugh, M. (2015). Interrogating Disciplines/Disciplinarity in WAC/WID: An Institutional Study. *College Composition and Communication*, 67(2), 243–266.
- Hutchison, A. (2019). Technological efficiency in the learning management system: A wicked problem with sustainability for online writing instruction. *Computers and Composition*, 54, 1–16.
- Kaufers, D., & Young, R. (1993). "Writing in the Content Areas: Some Theoretical Complexities." *Theory and Practice in the Teaching of Writing: Rethinking the Discipline*. Ed. Lee Odell. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 71–104.
- Mackiewicz, J. (2004). The Effects of Tutor Expertise in Engineering Writing: A Linguistic Analysis of Writing Tutors' Comments. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 47(4), 316–328.
- Spinuzzi, C. (2005). The Methodology of Participatory Design. *Technical Communication*, 52(2), 163–174.
- Thompson, I., Whyte, A., Shannon, D., Muse, A., Miller, K., Chappell, M., & Whigham, A. (2009). Examining Our Lore: A Survey of Students' and Tutors' Satisfaction with Writing Center Conferences. *The Writing Center Journal*, 29(1), 78–105.
- Weissbach, R. S., & Pflueger, R. C. (2018). Collaborating with Writing Centers on Interdisciplinary Peer Tutor Training to Improve Writing Support for Engineering Students. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 61(2), 206–220. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2017.2778949>
- Wolfe, J. (2009). How technical communication textbooks fail engineering students. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 18(4), 351–375.

Promises and pitfalls – how to handle and to use digital technology in academic writing. Three perspectives on digital writing from a Swiss project

Liana Konstantinidou¹, Caroline Lehr¹, Alice Delorme Benites¹, Sara Cotelli Kureth², Elizabeth Steele³, Romina Schaub-Torsello¹, Curtis Gautschi¹, Malgorzata Anna Ulasik¹, Maren Runte¹, Cerstin Mahlow¹, Laura Stahlhut⁴

¹ZHAW, Switzerland; ²Université de Neuchâtel, Switzerland; ³Berner Fachhochschule; ⁴Universität Zürich

Digital writing in academic contexts is a multi-faceted activity. It requires multiple skills ranging from finding information (in different languages) to reading and processing it to creating the final text product. From this spectrum, the project "Digital Literacy in University Contexts" focuses on two skills. On the one hand, we are interested in the reflective use of machine translation, on the other hand in the use of automated writing evaluation for text optimization. Both skills presuppose that people know the limits of what can be done by machines and use them situationally. The three talks point at this:

Talk 1: We present the results of a Swiss-wide survey of university staff and students that suggest that machine translation is being used widely for academic writing. Based on our results, we outline how MT is currently deployed in higher education and highlight some of the potentials but also risks of uninformed use of this technology (Bowker & Ciro, 2019; Delorme Benites et al., 2021).

Talk 2: Following Strobl et al. (2019) and Knight et al. (2020), 80 online tools underwent macro- and micro-level thematic content analyses. Broad ranges of tool purposes and feedback categories were identified (e.g., automated writing evaluation, visualization modes, granularity, statistical data and their uses), as well as a general paucity of tools available for German text feedback.

Talk 3: We investigate the topic of digital writing support from a technical perspective by focusing on machine-based text processing and implementation of automated feedback. We share observations collected during the development of a module for automated rhetorical unit recognition in theses' introductions. We demonstrate the limits related to machine-based feedback to students' writing and discuss potential solutions to overcome them.

Supervision, Academic Writing and Literacies in European Higher Education - f2f and online

Karl-Heinz Pogner¹, Vibeke Ankersborg¹, Anne Bang-Larsen², Mira Bekar³, Claudia Ioana Doroholschi⁴

¹Copenhagen Business School, Denmark; ²Southern Denmark University Odense, Denmark; ³Ss Cyril and Methodius University, R. N. Macedonia; ⁴West University of Timișoara, Romania

We bring together explorative research on supervision, feedback, literacies, and academic writing in Higher Education from different regions by exploring academic text production and literacy embedded in contexts of different education cultures and institutions, from different learning situations (L1 or LX) and media (face2face, digital, blended). The conversation at the symposium is aiming at discussing the different understandings of the concepts supervision, supervisor/ supervisee, the intertwined relations of role of education-cultural experience of supervisors and students, and the enabling and constraining effects of online and / or face2face supervision and learning. Our empirical studies are based on different methods of qualitative data collection (texts and ethnographic studies), interpretative methods (thematic analysis, philosophical-hermeneutic analysis), and different theoretical frameworks (supervision matrix, feedback, ecological perspective, academic enculturation, Discourse Communities / Communities of Practice, academic literacy/ies). They analyse the role of experiences and assumptions, educational and socio-cultural contexts, writer development, supervision and writing in inter- and multilingual encounters, as well as online, f2f, mixed supervision and feedback. Preliminary results of four context rich (case) studies: The Scandinavian way of Master theses process and product is built on students' autonomy and responsibility. This understanding is shared by supervisor and students; also in intercultural encounters and to a certain degree enacted in online supervision. Online peer review in academic writing in the Danish context health education program can support or hinder transition in the process of writing development – depending on how supervisors scaffold peer-supervisors on a digital platform. Online feedback in the context of bachelor thesis supervision in a post-pandemic Romanian HE setting shows differences and similarities of different feedback and uptake when looking at supervisor's feedback strategies and student's text revisions. In the North Macedonian context of writing in L2 English, supervisors try to combine local and Anglo-centred practices - without challenging the latter ones. The study shows the impact of globalization on students' and supervisors' thinking and practice when interculturality give more opportunities to develop faster in a digitalized context. The ultimate goal of bringing together these studies and perspectives is enabling us to draw conclusions about good practices across contexts in online/f2f supervision, as well as discuss what does not work across contexts because it is strictly context dependent and investigating patterns that emerge in supervision across different institutions in Europe, in the context of the increasing use of technology in the supervision process.

WORKSHOPS

Booksprints for students - teaching and learning collaborative writing

Sarah Brommer³, Katrin Girgensohn¹, Kirsten Schindler², Nadja Sennewald¹, Silka Rödl¹, Anja Voigt¹, Lea-Liane Winkler¹

¹*SRH Berlin University of Applied Sciences, Germany;* ²*Universität Wuppertal;*

³*Universität Bremen*

Booksprints are an innovative teaching and learning format in which students collaboratively go through an authentic academic writing and publishing process. Booksprints are designed to produce published texts within a few days. This is possible due to a very structured process and requires reflections on new conceptions of authorship, which include that roles as project manager or copyeditor are as equally important as the role of a writer (Schindler & Wolfe, 2014). Therefore, booksprints in higher education always include reflection on the writing process.

As format in higher education, booksprints address different future skill sets such as written communication, feedback, reflection, collaboration, project management and often also digital skills. Dürkop and Ladwig (2016) explicitly point out that booksprints represent a new (professionally relevant) form of co-production of knowledge by teachers and learners: "These current projects [...] in national and international university contexts indicate that knowledge is increasingly constructed and produced in a team- and group-based manner" (Dürkop & Ladwig, 2016, p. 7).

In our joint project at three German universities, we experiment with integrating booksprints into content teaching in different subjects to find out which conditions can make booksprints successful. We will share insights into six booksprints based on the ongoing qualitative research that accompanies the project. We will share a rubric that shows the variety of conditions, like assessment, length, number of participants, analog or digital and so forth. Participants will then split up and discuss various challenges for implementing booksprints as well as possible solutions, based on questions like, for example: How can it be made possible to integrate booksprints of several days into the tight schedule of university courses? How can collaborative writing be assessed? How can new forms of assessment gain acceptance with regard to university policies? How can booksprints use digital settings and AI?

Machine translation literacy for academic writing

Sara Cotelli Kureth¹, Alice Delorme Benites², Caroline Lehr³, Elana Summers⁴, Elizabeth Steele⁵

¹Université de Neuchâtel, Switzerland; ²ZHAW, Switzerland; ³ZHAW, Switzerland;
⁴ZHAW, Switzerland; ⁵Berner Fachhochschule, Switzerland

Workshop: Machine translation literacy for academic writing

Sara Cotelli Kureth (UniNE), Alice Delorme Benites (ZHAW), Caroline Lehr (ZHAW), Elizabeth Steele (BFH) and Elana Summers (ZHAW)

This workshop deals with ubiquitous tools for learning, neural machine translation (NMT) systems. Numerous students use these to read articles or as support to produce their own L2 texts (Delorme Benites et al. 2021). Hellmich (2021) reports that MT can support but also hinder students' writing performance. Bowker & Buitrago-Ciro (2019) have advocated that researchers should develop MT literacy. Language teachers have tried to introduce MT tools in the teaching of academic writing and found that, with MT, students wrote more words, longer sentences and better vocabulary (Kol et al. 2018) and they provided texts with less mistakes and more complex vocabulary (Tsai 2019; Lee 2020; Xu 2021; Lee & Briggs 2021). These experiments are interesting but some of these results are put into question by our understanding that NMT output, although of excellent grammatical and lexical quality, has numerous bias (e.g. gender, Stanovsky et al. 2019) and shows a lack of diversity in both grammar and lexicon compared to human translation (Loock 2020; de Clercq et al. 2021). Also, it is very difficult for students to identify and correct MT errors (Loock & Léchaugette 2021). Students could thus introduce mistakes because of faulty MT output.

This workshop is targeted at language teachers who teach academic writing but it is open to all teachers and researchers interested in machine translation. Its aim is twofold. Important facts about NMT and its use in higher education will be discussed and shared between participants, based on a survey conducted in 2020-2021 in Swiss universities (Delorme Benites et al. 2021). Participants will then be asked to share their experience with NMT in the writing classroom. Lastly, small-group discussions will be organised to discuss real teaching scenarios so that students may benefit from this technology without falling into the pitfall outlined above.

References (APA 7)

- Bowker, L. & Buitrago-Ciro, J. (2019). *Machine translation and global research: Towards improved machine translation literacy in the scholarly community*. Emerald Publishing.
- De Clercq, O., de Sutter, G., Loock, R., Cappelle, B., & Plevoets, K. (2021). Uncovering machine translationese using corpus analysis techniques to distinguish between original and machine-translated French. *Translation Quarterly*, 21-45.
- Hellmich, E. A. (2021). Machine translation in foreign language writing: Student use to guide pedagogical practice. *Alsic. Apprentissage Des Langues et Systèmes d'Information et de Communication*, 24(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.4000/alsic.5705>
- Kol, S., Schcolnik, M., & Spector-Cohen, E. (2018). Google Translate in academic writing courses? *The EuroCALL Review*, 26(2), 50-57.
- Lee, S.-M., & Briggs, N. (2021). Effects of using machine translation to mediate the revision process of Korean university students' academic writing. *ReCALL*, 33(1), 18–33. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344020000191>
- Lee, S.-M. (2020). The impact of using machine translation on EFL students' writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3), 157–175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1553186>
- Loock, R. (2020). No more rage against the machine: How the corpus-based identification of machine-translationese can lead to student empowerment. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 34, 150-170.
- Loock, R., & Léchaugette, S. (2021). Machine translation literacy and undergraduate students in applied languages: Report on an exploratory study. *Revista Tradumàtica: tecnologies de la traducció*, 204-225. DOI: 10.5565/rev/tradumatica.281
- Loock, R., Léchaugette, S., & Holt, B. (2022). The use of online translators by students not enrolled in a professional translation program: Beyond copying and pasting for a professional use. In *Instructions for EAMT 2010 Proceedings*, URL: <https://aclanthology.org/2022.eamt-1.5.pdf>
- Stanovsky, G., Smith, N.A., & Zettlemoyer, L. (2019). Evaluating gender bias in machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 57th annual meeting of the Association of Computational Linguistics*, 1679-1684. DOI: 10.18653/v1/P19-1164
- Tsai, S.-C. (2019). Using google translate in EFL drafts: A preliminary investigation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32(5-6), 510-526.

Xu, J. (2021). Google Translate for writing in a Japanese class: What students do and think. *The Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages*, 30, 136-182.

Creating Guidance for the Appropriate Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools by Student Writers

Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams, Irene Glendinning, Julie McCall

Coventry University, United Kingdom

The availability of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools which students can use to assist with or to create coursework is proliferating (Sharples, 2022). Some view these tools as a threat to teaching and learning in Higher Education (HE), while others see opportunities for educating students in the use of AI. This debate has particular resonance for Academic Writing teachers and scholars, as signalled by EATAW listserv discussion in January 2023 following the release for public use of ChatGPT, a high-level chat bot that can produce outputs, including text, in an array of fields (OpenAI, 2022). The aim of this workshop is to examine the potential use of AI tools by students in relation to their learning to write at university, and to consider to what extent HE institutions can define, create, and enforce guidance and/or policies for the appropriate use of AI tools.

The workshop facilitators will begin with a presentation linking the topic of AI tools to student coursework and showing examples of AI tools and categories. They will outline a Consultation that is currently being conducted by their institution, Coventry University, England, on creating guidance for the appropriate use of AI tools in relation to students' academic work. Workshop participants will then fill in a questionnaire to stimulate—and to help them to articulate—their thinking on these topics. Next, three sets of 'small-group into whole-group' discussions will take place, with time to discuss and report back on the following key questions. Should HE institutions be concerned about the potential for students to use AI tools when writing or producing coursework? How can academics and other staff at HE institutions detect students' use of AI tools? How can HE institutions control or guide students' use of AI tools when writing or producing coursework?

Corpus Linguistics and Academic Writing

Christian Krekeler

Konstanz University of Applied Sciences, Germany

Corpus linguistics and the use of corpora can potentially enhance writing instruction. Corpus linguists have produced valuable insights and highlighted the potential of their findings for writing instruction. However, a comprehensive understanding of writing instruction principles is sometimes lacking. In this workshop, we will explore the various ways in which corpora can support the instruction of academic writing. We will also discuss whether corpus research has become obsolete with the availability of powerful chatbots and compare corpus searches with chatbot queries.

The workshop will begin with a brief overview of the current state of the field, followed by an introduction to basic corpus search techniques. During the main part of the workshop, we will conduct corpus searches, evaluate their usefulness in the instruction of academic writing, and compare corpus searches with chatbot searches. We will use examples from writing in English and German.

The goals of this workshop are threefold: to introduce basic corpus research techniques, to demonstrate the potential of corpus linguistics for writing instruction, and to enable participants to critically evaluate the relevance of corpus research in the age of chatbots.

This workshop is suitable for participants of all levels of experience, whether they are new to the subject or have prior knowledge. Experienced colleagues are encouraged to share their expertise with the group. Participants should bring a laptop or a tablet to the workshop if they wish to conduct their own corpus searches.

Prior to the workshop, participants should register with the British National Corpus (BNC, at <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/> à “BNCWeb at Lancaster University”). We will also access the Michigan Corpus of Upper-Level Student Papers (MICUSP, <https://elicorpora.info/main>) and the British Academic Written English Corpus (BAWE, <https://app.sketchengine.eu/#dashboard?corpname=preloaded%2Fbawe2>).

References

Andresen, M., & Zinsmeister, H. (2019). *Korpuslinguistik*. Narr.

Karpenko-Seccombe, T. (2020). *Academic writing with corpora: A resource book for data-driven learning*. Routledge.

Pérez-Paredes, P. (2021). *Corpus linguistics for education: A guide for research*. *Routledge corpus linguistics guides*. Routledge Taylor & Francis.

How to Write in A Science Fictional Universe

Tom Muir

OsloMet - Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway

Suppose any definition of “academic writing” ended with the words “... produced by a human or machine.” What kind of future would we be in, and what would have happened to get us there?

We are perhaps already en route – Yarris *et al* (2020) suggest that medical education will become more and more reliant on curated content, with educators guided by trusted curators to the most relevant articles or summaries. It is easy to imagine a future in which an AI carries out this kind of curation.

Taking inspiration from recent work on AI as presenting opportunities for teaching writing (e.g. Anson and Straume 2022, Fyfe 2022), the purpose of this experimental workshop is to try and imagine ourselves into this future a little more clearly. By combining our knowledge and expertise, we can peer over the horizon, and imagine how academic writing as a concept might change, mutate, evolve in a higher education environment that looks increasingly like a product of science fiction. One guiding principle here is Molinari’s (2022) characterization of academic writing as emergent – i.e., the way new forms, concepts and properties emerge as a result of the complex interaction of individual systems.

By folding the development of writing technologies – including AI – into our sense of writing as a social practice, and by using our imaginations, we can speculate about what might seem perfectly normal fifty years from now, but might seem challenging to us today. These speculations can change our perspective, and make us better able to navigate present challenges.

The workshop will be run using a very low-tech method, the world café approach. Participants will move between themed tables, where they can discuss topics such as machines as co-writers, using history as a mode of prediction, and change and continuity in reading practices. After three rounds of twenty-minute conversations, the workshop will conclude with a plenary discussion.

Technology doesn't know your audience: Guiding EAP and ESP students to focus on their audience in writing

Lisa Nazarenko

University of Vienna, Austria, University of Applied Sciences Technikum Wien

While there are many online sources that support students in developing a wide range of writing skills, there are limits to technology in academic writing. An important skill in *any* type of writing is being aware of one's audience, and it is especially crucial in persuasive, critical or analytical texts in order to achieve the purpose and choose the appropriate language. However, a cognitive bias commonly known as 'the curse of knowledge' often interferes with a writer's ability to focus on the intended audience. This occurs when a writer or speaker assumes the audience has the background knowledge that is necessary to understand the content. For the students in my tertiary EAP and ESP courses, I have developed activities to help them first notice aspects of audience in the texts they read, such as choice of vocabulary, level of register, information given or assumed, intercultural references, insider knowledge, etc., and then use this information to incorporate these features into their own academic writing. This will be useful as well for the possible audiences in their academic and professional lives, such as colleagues, experts in the same or different fields, proposal committees, funding sources, general public, etc. In this workshop, I will first give a short overview of the importance of understanding the concept of audience. Then participants will try out some of the activities presented, which use sources found online, so they can decide which ones can be used in their own courses. The activities are structured into three types: raising awareness of what is meant by *audience*; noticing the techniques used in texts to focus on a specific audience; and leading students to use those techniques in their own writing. Participants will have time to discuss and compare their assessment of the activities.

References

Heath, C. and D. Heath (2006) The Curse of Knowledge, *Harvard Business Review*, December issue. <https://hbr.org/2006/12/the-curse-of-knowledge> [downloaded 26 February 2022]

Hyland, K. (2009) *Teaching and Researching Writing* (2nd ed.) Longman.

Nazarenko, L. (2021) Using text comparison to illustrate the concept of audience. Chapter in *Developing Advanced English Language Competence: A research-informed approach at tertiary level*, pp. 189-194. Berger, A., Heaney, H., Resnik, P., Rieder-Bünemann, A., & Savukova, G., eds. Springer.

Nazarenko, L. (2015) Inter-professional Communication in ESP: Preparing engineering students to communicate across the professional divide. Chapter in: *Current Trends and Issues in Higher Education: An International Dialogue*, pp. 69-83. Bakić-Mirić N. and Davronzhon Erkinovich G., eds. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Nazarenko, L. and G. Schwarz-Peaker (2013) Communicating effectively in writing: issues and strategies for engineers. Chapter in: *Green Design, Materials and Manufacturing Processes*, pp. 7-10. Bártolo H. et al., eds. Taylor & Francis (ISBN:78-1-138-00046-9).

Pinker, S. (2014) *The Sense of Style: The Thinking Person's Guide to Writing in the 21st Century*, Penguin.

Didactic benefits from the use of plagiarism-detection software. A workshop exploring possible types of text-matching-software application in universities based on case studies from HTWG Konstanz University for Applied Sciences

Monika Oertner, Ansgar Schäfer

Konstanz University for Applied Sciences (HTWG), Germany

Possible sanctions for plagiarism are threatening to students. Their motivation to give their best and avoid unintentional plagiarism can be turned into an incentive to train their scientific writing competence and discuss concepts of good scientific practice. The workshop explores the application of text-matching software for this purpose – instead of pure detection and sanctioning.

We will start with a brief presentation of the functionality, performance, and limitations of widely-used text-matching software such as PlagScan, Ouriginal, or Turnitin. We will then compare different ways the software is applied in higher education regarding goals, procedures, scope, etc.

In a participant's discussion, we will jointly assess a series of text matchings from theses written and tested at HTWG Konstanz University for Applied Sciences, Germany. These bachelor, master, and doctoral theses cover a wide range of subjects from economics, mechanical and construction engineering, computer sciences, tourism, and law. The examples show the variety of matching types: Some are obvious rule violations, some are due to (academic or legal) language patterns, and some are difficult to assess even for experienced academics.

Concluding, we present the model of software application at HTWG Konstanz. The model creates an incentive for students in their skills development as well as supporting faculty to use software in a professional manner.

In the course of the workshop, the participants share their perspectives and experience. How can text-matching software be applied best with a view to increasing the student's competence in scientific writing and academic integrity? What are the requirements, advantages, and disadvantages of different application scenarios? Or, prospectively, will text-matching software rapidly become obsolete since text written by artificial-intelligence tools is not detectable by it?

Digital Academic Writing Retreats for Doctoral Candidates: Sharing experiences and developing action plans

Ute Reimers

University of Siegen, Germany

Writing retreats have become popular among academic writers especially because familiar surroundings are left for several days to particularly focus on one's own writing. Their positive effect can be traced to three main factors: 1) Distance from possible distractions, 2) fixed slots for writing and breaks and 3) exchange of experiences among fellows.

Doctoral candidates especially struggle to make time for concentrated writing slots in their daily university life. They feel overwhelmed by the amount of seemingly more urgent tasks they face next to their PhD project. Additionally, they hesitate to decline spontaneous requests, be it via e-mail or informal corridor talks. Off-campus writing retreats therefore meet their needs and contribute to productive writing routines.

As a writing retreat organiser, I had to find new ways to support junior researchers when the covid-19 pandemic prevented conducting face-to-face activities. I was sceptical when planning a digital writing retreat for doctoral candidates in March 2022, assuming that the three factors characteristic for successful writing retreats could hardly be met. However, in the end, I was overwhelmed by the positive outcomes and feedback. This experience inspired me to design the following workshop format for the EATAW 2023 conference:

- 1.) Introduction: A short report on my particular case to give an example and state the aims of the workshop
- 2.) Shared group reflection on general advantages and disadvantages of digital writing retreats as opposed to face-to-face versions
- 3.) Developing checklists in three instructed discussion groups:
Group A: Helpful digital platforms and tools
Group B: Fostering a sense of community during a digital retreat
Group C: Supporting writing at home (e.g. decrease distraction factors) during the retreat and in the longterm
- 4.) Sharing checklists and developing action plans for individual contexts
- 5.) Drawing conclusions concerning the future of digital academic writing retreats

PAPER BASED PRESENTATIONS

Titles, abstracts and keywords: The choices that emerge in the elements that present the texts

Luís Filipe Barbeiro¹, José Brandão Carvalho², Célia Barbeiro³

¹School of Education and Social Sciences - Polytechnic of Leiria, Leiria, Portugal;

²Institute of Education - University of Minho, Portugal; ³Correia Mateus School - Leiria, Portugal

Titles, abstracts as well as keywords play an essential role in academic text genres, such as master's reports or dissertations, as they provide readers with relevant information about the nature and the content of texts and try to capture their attention. The achievement of this function implies choices concerning the scientific and discursive domains that are given salience and the strategies adopted.

These choices are made in the context of the discursive community to which the writers belong. The present study analyzes the titles, the abstracts and the keywords of master's reports produced in four Portuguese teacher training institutions. Its objectives are to identify the choices regarding the emerging elements and strategies and verify whether these choices present specificities associated with the discursive communities formed by the training institutions.

Methodologically, the study analyzes three corpora, one formed by the titles, another by the abstracts and a third by the keywords of 800 master's reports (200 from each institution). The analysis resorted to Corpus Linguistics tools and considered the frequency of the content words and the distinctive corpus "keywords" that differentiate each institution's corpus from the others' corresponding corpus (reference corpus). The analysis was deepened by associating the terms with the domains that perform the functions. Globally, the results show that the function of informing predominates in the three elements under analysis. The frequency of terms and the distinctive "keywords" reflect not only the prominent research fields in each institution but also discursive choices concerning terminology, elements and referential or processual approaches used to inform and strategies adopted to attract. The members of the teacher training communities may become aware of the possibilities highlighted by the corpora to broaden the field of choices in writing a genre.

Plagiarism in the era of hypercommunication: how do we assess academic writing?

Mari Mar Boillos

University of the Basque Country, Spain

Easy access to information on the Internet, digital tools to construct texts, and bibliographic online resources go hand in hand with an increase in misconduct in academic writing. If we add to this the lack of scientific ethics, it seems logical that, nowadays, plagiarism has become endemic in all university cultures. Moreover, efforts to regulate this issue with educational laws and internal norms do not seem to prevent its propagation. In the case of Spain, plagiarism is present at all university levels. At the undergraduate level, it has a greater incidence in final degree projects. As a consequence, plagiarism detection tools have become essential, but these are not useful to address literal translation. This practice is extended in bilingual communities in Spain where Spanish texts are translated into minority languages and vice versa. In view of these circumstances, it seems important to analyze the evaluation mechanisms used by universities, especially in these bilingual communities. In this research, the purpose is to analyze which tools are used to evaluate final degree projects and what role is given to academic writing and plagiarism in these tools. To this end, we study the instruments used in a bilingual public university with 28 faculties and more than 100 degrees. The results show that, although the university guidelines are clear, there is no homogeneous behavior among the faculties, which conditions the performance of the tribunals. In addition, the quality of writing appears, in some cases, as a secondary factor and is not considered a key competence of the students. These results allow us to reflect on what steps should be taken to avoid these practices.

Students' attitudes towards using AI in writing – an explorative study

Melanie Brinkschulte, Ella Grieshammer, Annett Mudoh, Lefkothea Sinjari

University of Goettingen, Germany

With the advancement of AI-based writing tools and their open-source availability, many students probably use those tools for their writing and revision processes. To foster students' writing skills and design writing support according to their needs, it might be useful to know how students perceive these tools and in which ways they use them. At the International Writing Lab at the University of Göttingen, an explorative study has been carried out to get a first grasp on students' attitudes towards and use of AI-based tools for writing, translating, and revising. We conducted two focus group discussions (Barbour 2007) with in total 18 students of Intercultural German Studies. This group of students can be characterized as international, multilingual, and with a strong interest in language(s) and language acquisition, which also becomes obvious in their statements. Within the focus groups, students discussed their experiences with several AI-based tools such as DeepL. The first analysis of the transcribed discussions shows that students integrate these tools in different stages of their (academic and professional) writing processes with differing functions. Findings also suggest that students look at those tools from different perspectives: as academic writers, language learners, language teachers, and interpreters. Their attitudes towards those tools differ according to the perspectives they take on. Most of the students see AI as a useful tool for their writing processes although they also express skepticism and concern. We are going to analyze the data more in detail using qualitative content analysis (Mayring/Fenzl 2019), a method for coding and structuring qualitative data. In this presentation, we will present the findings from this analysis, showing how these students' perceptions of AI writing tools vary between acknowledging them for efficiency and time-saving and seeing them as deficient compared to human writing.

References:

Barbour, R. (2007). *Doing Focus Groups*. Sage.

Mayring, P., & Fenzl, T. (2019). Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. In: Baur, N., & Blasius, J. (eds.), *Handbuch Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung*. (p. 633-648). Springer VS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-21308-4_42

Using data visualization for text analysis

Monica Broido, Bibiana Jou

Tel Aviv University, Israel

Text and document data visualization is a growing research field in the digital humanities (Kucher and Kerre, 2019) as it allows new forms of analysis that can identify patterns present in the textual reality (Nualart-Vilaplana et al., 2014), which may not be apparent through other means.

As we know, texts are linear, one-dimensional data, organized sequentially (Schneiderman, 1996), composed of rhetorical moves. Being able to visualize how groups of students instantiate these moves and how they structure their texts both at an individual level and group level could aid in the analysis of multiple texts together, which may not be possible otherwise. To visualize the progression of these rhetorical moves, using a Proof of Concept approach (Kendig, 2016), we developed a web-based app, based on Google docs' API, that can create linear visualizations of sets of texts automatically.

As a test case for our app, we analyzed texts produced during a pedagogical sequence in which students produced four analytical texts in a B1 Spanish class at our university. The resulting visualization enabled us to see the changes in rhetorical moves in each individual's texts throughout the sequence, however, the visualization was especially critical for revealing the changes across different text times (T1-T4) at the group level.

In this presentation, we will show how this visualization uncovers distinct shifts in text organization and rhetorical move sequencing. We propose that this type of visual analysis can help improve the speed and clarity with which we analyze textual data. As it can be used to follow groups of students' writing across time, the app can provide a better understanding of the process of student writing development for research purposes, as well as to inform writing pedagogy.

International Writing Centers: A Chronicle of Change

Pamela Bromley¹, Shareen Grogan²

¹Scripps College, United States of America; ²University of Montana, United States of America

Writing centers, first established in the United States (Lerner, 2009; Nichols 2017), are growing around the world (e.g., Thaiss et al., 2012). While writing center scholarship outside the US is expanding, without systematic investigation we cannot see the full picture. Progress has been made documenting writing centers (Molina-Natera & López-Gil, 2019; National Census of Writing 2017; Purdue Online Writing Lab, n.d.); however, much information relies on self-reporting and is usually geographically limited. A census is one way to address these shortcomings as it seeks out institutions and asks the same questions in each iteration, allowing for comparisons across time and location. In 2015-16, one of the presenters conducted a census of writing centers located outside the US. In 2022-23, the presenters will repeat the census and present comparative data at EATAW.

This project has two parts: a database of writing centers outside the US and an online survey of professionals working in those centers. First, a novel database of writing centers outside the US was created, using existing resources and internet searches of countries and key terms in Germanic and Romance languages. Centers offering one-on-one consultations are included in the database, a hallmark of writing center practice (Harris, 1988). Second, a survey was emailed to writing centers included in the database, using and adapting questions from the largest of the surveys, the National Census of Writing and the Writing Centers Research Project, to better compare results. This presentation shares a snapshot of international writing centers, focused on the expansion and contraction of centers since the 2015-2016 census. This census, using digital tools, helps expand definitions of what a writing center is and what it does, provides a greater sampling of models of writing support, and illuminates the ways in which writing is supported in and beyond the university.

Exploring Refugee-background Adolescents' Writing in a U.S. Community-based After-school Program: An Assemblage Analysis of Making Digital Scrapbooks

Xia Chao

Duquesne University, United States of America

Refugees from Asia and Africa remain largely invisible in the current national discourse in the United States, and even less attention has been given to refugee-background adolescents' digital written texts, particularly in the community-based setting. This ethnographic study is part of a two-year collaborative project aiming to examine how refugee-background Asian and African adolescents aged between 10 and 18 become writers through the digital making of scrapbooks in a community-based after-school program in a Northeastern U.S. city. The program was chosen because it represented recent migration to the city and served high concentrations of ethnically diverse, economically disadvantaged adolescents in the low technology resettlement communities. Grounded in the intersection of posthumanism, literacy, identity, images, and texts as sociomaterial objects (Burnett & Merchant, 2020; Ehret et al., 2016; Leander & Burris, 2020; Pahl & Rowsell, 2006), this study explores scrapbooks created by refugee-background adolescents as semiotic and discursive space where adolescents mobilized borders of written text production and shared their lived experiences, sociomaterial practices, and cultural and linguistic identities. Data were collected from ethnographic interviews, observations, fieldnotes, photovoice (Wang & Burris, 1997), and digital writing artifacts. This study finds that making digital scrapbooks is a sociomaterial, performative, and relational writing assemblage, and it has a potential for bidirectional movement between written texts and all aspects of everyday performance. This study illustrates an asset-based approach to perceiving refugee-background adolescents as writers, digital artmakers, and community advocates in the digital making of scrapbooks. This study extends the emerging literature of literacy as a posthumanistic phenomenon from the school-based setting to the community-based setting. It suggests writing teachers, writing developers, and writing researchers to use an asset-based approach to focusing on refugee-background students' cultural and linguistic assets as well as unique lived experiences to enhance their literacy and overall wellbeing in resettlement.

Corpus integration into L2 discipline specific writing courses: a cross-linguistic intervention study

Karla Csürös, Claudiu Gherasim, Madalina Chitez

*West University of Timisoara / Department of Modern Languages and Literatures
/ CODHUS*

As a university student, writing in a foreign language is frequently associated with challenges, such as insufficient training offers (Villares, 2021) or the lack of appropriate digital resources (Kessler, 2016). In this paper, we present the results of an intervention study in which we used the same methodology for corpus-informed writing instruction in two different L2 teaching contexts: English and French. The aim of the study is to evaluate the effectiveness of using corpora to improve disciplinary writing in different foreign language contexts for the same native speaker group, i.e. Romanian. As previous studies concerned with teaching writing in Romanian university settings indicate (e.g., Bercuci et al., 2021), when using digital resources such as corpora in writing courses, different components are prone to improvement depending on the language in which students write their texts. If the writing is performed in English L2, corpora help students improve their discipline specific vocabulary, whereas for writing in Romanian L1, general writing is radically improved. Given these preliminary analyses, for this study, we replicated previous didactic intervention scenarios (e.g. Bercuci & Chitez, 2019; Chitez & Bercuci, 2020, 2019) consisting of: (a) writing an initial paper as an in-class assignment; (b) training for corpus tool use; (c) introduction to the target language corpora (i.e. corpora of English L1 and French L1); (d) rewriting the assignment in (a) using corpora in (c); (e) answering a corpus use satisfaction survey. Both linguistic data, obtained by comparing twenty initial writing paper batches with final paper batches, and surveying data (40 informants total), emphasize the need to adapt corpus integration approaches in writing classes to the specifics of the language in which writing is performed. For example, while L2 English students use corpora for phraseology, L2 French students are interested in basic grammar and simple lexical item use. The survey results indicate that the majority of students find corpora very useful for disciplinary writing tasks. However, while English is a digitally resourceful language, using corpora for writing in French (Chambers & O'sullivan, 2004) or Romanian (Rogobete et al., 2021) is less common, since fewer corpora are available. For this reason, even if the comparison between teaching L2 English and L2 French with the help of corpora is not balanced, due to different resources, the results of the study are also to be used as indicators of the necessity to build more specialized or general corpora in under-resourced languages.

References:

- Bercuci, L., Pop, A.-M., Chitez, M. and Dinca, A. (2021). *Navigating corpora for self-directed LSP writing: a comparative study of digital method and resource integration in L1 versus L2 language courses*. In L. Escobar and A. Ibáñez Moreno (Eds.), *Mediating Specialized Knowledge and L2 Abilities*. New Research in Spanish/English Bilingual Models and Beyond (pp. 289-310). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bercuci, L. and Chitez, M. (2019). *A corpus analysis of argumentative structures in ESP writing*. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 6(4), 733-747.
- Chambers, A., & O'sullivan, I. (2004). *Corpus consultation and advanced learners' writing skills in French*. *ReCALL*, 16(1), 158-172.
- Chitez, M. and Bercuci, L. (2020). *Calibrating digital method integration into ESP courses according to disciplinary settings*. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 20-29.
- Chitez, M. and Bercuci, L. (2019). *Data-driven learning in ESP university settings in Romania: multiple corpus consultation approaches for academic writing support*. In F. Meunier, J. Van de Vyver and L. Bradley (Eds.), *CALL and complexity: Short papers from EUROCALL 2019* (pp. 75-81). France: Research-publishing.net.
- Kessler, G. (2016). *Technology in language teaching and learning*. In *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 186-198). Routledge.
- Rogobete, R., Chitez, M., Muresan, V., Damian, B., Duciuc, A., Gherasim, C. and Bucur, A.-M. 2021. *Challenges in compiling expert corpora for academic writing support*. In *Conference Proceedings - 11th International Conference Future of Education*, 1-2 July 2021, Florence, Italy, pp. 409-414. Bologna, Italy: Filodiritto Editore.
- Villares, R. (2021). *Engaging Internationally in Academia: How Personal Experience Shapes Academic Literacy Development*. In: Muresan, L M., Orna-Montesinos, C. (eds) *Academic Literacy Development*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62877-2_13

Monolingual norms in a multilingual educational setting

Maria Eklund Heinonen

Södertörn University, Sweden

Widening participation in Higher Education (HE) and its consequences has led to a vivid debate, that has primarily targeted the students' lack of writing competence. However, less attention has been paid to how HE can adapt to meet the needs of the new student groups. Multilingual students are often included in this discussion, which calls for increased multilingual awareness among teachers in HE.

This study focuses on the teachers' attitudes towards multilingual students' writing. Data was collected from a teacher education program in a Swedish multilingual university setting, and consists of students' texts, collected from different courses in the program, teachers' feedback, and retrospective interviews with the teachers, regarding their feedback on the texts.

A sociocultural theoretical framework has been applied, *Academic Literacies* (Lea & Street, 1998), while the interviews were analyzed with a micro level discourse analysis (Sidnell & Stivers, 2013) to capture norms and attitudes, as well as the concepts *monolingual* and *multilingual* norms (García, 2009). An overall goal is to deconstruct the norms in play in the educational setting, in order to develop new pedagogical approaches for diverse student groups.

The data reveals different perspectives on multilingualism. The results suggest that the educational conditions differ for the students within the same program, as the teachers express different norms and attitudes, sometimes contradicting the ones reflected in their feedback. These differences lead to competing approaches, creating a contradictory educational context, difficult for the multilingual students to navigate through. For example, teachers who express a monolingual norm tend to assess students' texts according to traditional academic ideals and focus on the surface level. In contrast, teachers who embrace multilingual norms tend to view the students from a broader developmental perspective, creating an empowering environment. In the presentation, some results as well as examples from the data will be discussed.

References

- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century. A Global Perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lea, M.R. & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157–172.
- Sidnell, J. & Stivers, T. (2013). *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Education in style with SSPArC: An online tutorial

Aliza Glasbergen-Plas, Tyche Grijns

Delft University of Technology, Netherlands

A vast body of research describes the style that is common in academic prose (e.g., Biber et al., 1999; Biber & Gray, 2010), and numerous books offer advice on writing style (e.g., Johnson, 2014; Swales & Feak, 2007). However, although students struggle with adopting an appropriate style (De Wachter & Heeren, 2011), there is little research into how students may be aided in this task (though see Campbell et al., 1999). This study aims to inform style education by evaluating to what degree students can revise their style upon following an online tutorial named SSPArC. SSPArC uses strategy instruction, which has been shown to be effective in teaching writing skills, including revision (Donker et al., 2014; Graham, 2006). In short videos (1-3 minutes) followed by online exercises, SSPArC teaches students to employ five style principles. Participants in the study were 62 MA students of a technical discipline at Delft University of Technology. They all followed SSPArC, which was integrated into an on-campus academic writing course. Subsequently, they were asked to apply each style principle to a sentence that they had themselves previously written. Two coders used an extensive coding scheme to reach inter-coder reliability. They (1) determined whether the style principle had been successfully applied and (2) noted patterns in the revisions, such as recurring mistakes. The results indicate that upon following SSPArC, 75% to 93% of the students (differing per principle) could successfully apply a style principle to a sentence. In addition, our analysis of the revisions reveals a number of patterns that may inform lecturers' instructions and course designs. We conclude that SSPArC is a useful addition to a writing course, suggesting that (1) strategy instruction is a promising avenue to explore for style education and (2) thirty minutes of online learning can provide students with a first step towards improving their writing style.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English* (Vol. 2). Pearson Education Limited.

Biber, D., & Gray, B. (2010). Challenging stereotypes about academic writing: Complexity, elaboration, explicitness. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(1), 2-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.01.001>

Campbell, K. S., Brammer, C., & Ervin, N. (1999). Exploring how instruction in style affects writing quality. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 62(3), 71-86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/108056999906200308>

De Wachter, L., & Heeren, J. (2011). *Taalvaardig aan de start. Een behoefteanalyse rond taalproblemen en remediëring van eerstejaarsstudenten aan de KU Leuven*. KU Leuven, Instituut voor Levende Talen.

Donker, A. S., De Boer, H., Kostons, D., Van Ewijk, C. D., & Van der Werf, M. P. (2014). Effectiveness of learning strategy instruction on academic performance: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 11, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2013.11.002>

Graham, S. (2006). Strategy instruction and the teaching of writing: A meta-analysis. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 187-207). Guilford.

Johnson, S. (2014). *Getting it across: A guide to effective academic writing* (2nd ed.). Techne Press.

Swales, J. & Feak, C. B. (2007). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (2nd ed.). Crane Publishing.

Watch your jargon – using the ‘Half-Life Your Message’ task and interactive, AI-based feedback in writing a research summary for lay audiences

Tzipora Rakedzon¹, Ayelet Baram-Tsabari¹, Roy Yosef²

¹*Technion, Israel*; ²*The Open University*

Writing for a lay audience is part of communicating academic research; this may include, for example, writing lay summaries for grant applications, journals, or websites on public health issues (Bavel et al., 2020; Dubé & Lapane, 2014). However, scientists find writing for non-expert audiences difficult because they often rely on jargon and lack training (Authors, 2017). In this study, we use a new version of the ‘Half-Life Your Message’ training task (Aurbach et al., 2018), which requires participants to write and shorten their research summary for lay audiences in several iterations. Such a task is done face-to-face orally, but here we implement a written exercise with interactive feedback and artificial intelligence (AI) prompts that mark jargon, provide suggestions based on AI, and provide comments that encourage the writer. We ask whether providing students with interactive feedback about their jargon use aids students in writing short summaries of their research for a lay audience. This was investigated by asking Ph.D. STEM students in an academic writing course to write a 120-word summary, followed by several iterations, about their research for a lay audience. Using a website that analyzes jargon, we compare a group that receives feedback from an interactive program about potential jargon before each subsequent iteration, a group that receives interactive feedback about potential jargon and AI-based rewrite suggestions, and a control group that does not receive any feedback before each rewrite. Specifically, we explore whether students used this interactive feedback in their rewrite by analyzing which suggestions they implemented, how they perceived the effectiveness of the feedback, and whether their revised summary was rated as suitable for the target audience. This presentation will introduce new results being collected in the current semester and discuss pedagogical implications for the incorporation of interactive AI-based tools when writing for a target audience.

References

- Aurbach, E. L., Prater, K. E., Patterson, B., & Zikmund-Fisher, B. J. (2018). Half-Life Your Message: A Quick, Flexible Tool for Message Discovery. *Science Communication*, 40(5), 669–677.
- Bavel, J. J. V., Baicker, K., Boggio, P. S., Capraro, V., Cichocka, A., Cikara, M., Crockett, M. J., Crum, A. J., Douglas, K. M., Druckman, J. N., Drury, J., Dube, O., Ellemers, N., Finkel, E. J., Fowler, J. H., Gelfand, M., Han, S., Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., ... Willer, R. (2020). Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nature Human Behaviour* 2020 4:5, 4(5), 460–471. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
- Dubé, C. E., & Lapane, K. L. (2014). Lay abstracts and summaries: Writing advice for scientists. *Journal of Cancer Education*, 29(3), 577–579. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S13187-013-0570-1/TABLES/1>
- Rakedzon, T., Segev, E., Chapnik, N., Yosef, R., & Baram-Tsabari, A. (2017). Automatic jargon identifier for scientists engaging with the public and science communication educators. *PLOS ONE*, 12(8), e0181742. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0181742>

Disciplinary literacy vs translingual access - what does technology or AI support mean?

Magnus Karl Hugo Gustafsson

Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Recent observations and discussions in editorial teams about revision and copy-editing have highlighted the by now familiar problem of access and inclusion in our translingual knowledge production contexts. How dynamic are disciplinary discourses really, and what are the implications of recent advances in language tools and AI for translingual concerns?

With an interest in a student and learning perspective in a context of STEM higher education ranging from BSc students to PhD candidates writing for publication, I explore the inherent tension in the notion of disciplinary literacy and then try to investigate how translingual students are affected by assumptions about disciplinary discourse.

The theoretical influences come from predictable critiques of 'disciplinary literacy' (Wallerstein, 2003; Gee, 1989; Trowler, 2014; Negretti, 2022; Luzon, 2005) and more recent assumptions about inclusion and impact in a translingual knowledge producing society or the higher education for such a society (Garcia & Wei, 2013; Navarro et al., 2022; Curry & Lillis, 2022). The pedagogical assumptions are largely based on genre-based writing instruction and academic literacies approaches (Hyland, 2007; Swales & Feak, 2004; Tardy, 2020; Johns, 2006; Lea & Street, 2006; Lillis et al., 2015).

I have data from 24 participants on PhD writing courses to exemplify their assumptions about their disciplines and readers as well as their revision history for one isolated publication process: There is also data from multi-disciplinary intra-engineering BSc projects and the students' issues with their respective intra-disciplinary assumptions. Both sets of data are limited but randomized in terms of student and writer participation in courses and publication processes. The data suffers convenience sampling, but the risk of bias is limited.

The shared dimension for the three sets of data is the question about how they are affected by the current and rapid changes in language technology support. How good are the open AI-engines and bots in editing texts that maintain translingual writer identities and qualify as disciplinary while still advancing the disciplinary discourse?

“It's hard to read, but at least it's personal”: Investigating student preference for handwritten feedback over electronic—even if the handwriting is “like, really bad”

Sarah Sue Haas

Ghent University, Belgium

With the move towards digitisation, whether out of necessity, or desire for progress, feedback on writing has been shifting from hand-written towards electronic. While studies regarding the relative merits of these feedback delivery methods have shown varied results, electronic feedback has consistently been found to be advantageous due to timeliness and accessibility. On the other hand, students have noted that handwritten feedback feels more personal, and gives more of a sense of being connected to the teacher/reader. A disadvantage of hand-written feedback is potential illegibility of handwriting, which can make the feedback difficult for students to access and process.

To investigate the interplay between feeling more personal, and being less accessible due to illegibility, a survey was given to 112 second-year undergraduate students who had received both electronic and hand-written feedback from a teacher who was notorious for having bad handwriting. To nuance the results of the survey, 10 students were consulted in a focus group.

A comparison of the feedback itself indicated that there was little difference in quality between the hand written and electronic comments; as such it was expected that students would prefer the legible electronic feedback. The surprising results, however, showed that 68% of the students strongly preferred the hand-written feedback, even though the handwriting was “less than ideal (like, really bad)”. Both the survey and the focus group pointed to the preference being due to the feedback “feel[ing] more personal... like someone actually cares.”

Further study needs to be done, but in post-pandemic education, where students’ need for connection has been brought into sharp relief, we should not underestimate the importance of the “personal” aspect of feedback on writing. Innovations that allow us to maintain the personal, without placing more demands on already-busy teachers, are highly desirable.

Blogs at the cutting edge, or as a blunt tool?

John Harbord

Maastricht University, The Netherlands

The growth of online communication has created new genres, which are entering higher education as assessment formats. One such is the blogpost. Students may be required to post texts in an online format. It is assumed they will thus imitate and acquire conventions of blogging as a life skill. As a genre, blogposts seem to be highly diverse, with a common distinction between academic and popular blogs. While some attention has been paid to the use of blog writing in EFL teaching (Al-Jarf, 2022; Fithriani, Rafida & Siahaan, 2019; Vurdien, 2011), there has been less focus on what roles the genre may play in content courses in higher education (though see Hansen, 2014), thus running the risk that it may simply be used because it seems fashionable.

In this presentation I look at one assessment assignment in a first year BA course, a reflective blog. The assignment was first designed by staff in the discipline, and I was later recruited to provide writing support to help students who had difficulty with the assignment. Over a period of time it became clear that the role of the blog as a genre had not been fully thought through, and was at odds with certain other course objectives. Put differently, while the aims of the assessment task were aligned with the ILOs of the course, the choice of genre was not obviously so. This presentation discusses the (ongoing) collaboration between discipline and support staff to align the assignment and teaching and learning activities to maximise student learning success. Findings will include both pitfalls to avoid and successful solutions to collaboration on new genres.

Al-Jarf, R. (2022). Blogging about Current Global Events in the EFL Writing Classroom: Effects on Skill Improvement, Global Awareness and Attitudes. *Online Submission*, 1(1), 73-82.

Fithriani, R., Rafida, T., & Siahaan, A. (2019, June). Integrating online blogging into EFL writing instruction: Exploring students' perceptions. In *UNNES International Conference on English Language Teaching, Literature, and Translation (ELTLT 2018)* (pp. 87-90). Atlantis Press.

Hansen, H. E. (2016). The impact of blog-style writing on student learning outcomes: A pilot study. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 12(1), 85-101.

Vurdien, R. (2013). Enhancing writing skills through blogging in an advanced English as a Foreign Language class in Spain. *Computer assisted Language learning*, 26(2), 126-143.

Teaching referencing guided by variation theory – exploring critical aspects of learning

Josefin Hellman

Södertörn University, Sweden

Referencing is central to all academic writing, but challenging to teach as it is a complex skill, much more so than summarising or following various conventions (Mateos & Solé, 2009). The purpose of this paper is to present findings from a study on referencing in higher education, exploring the variation theory of learning as a guiding principle for instruction. The variation theory rests on the assumption that there are different ways of approaching a phenomenon, since we discern and focus on different aspects of it (Marton & Booth, 1997). It is assumed that learning involves a changed experience where new aspects of the phenomenon are discerned. The aspects that are necessary to discern to develop a specific knowledge and/or know-how and which the students have not yet discerned, are called critical aspects. Thus, the focus of teaching is to make it possible for students to discern these (Marton, 2015).

Empirical data consisted of pre- and post-lecture assessments from 24 students, as well as video recordings and transcriptions from two lectures. The staged lectures were analysed guided by variation theory to find what was made possible to discern and thus learn. Pre- and post-tests were analysed regarding the quality of source use. By analysing the interplay between the staged lecture and student outcomes, four critical aspects of learning referencing then emerged. The students need to discern 1) that there are ideas in source texts as wholes and longer text passages, 2) how ideas in texts can be separated from their form, 3) that ideas from sources must serve a purpose in one's text, and 4) how one's ideas can be separated from those of others. Based on this, it is discussed how the critical aspects can be used when planning teaching in academic writing and in further research.

Social Annotation Technologies at Scale: Insights on the Patterns and Characteristics of Student Annotations

Justin Hodgson, Remi Kalir, Chris Andrews

Indiana University Bloomington, United States of America

Annotating a text is a deceptively simple writing practice with deep relevance to many disciplines in the humanities. But this simple, yet critical act is more than just the marking up a document or scribbling in the margins: it is an act of writing, a kind of “first draft thinking” (Kalir 2020). Moreover, looking at reading practices and annotation has a long history in writing studies (see Horning in the 1980s and Joliffe and Wolfe in the early 2000s). But there has been a renewed interest in the past decade or so (see Carillo 2015, Joliffe 2017, and Sullivan et al 2017) as changes in technology have radically expanded the mediascape and possibilities for the act of annotation. We’ve seen a turn to multimodal annotation practices (Davis & Mueller 2020) as well as a major shift toward technologies that support collaborative or social annotation. It is to the latter that this paper turns its focus.

The first portion focuses on introducing social annotation (SA) as a writing practice, situating SA (and related technologies) pedagogically, and providing insights on implementing SA in a single course or, as in this study, at scale: i.e., 55+ writing courses/semester. Then, using our programmatic scale as context, this paper will present insights from a subset of data: 3 course readings that appeared in 90 sections of first-year-composition across 3 semesters, which accounted for over 10,000 annotations generated by more than 1800 students. It will present broad patterns that emerge from how students annotate critical (and culturally charged) course texts and feature insights on specific student characteristics of annotation (gleaned by using computational textual analyses (linguistic inquiry; topical modeling). It will conclude with how our research findings can guide writing teachers to better leverage student annotation and SA technologies in the context of the writing classroom.

Retooling AI Language-Generation Technologies for Improved Academic Writing

Adeiza Isiaka

University of Toronto, Canada

Automatic writing tools, trained using vast bodies of authentic texts, are now optimized for generating life-like writing on diverse topics across disciplines. AI technology such as GPT-3 or its newer version—InstructGPT is now publicly available and being used to craft essays, term papers, or take-home exams. While students find an ally in these tools, teachers are worried about their potential for encouraging sophisticated plagiarism and intellectual indolence. My talk will focus on the implications of AI tools for academic writing and ways of harnessing their affordances in advanced scholarly writing. I compare a range of human- and ChatGPT-generated introductory paragraphs of research papers in the humanities, analyzing their rhetorical moves and structural patterns. I look to highlight the limits of machinegenerated texts with regard to metadiscursive fluency and syntactic fluidity, suggest countering strategies, and invite thoughts on the future of writing pedagogy in the age of AI language-generation technologies.

Keywords: AI-language technologies, writing pedagogy, academic writing, metadiscursive strategies, syntactic fluidity.

Is The Essay Dead in Higher Education? Exploring the skills & scope of ChatGPT in writing assessment

Ilkem Kayican Dipcin

Sabanci University, Turkiye

Since the launch of AI chatbot, ChatGPT on 2 December, 2022, there has been a growing discussion about its implications for higher education. As the academic writing skills coordinator of a year-long compulsory humanities freshman course in an international university that has English as medium of instruction, I decided to explore its capabilities by conducting a research and use the outcomes for revising existing writing assessments. Society & Humanity is a two-semester course and students are asked to write a summary and a response paper in their first semester. Using the response paper assignment as the sample assessment, this paper aims to investigate the skills and scope of the AI text generators, ChatGPT in generating the papers to evaluate how much they are aligned to the assessment criteria. Student participants will be asked to use the either tool to complete two different response paper assignments and they will be interviewed to examine how they utilize the tool as reading and writing aid. And asking questions informed by the following overarching research questions:

1. To what extent is a ChatGPT or GPT-3.5 generated text successful based on the criteria of the response paper?
2. Based on their experience in writing with ChatGPT, to what degree do students feel involved in completing the assignment?
3. How should the assessment and pedagogy in writing shift to minimize the negative implications of tools like ChatGPT and GPT-3.5 in the learning process of academic writing?

The paper will then move on to address the main goal of this research, namely the creation of a set of instruments and suggestions that aim to discuss the types of alternative assessments that also integrate themselves to this new reality. The study will be conducted in collaboration with a faculty member from computer science department to be in good understanding of the technical abilities of the AI tools that will be used.

Grammarly vs. Writing Center: Assessing Students' Perceptions of the Uses of Grammarly and the Writing Center

Sona Khachatryan

American University of Armenia, Armenia

Writing center scholarship emphasized that writing centers' main role is to create better writers rather than fix the papers. (North, 1984) Adhering to this philosophy, the Writing Center at the American University of Armenia has incorporated a "minimalist tutoring" approach. (Brooks, 1991) AUA is an English-medium university, and while students have strong TOEFL scores, English is not a home language for most AUA students. As a result, even though the Writing Center advocated that it is not a proofreading/editing center, students still had these expectations from the Writing Center. In the last three years, with the increase of the purchase of 2000 Grammarly Premium keys (for the student population of 2200), students have used this imperfect AI-software tool for final editing. In recent years, very few studies examined the writing center vs. Grammarly relationship. Dembsey's (2017) pioneering study argued that Grammarly did not achieve its claim to "close the gaps" in writing center services, while the consultants' grammar feedback can be inaccurate too. In response to Dembsey's call, Zhang et al. (2020) investigated ESL students' perceptions of Grammarly as opposed to face-to-face tutoring, the participants highlighting the use of each service for addressing different needs in the writing process. The current study attempts to explore if the popularization of Grammarly among the AUA students affected the students' perceptions about the Writing Center. To meet this goal, an online survey sent out through email was conducted among university students. The findings from 120 respondents show that students have used the Writing Center and Grammarly for different purposes; namely, the Writing Center for higher order concerns, while Grammarly for lower order concerns. The results of this study suggest that AI technology - Grammarly - can support students looking for feedback on LOCs, allowing writing consultants to work with students on HOCs.

Mid-Project Results of a National (United States) Survey on STEM Writing Instruction

Susan Lang¹, Roger Yallop^{1,2}

¹*The Ohio State University, United States of America;* ²*Tartu University*

This presentation will update the results and work completed on the multiphase undergraduate STEM writing survey. The survey is designed to provide a more comprehensive understanding of where and how writing is taught in the United States to undergraduates in key STEM disciplines. Data-informed research regarding writing instruction to STEM students is needed because many discussions regarding the state of instruction are 1) grounded in personal observations and casual discussion, and 2) ultimately fail to find scalable solutions.

Because of professional accreditation requirements and demands associated with sustaining a strong research program, most STEM faculty don't have the time, training, or in some cases, the inclination to teach writing in their curriculums even though many acknowledge its value. If we are to sustain a more diverse student population in STEM, communication between students from different backgrounds and communication knowledge is critical. *To effect change, we need to understand important systematic gaps in STEM curricula and writing pedagogy before we can improve instructional practices, student experience, and subsequent successful engagement in STEM professions.*

Initial results were discussed at WRAB 2023. This presentation will consider the entire survey results data set and explain any notable findings. It will also discuss how survey administrators are migrating to the second phase of the project--the collecting of instructional artefacts, such as syllabi, course schedules, and assignment descriptions--and the methods of analysis that will be/are being applied to these by an interdisciplinary coding team.

In terms of longer impact, administrators will consider if/how they will design follow-up survey(s) to address questions or issues that they uncovered in the first survey results or whether the project will be best served by moving to a focus/group and interview phase after instructional artefacts are coded.

Building a database of academic text: challenges and solutions

Djuddah Leijen, Helen Hint, Helena Lemendik, Marleen Kirsipuu

University of Tartu, Estonia

To construct machine learning models of academic writing traditions, large databases of existing academic texts are needed to both train and test these models. In our research, we have collected 1000s of publicly archived academic texts (BA, MA, and PhD theses and Journal Articles) in Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian. The aim of the database is to investigate academic writing traditions and structures of the various genres and disciplines of academic text contained in the database. Given the lack of academic text databases to investigate textual features of writing in these languages, our project has three main aims:

Create a representative and meaningful structured database of academic texts.

Develop a model which can be used to measure specific features of texts which could help us describe how these occur or vary across different types of texts and/or languages.

Apply machine learning methods on the created database to train and test each feature from the model individually and the features in combination.

In this presentation, we will focus on the first aim, but we will also show the value of the database in the context of the second and the third aim.

To construct the database, we first determined which academic texts we wanted to include in our database, including how far back in time we wanted to go. Secondly, we allocated publicly accessible data and repositories from which we could mine the texts. Finally, we had to build a structure and interface for the database, which would allow us to ask specific questions that the machine learning algorithm would be able to construct a model.

We will report on the challenges we faced creating the database and solutions. We will also show how the structured database can support the analysis of academic texts using machine learning methods.

The lonely supervisor? Collective aspects of supervision of degree projects within higher education

Jenny Magnusson

Södertörn University, Sweden

Supervision in higher education has traditionally been associated with an individualistic learning culture: a dyadic pedagogical relation between two people, where one is teaching and one is learning. This more traditional view of supervision has, however, become increasingly questioned, and greater focus has been put on collective structures within the academic community, viewing the practice of the individual supervisor as continuously existing and developing in social interaction with others (Dysthe & Samara 2006, Magnusson & Zackariasson 2021). The aim of this presentation is to discuss how such social and collective aspects may come to show in the interaction between degree project supervisors and students during supervision meetings, through looking at how supervisors speak of, refer to, or give voice to other actors relevant to the degree project process.

The presentation is based on empirical material from an interdisciplinary research project on independence in higher education, where supervision of degree projects within teacher education and journalism education was the main focus. One part of the material collected within the project consists of recorded supervision meetings, and it is this material we concentrate on in this presentation. The wider theoretical framework for the project starts from the field of academic literacies (eg Lea & Street 2000, 2006; Lillis 2001; Lillis & Scott 2007). The more specific theoretical concepts used in this presentation are *scaffolding* (van de Pol et al 2012), *active voicing* (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998), and *attribution* (Martin & White 2003).

The findings show that the supervisors frequently and in various ways made a number of actors and roles relevant in the supervision interaction, mainly course organizers/seminar leaders, examiners and students. In this way, the supervision of a particular degree project thus became situated in a wider collective and social practice.

References

- Dysthe, O. and Samara, A. 2006. *Forskningsveiledning på master- og doktorgradsnivå*. Oslo: Abstrakt forlag.
- Lea, M. R. and Street, B. V. 2000. Student writing and staff feedback in higher education: An academic literacies approach. In M. R. Lea and B. Stierer. Eds. *Student writing in higher education. New contexts*. London: Open University Press. 32-46.
- Lea, M. R. and Street, B. V. 2006. The 'Academic Literacies' Model: Theory and Applications. *Theory Into Practice*, 45(4), 368-377.
- Lillis, T. 2001. *Student writing : access, regulation, desire*. London: Routledge.
- Lillis, T. and Scott, M. 2007. Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 5-32.
- Hutchby, I. and Wooffitt, R. 1998. *Conversation analysis: principles, practises and applications*. Oxford: Polity.
- Martin, J. R. and White, P. R. 2005. *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- van de Pol, J. E. 2012. *Scaffolding in teacher-student interaction: exploring, measuring, promoting and evaluating scaffolding*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Magnusson, J. & Zackariasson, M. 2021. *Handledning i praktiken: Om studenters självständighet och akademiska litteracitet*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

First Insights into Post-Feedback Revision Strategies based on Writing Process and Product Data

Cerstin Mahlow, Malgorzata Anna Ulasik, Igor Matic

ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Switzerland

Writing a research plan or the introduction for a master thesis usually requires several rounds of revisions. Students revise drafts based on feedback by supervisors or peers. Although we teach how to write research plans and introductions, and we also teach how to revise, we have only little insight into what students actually do during revision sessions. Which strategies do they apply and how do they change text step by step to fix issues raised in feedback but which might be phrased only vaguely? Looking at second drafts and interviewing writers does give shallow and biased information only (Gao et al. 2019, Link et al. 2022). Information on variants tried but not included in the revised version is not accessible. Deeper insight into the processes will support further formative assessments of second drafts by considering not only the product but the process as well.

In a pilot study with 20 master students in nursing, we logged two writing sessions—first draft and revision of this draft based on feedback—during a workshop on academic writing with Scriptlog (Johansson et al. 2018). The texts products—drafts and feedback—are stored in TEI format in a BaseX database (Mahlow et al. 2012) to be queried. The texts are annotated automatically with POS, morphosyntactic, and syntactic information using spaCy (Honnibal et al. 2020). The feedback is stored as additional annotation layer, thus forming a new kind of writing corpus. We applied THETool (Mahlow et al. 2022) to keystroke logging data for analyses and visualizations. Based on this students received individual feedback on their writing processes and strategies. The results both helped to guide students how to address feedback and allowed for better instructions on how to give helpful feedback, which we will implement in future writing workshops.

“See you in a week!” Building regularity and community in a virtual writing room

Jenny Mattsson, Emma Karin Brandin, Ann-Kristin Hult

University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Academic writing retreats and writing groups are ways of socializing and structuring writing that can greatly benefit academics’ productivity (Murray & Newton 2009; Carter et al. 2020) and wellbeing (Mattsson et al. 2020; Eardley et al. 2021). During the pandemic, writers all over the world found digital solutions to help them preserve these benefits in times of social distancing (Janz 2020).

At the University of Gothenburg, Sweden, the Unit for Academic Language has developed a variety of structured writing activities for university staff (including doctoral students) over the past five years, e.g. writing retreats and writing groups. The pandemic necessitated the development of digital versions of these activities as a way to continue to provide collegial support, space, and structure for writing. However, even as the activities were able to return to campus post pandemic, writers across the university expressed a continued need for structured writing online. As a response, the unit created The Writing Room – a digital space, a Zoom room for writing, open to all university staff on a regular basis.

The present study will give an account of this new resource for staff at the University of Gothenburg. By exploring qualitative survey data on participants’ experiences, the study aims specifically to examine the powers at work in The Writing Room. What do the participants come (back) for? What do they learn about themselves and from each other, as writers? Preliminary results indicate that it is the accessibility and regularity of the format, as well as the sense of community established in the room, that benefit participants most. The results of the study could contribute to existing research on digital and physical writing retreats, and more broadly to the development of virtual writing activities in the digitalized university and beyond.

Team projects through Google Drive: From research proposal to poster presentation in a professional writing course

Zsuzsanna Mikecz Munday

AUS, United Arab Emirates

Over the last few years, the range of technology supporting writing instruction has been dramatically increasing in higher education. In EFL writing classrooms, the main support has been on micro-level, focusing on grammar and spelling, whereas fewer resources have been developed for macro-level support relating to essay structure or rhetorical strategies (Stroble, et al, 2019). Digital technology has created new genres and greatly influenced the way student writers approach and complete writing assignments. It has revolutionized not only research and idea generation, but text production, feedback, annotation, revision and collaboration in writing (Nation & Macalister, 2020). The presenter will demonstrate how digital technology has changed various stages of the writing process in a professional writing course for engineering students at an American university in the UAE. The course, 'Professional Communication for Engineers', builds on three academic writing courses and develops technical writing and professional communication skills through Engineering Multi-Disciplinary Projects (EMDPs), analyzing distinctive features of various professional, oral and written genres. The benefits of Google Drive for collaborative writing has been discussed by scholars (Morris in Lamb & Parrot, 2019; Cotugno, 2014). In this course, it is used to create text at various stages of the writing process from researching, annotating and evaluating sources, through writing the research proposal and several drafts. Google Drive supports multimodal composing of text such as incorporating tables, pictures, diagrams in reports, and for delivering poster presentations. In addition, editing and feedback from peers and instructors are more effective by being more direct, systematic and explicit (Ene & Upton, 2014). Although error checking softwares for linguistic accuracy are used by many instructors, using Google as a collaborative writing platform is of paramount importance for EMDPs. It makes group composition of texts interactive and public, allowing students more authority and engagement in their learning process. The demonstrated teaching practice is applicable to multiple audiences in various writing programmes around the world.

Did you note that? Tracing the way from conflicting multiple documents towards coherent discourse syntheses

Aleksandra Opacic, David Romero, Maik Philipp

Zurich University of Teacher Education, Switzerland

Background: Reading conflicting multiple documents for writing discourse syntheses requires students having highly elaborated cognitive skills. According to the D-ISC model, readers employ sourcing strategies to link conflicting claims to sources and re-establish coherence (Braasch & Kessler, 2021). To achieve this, students can specifically use source informations by taking notes or highlight them (Kobayashi, 2014). However, this has been rarely studied in multiple-documents literacy research.

Aim: In a pilot study, we trace the way from conflicting multiple documents towards coherent discourse syntheses. Starting from written discourse syntheses, we analyze (RQ1: products) how many intertextual conflicts students report by using sources in their texts, (RQ2: traces) how many source considerations (as suggested by Kobayashi, 2014) are found in their traces (e.g., notes), and (RQ3) whether they are related to the product measures.

Methods: The pilot study of the WRITE research project (funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation) took place in December 2022. Students (N=29) read conflicting documents with embedded sources and wrote discourse syntheses. They were allowed to take notes or to highlight during task completion. We analyze discourse syntheses (RQ 1), traces (RQ 2), and the relationships between traces and syntheses (RQ 3).

Results: Students' discourse syntheses and traces are currently coded for the number of conflicts identified and sources employed. Thereby, we count for reported intertextual conflicts in the discourse syntheses whether they are traced back to the sources (RQ1). In addition, we scrutinize students notes and highlightings by determining how many of the source informations were already noted and selected (RQ2). Finally, we analyze whether these traces of source use are statistically significant linked to their discourse syntheses (RQ3).

By tracing the way from processed metadata towards discourse syntheses, we highlight the potential of multi-perspective measures that are sensitive to complex information use in academic writing.

Coordinating writing courses in the digital age: A reflection

Ha Thi Phuong Pham^{1,2}

¹FPT University, Hanoi; ²Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

This paper is a cogitation on what being a coordinator of a writing course means, and what being a course coordinator of a writing course in the digital age indeed involves. The reflection is done using Kolb's (1984) reflective model, which is also referred to as the *experiential learning* model. The fundamental of this model is learners' own encounter, which is once experienced by the learners themselves, is critically reviewed and analysed in four stages – concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualisation, and active experimentation. Following this model, the author reflects on her experience as a coordinator of two writing courses provided by a university in New Zealand that were delivered online in the third trimester of the 2022's academic year. This reflection focuses on the central role of technology in these writing courses, and how it affected those involved, students and tutors for the most part. This paper expects to offer insight into how to better lead writing courses to success.

Technology-assisted collaborative writing in Vietnamese tertiary context: A comparative study between product vs. product-and-process assessment methods

Ha Thi Phuong Pham¹, Lan Thi Thu Nguyen²

¹FPT University, Hanoi, Vietnam; ²FPT University, Hanoi, Vietnam

Influenced by the widespread application of technology-assisted pedagogies in ESL/EFL teaching and learning, the effects of coupling collaborative writing (CW) with technology have piqued language teachers' and researchers' interests in recent years. Various research topics have been examined, for example, students' interaction, writing quality, student revision, peer feedback, and group dynamics (e.g., Kessler et al., 2012; Li, 2016; Pham, 2021; Ruegg, 2015; Zhang & Chen, 2022). Nonetheless, little research has been done on the assessment of students' group work, given its complexity; and even less frequently done is the effects of different assessment methods used in technology-assisted CW. This research was carried out to fill this gap. Built on the work of Zhang and Chen (2022) and using Google Docs as a tool for students' writing, this study examines how two assessment methods, product-based vs. product-and-process based, compare regarding students' collaboration and writing quality. A quasi-experimental research was conducted where students experienced both product- and process-and-product-based assessment. Participants were 18 EFL students in an English academic writing class that took place over ten weeks. Data from the study included written and spoken chats, students' co-authored writing, written reflections, and interviews. Our initial analyses showed that the process-and-product-based assessment entails more interactions on task clarification, generating ideas, structure, and editing. This assessment method was also found to result in better writing quality. Student opinions and reflections showed that the latter assessment practice was favoured since it encouraged more interactions and scaffolding among students while constructing their shared writing. Drawn on research findings, implications for the L2 technology-assisted collaborative writing class will be offered and discussed.

Is what you had planned really what you did? Task models and intertextual integration strategies when synthesizing multiple documents

David Romero, Aleksandra Opacic, Maik Philipp

Zürich University of Teacher Education, Switzerland

Presenting Author: David Romero, Zurich University of Teacher Education, Switzerland; Co-Author: Aleksandra Opacic, Zurich University of Teacher Education, Switzerland; Co-Author: Maik Philipp, Zurich University of Teacher Education, Switzerland

Background. Writing discourse syntheses is a demanding activity since propositions from multiple documents must be integrated. In addition, reading and writing strategies need to be orchestrated. According to RESOLV theory (Rouet et al., 2017), readers create a task model, that drives readers behaviour. It is modelled as a mental representation consisting of three dimensions: a) expected outcome, b) goals, and c) planned steps to complete the task. Although it is assumed to be crucial, both (1) the task model itself and (2) its association with intertextual integration strategies have hardly been investigated (List et al., 2019).

Aim. Therefore, we aim to investigate (RQ1) what task model students form before completing discourse synthesis tasks, and (RQ2) whether students with a more elaborated task model retrospectively report more intertextual integration strategies.

Methods. In the pilot study of the WRITE research project, funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation and conducted in December 2022, students (N=29) wrote discourse syntheses. Before completing the synthesis task, students' task model was captured with an open-ended three-part question to explicitly assess the three dimensions of the task model. To answer RQ1, a coding scheme based on previous studies (List et al., 2019; Schoor et al., 2021) was developed. Students' responses are currently been coded according to which dimensions are included. We will calculate a sum score for the task model. To answer RQ2, integration strategies were retrospectively assessed with the intertextual integration scale (Bråten & Strømsø, 2011). The score of the task models is used by median split to form two groups. We compare the groups' scores using t-tests to test whether individuals with more elaborated task models used more intertextual strategies.

This study contributes to establish a better understanding of students' task model and its association to strategies used when writing discourse syntheses.

What is Originality in Academic Writing

Ira {Irina} Rupp

University of Galway, Ireland

This paper will investigate the concept of originality in student writing. The term 'originality' has gained a new popularity and meaning due to its use by the submission and plagiarism detection software Turnitin and the popular grammar and style checker, Grammarly. In both cases, originality as applied to a submitted project is not used in the sense of the 'quality of being primary, or produced at first hand [or] authenticity [or] genuineness' (OED)[i], but as an absence or low incidence of textual overlaps between the submitted texts and those found on the web or in software repositories. Given the popularity of both Turnitin and Grammarly, the term is possibly undergoing a semantic change with likely implications for the students' understanding of their learning process.

The scarcity of research on the concept of originality in undergraduate writing contrasts with a vast body of work dedicated to the concept of plagiarism (Pecorari 2022). This high-stakes area of research has also revealed issues with lack of clear definitions (Eaton, 2021; Howard, 2000) as well as lack of consistency and consensus across the academic community (Borg, 2009; Pecorari & Shaw, 2012). While the precise relationship between student originality and plagiarism is yet to be defined, these concepts are inter-related (Salmons 2008). It is thus possible that by paying more attention to the meanings of the term originality, a quality we potentially would like to foster, we might gain a better perspective on the phenomenon we would wish to eradicate.

The paper will include a consideration of a possible theoretical approach to the definition and the study of originality in student writing as well as discussing potential steps for future field research into the area.

[i] "originality, n.". OED Online. June 2022. Oxford University Press. <https://www-oed-com.nuigalway.idm.oclc.org/view/Entry/132565?redirectedFrom=originality> (accessed July 15, 2022).

Toward a phenomenology of academic writing under electronic surveillance

David R. Russell

Iowa State University, United States of America

One critical aspect of digitalization is that the fusion of word processing with the internet allows for intimate surveillance of academic writing (Friesen), using video, keystrokes (Mangen), even eye movements (Bojko)—all of which now exist increasingly in networked classrooms, distance learning, and testing centers, particularly in North America after Covid (Duin).

This paper reports a study of university students writing under surveillance with time pressure. Nine students each wrote a timed exercise in a networked classroom while their keystrokes and eye movements were tracked (Ranalli). They were then interviewed about their “felt sense” of writing (Sargent; Ehret), using a protocol inspired by micro-phenomenology (Petitmengin; Horwitz). This combination of objective and subjective data were analyzed to reveal how the student writers experienced surveilled in-class writing. We give a phenomenological description (van Manen) of their “felt sense” of classroom writing under surveillance. We then explore implications for assessment and other common places where surveillance impacts writing (Marx).

Students had the impression that they were performing for observers, and this profoundly affected their “felt sense” of writing and the emotions surrounding it, particularly anxiety (Hoover). They expressed anxiety in terms of their bodily experience. They reported discomfort arising from their situatedness in an institutional environment—physically, socially, and ideologically—that might be understood in terms of the Panopticon (Fee) of Foucault, in their fear of being judged by powerful others.

Students reported that the surveillance initially created anxiety that often even included physical pain, and generally affected their perception of their performance negatively, though most adjusted over time, as evidenced by the keystroke analysis. The paper explores implications of these findings for testing centers, writing classroom design, and other common environments where surveillance may impact academic writing (Ching). These deserve further study because they can disadvantage students who don’t adjust quickly.

References (APA 7)

- Bojko, Aga. (2013). *Eye tracking the user experience*. New York: Rosenfeld Media. Retrieved from <https://www.flickr.com/photos/rosenfeldmedia/10910211665/in/photostream/>
- Duin, A. H., & Tham, J. (2020). The current state of analytics: Implications for learning management system (LMS) use in writing pedagogy. *Computers and Composition, 55*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102544>.
- Ehret, C. & Hollett, T. (2014). Embodied composition in real virtualities: Adolescents' literacy practices and felt experiences moving with digital, mobile devices in school. *Research in the Teaching of English, 48*(4), 428–452.
- Fee, T. R. (2012). Computer surveillance in the classroom: Or, how I learned to stop worrying and love the panopticon. *Pedagogy, 12*(2), 377–381.
- Friesen, N., Feenberg, A., Smith, G., & Lowe, S. (2012). Experiencing surveillance. In N. Friesen and A. Feenberg (Eds.) *(Re)inventing the internet* (73-84). New York, NY: Springer.
- Hoover, K. C., Crampton, J. W., Smith, H., & Berbesque, J. C. (2018). An empirical study of surveillance anxiety. *SocArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/yx6nk>
- Horwitz, E. B., Stenfors, C., & Osika, W. (2018). Writer’s block revisited: A micro-phenomenological case study on the blocking influence of an internalized voice. *Journal of Consciousness Studies, 25*(3–4), 9–28.
- Ching, K. L. (2018). Tools matter: Mediated writing activity in alternative digital environments. *Written Communication, 35*(3), 344–375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088318773741>
- Chory, R. M., Vela, L. E., & Avtgis, T. A. (2016). Organizational surveillance of computer-mediated workplace communication: Employee privacy concerns and responses. *Employee Reasons Rights Journal, 28*(1), 23-43.
- Mangen, A., & Velay, J. L. (2010). Digitizing literacy: reflections on the haptics of writing. *Advances in Haptic, 385-401*.
- Marx, G. T. (2016). *Windows into the soul: Surveillance and society in an age of high technology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Petitmengin, C. (2006). Describing one's subjective experience in the second person: An interview method for the science of consciousness. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 5(3–4), 229–269. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-006-9022-2>
- Ranalli, J., Feng, H. H., & Chukharev-Hudilainen, E. (2019). The affordances of process-tracing technologies for supporting L2 writing instruction. *Language Learning and Technology*, 23(2), 1–11.
- Sargent, M. E. (2003). Felt sense in the composition classroom: Getting the butterflies to fly in formation. *ADE Bulletin*, 135-135(1), 57-67.
- Smith, V. T. (2017). Timed writing assessment and its impact on students' self-efficacy. Retrieved from <http://dspace.calstate.edu/handle/10211.3/190567>
- van Manen, M., & Adams, C. (2009). The phenomenology of space in writing online. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 41(1), 10–21.

Writing (and communication) of PhD holders working beyond academia

Anna Sala-Bubaré, Montserrat Castelló

Universitat Ramon Llull, Spain

Writing is crucial for researchers. Besides the widely acknowledged relevance of research genres, such as articles addressed to peers in the researcher community, other genres have become vital for researchers to position themselves in their professional communities, disseminate knowledge and make their voices heard across contexts and sectors. These genres have been qualified as emergent and multimodal in academic contexts (Paré, 2017). However, there is scarce evidence of their prevalence, characteristics, and functions in non-academic contexts.

Therefore, the main objective of our study is to explore the characteristics of communication activities that PhD holders working beyond academia perform in their jobs. Considering genres as historically and contextually situated artefacts that structure and regulate social actions (Bazerman, 2009; Gee, 1996), we are specifically interested in displaying the characteristics and role of the genres that PhD holders working in diverse professional environments use and how these genres relate to the professional activities they develop.

Multimodal interviews were conducted with 50 PhD holders working beyond academia in different sectors and organisations in Spain and the UK. The results revealed differences among disciplines and across sectors in the number and types of genres PhD holders use beyond academia. While PhD holders with Social Sciences and Humanities backgrounds tend to use a broader range of communication genres (such as press releases, interviews, catalogues, and social media communication), those in the Sciences and STEM reported more frequent use of research-related genres (such as research reports and protocols). Furthermore, findings suggest that what has traditionally been called research-related genres have different functions and accomplishments in various sectors and organisations. Moreover, results show how participants intertwine oral and written modalities to produce research-related genres and address intra-organizational communication. Surprisingly, such modalities might unfold simultaneously as collective accomplishments when linked to projects or outputs perceived as crucial for organisations.

Valorising social interaction for student thinking and intellectual growth: refocusing writing for assessment on process rather than product

Britta Schneider¹, Stefanie Everke Buchanan², Shem Macdonald³

¹Monash University, Australia; ²University of Konstanz, Germany; ³La Trobe University, Australia

AI applications that can generate writing are rapidly developing, such as OpenAI (<https://beta.openai.com>) that is trained to understand and generate text. The appearance of such applications prompts the question at what point the application's actions replace the need for the learner to think and make decisions about the structure and content of their writing. What previously would have been covered in conversations between students and lecturers is now left to the application. The emergence of such open access writing tools requires urgent critical reflection on their pedagogical advantage, risks, and suitability with the core purposes of higher education.

In this contribution, we ask how the potential interference of AI will impact our ability to use writing for the purpose of assessing students' thinking and intellectual growth. More specifically, we argue that it is the interaction between student and student, student and lecturer (Schneider & Preckel, 2017) that creates a fruitful environment for writing practices. This is particularly the case in the early stages of developing and drafting ideas (cf. Bean and Melzer, 2021) that is cut short when the use of a machine produces seemingly perfect texts.

To think more deeply about these questions we present first results from ongoing practitioner inquiry that we trial in three different university contexts in Australia and Germany. Students use both digital and non-digital methods to record their thinking and to critique their peers' responses in preparation for a writing task. The activities valorise the processes of thinking and sharing that we argue students need to engage in to become effective writers. This allows us to see their original and evolving thinking which is not always visible in the final written draft.

We conclude that the future use of writing for assessment needs to focus on the process of writing as well as the end product.

Politicizing writing support: agency and big tech

Ingerid Straume

University of Oslo, Norway

The launch of Chat GPT-3 and similar AI-technologies is stirring commotion across the educational sector, where concerns are ranging from fear of plagiarism and loss of originality to questions about educational purpose. This paper discusses current technological trends from the latter perspective, and introduces a socio-political perspective to elucidate how democratic agency is under pressure in the context of academic writing.

In a neoliberal environment where “learning” has replaced terms like studies, knowledge and understanding (G. Biesta) and meritocratic ideology (M. Sandel, T. Piketty) enrolls children from a very early age in continuous struggles for educational “success”, AI-technologies are only one of many socio-political concerns. Underpinned by an ideological shift in educational theory from a European Bildung-tradition to Anglo-American educational standards of efficiency and testing, a vast apparatus for measuring learning ‘outcomes’ and research ‘outputs’ has been established over the past 40 years. This reorientation has opened an enormous market in the educational sector for big tech, most recently with personalised learning programmes, learning analytics, AI-based adaptive learning and intelligent tutoring systems (ITS). According to Kenneth Saltman, young students (called learners) are being turned into entities for data-generation as valuable forms of capital.

Among the educational-philosophical concerns discussed in the paper are changing conditions for subject formation, where the platonic eros of a student-teacher relationship cannot be replaced by machine, and, on the socio-political level, how opportunities for questioning and self-reflexivity are held back by linear, self-reinforcing or tautological technologies, thus effectively closing the door on the democratic project of autonomy and democracy. Environments offering writing support, it is further argued, should resist these tendencies by adhering to concepts that do not reduce individuals to learners, or intellectual work to outputs and various degrees of success.

How academic writing practices have changed in 14 years: a follow-up survey from a university in Estonia

Ilona Tragel, Kati Käpp, Marri-Mariska Tammepõld, Djuddah Leijen

University of Tartu, Estonia

Although writing is one of the foundations of higher education, students in European universities are often unprepared for academic writing and undersupported on their journey of learning to write (Kruse 2003: 21). In order to understand and address those difficulties better, data should first be collected on how and why writing is used in higher education.

In 2009 a large-scale survey was conducted, where 198 lecturers and 1015 students from different faculties and levels of our university were asked about their academic writing practices. The aim of the survey was to find out more about how writing tasks were used in teaching and what kind of problems did the students encounter in those tasks. An important goal of the survey was to compare the perspectives of students and teaching staff.

The answers revealed several noteworthy tendencies. For example, there was a discrepancy between the students' self-assessment of their writing skills and the teacher assessment of student writing skills: students evaluated their writing skills to be good (52% of the replies) or very good (12%), but teaching staff considered them to be satisfactory (51%) or weak (29%). (see Authors, XY 2015)

We are currently conducting a follow-up survey to investigate how these tendencies have changed in the past fourteen years. In addition to comparing our new results with the previous data, we wish to further examine how the interim technological leap has changed the nature of writing for students and teachers. Our hypothesis is that both the way writing tasks are used in teaching and the problems that students encounter in writing are shaped by the technical characteristics and limitations of the different platforms where the tasks are to be handed in.

Creating a shared knowledge base for a language and content-integrated approach to writing- and language development

Jacqueline van Kruiningen, Mariska Okkinga, Evelyne van der Neut

Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences

The benefits of a language and content-integrated approach are widely appreciated in Dutch higher professional education. Academic and professional writing tasks form an extensive component of this approach. However, there are few empirical studies on the effectiveness of such an approach, especially in higher education (Coyle & Meyer, 2021; Kuiper, 2018; Snow & Brinton, 2017; Van Gelderen & Van Schooten, 2011). More generally, evaluations of academic language policy and planning in higher education are scarce (Bonne & Casteleyn, 2022; Cajot & Heeren, 2019; Jansen, 2019). At the same time, there is a development towards more evidence-based teaching practices in Dutch higher education.

At Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences we set up a scoping review to investigate what is known from empirical studies about the characteristics and outcomes of a language and content-integrated educational approach in higher education, with a special focus on writing tasks. A comprehensive search strategy using multiple databases was employed to find relevant studies. An ultimate amount of 400 studies and their reported outcomes will be organized and analysed thematically in spring 2023. We combine this empirical basis with a qualitative exploration of teachers' practical knowledge about this approach at our university.

We will discuss the methodology of this combined study, present preliminary results, and discuss our work on the formulation of design principles and the development of a curriculum scan, based on this study, which will be used in the colleges at our university of applied sciences. This project contributes to the development of a shared knowledge base for a language and content-integrated approach to writing- and language development in Dutch higher professional education.

Noticing unpredictable encounters in multilingual writing on the move

Xiqiao Wang

University of Pittsburgh, United States of America

This study draws on connective ethnographic data (Leander & Sheehy, 2004) gathered at a midwestern university in the United States to explore one multilingual writer's distributed, mediated writing process in and beyond a first-year writing class. It complicates current understanding of transnational, multilingual writer's literacy practices, which tends to celebrate multilinguals' ability to use multiple languages and multimodal resources for strategic gains (Christiansen, 2017; Fraiberg & Cui, 2016; Lam, 2009; Wang, 2020; Yi & Hirvela, 2011). Using theoretical metaphors of chronotopic lamination (Prior & Shipka, 2003; Roozen, 2012) and unpredictable encounters (Sheldrake, 2020; Tsing, 2015), I perform triangulated reading of ethnographic data (e.g. interview, participant observation, literacy artifacts, social media tracing). I identify episodes of literate activity (e.g. translation, peer review, revision) and observe how ideas, stories, and phrases are laminated/layered across drafts and spacetimes. Specifically, I trace the becoming of a "calligraphy" story as it passed from one language, mode, writing technology, and writer to another. The student's writing ecology, complexly mediated by multiple writing technologies, directed the contour of his writing by encouraging sociality, supporting collaborative inquiry, and inviting spontaneous interactions. I consider WeChat (a Chinese social media platform) a writing technology, which created new possibilities for documenting, annotating, mobilizing, and inventing the story as a subject of academic inquiry. WeChat's social functions (e.g. screen capture, access permission, comments moderation) not only allowed the student to engage in imaginative time travel, but allowed the story to acquire layers of intellectual and affective meanings that thickened over time. In contrast to a celebratory stance towards multilingual writer's agency (Lorimer-Leonard, 2017), I theorize unexpected discovery and indeterminate meanings as important features of multilingual writing. It is through unpredictable encounters with writers, languages, and writing technologies that the student writer gained access to networked literacy resources.

Writing grant proposal summaries: How can a combined manual and digital approach help?

Karin Whiteside¹, Maggie Charles², Ahmed Halil³, Michael Jenkins⁴

¹University of Reading, United Kingdom; ²University of Oxford, UK; ³Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey; ⁴Independent researcher

The grant proposal is a high-stakes genre, since success in gaining funding enables researchers to pursue research and advance their careers. However, proposals are not generally publicly available, which makes their production challenging for inexperienced writers. The abstract/summary plays a key role in proposals and has attracted research interest (Feng & Shi, 2004; Matzler, 2021). However, such studies do not compare funded and unfunded proposals; nor do they investigate summaries written by learners.

This paper combines the use of manual (genre) and digital (corpus) techniques in the analysis of proposal summaries written by learners with Arabic L1 who are inexperienced in applying for research grants and it compares the summaries of funded and unfunded projects. The aim is to provide material for teaching proposal summary writing.

Research questions:

RQ1 What is the generic structure of inexperienced learners' summaries?

RQ2 What differences exist between funded and unfunded proposal summaries?

Learners are exiled Syrian academics on the Council for At-Risk Academics (Cara) Syria Programme. This charity offers grants for research projects by Syrian participants, with submission requiring a 500-word summary. The Syrian/UK team conducted a genre analysis of a 12,292 word corpus of 32 summaries (12 funded; 20 unfunded). Using Feng & Shi's (2004) three-move ten-step structure, analysis showed that the move *Claiming potential contributions* was underused in unfunded summaries. Within this move, unfunded summaries also underused the steps *Future Achievements* (academic contributions) and *Future Benefits* (real-world contributions). Corpus techniques (n-grams) were then applied to investigate the phraseology of these steps. This revealed lexico-grammatical phrases which are useful for teaching purposes e.g. *we will prepare (a report/article); this study will provide...* We argue that the combination of digital and manual techniques provides a powerful way of examining and teaching summary writing which could be applied to other academic genres.

Digital materials for disciplinary writing: Piloting online writing resources for undergraduate Psychology and doctoral Education

Karin Whiteside, Sarah Mattin

University of Reading, United Kingdom

This paper reports on the piloting of two digital disciplinary writing resources developed to reach and support a greater proportion of each target student cohort than had been previously possible in live classroom settings. The first was developed for undergraduate Psychology, focusing on the key disciplinary coursework genres (Nesi and Gardner, 2012) - the Report, Essay, Critical Review and Reflection. The second resource is for doctoral researchers in Education focusing on rhetorical structures, voice and stance within research writing and drawing in its design on ESP genre (Swales, 1990), SFL (Martin and White, 2005), and corpus-informed disciplinary discourse research (Charles, 2003; Thompson, 2012). Both resources were created within Xerte (The Xerte Project, 2021), an open-source multimedia tool for creation of interactive online learning materials, utilising Xerte 'Bootstrap' templates to curate content in a set of web pages.

Our research explored disciplinary staff and student user experience and perceptions of the usefulness of various content components to their writing contexts. Data was gathered via questionnaire surveys, focus groups, and interviews, and a number of shared themes emerged across data sets. There was generally positive feedback about the content and design of the resources, with respondents citing the usefulness of seeing analyses of successful authentic disciplinary writing. However, in both disciplines, some genre or sub-genre foci were judged to be more valuable than others, and the Psychology-resource research created opportunity for discussion and agreed revision of the genres focused on in light of curriculum developments in the department, which have seen less use of the Critical Review genre and greater use of tasks with qualitative and/or reflective dimensions. Feedback from both disciplinary cohorts suggested that more meta-guidance and navigation - entailing both technical adjustments and wording revisions - needed to be designed into the resources to facilitate most effective exploitation of the content.

Students' Remaking of Learning, Locations, and Digital Media During the Pandemic

Bronwyn Williams

University of Louisville, United States of America

During the pandemic, both students and teachers found themselves working from home and online, engaging in new practices of literacy, learning, and daily living. In this presentation I use sociomaterial theories of literacy to explore the ways in which the place, materials, and digital media were central, and working in concert, to redefine the nature of each other in students' learning and writing during the pandemic. The presentation draws from a research project at a US university in which I interviewed more than 30 university students several times between April 2020 and January 2022 to understand the effects of the pandemic on their literacy and learning practices and their affective experiences. During the pandemic, materials, place and digital interfaces created complex and fluid assemblages of life in home spaces, and through ongoing digital interactions with the larger world. These interactions had significant influences on students' perceptions of how, and where, learning and literacy take place. To explore the complexity and fluidity of the interactions of things, digital media, and people I use sociomaterial theories to focus on assemblages of materiality, place, and affect. Rather than try to separate the effects of place from the use of a laptop, I find it more productive to look for the connections and interactions of all these elements to see how practices of learning, working, relaxing all from the same space were being constantly made and remade. It is too simple and not fully accurate to just say the pandemic made people adapt their homes in multiple ways. Instead, the interactions of things, technology, affect, and place were all at work on each other and continually reordering and reconfigured these ongoing assemblages in unfamiliar and unpredictable ways that also affected students' literacy practices and their construction of their identities as students.

Wiping away the stain: From “plagiarism checkers” to AI-assisted “plagiarism removers” and the implications for students’ understanding of academic writing

Tine Wirenfelddt Jensen

University of Southern Denmark/METodo, Denmark

With the rise of AI-based natural-language processing systems, anti-plagiarism software is deemed a lost cause (Anson & Straume, 2022), and these systems certainly call for a renegotiation of concepts such as plagiarism, originality and writing (Dehouche, 2021; Anson, 2022).

However, while institutions are in the process of responding to these systems, anti-plagiarism software is still in use. Market-driven services seek new ways to profit from students who want to check their own work for plagiarism, now offering not only to identify but “remove” plagiarism with the use of AI-based NLP systems. This paper investigates how online plagiarism services offering “AI writing” attempt to reshape the discourse of plagiarism and the implications for students’ understanding of academic writing. As academic writing educators, it is important to be aware of these strategies and the potential effect on student behavior.

The representation of plagiarism, AI writing and students’ needs on the websites of ten online plagiarism services were coded thematically using grounded theory methods (Charmaz, 2006), informing a discourse analysis of the material (Laclau & Mouffe, 2001). The analysis shows how AI-assisted plagiarism “removal” is presented as a responsible solution to ensure that non-cheating students are not stained by plagiarism accusations. This strategy relies on the stigma of plagiarism, where the issue is viewed as a matter of morality, honor and shame (Mulholland, 2020; Zwagerman, 2008). This leads to anxiety about plagiarism among students who do not cheat, but still fear that their text might inadvertently trigger anti-plagiarism software. Plagiarism services seek to exploit this anxiety by claiming to guarantee “originality” at a level that exceeds what student writers might produce on their own. Paradoxically, the discourse of AI-assisted plagiarism services can thus lead non-cheating students to believe that using these tools is more academically responsible than not using them.

AI literacy in the context of working with sources: Pitfalls and possibilities of AI-based natural language production systems in academic writing

Tine Wirenfeldt Jensen¹, Søren Wirenfeldt Jensen²

1University of Southern Denmark/METodo, Denmark; 2Jyske Finans/IttyBits, Denmark

The ability to work with sources and references is a cornerstone of academic writing. With the rise of AI-based natural language production (NLP) systems, we need to educate students on how these systems function in the context of working with sources and references. Students use various digital interfaces when searching for sources (e.g. Google Scholar, library databases, SciSpace), and are not unlikely to view NLP systems as yet another interface to do the same.

While NLP systems have been able to produce convincing academic papers (see the small study by Best Universities, 2021), they have been less successful at providing authentic references. AI might generate “plausible-looking but fake references” (Sharples, 2022), which is not a type of search outcome students have prior experience with. However, NLP systems randomly succeed in producing accurate references, and this mix of results is likely to contribute to the complexity. To navigate this complexity, both students and academic writing educators need to build their AI literacy (Long & Magerko, 2020; Laupichler et al., 2022) in the context of working with sources.

This paper presents the results of developing and systematically comparing six approaches for accurately producing academic references using ChatGPT. These approaches were applied to a topic in biology, rhetoric, and law. The results indicate that while no approach is guaranteed to produce accurate references, some perform significantly better than others. By reframing instructional prompts (Mishra et al., 2021) exploring the interplay between the literature review as a genre, author voice and detailed topic descriptions, ChatGPT can in some instances produce near functional results. We propose that discussing these findings with students offers a particularly useful starting point for building AI literacy, as the errors made by ChatGPT when asked to produce accurate source illustrate that it is a language model, not a knowledge model.

Developing a pedagogical framework to support the long-term academic writing skills of university students in Estonia and the US; current status

Roger Yallop^{1,2}, Djuddah Leijen¹, Susan Lang²

¹University of Tartu, Estonia; ²The Ohio State University, USA

Nurturing academic writing groups where the members give and receive periodic feedback on each other's writing projects are an effective pedagogical means to provide long term writing support (Aitchison, 2009). For my postdoctoral project, and extending my PhD thesis, I am developing a pedagogical framework to provide long-term writing support to university writing groups within the contexts of Estonia (the University of Tartu) and the USA (the Ohio State University). This model is derived from socio-cultural theory (Garrison et al., 2010), hedging theory (Salager-Meyer, 1994), and studies into feedback affectiveness (F. Hyland & Hyland, 2001), feedback effectiveness (Liu & Sadler, 2003), and writing assessment (Moxley, 2013). Within their writing group, each student plays two distinct roles: (i) *student as reviewer* and (ii) *student as author*. The model describes how students can be trained to give *useful* feedback as reviewer, and also how they can *best* elicit and then implement their peers' feedback in their other role as author. As the groups are small, and the course is long, the students can also harness each other's unique and shared knowledges (Lewis & Herndon, 2011) to develop a sense of writing community over time. Thus, the model is dynamic and accounts for the individual. In this presentation, we report on how variables investigated thus far (e.g., synchronous writing group meetings) can influence the peer feedback process. Data are collected from participants within different writing groups at the University of Tartu (mainly L2 English writers) and the Ohio State University (mainly L1 English writers) from multiple sources (e.g., student written artefacts, online surveys, focus group meetings, etc.), and analysed within a mixed-methods approach. The results are triangulated within a grounded theory tradition to induce insights into how we can provide better support to our writing groups based on this new knowledge.

Overcoming Writing Blocks With a Chatbot and Open Learner Models

Libor Zachoal, Daire O'Broin, Oisin Cawley

SETU, Carlow, Ireland

Writing is a difficult subject that is frequently viewed negatively by writers and academics, and there are many reasons for it. For example, progress and knowledge development are not always apparent and writers must overcome writing blocks such as work apprehension and procrastination which hinder their writing (Sadler, 1989; Boice, 1989, 1993). These problems may render writing an unpleasant experience and can hinder the progress, career development, and mental health of writers (Boice, 1989, 1993). Such an experience can push academics into dropping out. However, a chatbot in conjunction with Open Learner Models (OLMs) may be a solution to the aforementioned problems. Since OLMs allow learners to access their information, such as knowledge development in an understandable format (Suleman et al., 2016; Bull, 2020). And, chatbots are used for creating a more personalised learning experience that fits the needs of a learner (Cunningham-Nelson et al., 2019; Sandu and Gide, 2019). Together, the chatbot can suggest methods for overcoming the different writing blocks, staying motivated, and making progress. As such, the aim of this study was to measure the effectiveness of the chatbot in helping learners stay motivated in practising their writing skills through a series of writing exercises. A rule-based chatbot was utilised to analyse learner behaviour and instigate motivating conversation which involved the recent performance of a learner. In this study, participants were divided among two groups, a control group which had access to the OLM only, and a chatbot group which had access to the OLM and chatbot. This talk will present observations and findings from the use of the system as part of a postgraduate course in academic writing, and its effectiveness in combatting stagnation, reducing how often writers encounter writing blocks and helping them to stay on track by reminding them of how far they had gone since they started.

Self-monitoring: Writing More with Writing Analytics

Libor Zachoal, Daire O'Broin, Oisín Cawley

SETU, Carlow, Ireland

This study revisited the work of Boice between 1980 and 1990. Boice worked with academics and faculty members to help them produce more writing, and overcome writing blocks through the employment of self-monitoring, contingency management, and social support (Boice, 1982, 1985, 1989). With technological advances, our lives have been made more convenient. For example, Fitbit automatically tracks our activity, exercise, food, weight, and sleep, and makes the information easily accessible. As such, people have grown accustomed to such levels of convenience (Psychology Today, 2018). Even back 30 years ago convenience was an issue when 14 participants dropped out of Boice, (1985) study because they did not have “enough time or patience to complete the graphing and logging requirements” (Boice, 1985, p. 475). Self-monitoring is important as it allows us to track our progress and productivity, and Boice, (1989) uncovered that people cannot estimate the time they spend working very accurately. Additionally, people who write consistently (15-60 minutes each day) produce the most writing and generate more creative ideas (Boice, 1982, 1985, 1989). Thus, this study focuses on the aspect of self-monitoring by using writing analytics, a graph representing the number of words produced and time spent writing each day. A randomised within-subjects trial consisting of 40 postgraduates across different fields (n=40) was undertaken for three weeks. Each participant experienced each condition for a full week: daily feedback (email containing analytics), anytime feedback (daily email and access to a webpage containing analytics), and no feedback (no email or webpage access). At the end of each week, learners carried out a self-reflection which considered the convenience and usefulness of writing analytics. The results indicate that writing analytics were found useful, convenient, and even motivating, especially by those producing writing. Findings suggest that self-monitoring can make writing a more enjoyable and motivating experience which results in increased productivity, otherwise self-monitoring is likely to be avoided as seen in Boice (1985).

TEACHING-ORIENTED PRESENTATIONS

High-Road Transfer and Nature Writing in Scientific and Technical Writing

Bradley Cole Bennett

Abilene Christian University, United States of America

Writing Studies scholarship has focused on the differences between low-road and high-road transfer, yet technical writing remains fertile ground for investigation (Hopton & Zurhellen, 2022). Low-road transfer is a more passive, sometimes unplanned or accidental connection made to learning, described by Yancey et al., (2014) as “without conceptual reflection or understanding,” while high-road transfer finds writers importing and exporting rhetorical skills “when two occasions are ‘paradoxical,’ both similar and different” (p. 15). In service to this crucial difference, Blythe (2017) argues for a pedagogy that empowers a writer to believe that “personal and social affordances will make the [writing] task possible and worthwhile” (p. 52).

This teaching presentation will argue for the high-road transferability of a digital nature-writing portfolio within a Scientific and Technical Writing class at a four-year, liberal-arts university. The presenter was persuaded by Agricultural Sciences faculty, whose students comprise the majority of enrollees of this course, to require a unit on nature writing. At first hesitant, the presenter developed and included such a section, realizing its value as a rhetorically transferrable asset useful across exigencies. In a course saturated heavily with writing that serves technological ends, this mid-course portfolio necessarily thwarts genres and crosses disciplinary and rhetorical boundaries; students must bring data gathered from their human senses to the page, then transform drafts to poetry or nonfiction essays. These deliverables yield high-road transfer that can assist these writers both immediately and beyond the university setting. This presentation will include descriptions of all assignments in the nature portfolio as well as an argument toward high-road rhetorical transfer.

What AI can do and what we can do about it – guiding students to the road of ownership

Fia Christina Börjeson, Carl Johan Carlsson

Chalmers University of Technology, Sweden

Central to teaching academic writing is the relationship between writing and learning (e.g. Emig, 1977; Roozen et al., 2015; Carver & Pantoja, 2022). With emerging technologies such as AI, teachers of academic writing will face new challenges (e.g. Abdelaal, et al., 2019; Nanda, 2021; Roe & Perkins, 2022). Even if writing assignments have always meant a temptation for students to find shortcuts, there have never been so many digital opportunities to reduce the writer's effort in the different parts of the writing process than today. These "shortcuts" in the writing process also reduce the cognitive engagement; there is a risk that information is not transformed into knowledge.

Therefore, engaging students in critical reading and critical thinking is important when teaching academic writing in order to support students' writing processes within disciplinary discourses (Dunn & Smith, 2008; Bharuthram & Clarence, 2015). Working actively with critical thinking in relation to writing can be a means for strengthening students' ability to discover different voices – their own and others'. Critical thinking also allows students to evaluate information and ideas, enabling them to make well-informed decisions and arguments.

To support such a self-regulated writing process, students are introduced to many different tools and methods that they need to master and relate to on the road towards ownership. They must also be given opportunity to practise their thinking, to reflect and to find their own voice when engaging with the disciplinary discourses.

In this presentation, we provide examples of learning activities that are designed to emphasize ownership through the writing process, and to make students aware of the interrelationship between writing, understanding and knowledge. Apart from strengthening students' authorship and writing strategies, we argue that these learning activities also work as countermeasures to plagiarism and alluring digital shortcuts such as AI-produced texts.

Creating a new Centre for Academic Writing: how much digitalisation?

Graham Burton, Maria Cristina Gatti

Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy

In 2021, the Centre for Academic Writing (CAW) was created at the Faculty of Education, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano (unibz). The aim of the centre is to provide support to students and staff and carry out research in the somewhat unique sociolinguistic environment: unibz has a trilingual teaching model, with students studying in German, Italian and English, and all three languages having an equal status.

As a new entity, there was no need to digitalise any existing services at the CAW since everything was to be created from scratch. This teaching-orientated presentation focuses on decisions made so far at the centre on how to incorporate digital tools and offerings, partly in the light of research carried out in the form of a focus group with students, and will outline:

the provision of online academic writing 'helpdesks' for students in the three languages, with automated booking and satisfaction-level feedback systems. The helpdesks are also used to record digitally students' queries, with this data used to inform future course content;

decisions made, and re-made, on teaching provision, including the choice between face-to-face and online courses, alongside asynchronous input with online tutor support;

plans to introduce additional teaching support through short, pre-recorded videos;

the introduction of online writing groups for both students (branded as 'Writing Socials' (Davenport 2022)) and staff, in addition to face-to-face writing retreats (Murray and Newton 2009). The latter have the specific aim of giving writers the opportunity to 'switch off' digitalisation and its inherent distractions.

We will also briefly outline our planned contribution to a multi-partner research project, currently in its initial stages, on implementing writing technologies such as intelligent tutoring, automatic writing evaluation and machine translation in university contexts.

References

Davenport, E. (2022). The writing social: identifying with academic writing practices amongst undergraduate students. *Investigations in university teaching and learning*, 13.

Murray, R. & Newton, M. (2009). Writing retreat as structured intervention: Margin or mainstream? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(5), 541–553. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360903154126>

Teaching & Learning Across Continents: The Virtual Collaboration & Global Teamwork Project

Barbara L. Ciccarelli¹, Heidi A McKee²

*¹Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands; ²Miami University,
United States of America*

For the past three years, the presenters, one in the Netherlands, one in the United States, have teamed students in their business communication classes in a six-week-long project, the Virtual Collaboration & Global Teamwork Project. In small cross-institutional teams, students communicate frequently orally and in writing via synchronous web video and text means (email, WeChat) with their teammates to research, plan, and produce an 8- to 10-minute video about virtual collaboration and global teamwork for specific industries and specific contexts. The project with its many scaffolding assignments engages students in both studying and experiencing virtual communications and the dynamics of intercultural team writing and team production. In this presentation the presenters will discuss the collaborative project, how their design and teaching of it has evolved, the scaffolding assignments they designed, and their insights and suggestions for others interested in such a project. They will also share and show (with student consent and IRB-review) student work and student reflections on the project.

Computer-mediated collaborative writing: Google Docs in the online writing classroom

Claudia Ioana Doroholschi

West University of Timisoara, Romania, Romania

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, many educational institutions across the world were forced to transition to what has been called “emergency remote teaching”, namely the temporary shift to online modes of instruction in educational situations in which would normally have involved face to face instruction. This meant that teachers, who often did not have training in online teaching, had to rapidly find ways to adapt their curriculum to the online medium.

The present paper gives an account of the adaptation of two writing courses in L2 English, normally taught face-to-face, which were delivered online through Google Meet for two years during the COVID-19 pandemic. One of the challenges in transitioning to online classes was that of finding new ways for students to interact among themselves and with the teacher. However, the online medium also offered new opportunities for collaboration among students, particularly when working with texts. Collaborative writing, understood as writing co-authored by two or more writers, has been shown to be an effective teaching strategy in L2 contexts. In this presentation, I discuss synchronous online collaborative writing activities with Google Docs, used at all stages of the writing process (brainstorming, planning, text production, feedback), and I highlight the benefits of shared text production in the online medium. I argue that asking students to write collaboratively and viewing each others’ texts online in real time can contribute to a shared sense of what represents good writing, can help scaffold student writing, and can enhance student writers’ audience awareness.

ChatGPT as a tool for teaching academic writing

Gea Dreschler

Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the Netherlands

Digital writing tools based on Artificial Intelligence (AI) raise serious concerns about, for instance, fraud. While these concerns are valid and obviously need to be addressed, in this talk we want to look at recent developments more positively by looking at the opportunities for teaching that the recent open-source version of ChatGPT by OpenAI presents. We believe that AI tools can play a role in teaching students to write academic texts. As a team of language specialists, we teach academic writing courses to mostly non-native speakers of English in a wide range of programmes at a Dutch university.

We have designed one in-class and one homework assignment for students in an academic writing course in their first year at university. The students are doing a degree in AI, so we assume they know about recent developments, and the tool may represent an opportunity to ensure their interest in the course. The assignments require them to (i) think carefully about the input for ChatGPT; and (ii) analyse the output. We have tailored the assignments so they align with three key course topics: academic style, structure, and referencing. Specifically, we want the students to analyse how aspects of formality (e.g. lexical choice, academic idiom) and structure (e.g. linking words, paragraphs) show up in the generated texts and evaluate this outcome against our course instructions. Of course, we will also ask them to reflect on the aspects of the assignments that ChatGPT cannot perform.

In our talk, we will give more detailed information about the assignments and share our experiences in working with these assignments. We will include both instructors' and students' evaluations. We hope that the tools can aid in training the students' writing skills as well as their critical thinking skills with regard to using these automatic tools.

Navigating the Challenges of Collaborative Student Writing and Learning: A Workshop for Faculty

Micha Gerrit Philipp Edlich, Dagmar Knorr

Leuphana University of Lüneburg, Germany

Collaborative writing assignments play an important role in many degree programs in STEM or the social sciences. Anecdotal evidence suggests that instructors face several problems when facilitating collaborative writing processes or when evaluating final group projects. For example, instructors may not observe or be able to resolve interpersonal conflict in writing groups, or they may find themselves incapable of assessing contributions by individual students in a transparent and fair manner. Professional development programs or workshops, for example those offered by university centers for teaching and learning, can help faculty to avoid these problems. Addressing this institutional desideratum, this paper discusses the design of a workshop meant to prepare instructors for their role as facilitators of collaborative student writing and learning. This design draws on writing theory and pedagogy and, specifically, the literature on collaborative writing (Lunsford & Ede, 2012; Wolfe, 2010) while also considering the technological and legal parameters of collaborative student writing in a European context. This paper shows how instructors can be prepared to design (writing) processes and scaffolding for their students that will allow them, among other outcomes, to develop (collaborative) writing competencies, project management skills, and digital literacy. Although the instructional design discussed in this presentation has yet to be tested empirically, this contribution will be of interest to writing program or writing center directors and staff supporting faculty or administrators tasked with improving the quality of instruction at their institutions.

References

Lunsford, A. A., & Ede, L. (2012). *Writing Together: Collaboration in Theory and Practice*. Bedford/St. Martin's.

Wolfe, J. (2010). *Team Writing: A Guide to Working in Groups*. Bedford-St. Martin's.

A Constructive Alignment approach to the topic of Automated Paraphrasing Tools (APTs) in a university writing course.

Anna Ekert-Centowska

Universität Zürich, Switzerland

Automated Paraphrasing Tools (APTs) have recently contributed to the already complex debate on dishonest practices in academic writing (e.g., Roe & Perkins, 2022). Novice academic writers not only have to hone their paraphrasing skill but also grapple with vague definitions of paraphrasing or plagiarism (e.g., Bens, 2022; Gullifer & Tyson, 2014; Rossi, 2022) and institutional plagiarism policies that take a moralistic rather than an educational stance (e.g., Eaton, Guglielmin & Otto, 2017; Sutherland-Smith, 2010). In addition, paraphrase tools, or more broadly Artificial Intelligence-based tools, are investigated as potential didactic tools (e.g., Adams & Chuah, 2022; Chen et al., 2015), which can create confusion around the acceptability of their usage. The multifaceted character of the current paraphrase-plagiarism debate requires writing instructors to integrate APT-related topics into course programs (see McNeill, 2022 for a compelling example of a successful initiative). I use the principles of Constructive Alignment (CA; Biggs & Tang, 2011) to design a series of tasks for a university writing course. The aim is to help students distinguish between paraphrasing and dishonest writing practices and reflect on the use of APTs for writing. Students are encouraged to critically analyze concrete examples of APT use from literature and practise paraphrasing strategies that will allow them to seamlessly integrate outside sources into their texts. I would like to open discussion on ways in which writing instructors could help equip students with knowledge and skill that would allow them to approach APTs with academic integrity.

Integrating Concordance Software into an Academic Writing Course

Katie Lynn Fry

University of Toronto, Canada

This teaching-oriented presentation will describe a technological exercise I recently integrated into an academic writing course for multilingual graduate students: the use of concordance software to create a class corpus. Inspired by Sally Burgess and Margaret Cargill's (2013) article "Using genre analysis and corpus linguistics to teach research article writing," I asked students to select and submit academic texts (not written by the students themselves) that exemplified the kind of writing done in their field. I then created a specially made corpus using the concordancer AntConc (Anthony, 2022), which we used throughout the course to examine features of academic writing. I was unsure whether the class corpus would prove useful in my teaching context because my students—unlike Burgess and Cargill's students—were from different disciplines, and I was teaching general characteristics of academic writing rather than the conventions of a specific genre. In the very least, I hoped that the class corpus would be useful in relation to vocabulary building, since the need to familiarize oneself with new words by studying how they are used in multiple authentic contexts is well established (Beheydt, 1987; Nagy et al., 2012; Szudarski, 2017). However, I was surprised by how many other ways the class corpus proved to be useful, both to the students and to the instructor. In my presentation, I would like to outline some of the benefits of this corpus creation exercise, which include increasing student awareness of transdisciplinary patterns and discipline-specific conventions in academic writing, and providing the teacher with authentic, easy-to-search examples of academic writing that cater to the expertise of students in the class. My hope is to encourage other instructors who (like myself) may be suspicious of and/or intimidated by technology to incorporate this relatively simple tool into their pedagogical practice.

References

- Anthony, L. (2022). AntConc (Version 4.1.4) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>
- Beheydt, L. (1987). The semantization of vocabulary in foreign language learning. *System*, 15(1), 55–67. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(87\)90048-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(87)90048-0)
- Burgess, S. & Cargill, G. (2013). Using genre analysis and corpus linguistics to teach research article writing. In V. Matarese (Ed.), *Supporting research writing: Roles and challenges in multilingual settings*, pp. 55-71. Chandos Publishing.
- Nagy, W., Townsend, D., Lesaux, N., & Schmitt, N. (2012). Words as Tools: Learning Academic Vocabulary as Language Acquisition. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(1), 91–108.
- Szudarski, P. (2017). *Corpus Linguistics for Vocabulary: A Guide for Research*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315107769>

Projects in Digital Literacy and Composition

Justin Hodgson

Indiana University Bloomington, United States of America

This teaching presentation highlights four instructors' experience bringing Minecraft EDU into the first-year composition classroom to help students learn to enjoy—and play with—the writing process. The instructors (one lead instructor and three support instructors) facilitated a hybrid course that operated at the intersections of digital literacy practices, active learning pedagogies, and project-based engagement. It focused on using experience design as a mode for thinking about the practices of writing (across media) and did so through a range of digital writing practices and approaches.

In the course, the 96 students worked in teams of 6 to construct virtual renditions of campus buildings in Minecraft EDU, with these immersive final project constructions including links to their multimodal writing assignments from the course (videos, podcasts, web pages, digital magazines, etc.). The goal was to integrate rhetorical principles with digital story practices with immersive design, along with core archival research practices, to create a compelling experience that entertains and informs their target audience.

This teaching presentation, then, will feature key examples of student work from the course, highlight the strategies for bringing digital literacy and active learning together in the writing classroom, showcase key takeaways from the faculty mentorship/graduate student apprentice model, and invites a conversation among participants on key considerations, potential challenges, and future iterations (especially across a more global context)

Using corpus tools to teach academic writing: Practical use of concordancers in teaching rhetorical functions

Tatyana Karpenko-Seccombe

University of Huddersfield, United Kingdom

The general spirit of a conference calling for joining up technological advances with what really matters for teachers of academic writing, this teaching-oriented paper looks at the practical use of corpora and concordancers in teaching rhetorical functions. The classroom use of concordancers based on the principle of Data Driven Learning (Johns 1994) has been acknowledged since the 1990s. Since then, the main emphasis of its application in academic writing classes has been on teaching vocabulary, and, even though there has been an increase in the number of studies exploring the use of corpora at the level of discourse, the main focus of corpus consultations is still lexical or lexico-grammatical (Charles 2011a; Cobb and Boulton 2015) and there is still a need to integrate lexico-grammatical corpus consultations with higher-level rhetorical enquiry (Ädel 2010, Charles 2007).

This paper explores the potential for using corpus tools in teaching the rhetorical elements of academic writing research papers and thesis. An emphasis is placed on practical suggestions for tasks and activities helping to connect lexical patterns with discursive meaning in teaching rhetorical functions. The paper provides examples of practical corpus-based patterns associated with such rhetorical moves as introducing the research gap or problem, presenting and supporting claims, giving reasons, using counter-argumentation and framing results in the context of previous research (Karpenko-Seccombe, 2020). The paper suggests ways of integrating corpus consultations into everyday classroom practice for upper-intermediate and advanced second language learners – senior undergraduates, postgraduates and researchers. The assignment suggestions are based on the use of several freely available online corpus tools, BNC-English corpora and Lextutor concordance.

References

- Ädel, Annelie. 2010. "Using corpora to teach academic writing: Challenges for the direct approach." In *Corpus-based approaches to English language teaching*, Campoy, M. C., et. A (eds), 39-55. A&C Black.
- Charles, M. (2007). Reconciling top-down and bottom-up approaches to graduate writing: Using a corpus to teach rhetorical functions. *Journal of English for academic purposes*, 6(4), 289-302.
- Charles, M. (2011). Using hands-on concordancing to teach rhetorical functions: Evaluation and implications for EAP writing classes. *New trends in corpora and language learning*, 26-43.
- Cobb, T., & Boulton, A. (2015). Classroom applications of corpus analysis., In: *Cambridge Handbook of English Corpus Linguistics*, Biber, D. and Reppen, R. (eds), 478-497. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI:10.1017/CBO9781139764377.027
- Johns, T. (1994) From printout to handout. Grammar and vocabulary teaching in the context of data-driven learning. In: *Perspectives on pedagogical grammar*, T. Odlin, (ed), 293-313. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karpenko-Seccombe, T. (2020). *Academic writing with corpora: A resource book for data-driven learning*. Routledge.
- Lee, D. and Swales, J. (2006). A corpus-based EAP course for NNS doctoral students: Moving from available specialized corpora to self-compiled corpora. *English for specific purposes*, 25, no. 1, 56-75.

Corpus tools

Cobb, Tom. Lextutor concordancer. Available at lextutor.ca/conc/eng/

Davies, Mark. 2004. *British National Corpus* (from Oxford University Press). Available online at <https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/>

The role of writing developers at the times of AI tools: Czech Academic Phrasebank project

Alena Kasparikova¹, Kamila Etchegoyen Rosolova²

¹*VSB-TUO, Czech Republic;* ²*Czech Language Institute, Czech Academy of Sciences*

Since John Morley published the Manchester Academic Phrasebank in 2005 (Davis & Morley, 2022), it has become a widely used writing tool even among native English speakers (Davis & Morley, 2018). Numerous efforts have been made in various countries to develop academic phrasebanks in their national languages (Jürine, 2018; Dubova et al., 2020; Zubaitienė et al., 2020; Rienecker, Jørgensen & Jakobsen, 2020). In the Czech Republic, we have made a similar effort with the development of a Czech academic phrasebank. But can a phrasebank be useful in the context of the unprecedented development of AI writing tools capable of making decisions for the writer (Katsnelson, 2022) and even producing the full texts based on the writer's requirements (Anson & Straume, 2022)? In this presentation, we argue that phrasebanks can be valuable pedagogical and research tools if they can connect the users with authentic, transparently built corpora and if they are accompanied by user/teaching guides. We share our case of developing the Czech phrasebank to illustrate what we have learned from the literature and other phrasebanks. We outline the steps that our interdisciplinary team has taken to build a corpus of research articles in Czech, develop a meaningful phrasebank and support it with a handbook for faculty and students (work-in-progress) to provide guidance on meaningful phrasebank use. We hope that our teaching-oriented presentation will help others think of useful ways to incorporate academic phrasebanks into their teaching so that students are empowered to make informed decisions even when using more advanced tools.

References

1. Anson, C. M., & Straume, I. (2022). Amazement and Trepidation: Implications of AI-Based Natural Language Production for the Teaching of Writing. *Journal of Academic Writing*, 12(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v12i1.820>
2. Davis, M., & Morley, J. (2018). Facilitating learning about academic phraseology: teaching activities for student writers. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, Special Edition: 2018 ALDinHE Conference: 1–17.
3. Davis, M., & Morley, J. (2022). 'It can facilitate so much!' Student writers' practice of self-efficacy to develop their use of formulaic phrases. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, 24, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.47408/jldhe.vi24.856>
4. Dubova, A., et al. (2020). Zinātnes valodā lietojamās frāzes (Phrases in scientific language). *Zinātnes valoda*. Available at: <https://www.zinatnesvaloda.lv/frazes>
5. Jürine, A. (2018). Akadeemiliste väljendite varamu (Repository of academic expressions). Available at: <https://www.teadustekst.ut.ee/>
6. Katsnelson, A. (2022). Poor English skills? There's an AI for that. *Nature*, 609, 1 September 2022, 208-209. Available at: <https://media.nature.com/original/magazine-assets/d41586-022-02767-9/d41586-022-02767-9.pdf>
7. Rienecker, L., Jørgensen, P. S., & Jakobsen, A.S. (2020). Akademiske fraser til opgaver, projekter og artikler (Academic phrases for assignments, projects or articles). Frederiksberg: Samfundslitteratur.
8. Zubaitienė, V., et al. (2020). Akademiųjų frazių sąvadas [elektroninis leidinys] (Interactive phrasebook). Available at: <http://www.frazynas.flf.vu.lt/>. DOI: 10.15388/academic.phrasebank

Building subject teachers' knowledge of academic literacies

Ingrid Lennartson-Hokkanen, Ingela Norberg

Mid Sweden University

There is general agreement that academic literacies are crucial competences for university students and that conditions surrounding learning situations are pivotal as well (Wingate, 2016; Wingate, 2019). In view of that, an academic literacies project, targeting subject lecturers, was initiated at a Swedish university. The project has a sociocultural framework which rests on Academic Literacies in higher education pedagogy as an essential competence for scholars in their role as subject lecturers and with the embedding of academic literacies (Lea & Street, 1998; Jacobs, 2015).

The project is designed as a series of workshops developed for subject lecturers. The workshops have a transformative aim to promote and encourage the integration of academic literacies instruction into study programs, and ultimately strengthen students' development of academic literacies (Wingate, 2016; Wingate, 2019). Subject lecturers are organized into program-specific teaching teams and set the task to explore, develop, discuss and question their own educational practices, guided by literacy development practitioners. The explorative and developing work is a dialogic and collegial process which has proven to be both eye-opening and rewarding. This approach also means that the responsibility for scaffolding students' academic literacies is put on the study programs, rather than on individual teachers. As funding ends in 2023 discussions are proceeding of how the project can continue. One suggestion is the development of higher education courses for teachers concerning academic literacies. Another idea is to appoint literacy development practitioners as academic literacy sponsors and continuously enable their collaboration with subject teachers (Brandt, 2019).

This presentation will report on the organization, follow-through and a current survival plan to keep the project thriving after funding terminates. It will focus on the following three questions: How can a transformative approach to Academic Literacies theory be put into practice? How can literacy development practitioners collaboratively work with subject lecturers? What key insights can reinforce the possibility of change in other settings?

References:

- Brandt, D. (2019). The problem of writing in mass education. *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 28(2), 27–53.
- Lea, M. and Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An Academic Literacies approach, *Studies in Higher Education* 23(2), pp.157-172.
- Jacobs, C. (2015). Opening up the Curriculum. Moving from the Normative to the Transformative in Teachers' Understanding of Disciplinary Literacy Practices. I: Theresa Lillis et al. (red.), *Working with Academic Literacies. Case Studies towards Transformative Practice*. Parlor Press. S. 131–141.
- Wingate, U. (2016). Academic Literacy across the Curriculum: Towards a Collaborative Instructional Approach. I: *Language Teaching* 51:3. S. 349–364
- Wingate, U. (2019). Achieving transformation through collaboration: the role of academic literacies. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education* 15.

The online academic poster as a step towards essay writing

Katy Jones

Cardiff University, United Kingdom

Academic poster presentations are a familiar feature of academic conferences, but a less recognised benefit is the role they play in the student learning process. They have been argued to: promote the development of deep learning (Biggs and Tang 2011); develop transferrable employability skills (Akister et al 2000); facilitate the development and application of knowledge, analysis, synthesis and evaluation skills (Summers 2005); offer a flexible and inclusive multi-modal alternative to academic essays (Thomas and Lees-Maffei 2018); and provide the opportunity for reciprocal learning (Akister et al. 2000). However, in-person conference-type presentations can be intimidating for the student academic.

This paper presents the process and outcomes of the development and use of online poster presentations as a formative writing strategy. Final year undergraduate students planned, designed, and presented an academic poster of a detailed plan of their final essay. The presentation stage, which took place on Microsoft Teams, was part of a structured peer-feedback process: students, working in pre-established groups, read and listened to a recorded presentation of their peers' posters and offered feedback following the module's assessment criteria. Students revised their posters following peer feedback and resubmitted for summative feedback and assessment. They then used all the feedback to shape their final essays.

Students completed a questionnaire about their experiences. Results showed they found the process of planning, producing, and presenting a poster in an online environment positive and transformative. For example, articulating the content of one text type to another deepened students' understanding of their topic, developed their voice and helped with overall organisation and structure, and the peer feedback process offered them new ideas while also consolidating existing knowledge. Carrying out this whole process on a digital platform was reported to be less intimidating and more inclusive than an in-person presentation, demonstrating the advantages technology affords.

References

- Akister, J., Bannon, A., and Mullender-Lock, H. (2000). Poster presentations in social work education assessment: a case study. *Innovation in Education and Training International*, 37(3), pp. 229-233.
- Biggs, J., and Tang, C. (2011) *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. New York: Open University Press.
- Summers, K. (2005) Student assessment using poster presentations. *Paediatric Nursing*, 17(8), pp. 24-26.
- Thomas, P. and Lees-Maffei, G. (2018). The poster session as fusing theory and practice in art and design education: exhibiting an occluded genre. *Journal of Writing in Creative Practice*, 11(2), pp. 233-259.

Technologies of Revision

Jennifer Beth Lewin

University of Haifa, Israel

This paper analyzes the responses of 60 first-year academic writing students to a survey on the perceived relationship between their revision process in text production and the availability of the departmental Writing Center at the University of Haifa. Our mandatory, writing-intensive skills course requires revisions of three short papers. Although the lengths of the papers do not increase dramatically, our expectations for improvement and independence, as well as for progress, do. Because students nearly universally report difficulty in recognizing how to edit their paper drafts independently and to identify problems or errors prior to submission, we have attempted to devise opportunities for such learning to take place. At the same time, we have sought to reduce the burden on instructors of extensive marking. The students' use and understanding of the Writing Center's approach to solving these issues will be presented in the paper. The presentation offers teaching and feedback strategies as influenced by digital framework and tools.

Transitioning From Emergency Remote Instruction to Inverted Classroom Practices in L2 (English and German) Writing Across the Department of Foreign Languages

Tetyana Müller-Lyaskovets, Meni Syrou

*Zentrum für Hochschulbildung (zhb), Bereich Fremdsprachen, TU Dortmund,
Germany*

A growing body of literature recognizes the effectiveness of the inverted classroom for teaching and learning. This effectiveness is usually linked to fostering self-regulated and active learning. Both skill sets are crucial for developing L2 writing proficiencies. In our Department of Foreign Languages, we explore the potential of the blended learning design to engage students more actively in their learning processes so that they become better writers. Our department offers writing instruction and support for German and English via credit-bearing writing and language courses, autonomous learning courses, workshops, and counseling. The department is a home of a Writing Lab w.space launched online in 2020.

To invert a writing and language classroom within the blended-learning design, instructors need a clear understanding of online tools and formats that lend themselves to raising more independent learners and writers. The instructors also need a better understanding of the challenges that these formats and tools introduce.

The purpose of our teaching-oriented presentation is to reflect on how, across different language and writing instruction and support formats, our instructors capitalize on such features of online instruction as flexibility, higher assessment transparency, and collaborative learning opportunities. Specifically, we discuss how our instructors use Moodle course features and plugins, forums, and instant feedback applications to delegate to students more control over their writing processes and products, thus tapping self-regulated learning. In addition, we reflect on how balancing on-site and online instruction helps ameliorate such challenges of online instruction as insufficient student engagement and increase social interaction one needs to develop writing.

We hope that sharing our experience with the use of online technologies will spur exchange among L1 and L2 writing and language instructors. In the next step, we intend to conduct a student survey to gauge the effectiveness of the above-mentioned technologies for student self-reported achievement.

Seamless reflection through e-portfolios

Lukas Musumeci, Susannah Parker Ewing

Universität Hamburg, Germany

Reflection processes cannot be planned, only encouraged and stimulated. They are not bound by space or time but happen anytime and anywhere. Thus, integrating reflection in a higher education setting calls for a seamless approach (as described by Wong and Loi 2019). To realize seamless reflection, the Schreibzentrum Hamburg has employed e-portfolios. They provide a digital reflection space which integrates formal and informal settings as well as guided and free, primary and secondary reflection. The latter, as described by Bräuer (2016) and elaborated by Hilzensauer (2017), address the descriptive steps (with)in the learning situation and the interpretive level taking place with some cognitive distance from the situation.

We employ e-portfolios in two settings with an eye to encouraging both reflective learning processes and a strong awareness of personal development. First, our peer writing tutors-in-training use e-portfolios to reflect on their role as writing tutors, their writing and consultation practices and the development of their consultation skills. The second setting is the project Innovation by Legal Design Thinking within the Digital and Data Literacy Teaching Lab. Here, an interdisciplinary student group develops a legal analytics application, employing a problem-based design thinking approach. In their portfolios, students reflect on design ideas, their methodological competence regarding legal design thinking and their competence to work in an interdisciplinary team.

In both settings, the portfolios integrate other assignments and artifacts with writing and learning journals which cover primary and secondary levels of reflection and extended meta-reflection regarding their plans for further developing their skills. Thus we realize seamless reflection through seamless writing (Kruse/Rapp 2019), as we reduce the spatial and temporal seams and the seams between writing and learning. Our contribution explores the design of e-portfolios in these settings and the benefits of seamless reflection for teachers and learners.

References

- Bräuer, G. (2016). *Das Portfolio als Reflexionsmedium für Lehrende und Studierende*. Barbara Budrich.
- Hilzensauer, W. (2017). *Wie kommt die Reflexion in den Lehrerberuf? Ein Lernangebot zur Förderung der Reflexionskompetenz bei Lehramtsstudierenden*. Waxmann.
- Kruse, O., & Rapp, C. (2019). *Seamless Writing: How the Digitisation of Writing Transforms Thinking, Communication, and Student Learning*. In C. K. Looi, L. H. Wong, C. Glahn, & S. Cai (Eds.), *Seamless Learning. Lecture Notes in Educational Technology* (pp 191-208) Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3071-1_10
- Wong, L. H., & Looi C. K. (2019). *The Conceptual Niche of SeamlessLearning: An Invitation to Dialogue*. In C. K. Looi, L. H. Wong, C. Glahn, & S. Cai (Eds.), *Seamless Learning. Lecture Notes in Educational Technology* (pp 3- 27) Springer.

A Digital Tool to Support Deliberate Practice in Academic Writing

Daire O Broin, Niamh McCrea

SETU, Ireland

Despite its inherent complexity (Castelló et al., 2013), mastery of academic writing is often relegated to ad hoc, 'feedback as telling' approaches (González-Ocampo & Castelló, 2018; Sadler, 2010) that leave learners emotionally and intellectually drained (Aitchison et al., 2012). One potential way of enhancing academic writing development is to draw on the concept of deliberate practice (A. Ericsson & Pool, 2016). Ericsson (Ericsson & Pool, 2016, p. 14) found that what drives expert performance is not so-called 'naive' practice, i.e. 'just doing something repeatedly, and expecting that the repetition alone' will lead to improvement. Rather, what is required are 'goal-directed activities designed to improve specific aspects of performance through self-evaluation and gradual refinement of performance with feedback' (Nandagopal & Ericsson, 2012). Despite the promise of deliberate practice, its application to higher education has been limited (Kolb, 2014, pp. 3–4). Critically, its pedagogical promise is impeded by the challenges associated with implementing its constituent elements in an accessible and efficient format, and in ensuring that they work in concert. This paper analyses a digital tool (Cleachtas) that was designed according to deliberate practice principles, as well as overlapping aspects of self-regulated learning and feedback recipience (Winstone & Carless, 2020). Specifically, the tool helps learners to: (i) internalise standards in academic writing; (ii) critically appraise their own writing and that of peers against the required standards, identifying gaps (Sadler, 1989) (iii) engage in focused evaluative dialogue with peers; (iv) close identified gaps, and (v) monitor and visualise the development of their skills in a systematic way over the course of their research programme. The paper explains how each of these five elements are achieved as part of a postgraduate module in academic writing, and evaluates the effectiveness of each using preliminary findings from data captured by the tool itself, as well as reflections from module learners and teachers.

Globalization and its effects on the genre of resumes

Zsuzsanna Palmer

Grand Valley State University, United States of America

Globalization and the interconnected world have resulted in calls to implement innovative pedagogies that open up new opportunities in higher education. In writing studies, we can answer these calls not only by preparing our students to work with people of diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds but also by increasing students' awareness of how writing practices are influenced in the global context. With English as a global language and through the global tendencies affecting trade and culture, genres are becoming more fluid. Through an exploration of a specific genre (resumes) students can discover how the shared purpose of these documents leads to their similar content and structure globally while also incorporating some local genre expectations (St.Amant, 2020). For a high-impact learning experience, we can teach our students about these topics through online international collaboration projects based on strong relationships among faculty in different countries while also building new relationships among students across borders (Starke-Meyerring & Wilson, 2008).

In my proposed, pedagogy-focused presentation, I plan to introduce participants to a collaboration project structured around career-focused writing such as resumes. In this project, students at a US Midwestern university form groups with students from a country in Europe to discuss cultural and linguistic similarities and differences in the specific context of job application documents in the age of Applicant Tracking Systems. The presentation will feature the schedule of the project and a thorough explanation of how technology (Zoom, Google Apps) is utilized to connect students. In addition, I will share the description of some scaffolding assignments such as the comparison of European CVs and US resumes. Through these activities, students not only learn about the effects of global context and technology on writing, but they also connect to their peers in a different country and learn to appreciate perspectives different from their own.

In-person, online or asynchronous? Factors impacting student choice of study mode in a hybrid-flexible academic writing course

Gayle Pringle Barnes

University of Glasgow, United Kingdom

Students increasingly experience both on-campus and online provision as blended learning becomes the 'new normal' (Buhl-Wiggers et al, 2022). Blended learning brings opportunities but also potential challenges for both students and teaching staff as they navigate a variety of study modes (Lomer and Palmer, 2021). There is, therefore, a growing need to explore how and why students engage with an increasingly diverse range of learning opportunities.

This presentation explores why students choose particular study modes to access an academic writing course. This course was designed with a 'hybrid-flexible' approach (Beatty, 2019), where students can opt to learn through different study modes, including synchronous classes (in-person or online) or asynchronous activities. All study modes support the same learning outcomes and students can switch between them as they choose.

The data for this study comprises survey responses from 93 taught postgraduate (Masters) students engaged in co-curricular classes and activities on disciplinary writing in social sciences subjects. Quantitative and qualitative data are analysed to explore why students choose to access each writing topic through one of three different modes: (1) in-person (on-campus) classes; (2) online classes; or (3) asynchronous, interactive activities designed for independent study. I will also reflect on my experience as a teacher designing and delivering hybrid-flexible content.

The study reveals different motivations for choosing each mode, with in-person classes associated with an enhanced learning environment while online classes tended to be chosen for more practical reasons. Asynchronous study was often selected for revision rather than for initial learning. This suggests the aims of these study modes are often understood differently by students. I will discuss how these findings can enhance our understanding of students' engagement with academic writing provision in the digitalised university.

References

Beatty, B. J. (2019). *Hybrid-Flexible course design: Implementing student-directed hybrid classes*. EdTech Books.

Buhl-Wiggers, J. Kjærgaard, A. & Munk, K. (2022). A scoping review of experimental evidence on face-to-face components of blended learning in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2123911>

Lomer, S. & Palmer, E. (2021) 'I didn't know this was actually stuff that could help us, with actually learning': student perceptions of Active Blended Learning. *Teaching in Higher Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1852202>

The travel metaphor: an approach to teaching essay structure and understanding the reader–writer relationship

David Schönthal

Cardiff University, United Kingdom

This paper presents a novel approach, using metaphor, to teach essay structure to learners of academic writing and strengthen their awareness and understanding of the reader–writer relationship. In academic writing, in order for writers to successfully present a convincing and clear argument, they need to be aware of their reader (cf. Hyland 2001), understand their shared knowledge base, and guide them through their text step by step. However, research has shown that writers often struggle to efficiently cater for their reader (cf. Warren et al. 2021), not truly understanding the complex relationship between themselves and their readers. Following Lakoff and Johnson’s (2003[1980]) seminal work, *Metaphors We Live By*, metaphors have been used in teaching as a means to help people understand such complex target domains by mapping them onto more accessible source domains (cf. Saban 2006), such as Hagstrom et al.’s (2000) geology metaphor to visualise the beauty of teaching or indeed Warren et al.’s (2021) restaurant metaphor to conceptualise abstraction in writing. This paper introduces the use of the ‘travel metaphor’ to show students how to structure an essay and to help them understand their role in guiding the reader through their argument. The metaphor views the writer as a tour guide or travel agent who is organising a trip for their reader, the traveller or tourist. Received positively in student feedback, the metaphor allows a simple, accessible explanation of the structure of an academic argument (a trip through Europe) with its supporting arguments (different cities), examples and evidence (tourist attractions), the nature of introductions (a first meeting at the tourist office) and conclusions (a post-holiday photo session), transitions between paragraphs (connecting flights between cities), overall coherence (the writer’s work in guiding the reader), etc., and it furthers students’ understanding of their relationship with their reader.

Identifying the shortcomings of available resources for implementing feedback in process writing

Ilona Tragel, Liisa-Maria Komissarov, Nele Karolin Teiva, Kati Käpp

University of Tartu, Estonia

Several studies have found that process writing and peer feedback have a positive impact on teaching academic writing (e.g. Sivan 2000; Lundstrom & Baker 2009; Nicol et al. 2014). However, this approach is still far from being widespread in Estonian universities.

One of the reasons for why process writing is still a largely untapped potential might be the technical difficulty of organizing it. We have used process writing on different platforms (Eli Review, Google Docs, Microsoft OneDrive) for four years in an undergraduate course with 250 students (see also Authors 2022a, 2022b) and for two years in a state exam preparation course for 1500 twelfth-graders. From those experiences, we have identified several shortcomings.

The type of feedback that can be given depends solely on the platform used. For example, popular word processing platforms like Microsoft Word and Google Docs allow leaving comments straight to text, yet there is no distinct space to leave comments at the end or the beginning. Furthermore, there is no convenient possibility for making feedback comments simultaneously anonymous for students (cf. Patchan et al 2017: 3) but identifiable for instructors. Nor can the feedback comments later be extracted for meaningful quantitative research. Although there are platforms catering for peer feedback (Patchan et al. 2017), they also have significant limitations, for example in accommodating cover letters (see Daniel et al. 2014; Yallop 2020) and instructor feedback.

In our paper we will discuss how these shortcomings influence the impact of process writing. Based on our own aforementioned experiences, we offer our perspective on what a process writing oriented platform should include to make the learning of writing more comfortable and rewarding for students and instructors alike.

Getting a grip on academic writing processes with the Writing Machine

Janneke van der Loo¹, Renske Bouwer²

¹Tilburg University, The Netherlands; ²Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Despite efforts in many higher education programs to develop students' writing skills, lecturers often complain about the quality of student writing. To turn students into better writers, we have developed the digital platform The Writing Machine (<https://academischrijven.nl/en/>). With the Writing Machine, we aim to enhance students' self-regulated writing skills, which is essential in writing education (Graham & Harris, 2018).

For students to become good writers, they must be able to set goals, monitor their progress, and persevere when things get difficult (Sala-Bubaré & Castelló, 2018). However, this is where things often go wrong, e.g. students put off writing until the last minute, they do not set goals and they find it difficult to persevere when the going gets tough. With the digital tools of the Writing Machine, we shifted the focus in academic writing instruction from the product to the underlying writing processes by: (1) orienting with knowledge clips, (2) goal setting with the quiz "What kind of writer are you?", (3) process feedback with keystroke logging (Vandermeulen et al., 2020), and (4) (peer) assessing texts with comparative judgment. Over the past two years, we have tested the Writing Machine with approximately 300 students at two Dutch universities.

In this presentation we will introduce the four main components of the Writing Machine and how we integrated these into our academic writing courses. We will also discuss the results of the qualitative and quantitative user evaluation we performed with our students. This way we hope to give insight into how we try to give our students a better grip on their writing processes.

References

- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2018). An examination of the design principles underlying a self-regulated strategy development study. *Journal of Writing Research, 10*(2), 139-187.
- Sala-Bubaré, A., & Castelló, M. (2018). Writing regulation processes in higher education: a review of two decades of empirical research. *Reading and Writing, 31*(4), 757-777.
- Vandermeulen, N., Leijten, M., & Van Waes, L. (2020). Reporting writing process feedback in the classroom using keystroke logging data to reflect on writing processes. *Journal of Writing Research, 12*(1), 109-139

"Finer Spirit of All Knowledge": Doctoral Students Writing Poems about Their Research

Nadya Yakovchuk, Mike Rose

University of Surrey, United Kingdom

In this teaching-oriented presentation, we report on the competition 'Your Project as a Poem' that we have successfully run at the University of Surrey, UK since 2021 as part of AcWriMo (Academic Writing Month). In this competition, we ask doctoral students (and the wider research community) to transform their doctoral theses or research papers into a different genre – a poem. This approach takes inspiration from English's (2012) exploration of how 'regenring' helps students to engage with their disciplines in new ways, and Quinlan's (2016) work on using poems to explore learning and teaching in higher education. It parallels Savickey's (2017) pedagogy of 'acting out' intellectual problems to see beyond their academic confines.

We will describe how we came up with this initiative, how we have utilised the digital sphere (e.g. blogs, newsletters, Twitter) to promote the competition and individual submissions, and how we have engaged our in-house poets in running preparatory workshops and judging in the competition. We will also share our own reflections on the project, including the opportunities and challenges of making this initiative inclusive of all, with some researchers expressing pleasure in being 'allowed' to write poetry since our institution is not arts-centred, with engineering, health sciences and science disciplines dominating. Most importantly, we will discuss how the experience of writing a poem about their research has impacted our doctoral students in various ways, from allowing some to take respite from the intensity of doctoral study, to helping others refocus and find new motivation for their projects, to opening up new and unexpected possibilities for presenting and publishing their research. And of course we will offer extracts from the wonderful poems received from our doctoral researchers!

POSTERS

The KTH Guide to scientific writing: shaping an online resource for students and supervisors

Susanna Lyne, Jane Bottomley, Jamie Rinder

KTH, Sweden

Students need strong scientific writing skills in order to produce successful degree projects and theses. To support them in this task, there are a number of excellent and well-established web resources, such as the *Purdue OWL* and the *Awelu* (Academic Writing in English at Lund University). However, these guides tend to be general in nature, which we believe can make it harder for students to relate the advice to their own disciplines. To meet particular disciplinary needs, some universities have developed department-specific or field-specific guides (Christiansen et al. 2014; Economou and James 2017).

This poster presents our contribution to this set of specific guides: the KTH Guide to scientific writing, an online resource developed in 2021/2022 by a team of English teachers at a technical university. The Guide covers some of the most important aspects of STEM writing, and presents these in an accessible way. Points are often illustrated with a less successful and a more successful version of a sentence, with many examples drawn from student theses from our own university. This way, we hope that students and faculty will be able to relate to the topics and the language points included.

In addition to incorporating the Guide in our English courses, for instance with quizzes in our learning management system, we are promoting the Guide to students outside our courses and to faculty. We hope that wide use of the Guide will help foster the use of a common language for talking about writing across the university, a need also recognised by Basturkmen et al. (2014).

Feedback shows that students are positively engaging with the Guide, but users also point to difficulties with navigation and the lack of a search function. The poster presents ways in which we are developing the Guide to maximise user-friendliness.

References

- AWELU – Academic Writing in English at Lund University. (2021). Available: www.awelu.lu.se. Accessed 2022-12-15.
- Basturkmen, H., East, M., & Bitchener, J. (2014). Supervisors' on-script feedback comments on drafts of dissertations: socialising students into the academic discourse community. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 19(4), 432–445.
- Christiansen, M. U., Eshan, D., Hanson A. T., Jenson, J. D., Ojard, S., Saftner, D. A., & Teasley, R. (2014). Development of a Department Writing Guide for Civil Engineering. In *2014 ASEE North Midwest Section Conference* (Vol. 2014, No. 1). University of Iowa.
- Economou, D., & James, B. (2017). A research writing tool: Designing an online resource for supervisors and students. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 54(6), 590–600.

Organizing, reflecting and evaluating writing consultations with an open-source, web-based application

Alexander Kaib

Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany

Organizing writing consultations entails a lot of administrative work, especially when including quality management and personnel development. While tools exist that alleviate the institutional burden, they tend to be expensive and/or ill-suited to the specific context of European university writing centers. In response, our writing center has developed its own mobile-friendly web application from the ground up. The main function is a calendar where peer tutors can set their own appointment schedule, and students can book appointments using filters for discipline, language, and format (online/in person). Peer tutors can also reflect on and document each consultation by filling out a form, which is saved in a searchable archive. Administrators are able to quickly access statistics, such as the number of available/booked appointments. All these functions can be tested during the demo. The app is built on the modern JavaScript framework React with a simple PHP/SQL backend. It thus requires relatively little server-infrastructure, running on a typical LAMP stack.

While the tool was developed and fine-tuned to the context of our writing center, we would like to use this opportunity to connect with institutions and professionals who could benefit from and contribute to the project. To that end, the source code is available on a public repository under an open-source

license: <https://github.com/alexkaib/writing-consultation-planner>.

Are we teaching the right things? How to prepare students for future writing tasks in the engineering proficiency

Ida Pinho, Linda Söderlindh

KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden

Preparing students for working life is essential for engineering education. However, as previous studies have suggested, there is a gap between the contents in engineering education and the skills required for engineering work.

Especially spoken and written communication skills are needed in a workplace environment, although these skills rarely receive sufficient focus in engineering education. It has also been shown that engineering students face several challenges when starting their professional careers after graduation. The vast amount of written communication in an engineers' professional life covers many different text types, which students aren't always prepared for (Rinder et al. 2020; Dyke Ford et al. 2021)

As a step towards closing this gap, the course Writing in the Engineering Profession is compulsory for all first-year students in computer science at our technical university, as a way to prepare students for writing in academia and their future profession. Asking the wider question of how communication skills can be taught in a way that prepares students in computer engineering for writing in the workplace, this ongoing case study sets out to investigate how students view their own writing experience, strategies and skills, and the expectations of their potential workplaces.

We have collected data (surveys) from students in this course for the past six years. Combined with semistructured interviews with industry management in computer engineering workplaces, we also investigate what the industry requires in terms of written communication skills from new engineers.

This poster presents the results from this work in progress (Pinho & Söderlindh, 2019) illustrating both the students' views and approach to writing and the preliminary results from industry interviews. We also discuss the gap between writing training in engineering education and industry expectations, suggesting ways of equipping students with the relevant writing skills for the computer engineering profession.

Teaching Academic Writing through Flipped Classroom and Gamification

Madona Giorgadze

Ilia State University, Georgia

At the current stage, academic writing has been developing in various directions. Traditional methods of teaching are no longer enough to cope with present-day challenges and to receive the education of the future. If not so long ago, face to face learning was considered as an unparalleled form, the integration of technologies into the learning process, turned the education process upside down.

Along with the information technological advances, various e-learning platforms have been introduced and blended learning has been implemented, and flipped classroom became one of the topical contemporary approaches. Considering the fact that the great majority of students are representatives of digital generation, to whom electronic gadgets are integral part of everyday life, it becomes clear that enriching the academic writing course with media and technologies is important and even necessary. Therefore, the integration and implementation of appropriate technological tools into the learning process represents one of the main challenges for authors and teachers of academic writing course. This will enrich and facilitate learning process and moreover, bring it closer to students natural and convenient environment.

The article discusses the teaching of academic writing from the perspective of flipped classroom and elements of gamification. This method implies the transfer of information from **public space** (lecture) to **private space** (house), pedagogical impact through elements of games and the use of technologies in the following directions:

As a tool for monitoring students knowledge; kahoot/ Slido,

As a presentation tool to illustrate and explain new material; ted ed

Computer modeling of practical exercises; mentimeter

The gamification design significantly changes learning/teaching process, it tunes the learner from a passive object to a creative subject. The integration of gamification element into the learning process ensures students' involvement in gamified learning process: this will help students learn in relaxed atmosphere within fixed time limit and space limit, go beyond frames, increase motivation and achieve maximum results. On the other hand, the lecturer will be able to effectively use the lecture-time and work on developing higher-order thinking and writing skills.

Knowledge Creation Mediated by Different Writing Tools

Isabella Ollinger

University of Vienna, Austria

Writing empowers knowledge creators to develop and transform epistemological structures, while at the same time writing itself is shaped within different structures and meanings - which make an impact on daily writing practices (Elbow, 1998). Also, the use of writing technologies mediates our practices because every tool opens very specific possibilities for writing and thinking (Meder, 2004, 2007; Römmer-Nosseck, 2017). The concept of the medial habit allows enlightening the practical interwovenness of bodies, artifacts, and symbolic-discursive formations (Bettinger, 2018). To get an insight into implicit knowledge which is transported through writing practices and the devices interacted with, the research question for this investigation is:

Which modifications observe academic knowledge creators for the flow of writing and thinking when doing Freewriting with different tools?

For this praxeological setting (Knecht, 2014), routines and habits are disrupted by challenging the writers to use more or less common tools for academic writing: notebook, tablet, pen and paper, or smartphone. After every Freewriting for three consecutive days, the participants answer a written survey about their observations of tempo, view, and correction while writing. For the Freewriting on the fourth-day writers choose the tool they liked most and reflect and compare the use of the different tools. The first results of the analysis show insights into the individual recognition of their own understanding of writing as a media of thinking. Relations between the flow of writing and the flow of thoughts are expressed. The tempo of writing becomes identified as a factor for different qualities of writing and thinking. Also, the observations about the benefits and struggles with different functions of auto-correction show connections to specific ways of writing and thinking.

References

- Bettinger, P. (2018). *Praxeologische Medienbildung*. Springer Fachmedien.
- Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing without teachers* (2. ed.,). Oxford University Press.
- Knecht, M. (2014). Ethnographische Praxis im Feld der Wissenschafts-, Medizin- und Technikanthropologie. In *Science and Technology Studies* (pp. 251–280). transcript Verlag.
- Liessmann, K. P. (2015). Über die allmähliche Verfertigung der Gedanken beim Schreiben. In S. Schmölder-Eibinger & E. Thürmann (Eds.), *Schreiben als Medium des Lernens. Kompetenzentwicklung durch Schreiben im Fachunterricht* (pp. 345–351). Waxmann.
- Meder, N. (2004). *Der Sprachspieler*. Königshausen & Neumann.
- Meder, N. (2007). Theorie der Medienbildung. In W. Sesink, M. Kerres, & H. Moser (Eds.), *Jahrbuch Medienpädagogik* (Vol. 6, pp. 55–73).
- Mueller, P. A., & Oppenheimer, D. M. (2014). The Pen Is Mightier Than the Keyboard: Advantages of Longhand Over Laptop Note Taking. *Psychological Science*, 25(6), 1159–1168.
- Römmer-Nosseck, B. (2017). *Academic Writing as a Cognitive Developmental Process: An Enactivist Perspective* [Dissertation]. Universität Wien.
- Swertz, C. (2000). *Computer und Bildung. Eine medienanalytische Untersuchung der Computertechnologie in bildungstheoretischer Perspektive* [Dissertation]. Bielefeld.

SKILL: A social science lab for inquiry-based learning with AI

Katrin Girgensohn¹, Dorothea Horst²

¹SRH Berlin University of Applied Sciences, Germany; ²European University Viadrina, Germany

Researchers: Katrin Girgensohn, Dorothea Horst, Franziska Liebetanz, Margret Mundorf (Center for Teaching and Learning, European University Viadrina), Sassan Gholiagha, Jürgen Neyer, Mitja Sienknecht (European New School of Digital Studies, European University Viadrina); Bernd Fröhlich, Dora Kiesel, Patrick Riemann, Benno Stein, Magdalena Wolska (Bauhaus University Weimar)

The SKILL project is a German cooperation of the European New School of Digital Studies (ENS) and the Center for Teaching and Learning (ZLL) of the European University Viadrina as well as the Bauhaus-Universität Weimar. Together, the research team aims at developing an AI social science lab for inquiry-based learning (SKILL).

Currently, student researchers are involved in the process of building AI-based technologies. These technologies will be able to recognize, analyze, and visualize the structure of argumentation in scholarly articles in Political Sciences.

In a next step, the AI-technology developed by the SKILL team will be used in seminars in social sciences that follow the didactical approach of inquiry-based learning (Pedaste et al, 2015). Students will use the AI-technology to conduct literature-based research on their own questions dealing with current political situations, like the war in Ukraine and will write papers on this.

With regard to didactics, the SKILL team aims at developing a deeper understanding of the benefits and limitations of the use of AI technologies in higher education learning. For this, students write reflections on steps of their own research projects, like understanding theory, developing research questions, working with annotations. This will also help to deepen our understanding for the use of student reflections when integration AI into higher education learning. During the poster session, we will report from our ongoing classroom study.

SKILL is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF).

References (APA 7)

Pedaste, M., Mäeots, M., Siiman, L. A., Jong, T. de, van Riesen, S. A., Kamp, E. T., Manoli, C. C., Zacharia, Z. C., & Tsourlidaki, E. (2015). Phases of inquiry-based learning: Definitions and the inquiry cycle. *Educational Research Review*, *14*, 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.02.003>

ROUNDTABLE

OpenAI ChatGPT– friend or foe? A critical discussion about the pedagogical challenges and ways forward

Susanna Lyne, Ida Pinho, Linda Söderlindh

KTH, Sweden

In late 2022, the launch of the OpenAI Chat “ChatGPT” gave writers all over the world the opportunity to have well-written texts produced in under a minute (Stokel-Walker 2022). Media around the world were quick to report on the new tool. According to the Guardian, the bot can produce texts that would score the highest marks “if submitted by an undergraduate” (Hern 2022). Being free of charge and already available in multiple languages, this tool clearly offers a number of challenges that require serious consideration.

With an artificial and intelligent ghostwriter, students can now produce texts on any topic and in any genre with only a one-sentence prompt, begging the question: how should and could we as academic writing teachers relate to this technology? We therefore feel an urgent need to discuss the implications of this technological development, as well as the potential for teaching and assessing students with access to this type of AI.

At this roundtable, we want to discuss this issue, for instance by addressing the following questions:

What are the short- and long-term implications of an AI like ChatGPT for academic writing, student writing skills development and writing pedagogy?

Does the notion of “academic writing” need to be re-defined?

Do we need to re-think how we teach and assess writing skills?

In a wider sense, how does writing with a chatbot affect students’ language skills in general, for instance when they have not engaged with the writing process?

What about plagiarism?

How should we teach writing, and motivate students to develop their writing skills, when they have an AI within their reach?

We hope that the discussions will lead to insights, ideas and strategies for teaching academic writing in co-existence with AI.

References

Hern, A. (2022). AI bot ChatGPT stuns academics with essay-writing skills and usability. *The Guardian*, December 4, 2022.

Stokel-Walker, C. (2022). AI bot ChatGPT writes smart essays – should professors worry? *Nature*, 09 December 2022. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-04397-7>

Don't Panic! Potential Implications of Writing AI for Academic Writing Development

Erika Unterpertinger, Brigitte Römmer-Nossek, Frano Rismondo, Klara Dreo, Marcela Hubert

University of Vienna, Austria

OpenAI's ChatGPT-3 (OpenAI, 2022) came as a shock to the academic writing community and evokes perspectives ranging from curiosity (Gero, 2022) to fears of AI becoming a ubiquitous ghost writer.

It is an essential part of academic socialization to develop routines and strategies of academic writing to be able to respond to heuristic and rhetorical affordances during the writing process (Dengscherz, 2020). Academic writing can be described in terms of embodied, embedded and extended cognition and, from an enactivist point of view, as a sense making and word making activity. Developing as an academic writer involves the ability to define the theoretical space for research questions, arranging the physical space, to decide which methods and tools to use and to motivate oneself. All these involve making decisions and taking responsibility in order to develop from knowledge recipients to knowledge producers (Römmer-Nossek, 2017). We argue that this will not change. What will change is how the higher education system provides teaching and learning in a changing environment: attention needs to shift towards didactical setting, good assignments, and project documentation; becoming an academic writer will involve developing a critical stance towards the output of "Writing AI".

We do not fear that AIs will soon write students' theses. We argue that ChatGPT-3 illustrates the general societal need of gaining a basic understanding of the functioning of deep learning algorithms as well as the necessity to take up the didactical challenges with regard to teaching academic writing and assessment practices. In this roundtable, we start with a perspective on writing and AI on an institutional level before developing didactically relevant questions on the basis of the differences between human academic writing processes and Chat-GPT text production. In the discussion that ensues, we will map challenges academic writers usually face during their writing development and discuss possible positive and negative impacts in using Chat-GPT. With this, we invite the community to envision potential added value and supportive qualities of human-AI interactions in academic writing while voicing concerns about potential pitfalls.