

**Supporting Multilingual Writers in Academic Writing:
A Teacher Training Workshop**

San Francisco State University
M.A. TESOL Capstone Project
Spring 2020

Claire Northall

Table of Contents/Outline

1. Introduction	3
2. Literature Review	6
a. Theoretical frameworks- What is academic language socialization?	6
b. WAC - What is it? Why is it important?	8
c. The “Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity”	9
d. Exactly who are multilingual writers?	10
e. Specific challenges/coping strategies of L2 students	12
f. Issues of Teacher Preparation	14
3. The Professional Development Workshop	16
a. Context	16
b. Rationale: Why teacher training workshops?	17
c. Methods	19
d. Needs Analysis	20
e. Situational Analysis	21
f. Workshop Goal and Objectives	25
g. Scope and Sequence	26
h. Detailed Workshop Procedure	27
4. Conclusions and Reflections	31
5. References	34
6. Appendices: Survey questions and workshop materials	37

Introduction

Many college students face difficulty acclimating to the academic discourse of the university (Spack, 1997; Spack & Zamel, 2004), but specially multilingual students writing in the disciplines in English-medium post-secondary institutions often struggle with academic discourse due to a lack of familiarity with discipline-specific academic discourse (Hyland, 2004; Spack, 1997). Different methodologies have been employed to deal with the “ESL problem” such as English for Academic Purposes programs which often seek to cram newly arrived international students with discipline-specific language (Ferris et al., 2011; Ferris & Tagg, 1996). However, short-term EAP programs often don’t address the needs of multilingual students who need to be “apprenticed” into a discipline (Duff, 2010; Leki, 2017; Wette & Furneaux, 2018).

As the instructor of a high-intermediate level oral skills class for international students at the American Language Institute (ALI), an EAP program at San Francisco State University (SFSU), I share these concerns about multilingual learners’ academic literacy and language development. ALI students are “cultural-newcomer” international students, and they have a variety of educational goals. The mandated curriculum focuses on English instruction of general academic language and skills, such as discussions and oral presentations, in order to prepare them for entering American university contexts. My goal is to not only give the students the language and skills necessary for them to be successful in their individual majors, but to help socialize students into US university academic contexts. However, instruction in discipline-specific language is limited because EAP courses cannot do generic

preparation of genre specific tasks because the rhetorical conventions of each discipline are very specific (Hyland, 2004; Leki & Carson, 1994). Similar to Leki & Carson (1994), my students demonstrate a need for on-going language development, such as understanding rhetorical conventions. In informal conversations, some of my former EAP students have reported struggling to understand discipline instructors' feedback. But as Zamel (1995) noted, "language of the academy cannot be packaged and transmitted to students before they enter the classroom context ...[so] it is unrealistic and counterproductive to expect writing and ESOL programs to be responsible for providing students with the language, discourse, and multiple ways of seeing required across courses." EAP programs can't "fix" all of multilingual students' language issues. multilingual students need on-going support throughout their academic careers (Cheng et al., 2004; Zamel & Spack, 2004). Therefore instructors in the disciplines are critical to supporting multilingual learners' language development and academic discourse socialization (Schneider, 2018).

As students completed my course and transferred to the university, I began to wonder: my ALI students' major instructors know the specific genres of their discipline, but do they know how to make the academic and social norms explicit? How well prepared are my students' major instructors who are tasked with the challenge of teaching genre-specific writing and therefore socializing students into their disciplines?

Postsecondary faculty often are not trained to specifically address multilingual student communication errors in their initial faculty orientation or training (Janopoulos, 1992; Katz et al., 2010). They often don't have any theoretical background in language

acquisition, and some assume that these students should be proficient enough to comprehend and produce a post-secondary level of academic English by the time they arrive in post-secondary classrooms (Ruiz de Velasco & Fix, 2000) and often blame students for inadequate English language instruction (Spack & Zamel, 2004). Research into Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) has shown an increased emphasis on writing across undergraduate programs but it has failed to provide mechanisms that help multilingual students succeed as writers and has not created necessary faculty development programs that offer training in working with multilingual writers (Cox, 2011).

As US college campuses become increasingly linguistically and culturally diverse, both L2 researchers and Composition-rhetoric researchers are investigating ways to address the issue of training faculty in writing courses across the curriculum. A majority of research into understanding multilingual undergraduate students' writing and learning processes in writing courses comes from the context of ESL classrooms (e.g., Canagarajah, 2013; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2013; Leki & Carson, 1994; Silva & Matsuda, 2001; Zamel, 1995; Zamel & Spack, 2006) but recently researchers from across the disciplines have become more concerned about the growing number of linguistically diverse students in "mainstream" content-area classrooms, and L2 scholars have broadened the scope of their research to address issues that arise outside of an ESL class and in the disciplines (Ferris & Thaiss, 2011; Leki, 1995; Spack, 1988, 1997; Wette & Furneaux, 2018; Zamel & Spack, 2006, 2012) . This research exposes a lack of training for instructors in the disciplines (Ferris et al., 2011; Schneider, 2018).

Though multiple studies have called for such workshops for instructors in the disciplines (Ferris et al., 2011; Matsuda et al., 2013; Miller-Cochran, 2010; Schneider, 2018), few studies have provided concrete frameworks to these workshops. In this project, I outline a professional development workshop for faculty in the disciplines at San Francisco State University that includes resources and suggestions for best practices to help multilingual learners build their “genre knowledge” (Hyland, 2004) and successfully engage in classroom academic discourse. This project uses Situated Learning and Language Socialization frameworks in Second Language Acquisition, and is informed by my teaching experiences, reflections on conversations I have had with colleagues in past semesters, and a review of published research and pedagogical theory. In particular, as a useful focus for promoting multilingual student academic language socialization in a specific discipline, this project offers suggestions for Writing-Across-the-Curriculum (WAC) developers and Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) for faculty development for Business instructors around multilingual writer issues.

Literature Review

Theoretical Frameworks: What is academic language socialization?

Academic discourse has been defined as “a complex representation of knowledge and language and identity” (Duff, 2010, p. 175), and academic discourse socialization as the processes by which novices gain full membership in their disciplinary communities (Duff, 2010). The specific field of academic discourse

socialization draws from the broader field of language socialization, which has its theoretical roots in several disciplines, such as linguistic anthropology (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), sociology (Bourdieu, 1977), cultural psychology (Lave & Wenger, 1991), sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978), and literary theory (Bakhtin, 1981). The language socialization paradigm proposes that participants are socialized *through* language as well socialized *into* language (Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). In other words, the process through which novices (such as multilingual learners) are socialized to become competent members of a group by acquiring culturally requisite skills for participating in that society, including appropriate ways of acting, feeling, and thinking, is embedded in language learning (Ochs & Schieffelin, 2008). Research into academic language socialization often considers multilingual learners within a sociocultural context and incorporates into its framework sociocultural theory and the notion of *community of practice* (Lave & Wagner, 1991). According to these concepts, the purpose of learning is to become a competent member of a community and requires changing participation roles as the individual moves from one learning activity to another (Yim, 2011).

These perspectives assume that learning and socialization entail a process of gaining competence and membership in a discourse community. While part of the scholarship disagrees over notions of *discourse* and *discourse community* (Duff, 2010), some scholars advocate for the perspectives that consider a discourse community as open, conflictual, and dynamic rather than autonomous, coherent, or static (Prior, 1998, Morita, 2004, Duff 2010). The concept of communities of practice derives from the

notion of *situated learning* (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which considers learning to be a social practice by which newcomers gradually move towards fuller participation in a given community's activities by interacting with more experienced community members (such as instructors in their disciplines) - a process called *legitimate peripheral participation* (LPP). According to Lave and Wenger, *peripherality* is a positive term that suggests "an opening, a way of gaining access to sources for understanding through growing involvement" (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 37). Within this framework, scholars often understand academic discourse socialization as a process by which newcomers, including L2 students, become increasingly competent in academic ways of knowing, speaking, and writing, as they participate peripherally and legitimately in academic practices (Morita, 2004; Duff, 2010). Though legitimacy is essential for learning, several studies reported how different learners are often granted different degrees of legitimacy depending on how a given community of practice organizes social relations of power (Leki, 2001; Morita, 2004; Kim & Duff, 2012). Disciplines (e.g. scholarly communities) function as communities of practice that enable faculty and students to explore specialized content by enacting particularized ways of knowing and doing. As communities of practice, disciplines also produce students capable of conducting research and creating discipline-specific writing—the specialized domain of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC).

WAC - What is it? Why is it important?

Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) is a movement emanating from within composition-rhetoric studies which advocates for incorporating writing training into all

disciplines, not only in English composition courses. According to historical accounts (Bazerman et al., 2005; Russell, 1991), competence in literacy and communication was assumed at the student's entry into a specialty, and the English department's research was primarily focused on literary analysis. The open admissions policy in the US in the 1970s increased the demand for language skills training for previously educationally disadvantaged students. As changing workplace norms pressured higher education for higher communication standards and a college degree became the prerequisite for a job, there was an increased interest in critical thinking skills, rhetoric, and writing skills. Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) pushed other university departments to emphasize writing-to-learn activities in their classes and shift writing instruction from the sole domain of Composition by creating discipline-specific writing intensive courses. From these developments, the Writing Across the Curriculum movement evolved and has become widely adopted. In a study by Thaiss and Porter (2010), 64% of the responding U.S. institutions of higher education reported either having or planning to begin a WAC program (p. 541). Writing-intensive courses, faculty workshops, writing fellows programs, and other WAC-related programming have proliferated in colleges and universities across the US (Cox, 2011).

The “Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity”

Though the numbers of multilingual writers enrolling in California colleges has risen steadily over the years, the issues of differing linguistic needs has not been a central concern from Composition and Writing Program Administrators (Matsuda, 2006). In fall of 2016, about 30 percent of new students in the University of California system

declared that English was not their first language, and another 30 percent considered both English and another language to be their first languages (University of California, 2017). However, until the last decade, Composition literature often overlooked the growing linguistic diversity in the mainstream Composition classroom (e.g. Friedrich, 2006; Matsuda, 2006). Matsuda (2006) argues that there is a “the myth of linguistic homogeneity - the tacit and widespread acceptance of the dominant image of composition students as native speakers of a privileged variety of English [which]...has in turn kept U.S. composition from fully recognizing the presence of second-language writers who do not fit the dominant image of college students.” Cox (2011) asserts that, though WPAs successfully raised the status of writing and increased the emphasis on writing across the disciplines, there has been little interdisciplinary research between L2 writing researchers and WAC researchers, and multilingual student issues have largely been ignored. WAC has increased emphasis on writing across undergraduate programs without creating mechanisms that help multilingual students succeed as writers and without creating faculty development programs that offer training in working with multilingual writers. (Cox, 2011). Writing is given preference because there is an emphasis on assessment via writing - but in order to facilitate participation, learners need to develop their oral/aural skills, which doesn't only take place in an EAP curriculum (Ferris & Tagg, 1996; Matsuda & Jablonski, 1998; Zamel & Spack, 2006). As more and more multilingual students populate American university classrooms, it becomes increasingly important to provide support for instructors of those writers in their Writing Across the Curriculum.

Exactly who are multilingual writers?

Though all instructors would agree that it's crucial to get to know your students, Composition and WAC instructors' knowledge of multilingual writers is often limited, because multilingual writers are not always easy to identify (Miller-Cochran, 2010; Schneider, 2018) and US-educated multilingual writers often reject the label of "ESL" (Ortmeier-Hooper, 2008), which means they are unlikely to self-identify in beginning of the semester student information surveys. One issue highlighted in the literature is the use of overly simplistic terminology (Matsuda, 2006). Umbrella terms that are commonly used to describe multilingual student writers—including *ESL students*, *English Language Learners (ELLs)*, *nonnative writers*, and *second language writers or L2 writers*—obfuscate a range of diversity among these students, and many of the differences have implications for pedagogy (Schneider, 2018). More recently, (Roberge et al., 2015) adopted the phrase "US-educated multilingual writers" to refer to a broader group of students including 'Generation 1.5' immigrants, US-born multilingual students who enter U.S. schools while still dominant in their home languages, transnational and migrant students who have alternated between U.S. and foreign K-12 schools. This description usefully captures a wider range of learners who share some distinguishing features. However, It's important to distinguish that the field of research is still often called "L2 writing".

One of the most crucial distinctions is between international/F-1 visa students and US-educated multilingual students. International students usually come to the United States only for the purpose of study, and will likely return to their home countries after graduation. US-educated multilingual students live in the United States

permanently and typically have family ties and lives beyond the university. In terms of writing skill proficiency, international students are more likely to have literacy skills in a language other than English which transfers to their L2. On the other hand, the literacy experiences of US-educated multilingual writers is quite diverse, and they are likely to have a dramatic difference between their writing/reading skills and speaking/listening skills (Schneider, 2018) and may or may not be biliterate. Multilingual learners vary in linguistic proficiency levels, attitudes towards language, and levels of academic preparation, which makes it really difficult to make easy generalizations about this broadly defined group. However, multilingual learners who are enrolled in US college courses share a common goal: to perform competently across the curriculum even as their English skills are developing (Zamel & Spack, 2006).

Specific challenges/coping strategies of multilingual students

Socialization into a new academic discipline is not a straightforward process (Duff, 2007). Various studies highlight the specific challenges and coping strategies of multilingual students. In Zamel's (2004) survey of 325 ESOL students from a range of disciplines, students reported that they felt silenced by the instructor in their classrooms, making the multilingual students feel inadequate and fearful to participate. Students reported limited possibilities for in-class engagement, involvement and inclusion. Students acknowledged that even after a year of instruction in their majors they still faced difficulties, but expressed frustration that these struggles were often interpreted as "deficiencies". Students reported feeling marginalized in their classes because of the lack of interactive in-class activities. In a detailed case study, one student from Japan

complained how she was “drowning in [her sociology professor’s] words” because of the predominantly lecture style format of the class (Zamel, 2004). Overall, students want smaller classes, relevant, writing-to-learn assignments, more active class discussions, and thoughtful, effective feedback on assignments.

Even highly educated students enter into American institutions unfamiliar with academic conventions. In Wette-Ferneaux’s study, irrespective of country of origin, almost all graduate students reported their previous writing instruction at their undergraduate home-institutions focused mostly on the sentence or paragraph structure, and they were unfamiliar with specific text-organization rhetorical conventions of their discipline. Participants considered that previous undergraduate writing instruction had not provided adequate preparation for graduate study in an English-medium university, particularly with regard to academic literacy norms and the construction of core genres. These experiences aren’t limited to a few specific multilingual learners. Chiseri-Strater’s (1991) ethnography of university classrooms reveals the authoritarian and limited ways that subject matter is often approached, the ways in which students, even those who are successful, are left silent and empty by the contrived and inconsequential work of many classrooms.

These studies highlight the core issue that content instructors without TESOL training often don’t recognize multilingual learners’ needs. Students are not blank slates (Soliday, 2004) so Wette & Furneaux (2018) urge instructors to be more aware of their multilingual students’ cultural backgrounds and go beyond the “deficit” model of home culture influences. The authors call for a greater awareness of the value of explicit

generic or discipline-specific writing instruction for making implicit aspects of academic literacies transparent to newcomers.

Issues of Teacher Preparation

Research on multilingual writers in US university classrooms often overlooks the issue of professional preparation of mainstream instructors who work with multilingual writers. For example, composition courses are commonly taught by teachers with no formal training in L2 writing pedagogy (Ferris & Thaiss, 2011; Matsuda et al., 2013; Shvidko, 2015). Previous research which investigated mainstream teacher's perceptions of their professional preparation to address multilingual learner's needs has indicated an overall lack of preparation. Ferris et al. (2011) explored mainstream Composition teachers' attitudes and the methods that teachers used in responding to multilingual writers. Ferris et al. found that the majority of respondents reported that they have not had any substantive formal training in working with multilingual writers learners. Furthermore, some teachers expressed resentment of the perceived extra burdens multilingual writers bring. In addition, many teachers in Ferris et al.'s study reported that they outsourced their students' language issues to the university writing center, rather than taking primary responsibility for addressing the needs of their students. These results mirror the findings of (Matsuda et al., 2013), who discovered that some instructors were unaware of multilingual writer's needs because they were fluent in oral English, while other instructors perceived that their students shouldn't have even been allowed to enroll in college, reflecting the policy of containment, in which

“language differences were to be “contained” by admission and placement procedures” (Matsuda, 2006).

Other studies have also indicated that instructors had difficulty knowing what kind of feedback multilingual writers need. Shvidko’s survey of composition instructors’ perceptions of their preparedness to teach multilingual writers highlighted that more than 60% of her respondents admitted to the feeling of unpreparedness, which was primarily caused by two factors—the lack of formal training in teaching multilingual writing and the lack of experiences in working with multilingual writers (Shvidko, 2015). Several comments showed that the teachers tried to provide effective feedback on students’ papers, but they were not always sure what kind of feedback would be effective. Shvidko emphasized instruction that focuses on multilingual students’ immediate academic needs, such as acquiring the norms and conventions of academic writing discourse. Researchers like Currie (1993), Chiseri-Strater (1991), and Walvoord and McCarthy (1990) seem to agree with this position, noting that professors across the curriculum do define part of their educational tasks as the initiation of students into the style of thinking and writing done by professionals in their field.

Most notable in the literature is the dearth of specific suggestions on teacher preparation in working with multilingual writers, along with little attention being paid to understanding the particular challenges that Composition instructors and WAC/WID instructors may face to be able to appropriately accommodate multilingual writers in mainstream classrooms (Cox, 2011; Shvidko, 2015; Zawacki & Cox, 2014). As Matsuda

et al. (2013) correctly noticed, “the infrastructure for producing trained multilingual writing teachers is still seriously lacking” (p. 82), thus, more attention needs to be paid to developing professional opportunities and mentoring teachers, as well as offering other types of support to instructors working with multilingual writers. (Shvidko, 2015) As noted by Ferris and Tagg (1996a, 1998), Lynch (1995), and Flowerdew (1995), it may be easier for EAP experts to train subject-matter instructors to adapt their communication styles than to train multilingual university students to understand and process information from professors who mumble, talk too fast, use inaccessible vocabulary, and do not provide visual aids for students. As the findings of Ferris et. al (2011) and other studies listed here demonstrates, there is a need for more substantial professional development and collaboration among writing instructors within the same program.

**“Supporting Multilingual Learners in Graduate Writing
Assessment Requirement (GWAR) courses”:
The Teacher Training Workshop**

Context

This teacher training workshop titled “Supporting Multilingual Learners in GWAR” is designed for instructors of writing-intensive GWAR Business 300 courses, who have multilingual learners in their classes at San Francisco State University (SFSU). GWAR (Graduate Writing Assessment Requirements) is an initiative at SFSU to incorporate principles from the Writing Across the Disciplines movement and create writing-intensive classes within each academic discipline or major. The specific

writing-intensive class for Business majors at SF State is GVAR BUS 300.

Undergraduates usually take GVAR courses in their third year of school. GVAR was created in part to replace a comprehensive writing exam JPET (Junior Placement English Test). In this workshop, I would offer GVAR BUS 300 instructors a targeted workshop on multilingual learner issues.

Rationale: Why teacher workshops in GVAR BUS 300?

Various authors have called for institution-wide interventions to better prepare their content area instructors to assist the growing number of multilingual writers in their classrooms (Ferris et al., 2011; Matsuda et al., 2013; Miller-Cochran, 2010; Schneider, 2018). Based on information from the SFSU WAC/WID website, GVAR BUS instructors at SFSU are offered some professional development in the form of workshops on incorporating the principles of WAC by L1 Composition experts in the SFSU English department, such as “Creating a Writing in the Disciplines Handout for Students”. However, these trainings do not necessarily focus on multilingual writers’ issues. Research indicates that WAC/WID instructors generally lack advanced formal training in TESOL (Cox, 2011; Ferris et al., 2011) and though, according to interviews, many GVAR BUS 300 instructors have some formal training in Composition, GVAR BUS 300 instructors may not know how to address the unique needs of multilingual writers (Ferris et al. 2011; Matsuda et al. 2013). Workshops led by multilingual experts can provide at least some support for content-area instructors and would supplement the WAC training given by L1 Composition experts at SFSU.

The basic framework for the teacher training workshops could be adapted for any discipline, but a biology instructor doesn't teach the same genres as a business instructor. In order to have a productive conversation about specific academic genres, it's important to focus on one particular discipline at a time. A majority of my ALI students report they intend to major in Business, based on student background info surveys that I conduct at the beginning of each semester in the ALI. SF State doesn't publicly report the number of undergraduate students who report themselves as multilingual. As far as I can tell, the University doesn't collect that information. However, the Office of International programs reports that of the roughly 1600 international students that are studying at SF state, more than half of them major in business. In addition, according to BUS 300 instructors (personal communication, n.d.), more than half of the students in their class are multilingual. As a useful focal point, this workshop framework is intended for GVAR Business 300 instructors at SFSU.

Why teacher workshops on written feedback?

Various L2 scholars (Ferris et al., 2011; Matsuda et al., 2013; Shvidko, 2015) indicate that responding to student writing is one of the key ways in which a teacher communicates academic expectations and instructors can provide explicit instruction that helps apprentice a student into their chosen discourse community (Ferris, 2003). When responding to student writing, studies showed that instructors tend to either over-focus on sentence level issues or overlook student errors, often asking students to seek help from tutors in the university writing center to "help with editing" (Ferris, 2011). Similar to the findings of Ferris et al. (2011), one Business instructor I interviewed stated

that her feedback strategies were not differentiated for multilingual writers (personal communication, n.d.). Encouraging discipline-instructors to critically examine feedback practices will likely help them also examine some of their underlying assumptions about multilingual writers. Though instructors may have established feedback practices, discipline instructors such as GVAR Business 300 instructors are unlikely to have any formal training in second language acquisition and how responding to multilingual student writing helps apprentice multilingual students into the discipline of Business, and helps with their academic language socialization.

Methods

In order to develop this curriculum for teacher training workshops, I analyzed my previous ALI students' beginning-of-the-semester information sheets (which asks for demographic data, such as education level, language background, and intended major) and determined that about 60% of my former EAP students declared that they intended to major in business. Because of this majority, I decided to narrow my focus to a specific academic discipline. I decided to craft this workshop for instructors of GVAR Business 300.

The next step in developing any curriculum is to conduct a needs analysis. Designing materials must begin by understanding the educational needs of the target student population (Richards, 2017). In order to gather information about the target population, a needs analysis was conducted. Information was gathered from SFSU WAC Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) Policy Statement in Second Language Writing and Writers

(CCCC, 2014). The schedule for Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 provided a list of the names of BUS 300 instructors. I followed suggestions of similar studies (Ferris et al., 2011; Matsuda et al., 2013; Shvidko, 2015): I drafted a list of interview questions (Appendix A) and interviewed two GVAR BUS 300 instructors about the specifics of their classes as well as their perceptions of their multilingual students' needs and amount of professional preparation to teach multilingual writers. One instructor provided their syllabus with goals and objectives of GVAR BUS 300, as well as handouts with detailed instructions for major assignments. The instructor noted that BUS 300 instructors have to teach most of the same documents and oral communication styles, but the standards and how the curriculum is implemented can vary greatly. I analyzed these materials, studied the curriculum, and analyzed the goals and objectives of BUS 300. These conversations and observations informed how I structured the workshop.

Data Analysis

The following is a summary of the data gathered from a consultation with two BUS 300 instructors. This summary provides recommendations for the design of materials and resources for the workshop. According to instructors, BUS 300 consists of a mix of native speakers, gen 1.5 and "true international students", who are identified as such because "they are Asian" (personal communication, n.d.). Though students should have acquired "basic writing skills" (such as "writing an essay, term paper, or report") one instructor perceived that many international and Gen 1.5 students haven't acquired the skills expected of a junior or senior level student. The goal of BUS 300 is to "go from long-winded academic writing" (personal communication, n.d.) to using high-quality

sources in short, concise, and highly informative writing (50-2000 words). Common writing assignments include short reports (50- 250 words in APA), cover letters, resumes, emails, and a proposal (150-200 words in APA). Both instructors' classes emphasized a lot of group work, because business professionals must work harmoniously with diverse groups of people. Notably, one Business instructor reported they perceive Asian international students reluctant to participate in whole class discussions because they are “shy” and “embarrassed of making a mistake” due to a “lack of knowledge”, which demonstrates a particular set of assumptions about Asian international students. When I consulted with GWAR Business instructors about how they identified their multilingual writers, one instructor replied that she has some “true international students” who are primarily from “Asia” while another instructor said they don’t distinguish because “the real world of work is not going to make exceptions for them, so I don’t either AND I let them know this.” (personal communication, n.d.). Though the instructors state that they think multilingual students have “strong”, “creative, useful ideas” and perceptive analysis, one instructor perceives the major challenge to encouraging multilingual student participation is that they need permission to express their own ideas and encouragement that acknowledges multilingual students’ efforts.

Situational Analysis

The proposed professional development workshop is designed for discipline-specific writing instructors of GWAR Business 300. According to the SF State Writing Across Curriculum/Writing in the Discipline website, WAC/WID “aims to provide

support to faculty teaching writing-intensive courses through creating opportunities for faculty to share best practices for effective writing pedagogy and strategies to assess student writing". WAC/WID on campus has the following goals:

- To improve students' writing proficiency throughout their education at SF State
- To promote principles of WAC/WID (<https://wac.colostate.edu/intro/pop3a.cfm>) at SF State
- To foster faculty engagement in teaching writing and support the development and dissemination of effective writing pedagogy across campus
- To promote the development and dissemination of effective practices and tools to assess student writing across campus
- To create a campus culture that values writing as a high impact practice in higher education.

(retrieved from: <https://ueap.sfsu.edu/wac/>)

The educational setting is San Francisco State University, which has a linguistically and culturally diverse student body. There are no available records of the total number of multilingual learners as SFSU does not publically measure those statistics. As noted in the literature review, not all multilingual students are international students, but the numbers of international students are openly reported by the Office of International programs, and can be used as a sample of the linguistic diversity of SFSU. The Office of International Programs Fall 2019 reports having a total of 1,686 international students on campus, 1,015 of whom are undergraduates. This is out of a total of 29,607 students, 25,839 of whom are undergraduates. SFSU suggests that international students make up about 5.7% of the student body. Of all major fields of study, Business (all concentrations) is the most popular major, with 533 students, or about 53% of undergraduate international students. Therefore, among the domestic students, there is likely to be a substantial number of multilingual learners in GWAR BUS 300 classes.

Challenges and Solutions

1. *Instructors may be resistant to being asked to attend professional development, especially if they have been teaching Business classes for a long time.*

According to GVAR BUS 300 instructors, WAC/WID was created about 8 years ago at SFSU. Some instructors may have been teaching Business for more than 10 years, and they may have had some training on multilingual learner issues or writing pedagogy. SFSU provides incentives to instructors to attend professional development through the Center for Equity and Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CEETL). For example, workshop-participants might receive \$250 in professional development funds or stipends, upon fulfillment of the workshop requirements. The university could offer additional financial incentives to encourage GVAR BUS 300 instructors to participate. In addition, the workshop would use research-based statistics about the instructors' population of multilingual students to demonstrate the efficacy of workshops for content area instructors in helping them address the specific needs of these students. Moreover, I would highlight the possibility for higher ratings on end-of-the semester student evaluation as a result of more accurately addressing the needs of multilingual students in their courses.

2. *Instructors are very busy. How would this workshop deal with time constraints?*

Instructors are often pressed for time by institutional constraints and do not have time for more robust training. Research on effective professional development (Birman et al., 2000) indicates that longer duration and frequency offer more opportunities for meaningful learning. Given these conflicting constraints, the workshop will be offered in

two different formats: 1) an intensive 4 hour in-service seminar or 2) as three 90-minute sessions, in order to fit into the timeframe of a lunchtime meeting, for example.

3. *Workshop-participants may lack an awareness of second language acquisition principles.*

Comprehensive knowledge of SLA would allow GWAR BUS instructors to have a more meaningful understanding of their multilingual students' difficulties. However, such a topic is too broad in scope to be covered in this particular workshop. I would provide a curated reading list for further reading (e.g., Schneider, 2018).

4. *Given that half of the BUS 300 sections are taught by instructors with a background in Composition Studies (some exposure to TESOL principles; definite exposure in offering individuated feedback), how might their professional expertise be leveraged in your workshops and perhaps deepened?*

This training would take a collaborative rather top down approach. The facilitator of the workshop is intended to be an L2 expert who might not be a business content-area expert. Thus, the facilitator would be socialized into the discipline of business by the instructors. Moreover, BUS 300 Instructors would likely have established feedback practices. An instructor would need to explicitly explain the assumptions of the business community - but in order to do that, they have to be aware of exactly what those assumptions are and explain them. Bazerman (1988) argues that the knowledge of the aims and assumptions of a community of practice is crucial for selecting situational appropriate rhetorical forms. By having instructors consciously reflect and articulate the literacy practices they are teaching (genre and social practice, and how they are responding to student writing and articulating those philosophies to a colleague, they would raise their awareness of whether their feedback practices are explicit.

Workshop Goals & Objectives

Rationale:

Defining the goals and objectives of the course under development is an indispensable part of the planning process. Graves (1996) uses the metaphor of a roadmap, with goals representing the destinations and objectives the specific steps required to reach those destinations. To be more precise, Graves defines goals as general statements of the overall, long-term purposes of the course and objectives as the specific ways in which the goals will be achieved (1996). Goals and objectives provide a framework to help determine the specific content and types of activities to be included in the course. Objectives can also provide the framework for evaluating workshop participant performance at the assessment stage (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010).

The workshop is flexibly designed as a single-day, 4 hour course or a 3-session workshop series. This workshop could be scheduled as a one-day intensive course or shorter meetings distributed throughout the semester. This would allow for flexibility with scheduling. The workshop would be intended for instructors who lack substantive formal training in multilingual writing. The participants could be recommended by their department to attend this workshop, or they could elect to participate, based on personal interest in multilingual writers. This workshop would give the workshop-participants opportunities to analyze multilingual writer issues.

Workshop Purpose:

The goal of this workshop is to provide GVAR BUS 300 instructors with the frameworks scaffolding their students' acquisition of discipline-specific academic discourse, particularly through teacher written response.

Workshop objectives:

- To assist GVAR BUS 300 to mentor multilingual students into their content disciplines
- To increase instructors' awareness of the differences between instructing multilingual/L2 writers and L1 writers
- To raise instructors' awareness of their status as a member of the discourse community of Business, and their role in facilitating students joining that discourse community, e.g. through their response to their multilingual writers
- To provide strategies that instructors could use to scaffold multilingual writer comprehension (e.g. assignment design; avoiding colloquialisms in lectures; slow down when lecturing and have more "wait time")
- To provide best practices for responding to student writing that will facilitate academic discourse socialization
- To encourage participants to build relationships with colleagues in order to continue the conversation about teaching multilingual students in GVAR.
- Help GVAR teachers of multilingual writers both develop and refine their responding practices so they are optimally helpful for student writers

Scope and Sequence

As mentioned previously, this course is offered in two different formats, either as a one-day intensive or as a shorter series of three sessions, with each meeting mapped out into approximately 90 minute sessions. This would allow flexibility with scheduling the workshop to match participants' availability. While extended and ongoing training is ideal, that may not be realistic for some contexts. In both models, participants will be encouraged to reflect on their practice, consider how to change and adapt ideas to their

own teaching context. In this training, participants will engage in a process of shared inquiry with each other and the facilitator. My intent is for them to reflect on their own practice and identify goals that are workable for them within their own teaching context. I hope that, with support, teachers would continue to discuss these issues with their colleagues after the workshop ends.

Outline of Topics

Here is a brief thematic overview of the 3-sessions. These are titles of the topics to be covered. This might be printed on a handout describing the workshop:

Session 1 - 100 mins	Session 2 - 75 mins	Session 3 - 80 mins
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who are Multilingual Learners? • General Principles of Written Response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Getting down to Business: Adapting for GVAR BUS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principles into Practice

The single day version and multi-day, 3 session versions of the workshop follow the same plan. The single day workshop allows for breaks. Below is a detailed procedure intended for the facilitator of the workshop. It is presented in the single day version format.

Detailed Workshop Procedure

(adapted from Ferris, 2003)

Before sessions: Participants bring a copy of their course syllabus with grading criteria and 2-3 samples of student writing from their class without commentary. The facilitators of the workshop could also provide ungraded samples of student writing, because teachers may not be willing or able to acquire samples of specifically multilingual writing.

Time	Procedure
10 min	<p>Session 1 - 100 mins Multilingual Learners and Principles of Written Response</p> <p>1. Warm-up/ice-breakers. Think-pair-share: Why did you come to this workshop? What do you hope to get out of this workshop? What are your most pressing questions/concerns about teaching L2 writers? Teachers write questions on sticky-notes, stick to the whiteboard. Then participants read other cards and write their initials next to two most pressing questions. Questions that receive the most votes will be prioritized in the workshop.</p>
30 min	<p>2. Discussion: What does “membership” mean to you? Brief Presentation of Research : Community of practice and language socialization What are the characteristics of a community of practice? How are communities of practice related to identity? What social communities are you a part of? Academic communities? What are the characteristics of a Business community of practice? What are some specialized lexis or terms associated with Business? *Key take-away: Instructors in discipline-specific genres are responsible for apprenticing their novices into their community of practice. One way of doing this is through feedback on written assignments.</p>
10 min	<p>3. <i>Ask trainees to reflect on feedback they have received about their own writing.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From your own experiences as a student writer learning business writing, what specific memories do you have of teacher responses to your texts? ○ What types of feedback have you as a writer found most helpful? Most problematic? (adapted from Ferris and Hedgcock, 2014)
10 min	<p>4. Discuss in groups of 3: Why do students take your class? What goals do they have? Do you have (m)any ESL/multilingual students in your classes? How do you distinguish them? Do you think that their needs as writers differ from those of the monolingual (native English speakers) students? If so, how? Have you had an assignment which was successful with a monolingual “native” student, which wasn’t as successful for multilingual students? Do you adapt your response strategies in any way with those students, and if so, how? (adapted from Ferris et al., 2011)</p>

<p>10 min</p>	<p>5. Debrief - Elicit answers from small groups and write on the board. Lead the participants to these key take-aways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The average college classroom is not monolingual ○ Not every assignment design will be appropriate for multilingual students ○ Multilingual students need different approaches and language support
<p>10 min</p>	<p>6. Task: Hand out student writing sample (Appendix E). Direct participants to spend about 10 minutes responding to the student writing.</p>
<p>20 min</p>	<p>7. Participants discuss why they decided to comment on certain features and ignore others. Participants try to explain their feedback and philosophies and strategies.</p>
<p>10 min</p>	<p>Break</p>
<p>20 min</p>	<p>Session 2 - 75 mins Getting down to Business: Adapting for GVAR BUS</p> <p>2. Lead participants in a discussion of how their feedback would lead to students learning the specific Business genre they are trying to teach.</p>
<p>20 min</p>	<p>3. Provide participants with the Response Guiding Principles (see Appendix B). How does it differ from their philosophies of response? What would they need to prioritize in order for students to explicitly understand the course and assignment goals?</p>
<p>45 min</p>	<p>4. Participants examine the Sample Essay Feedback Checklist (Appendix D). Individually, participants adapt this form to suit a particular writing assignment that is common in their class. In small groups, participants share their insights. Share examples with the whole class: What are ways we can make our feedback more clear to students?</p>
<p>10 min</p>	<p>Break</p>
	<p>Session 3 - 80 min Principles into Practice</p>

20 min	5. Participants examine the writing sample with teacher feedback (see Appendix E). Acknowledge that the writing sample is drawn from Composition, and there may be limitations to its direct applicability to certain Business writing genres. What components of the feedback are effective, according to the guiding principles? What comments would be comprehensible for their L2 learners?
30 min	6. Participants work in small groups and give feedback on the student writing samples they brought into the class using their adapted Sample Essay Feedback checklist (see Appendix D).
20 min	7. Ask participants to reflect in a free-write: As you responded to student papers, what did you focus on? What principles guided you? What do you think you still need to learn/practice to respond effectively to student writing? Participants share insights as a whole class.
10 min	8. Closing - participants fill out a Personal Action Plan (see Appendix F) which describes the steps or changes they will make to their response practices for L2 writers.

Conclusions and Reflections

I originally began this project with a personal question: How well am I preparing my EAP students by giving them the language and literacy skills necessary to join their chosen academic community of practice? However, as I dove into research on this topic, I began to see that EAP instructors such as myself cannot bear sole responsibility for L2 students language and literacy development, since joining an discourse community is a long-term, on-going process, and acquiring the language necessary to function in that community can only meaningfully happen within the discipline-specific context. I realized I was not just exploring a narrowly defined question. Broader questions arose: What kind of language development support do ESL students receive in a mainstream content-area course? What about multilingual, non-international students, like “Gen 1.5” and resident ESL students, who don’t go through EAP programs and are often considered less academically prepared? If writing is emphasized in all disciplines, to what extent have WAC/WID programs attended to L2 writers’ issues? How well-prepared are faculty across-the-disciplines to teach the multitudes of L2 writers in their classes?

As a novice member of my chosen community of practice of L2 writing experts, I still struggle to answer these questions. In the process of doing this project, I realized there are limitations to certain parts of the research design. First, I recognize that a more in-depth needs analysis is necessary to gain a more comprehensive understanding of all possible stakeholders. Similar to previous research of multilingual students’ perceptions of their academic discourse socialization difficulties (Wette &

Furneaux, 2018), I would formally survey my previous EAP students to highlight their specific challenges in acquiring the academic discourse of their major discipline. I would survey undergraduates in the Business school to find out how many multilingual writers are there in the business school, as well as what writing components of the BUS 300 program they find challenging. I would conduct a more formal survey of the BUS 300 instructors to find out more about what instructors know or don't about their multilingual students, as well as what they might want or need from this workshop. In addition to interviewing the teachers, I would also consult with the GVAR director and perhaps the dean of the business school to find out more about the GVAR writing classes and how they fit within the BUS curriculum. I would interview them about the curriculum and what the teachers say about the strengths and limitations of GVAR BUS 300. Specifically, I would ask them about business teachers' feedback practices as well as if feedback is something that business instructors have gotten previous training or assistance with. Additionally, I would contact the administrators of the SFSU's WAC/WID program. I would inquire about the scope and type of training provided in SFSU's WAC workshops, and if any of that training was targeted at multilingual learner's needs. I would attend a workshop and make note of the kinds of questions asked by attendees. I would summarize this information to provide recommendations for design of the workshop scope, sequence, and materials. I also acknowledge that my workshop materials are based on examples from Composition, which might not be directly applicable to Business genres. It would be more effective if writing sample materials were drawn from

Business-specific genres, though I hope that workshop participants would be able to meaningfully adapt the materials to their specific context.

Furthermore, information collected for the needs analysis indicates that additional workshop topics would be beneficial. Both BUS 300 instructors in my survey identified that they perceived group work to be a challenge for Asian international students. The instructor who perceives Asian as "shy" and embarrassed of making a mistake asked for strategies that encourage participation in group discussions. Another workshop could introduce BUS 300 instructors to the pragmatics of group work, and give them some strategies for facilitating group work more effectively.

Though further work is necessary to improve the teacher training workshop materials before implementation, I think my project underlines the exigence for increased L2 writing expertise across the disciplines. We need to encourage more interdisciplinary research between L2 writing and WAC/WID scholars, offer more training workshops for WAC/WID teachers, create opportunities for ESOL professionals to collaborate with WAC/WID colleagues, and discuss L2 writer issues in contexts other than an ESL/EFL classroom in our MA TESOL classes. Through these means, we can begin to answer some of the questions regarding how discipline-specific faculty can support (and be supported to teach) their multilingual writers.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by MM Bakhtin*. 1981. Speech Genre and other late essays.
- Bazerman, C., Little, J., & Bethel, L. (2005). *Reference guide to writing across the curriculum* (pp. 14–25). Parlor Press LLC.
- Birman, B., Desimone, L., Porter, A. C., & Garet, M. (2000). Designing professional development that works. *Educational Leadership*, 57(8), 28–33.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Information (International Social Science Council)*, 16(6), 645-668. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569910365892>
- Brown, D. & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. US: Pearson Education Inc.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). *Critical academic writing and multilingual students*. University of Michigan Press.
- Cheng, L., Myles, J., & Curtis, A. (2004). Targeting language support for non-native English-speaking graduate students at a Canadian university. *TESL Canada Journal*, 50–71.
- Chiseri-Strater, E. (1991). *Academic literacies: The public and private discourse of university students*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton.
- Cox, M. (2011). *WAC: Closing Doors or Opening Doors for Second Language Writers?*[1]. 20.
- Duff, P. A. (2007). *Problematizing academic discourse socialisation*. 18.
- Duff, P. A. (2010). Language Socialization into Academic Discourse Communities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 169–192. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190510000048>
- Ferris, D., Brown, J., Liu, H. S., & Stine, M. E. A. (2011). Responding to L2 Students in College Writing Classes: Teacher Perspectives. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(2), 207–234. <https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2011.247706>
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2013). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Routledge.
- Ferris, D., & Tagg, T. (1996). Academic Oral Communication Needs of EAP Learners: What Subject-Matter Instructors Actually Require. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(1), 31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587606>
- Ferris, D., & Thaiss, C. (2011). *Writing at UC Davis: Addressing the Needs of Second Language Writers*. 25.
- Friedrich, P. (2006). Assessing the needs of linguistically diverse first-year students- Bringing together and telling apart international ESL, resident ESL and monolingual basic writers. *WPA - Writing Program Administration*, 30(1–2), 15–36.
- Graves, K. (1996). *Teachers as course developers*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary Discourses, Michigan Classics Ed.: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Janopoulos, M. (1992). University faculty tolerance of NS and NNS writing errors: A comparison. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(2), 109–121.
- Katz, I. R., Haras, C., & Blaszczyński, C. (2010). Does Business Writing Require Information Literacy? *Business Communication Quarterly*, 73(2), 135–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569910365892>
- Kim, J., & Duff, P. A. (2012). The language socialization and identity negotiations of Generation 1.5 Korean-Canadian university students. *TESL Canada Journal*, 29, 81.
- Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in ESL students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(3), 337-369. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587624>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press.
- Leki, I. (1995). Coping Strategies of ESL Students in Writing Tasks across the Curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(2), 235–260. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587624>
- Leki, Ilona. (2001). "A Narrow Thinking System": Nonnative-English-Speaking Students in Group Projects Across the Curriculum.. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 39-67.
- Leki, I. (2017). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy*

- development*. Routledge.
- Leki, I., & Carson, J. G. (1994). Students' Perceptions of EAP Writing Instruction and Writing Needs across the Disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 81. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587199>
- Matsuda, P. K. (2006). The Myth of Linguistic Homogeneity in U.S. College Composition. *College English*, 68(6), 637. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25472180>
- Matsuda, P. K., & Jablonski, J. (1998). *Beyond the L2 Metaphor: Towards a Mutually Transformative Model of ESL/WAC Collaboration*. 17.
- Matsuda, P. K., Saenkhum, T., & Accardi, S. (2013). Writing teachers' perceptions of the presence and needs of second language writers: An institutional case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(1), 68–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.10.001>
- Miller-Cochran, S. K. (2010). 14. *Language Diversity and the Responsibility of the WPA*. 9.
- Morita, N. (2004). Negotiating participation and identity in second language academic communities. *Tesol Quarterly*, 38(4), 573-603.
- Morita, N., & Kobayashi, M. (2008). Academic discourse socialization in a second language. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 2805-2817). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Editorial Dunken.
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language teaching*, 44(4), 412-446.
- Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (2008). Language socialization: An historical overview. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 2580-2594). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2008). English May Be My Second Language, but I'm Not "ESL." *College Composition and Communication*, 59(3), 389–419. JSTOR.
- Prior, P. (1998). Writing/disciplinarity. *A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy. Mahwah*.
- Roberge, M., Wald, M., & Losey, K. (2015). *Teaching US-educated multilingual writers: Pedagogical practices from and for the classroom*. University of Michigan Press.
- Ruiz de Velasco, J., & Fix, M. (2000). *Overlooked & Underserved: Immigrant Students in US Secondary Schools*.
- Russell, D. R. (1991). *Writing in the Academic Disciplines, 1870-1990: A Curricular History*. 35.
- Schieffelin, B. B., & Ochs, E. (Eds.). (1986). *Language socialization across cultures* (No. 3). Cambridge University Press.
- Schneider, J. (2018). Learning How to Support Multilingual Writers. *Pedagogy*, 18(2), 345–374. <https://doi.org/10.1215/15314200-4359245>
- Shvidko, E. (2015). Assessing preparation of mainstream composition teachers working with multilingual writers. *INTESOL Journal*, 12(2), 31.
- Silva, T. J., & Matsuda, P. K. (Eds.). (2001). *On second language writing*. L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly*, 22(1), 29–51.
- Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study. *Written Communication*, 14(1), 3–62.
- University of California. 2017. *Annual Accountability Report, 2017*, Institutional Research Unit, Office of the President, accountability.universityofcalifornia.edu/2017/documents/pdfs/2017Acct_Rpt_web.pdf.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the development of children*, 23(3), 34-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.09.001>
- Wette, R., & Furneaux, C. (2018). The academic discourse socialisation challenges and coping strategies of international graduate students entering English-medium universities. *System*, 78, 186–200. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.09.001>
- Yim, Y. K. K. (2011). Second language students' discourse socialization in academic online communities. *Canadian modern language review*, 67(1), 1-27.
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in Academia: The Experiences of Faculty and ESL Students across the Curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46(4), 506. <https://doi.org/10.2307/358325>
- Zamel, V. (2004). Strangers in Academia. In *Crossing the Curriculum: Multilingual Learners in College*

- Classrooms* (pp. 3–17).
- Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (2004). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESOL students across the curriculum. In *Crossing the Curriculum* (pp. 17–32). Routledge.
- Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (2006). Teaching Multilingual Learners Across the Curriculum: Beyond the ESOL Classroom and Back Again. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 25(2), 126–152. JSTOR.
- Zamel, V., & Spack, R. (2012). *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures*. Routledge.
- Zawacki, T. M., & Cox, M. (2014). *WAC and Second Language Writers: Research Towards Linguistically and Culturally Inclusive Programs and Practices*. 493.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

(adapted from Ferris et al., 2011)

To GVAR Business Instructor

1. What are the goals for a GVAR class and, specifically, BUS 300? What knowledge and skills do you expect students to have acquired before they take your class?
2. What kind of in-class activities and assignments are common in your class?
3. How important are small-group and whole group discussions in Business classes? What does class participation look like in Business? Do students participate equally? How do you facilitate in-class discussion?
4. Do you give any explicit instruction around business writing genres? What kind of difficulties do students in Business GVAR classes have with acquiring and using academic language?
5. Please briefly describe your background experience teaching writing. Do you have any specific experience or training in working with ESL/multilingual student writers?
6. What are some of your guiding principles for responding to student writing? What have been your most successful or effective response strategies? (Note: “response” is not limited to written teacher feedback - it can also cover conferences, peer feedback, etc.)
7. Do you have (m)any ESL/multilingual students in your classes? How do you distinguish them? Do you think that their needs as writers differ from those of the monolingual (native English speaking) students? If so, how? Do you adapt your response strategies in any way for those students, and if so, how?
8. What other questions or concerns do you have about teaching ESL/multilingual students in your class?

Appendix B

Guiding Principles of Response (adapted from Ferris, 2003)

- Decide at which point(s) of the drafting process you will intervene.
- Do not feel that you must address every issue and problem you see in a student paper. Be selective and prioritize.
- Get to know the students' abilities as writers as quickly as possible so that you can construct feedback appropriate to their individual needs (e.g., obtain a diagnostic writing sample during the first week of class and analyze in detail for rhetorical and grammatical problems).
- Instructors need to see the process of reading the paper, identifying and selecting key feedback points, and constructing comments in ways that communicate clearly and helpfully to the student as a dynamic, creative, cognitively demanding process. Put student paper due dates on your calendar and carve out time in your schedule for responding.
- Tailor written responses to the needs of individual students and their texts. Do not attempt to give the same amount and type of feedback to every student, and do not adhere to rigid prescriptions (e.g. "content feedback only on the first draft"; "use questions rather than statements").
- Give personalized feedback that includes encouragement: Consider using the student's name, signing your own, making comments of praise in the margins and in the endnotes, and referring to previous drafts or assignments to show the student that you are aware of his or her progress. Show interest in the student's ideas, writing progress, and in the student themselves.
- If you have to choose between clarity and brevity or efficiency, choose clarity. Feedback that the student does not understand cannot help him or her to improve.
- Strike a careful balance between giving clear, helpful, specific feedback and appropriating the student's text.

Appendix C

Suggestions for writing clear and helpful comments (adapted from Ferris, 2003)

1. Read the paper through once without making any marks or other comments on it.
2. Write an endnote (either at the end of the paper itself or on a separate feedback form if you are using one) that provides specific examples of the general points you have raised in the endnote.
3. Add marginal comments, if desired, that provide specific examples of the general points you have raised in the endnote.
4. Check both your endnotes and your marginal notes for instances of rhetorical or grammatical jargon or formal terminology (e.g. subject-verb agreement) that may be unfamiliar to the student.
5. If you write comments in the form of questions, check them carefully to make sure that the intent of the question is clear, that the answer to the question, if provided, would actually improve the quality of the paper, and that the student will know how to incorporate the ideas suggested by the questions into their existing text.
6. Whenever feasible, pair questions and other comments with explicit suggestions for revision.
7. Use words or phrases whenever possible instead of codes or symbols.
8. Design or adapt a standard feedback form (like the one shown in Appendix D) that is appropriate to the goals and grading criteria for your course.
9. Do not overwhelm the student writer with an excessive amount of commentary.
10. Be sure your feedback is written legibly, if writing by hand.

Appendix D

Sample Essay Feedback checklist (adapted from Ferris, 2003)

1. Response to Prompt/Assignment

- The paper responds clearly and completely to the specific instructions in the prompt or assignment
- The paper stays clearly focused on the topic throughout

2. Content (Ideas)

- The paper has a clear main idea
- The main idea is well supported with several major points or arguments.
- The supporting points are developed with ideas from the readings, facts or other examples from the writers' own experiences or observations
- The argument or examples are clear and logical
- Opposing viewpoints have been considered and responded to clearly and effectively

3. Use of readings

- The writer has incorporated other texts into their paper
- The ideas in the readings have been reported accurately
- The writer has used summary, paraphrase, and quotations from the readings to strengthen their paper
- The writer has mastered the mechanics of incorporating ideas from other texts, including accurate use of quotation marks and other punctuation, accurate verb tenses, appropriate identification of the author and title, and effective integration of quotations into the writer's own text

4. Organization

- There is a clear beginning (introduction), middle (body), and end (conclusion) to the paper
- The beginning introduces the topic and clearly expresses the main idea
- The body paragraphs include topic sentences that are directly tied to the main idea
- Each body paragraph is well organized and includes a topic sentence, supporting details, and a summary of the ideas.
- Coherence devices (transitions, repetition, pronoun reference, etc.) are used effectively within and between paragraphs
- The conclusion ties the ideas in the body back to the main idea and summarizes why the issue is interesting and important

5. Language and Mechanics

- The paper is proofread and doesn't have serious and frequent errors in grammar, spelling, typing or punctuation
- The paper meets expectations regarding formatting conventions

Additional Comments:

Appendix E

Sample Student Paper with Teacher commentary
(adapted from Hedgcock and Ferris, 2014)

Note: The paper below was written for a university L2 writing course entitled “Writing for Proficiency” (see Ferris, 2001b). The prompt is reproduced in the box below. The essays were written in 50 minutes in class during the first week of the semester. Students had been given the reading and some prewriting questions to consider in advance. They were asked to revise their in-class drafts after receiving teacher feedback.

Please read the attached article by Terry Lee Goodrich entitled “Lies are so commonplace, they almost seem like the truth.” Then write a clear, well organized essay that responds to the following question:

Is lying always wrong? Why or why not?

Be sure to consider both sides of the issue as you explain your opinion. References to the article--facts, quotations, summary, etc.- are required.

Source: Ferris, Kennedy, & Senna 2003 Research Corpus, Essays 1-4.

Lying is not always wrong, if it is used for good intentions. Lying can be very manipulative, yet that particular quality, Goodrich mentioned, (‘is also exciting. Instead of using it for evil, lying can be a vital source for good, whether it from sparing a child feelings or doing it just to get something out of it. There are numerous explanations why people would create white lies. One reason why people lie is to surprise or distract a love one. Another reason why people do it is to create a diversion, in order to escape the difficulties that may take place by telling the truth.

There is no greater rush than getting away with a good, harmless lie. For example, on one occasion, I have used lies for good intention. My close friend birthday was coming up. My friends and I were planning a surprise birthday. We did not want the birthday girl to know of this, so we manipulated her into thinking that we did not remember her birthday. Making up stories that we were busy on that day, to convince her so. Seeing the hurt in her eyes further greaten our smile. Like Goodrich said, "even though people lie for good reason, lying can be harmful." My friends and I knew that by lying to her, the surprise party would be a total success.

Yes, our way of springing the party on her was wrong, but when the surprise was successful, seeing the joy on her face gave everyone involve a great rush, and that is exciting.

When Goodrich said that, "everyone lie" it could very well be the truth. People lie constantly to avoid difficult situation by telling the truth. For instant, I was at my friends' house for dinner. His mother was cooking her best dish that took hours to make. During the course of the meal she asked me how was it. The truth is that I didn't like it, maybe is because I hate shrimp, but to avoid being an unwanted guess, I bit my lips and told her that the meal was excellent. Besides my stomach hurting from the shrimp, no feelings got hurt.

To conclude, small, harmless lies can be exciting and fun. Not knowing if you will get caught in a lie, or knowing that you just got away with a lie is a great thrill. The truth is, some lies can be damaging when it is discovered, but if done properly, lies can be very beneficial. No one really likes to lie, but not everyone is aware that they are lying. Lying is not always wrong.

Lucy,

You did a nice job of taking a clear stand on the essay question by saying that "lying is not always wrong." Your two examples—the surprise party and the shrimp dish—were both effective in illustrating times when a lie may be harmless and even beneficial.

There are a couple of issues you need to think about as you write your next draft:

(1) You should also discuss times when lying is harmful. You hint at this a couple of times in your introduction and conclusion by saying that lying can be "manipulative" and "damaging," but the rest of your essay presents a very positive view of lying. I'd suggest adding a paragraph or two that defines the types of lies that are harmful and provides an example or two and perhaps ideas from Goodrich's article.

(2) The story about your friend's birthday is a bit confusing. You are honest about the fact that your lying caused her pain, and you even describe it as "wrong," yet you present it as an example of when lying can be

beneficial. See if you can make this clearer by explaining either (a) what you might have done differently or better; or (b) why you think the positive aspects of the surprise "erased" the hurt she felt when she thought you had forgotten her birthday.

- (3) *You need to use Goodrich's article more in your essay. Be sure to introduce it clearly at the beginning—author's full name, article title, and a brief summary of the main idea(s)—and see if you can use facts, examples, or specific quotations to support your own arguments and examples throughout the paper.*

You are off to a great start with clear organization and nice examples. I will look forward to reading your next draft! Be sure to email me, talk to me in class, or come by my office if you need any help as you revise! Good luck!

— Teacher

Appendix F: Personal Action Plan Handout

Think back over the workshop. What ideas do you want to remember?

--

Now, make a personal action plan with goals for your own teaching. (These may be strategies you want to try OR new ways of thinking). After you list your goal, think about *when* you could accomplish this goal.

MY TEACHING GOALS	I WILL DO THIS BY:

Colleagues:

In 3-4 weeks, I will contact these colleagues to share my own successes/challenges in achieving my goals and to ask about theirs.

Name	Email