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ABSTRACT

This study argues for sociolinguistics to be foundational to an adequate theory of rhetoric, and the need for composition teachers to view academic written English as a second language. By viewing academic written English as a second language, it is easier to see (1) how native students' struggles to learn genre or rhetorical conventions are similar to second-language acquisition problems, and (2) why there is a need for the development of multidisciplinary curricula and research using both pedagogical and research strategies from the rhetoric/composition and second-language acquisition fields. The goal of this study is to examine under what conditions analytical skills can be developed in students that they can later transfer from one genre or discipline to another.

Chapter 1 gives a background and overview of the study. Chapter 2 describes how and why sociolinguistics should be a basis for rhetoric and composition; introduces the connection between sociolinguistics and academic English as a form of discourse; and describes the benefits of a multidisciplinary base for composition research and pedagogy.

Chapter 3 further examines how the theory that academic English should be seen as a second language offers great insight from the ESL field as to the cause of (and potential solutions to) student writing errors. Chapter 4 describes a multidisciplinary curriculum created based on English for Specific Purposes (ESP) needs analysis methodology. The model for teaching composition that is offered teaches students how to deconstruct popular culture and academic genres using genre, rhetorical, and discourse analysis, and ethnographic techniques; extends the use of contrastive rhetoric from a means of looking at cultural differences to a method of exploring differences in disciplinary discourse; and teaches composition teachers how to use popular culture texts as analytical tools. The result is a new type of composition curriculum designed to
develop analytical skills in students that will enable them to discover the rhetorical
class and conventions of academic disciplines, master academic discourse, and expand
their repertoire of options and strategies for communicating in writing.

Chapter 5 describes how this curriculum was evaluated using an educational
ethnographic approach. Chapters 6, 7, and 8 describe the four case studies. And Chapter 9
reviews the findings from evaluations of the case studies, and offers suggestions for future
research utilizing this approach to teaching composition.
CHAPTER 1:  
ACADEMIC ENGLISH IS NO ONE'S FIRST LANGUAGE:  
A MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO TEACHING WRITING

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The claim that written academic English is a second language to native and nonnative speakers of English alike has been made from such writing and second-language teachers and researchers as Allen (1970) and more currently from Horning (1987), Bizzell (1992), and Leki (1992). This theory appeals to me for the following reasons: (1) my work with ESL and minority students (in the University of Arizona (UA) educational programs with Cholla High School and the Academic Preparation for Excellence (APEX) Summer Academic Workshops), who are caught between the English and Spanish languages as well as between academic and nonacademic languages; (2) my work with native college composition 101, 102, and business writing students, who struggle to grasp the language of the respective genres of the English classroom; and (3) my own resistance to identifying with the graduate student/academic voice that clashes so strongly with the voice I use in my free-lance writing (also called "Professional Writing") for popular magazines and newspapers.

And yet, in order to be a successful graduate student and member of the academic discourse community, I have had to be able to write a variety of texts from seminar papers to journal articles, in effect to code-switch between the language varieties of the two communities. This has not always been an easy process. My work on this dissertation alone has reminded me of the difficulties students can face as they traverse disciplinary boundaries. Here, I found myself at times struggling to accommodate a dissertation committee made up of three distinct audiences, with each reader anticipating his or her own conventional and stylistic preferences from the fields of classical rhetoric, linguistics,
and rhetoric with a specialty in ethnography (which comes from anthropology). Practicing what I teach my students, not only did I have to engage in a kind of meta-awareness of the rhetorical and stylistic differences (e.g., APA versus MLA, contractions versus no contractions, decimals versus Roman numerals) between several academic discourse communities, but also be mindful of the differences between academic discourse and non-academic discourse, being careful not to unconsciously incorporate inappropriate conventions (like colloquial words) into this academic text.

1.1.1 The Connection Between Fre-lance Writing and Academic Writing

In order to be a successful freelance writer, one has to learn how to write for a variety of audiences. For example, there is entertainment writing. This might include celebrity interviews, health and fitness features, travel or concert and record reviews. Corporate writing might include employee handbooks, employee performance evaluation guides, business plans, direct mail campaigns, newsletters, or press releases and kits. And financial writing can include investment reports, grant writing, market trends analysis, or financial and small business newsletters.

A freelance writer needs to know how to write so many types of texts for financial survival. Economic reality requires a successful fre-lancer to know how to write for a variety of genres. She needs to know how to pick a magazine or any other publication, analyze it by looking at the types of articles the editors publish, and how the articles that are published are structured and written. She needs to be able to change one article to fit many different types of publications; after all, it is much easier to rewrite one piece for three different magazines than to write three different, new pieces.

As I progressed through my doctoral program in Rhetoric, Composition and the Teaching of English (RCTE), with a minor in English as a Second Language (ESL), I
realized that the analytical skills that I had developed as a free-lancer could be described in academic discourse as "skills that allow the writer to analyze the formats and decipher the languages of particular genres created by particular discourse communities." What I realized was that I had been engaging in genre analysis by analyzing different types of magazines and corporate documents; rhetorical analysis by analyzing how different types of articles and reports were written for their specific audiences; and even discourse analysis by analyzing sentence level strategies in texts, especially in business and corporate instructional documentation. (I also engaged in a type of discourse analysis when teaching ESL in a workplace setting). I believe skills like these which have developed outside the academy can and need to be taught in the academy.

1.1.2 Creating Specialized Curricula

It is not a surprise then that my own goals as a writing teacher reflect my earlier professional background. Because of my work as a free-lance writer, I am attracted to the idea of designing specialized writing curricula and assignments to teach students how to analyze the connection between culture and rhetorical strategies and develop the skills necessary to quickly analyze texts and decipher the languages of particular genres created by particular discourse communities. These goals appear in my dissertation research project where I examine how a multidisciplinary approach to the teaching of writing in composition courses can develop analytical skills and communicative competence in students, skills that can be carried over to courses in other disciplines.

Using rhetoric/composition and second-language acquisition pedagogical techniques, and evaluated by interdisciplinary research methodologies, I created an interdisciplinary English 207 Sophomore Composition curriculum based on English for Specific Purposes (ESP) needs analysis methodology, combined with genre analysis and
discourse analysis, and the use of contrastive rhetoric and popular culture texts as analytical tools. Additionally, I used analytical methods drawn from educational ethnography.

Swales (1990b) has also put these multidisciplinary approaches together. In fact, after writing all but two chapters of this dissertation I discovered his book on genre analysis where, like my work, he describes trying to develop communicative competence in students through a genre-based approach to teaching academic writing by bringing "together ... the EAP [English for Academic Purposes] and WAC [Writing Across the Curriculum] practitioners, and [trying] to relate their activities to broader developments in such fields as composition, ESL and applied linguistics" (pp. 232-33).

Yet, while we share the same goals and discuss many of the same methods (discourse and genre analysis, and Swales briefly mentions contrastive rhetoric) for developing this competence, I have taken this research and applied it in greater detail to praxis using the lens of academic English as a second language while adding popular culture and contrastive rhetoric texts as means to develop analytical abilities. I also offer a curriculum that builds on the importance of the social situation of academic genres and disciplines by incorporating a section that explores the impact of culture on writing. In addition, I also focus on developing students' analytical skills to facilitate their development of communicative competence. Unlike Swales (or Bazerman or Miller) here I offer explicit details on curriculum design through ESP methodologies and classroom activities created to help students understand genres and rhetorical conventions of academic disciplines.

The purpose of this dissertation is to contribute to multidisciplinary composition research by offering a formative evaluation of the approach used in the multidisciplinary classroom, and by helping to fill in the void in empirical educational research through an
examination of conditions under which the analytical skills can be developed in students and later transferred from one genre or discipline to another. As Swales (1990b) claims in the epilogue to his book, and [as I would expand to include analytical skills], "[t]he conditions under which these gains can optimally be transferred to other contexts thus emerges [sic] . . . as a highly significant investigative issue" (p. 234).
1.2 OUTLINE OF THE DISSERTATION

I believe this dissertation will be a contribution to the composition field because arguing for a connection between the fields of rhetoric and composition and second-language acquisition, it examines the effects of interdisciplinary-based pedagogy in the composition classroom. I do this by beginning with Chapter 2: "Rhetorics Are Developed And Defined By The Cultures In Which They Are Created," where I describe how and why sociolinguistics should be a basis for rhetoric and composition and introduce the connection between sociolinguistics and academic English as a form of discourse. I also describe the benefits of a multidisciplinary base for composition research and pedagogy especially in viewing writing as a result of communication arising from social interactions that can be analyzed through rhetorical, discourse, and genre analysis.

In Chapter 3: "Cultures Create Their Own Languages, Genres And Rhetorics," I further examine written academic English as discourse and the connection between this form of discourse and why academic English should be seen as a second language. Only sporadically has this concept been examined, and yet as I describe in the next section, this approach offers great insight from the ESL field as to the cause of (and potential solutions to) student writing errors and struggles to learn academic English. Then, looking at academic discourse as language created in a discourse community, I describe a model for teaching composition that involves deconstructing genres using rhetorical analysis from composition studies, discourse analysis from applied linguistics, genre analysis and ethnographic techniques from the latter two fields; extends the use of contrastive rhetoric from a means of looking at cultural differences to a method of exploring differences in disciplinary discourse; and teaches instructors how to use popular culture texts as analytical tools from communications studies. The result is a new type of composition curriculum, one designed to develop analytical skills in students that will enable them to
discover the rhetorical character and conventions of academic disciplines, master academic
discourse, and expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communicating in
writing.

In Chapter 4: "Methods: ESP In The Composition Classroom," I describe how I
tested my argument that in the composition classroom the development of analytical skills
and an understanding of cultural-specific rhetorical conventions can be accomplished more
successfully using syllabus design and pedagogical strategies from both the
rhetoric/composition and second-language acquisition fields. I then discuss how I
successfully designed a multidisciplinary curriculum based on English for Specific
Purposes (ESP) needs analysis methodology for a sophomore English composition class
(ENGL 207). In particular, I focus on developing communicative competency through
learner and needs analysis borrowed from ESP and describe the data generated using this
methodology upon which the multidisciplinary syllabus was designed.

I describe how this curriculum was evaluated in Chapter 5: "Methods: Educational
Ethnography In The Composition Classroom," using an educational ethnographic
approach and the research tools (interviews, questionnaires, pre-and-post analytical
exercises, and case studies) employed to this end.

In Chapters 6, 7, and 8 I describe the four case studies involving Sharon, a fourth-
year senior in the creative writing program; Mark, an undecided sophomore; Gail, in her
second semester at the UA who had completed her BA in Philosophy at Kent State
University and was now working on a BS in Management Information Systems (MIS);
and Andrea, in the second semester of her second year at the UA majoring in psychology.

Finally, in Chapter 9, I discuss my findings from and evaluation of the four case
studies and offer suggestions for future research utilizing this approach to teaching
composition.
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In the end, I tried to answer the following research questions:

(1) If both native-speaking composition students and instructors need to develop greater analytical skills that will enable them to identify cultural-specific rhetorical conventions and successfully recreate them, can these skills and understandings be acquired through a combination of pedagogical strategies from both the rhetoric/composition and second-language teaching fields?

(2) If students learn how to use interdisciplinary tools to rhetorically analyze texts and discourses from different cultures and subcultures (e.g., American vs. Chinese culture or academic vs. popular culture), can they learn then how to transfer their newly developed analytical skills and understanding of rhetorical relations (using contrastive rhetoric, popular culture, and discourse analysis as tools) to their own specific American academic classroom texts? And will this help them expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing not only in their English classes, but in all of their classes?

(3) Can a genre-based composition curriculum help them in the acquisition of new analytical skills?

From my own experiences, I have developed my own goals as a writing teacher: to teach students how to empower themselves through their writing by instilling in them the confidence that they can analyze and understand the rhetorical, or persuasive, strategies created by their culture (and others), and then effectively transfer these strategies to their own writing.
CHAPTER 2:
RHETORICS ARE DEVELOPED AND DEFINED
BY THE CULTURES IN WHICH THEY ARE CREATED

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, I situated myself as a writer of many genres and described the impact this experience has on my teaching and curriculum designing. In this chapter, I argue for sociolinguistics to be foundational to an adequate theory of rhetoric. I argue that sociolinguistics should be a basis for rhetoric/composition so that a combination of rhetoric- and second-language acquisition-based multidisciplinary pedagogy and research methods can be used by teachers and students to discover and describe sociocultural knowledge in the classroom. This chapter will provide a basis for Chapter 3, where I describe how this combination of rhetoric and ESL pedagogies and research allows teachers to 1) see academic English as a second language, enabling them to uncover the causes for native students' problems in learning cultural-specific rhetorical conventions and recreating them; and 2) offer appropriate multidisciplinary pedagogical solutions using genre-based composition curricula and interdisciplinary tools (contrastive rhetoric, popular culture, and genre and discourse analysis) to rhetorically analyze texts and discourses from different cultures and subcultures.
2.2 INSIGHTS FROM SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION RESEARCH IN THE COMPOSITION CLASSROOM

2.2.1 Sociolinguistics: A Basis for Rhetoric and Composition

Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995) in *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/Culture/Power* describe the case of "Nate," an American graduate student at Carnegie Mellon University who, according to researchers who studied his writings, struggled during the first few months of his program to both digest and manage unfamiliar material from his reading and at the same time reconcile a familiar informal style with what he thought were appropriate conventions of formal discourse. An analysis of his papers reveals several months of confusion during which his writing suffered from numerous stylistic problems: poor cohesion, disorganized paragraphs, lack of focus, and inappropriate vocabulary. (p. 123)

As a composition instructor, I know that this description could be applied to many of my native and non-native speakers of English in my composition classes at the University of Arizona. Perhaps the theory that written academic English is no one's first language either cross-culturally or intra-culturally explains this phenomenon and allows us to easily understand Bizzell's (1992) argument that written language is actually a form of "discourse" which she borrows from the concept of the speech community in sociolinguistics (p. 222). Other scholars as well, like Scribner and Cole (1981), Bazerman (1990, 1981) and Horowitz (1987), have in the past 15 or so years "begun to show serious interest in the notion that the written work may be significantly shaped by social or instructional constraints on form and content" (Atkinson, 1990, p. 57). In this way, writing is understood by instructors and students to be discourse which is developed in a community of people who share stylistic, format, argument, logic/and illogic conventions, all created from social interactions among members of the community (Bizzell, 1992, p. 222).
For this reason, I argue that by using sociolinguistics with discourse analysis and genre analysis as a basis for their research and practice, composition and ESL scholars, researchers and teacher-researchers can discover how language and thinking is affected by specific social contexts and use contrastive rhetoric and popular culture texts to help students come to new understandings of the differences in rhetoric, from either cross-cultural or intra-cultural examination. These insights allow teachers to come up with pedagogical strategies and materials that more directly address problems students, initiates into academic communities, are having, and allow students themselves to become more aware of the differences in compositional expectations.

After all, since conversations are "structured, rule-governed, non-random sequences of utterances" (van Dijk, 1985, p. 112), research here (usually accomplished through ethnography of speaking) may tell a teacher or student how these rules might vary widely between one society and another, or one discourse community and another, or one genre and another. According to Farr and Nardine (1998) in their work on assessment, this is especially true of discourse used in composition textbooks--what they call "essayist literacy" (borrowed from Scollon and Scollon)--texts that they define as "rational decontextualized, explicit and carefully ordered internally" (p. 108). For them, sociolinguistic research is especially important in composition "because it provides the means of developing metalinguistic awareness of sociolinguistic difference, an awareness that can facilitate the teaching of essay-literacy conventions" (Farr & Nardine, 1998, p. 114).

One way to teach these conventions is through the sociolinguistic lens of genre analysis. As van Dijk (1985) claims, sociolinguistics has been "related with a more functional paradigm of social research: correlations or dependencies [are] described between verbal (grammatical) structures and the usual abstract categories of social
structure such as class, ethnic group, gender, status or role. So social settings [are] not analyzed as such, but [are] seen as sets of factors that determine style, meanings or speech acts" (p. 6). John M. Swales (1990b) in *Genre Analysis* defines genre and the creation of genre as

a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rational shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style. (p. 58)

The types of genres that appear in the academic writing are those genres that according to Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995) are "the media through which scholars and scientists communicate with their peers...[they] are intimately linked to a discipline's methodology and they package information in ways that conform to a discipline's norms, values and ideology" (p. 1). Berkenkotter and Hucken concur with Bizzell that instructors should use genre analysis to 'demystify' academic discourse for students and argue that this can be done by

helping them see the form-function correlations of discourse conventions. Forms by themselves have little meaning; it is only when they are seen as serving certain functions that they become meaningful. But...one cannot detect these functions without first noticing a pattern of forms, and often such a pattern cannot itself be detected without looking across genres and across time. (1995, p. 43)

When seen as a form of discourse, the importance of social contexts on academic language become much more apparent to students, teachers and researchers. For these reasons, sociolinguistics should be foundational to a theory of rhetoric.
2.2.2 New Trends in Rhetoric/Composition and ESL

In discussing why sociolinguistics should be foundational to the theory of rhetoric, it is necessary to give an abbreviated account of the move in ESL and rhetoric/composition from writing as a prescriptive exercise to writing as a culture-based communicative act to be researched through an interdisciplinary approach. As scholars like Leki, Purves, Bizzell, Winterowd and others in both ESL and rhetoric/composition have described, during the 1950s and 1960s, the structuralist, current-traditionalist, and positivistic approaches to the teaching of composition, literature, ESL, and even communications created what Berlin (1990) calls "narrowly utilitarian" pedagogy with an "emphasis on conformity" (p. 202).

In the latter half of the 1960s and into the early 1970s, a large number of basic writers were being admitted into universities for the first time through open-admissions policies, and a large number of international students were being admitted into the United States. Despite the pedagogical focus on grammar, it became apparent that many members of these two groups were having a hard time meeting traditional academic expectations.

In response to the situation in the ESL field, Kaplan (1966) became one of the first scholars to examine this phenomenon and coin the term "contrastive rhetoric" (Purves, 1988, p. 9). According to Leki (1992), from his study of about 600 second-language student essays written by ESL students in English, Kaplan concluded that "students from different language backgrounds systematically developed their ideas in writing in patterns different from those that would appear natural in English" (p. 89). He diagrammed what he believed to be the different styles of rhetorical patterns: straight line for English speakers, circular for Chinese, parallel for Arabic, etc. However, this line of thinking was declared prescriptive and reductionist by many and it ignored the cultural
context in which these strategies were created. Even Shaughnessy's (1977) important contribution to the field of basic writing during this time, Errors and Expectations, continues to be criticized (Winterowd, 1994; Lu, 1991) for being too focused on grammar as a solution to writers' problems. And yet, as we will see later, her work played a vital role in the argument for seeing academic English as a second language.

By the late 1960s and early 1970s, the focus had begun to shift in composition to process and more importantly for the purpose of my argument, to the writer as a member of a community. The shift to the individual was manifested in the Romantics (e.g., Ken Macrorie, Peter Elbow) while the New Rhetoricians (e.g., Flower and Hayes) began to examine the relationship between the writer, reader and text and encourage the use of research methods in other disciplines for theory building, like Emig's (1971) cognitivist-oriented The Composing Processes of Twelfth Graders that introduced case studies to rhetoric/composition (Winterowd, 1994, p. 47). According to Leki (1992), by the 1970s, ESL teachers had joined composition instructors in the move to a more process approach. However, the process approach was (and still is) criticized in both ESL and rhetoric/composition for a variety of reasons, including focusing too much on students' personal experience at the expense of developing their ability to meet the conventional expectations of academic disciplines, and being culturally offensive to some students (pp. 6-7).

However, with Purves' (1988) Writing Across Language and Cultures, textual studies in contrastive rhetoric began to include analysis of political and historical contexts. Defining rhetoric "as the choice of linguistic and structural aspects of discourse" (p. 9), Purves brought to the forefront the notion that not only is style important and culturally formed, but so is the "purpose, task, topic and audience" (Leki, 1992, 133).
Currently, much of American composition research and teacher-training (here I'm specifically referring to graduate student training) often focuses on the processes the individual goes through in their writing. For example, graduate instructors of composition (or GATs) at the University of Arizona (like myself) are encouraged to take English 510, *The Teaching of Composition*. One of the books required for this course when I took it in 1993 was Lindemann's (1987) *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*. Her third chapter entitled "What does the process involve?," which the professor focused on in detail, discusses the process of writing in three stages: prewriting, writing, and rewriting. This is not to say that in the past decade composition pedagogy and research has completely ignored writing's connection to social context. People like Emig (1971) and Kinneavy (1971), Bitzer (1968) (and later Grant-Davie (1996) who followed up on his work), Beach and Bridwell (1984), Odell and Goswami (1984) and others have discussed rhetorical situations and the like, and theorists like Berlin (1990, 1996) are promoting an awareness of writing and social context (although his work is rarely taught in composition teaching courses).

For Brandt (1986), in order to understand events around them and behave appropriately in them, language users, especially those involved in writing, rely on "their stores of prior knowledge about the world and the nature of discourse to provide the inferences necessary to make the general surface of language pertinent to particular human interactions" (p. 143). But context of the events is as important because "social contexts permeate texts and texts permeate social contexts" (Brandt, 1986, p. 143). Fortunately, this new understanding of social context in composition studies has emerged in the social constructionism movement and in the research of rhetoricians who work in genre theory like Miller (1994), Freadman (1994) and Bazerman (1995, 1996). For example, in 1991, Bazerman and Paradis gathered a collection of essays about texts in various professions,
including academia, in an attempt to "concretely elucidate the broad abstraction that writing is social action. Writing is more than embedded; it is socially constructive. Writing structures our relations with others and organizes our perceptions of the world. By studying texts within their contexts, we study as well the dynamics of context building" (1991, p. 3). Miller (1984) in "Genre as Social Action" argues that those in rhetoric need to support the idea "that in rhetoric the term 'genre' be limited to a particular type of discourse classification, a classification based on rhetorical practice and consequently open rather than closed and organized around situated action (that is pragmatic, rather than syntactic or semantic) . . . . The genre classification I am advocating is, in effect, ethnomethodological: it seeks to explicate the knowledge that practice creates" (p. 155).

In this study, I am defining genre in this way.

2.2.3 Interdisciplinary Research and Pedagogy

This shift from seeing writing as an activity existing solely in the writer's head to a highly socialized activity, has recently begun in earnest in the last decade or so with the works of theorists both inside and outside of composition who have advocated a move beyond texts and the individual to an examination of discourse and rhetorical patterns, ideology, and the rhetorical context in which they are embedded. But now a new focus is needed in the classroom as well, one that encourages multidisciplinary research and pedagogy in general, and sociolinguistics in particular, which will in turn redirect the focus from the individual writer to the society that surrounds and impacts him or her.

For example, Johnson and Roen (1988) from composition and ESL argue that teachers should use contrastive rhetoric to "discuss ways to engage students in rhetorical problem solving in the context of meaningful communication" (p. 162); but in order to do so, teachers need to be educated in the links between bilingual education, foreign
languages, rhetoric, ESL, etc., links found using a broad multidisciplinary base since "no
single theory from a single discipline can account for the complex and interacting social,
cultural, cognitive and linguistic processes involved" (p. 3).

From rhetoric, Bizzell (1992) claims that rhetoric and composition studies should
be interdisciplinary and "might be studied by more humanities-oriented research
techniques" (p. 17), techniques that should come from social sciences (ethnographic
research on writing, sociolinguistic research on language variety), literary studies (analysis
of styles, discursive practices and genres), and literary theory (ideological analysis of
discursive practices, historiographic studies). And with the research should come a
pedagogy that reflects this  knowledge in both its undergraduate and graduate classrooms

Similarly, researchers in the composition field like Lauer and Ashler (1988)
emphasize the benefits of using experimental and descriptive research (e.g. case studies,
ethnographies), calling for a multimodality to enrich composition studies, a multimodality
that had already appeared in linguistics with van Dijk and others and is based on
sociolinguistics (which I will address in the next section). A similar call for
interdisciplinary education has been sent out by researchers like Tchudi and Lafer (1996)
from the field of education and by Miller and McCartan (1990) and Graff (1989), who
claims that "ideas from any field are enriched by theories, concepts, and knowledge from
other fields. Problems of the world are not organized according to categories of scholars;
solutions to problems as diverse as pollution, defense, communications, and health require
knowledge and perspectives from several disciplines" (qtd. in Tchudi & Lafer, 1992, p. 8).
2.2.4 Sociolinguistics and Rhetoric: Pedagogy and Research

According to van Dijk (1985), sociolinguistics has strong connections with the social sciences in particular, especially sociology, anthropology, social psychology, and human geography (p. 21). Like rhetorical analysis, sociolinguistics allows for an examination of social factors that can determine which variety of the verbal repertoire is used on particular occasions, the language to use (such as in the case of diglossia "where two distinct varieties of a language exist side by side throughout the speech community" and each variety "is assigned a definite social function" (van Dijk, 1985, pp. 84, 97-98)), and the relationships and "relative statuses of the participants in the discourse" (p. 86).

Like Aristotelian rhetoric, sociolinguistics also looks at the way in which language can be used for "manipulating relationships [and] achieving particular goals" (van Dijk, 1985, p. 110). And what is especially important here is that multidisciplinary research and pedagogy based on sociolinguistic methodologies (sociology, sociology of language, and ethnography of communication) are "engaged in the study of everyday talk and the analysis of discourse" (van Dijk, 1985, p. 7) and in the process, allow linguistic and social phenomena to be correlated.

For example, Fishman's definition of sociology of language makes it easy to make a clear connection to genre and discourse studies. In The Sociology of Language (1972), he defines the sociology of language as the means to discover not only the societal rules or norms that explain and constrain language behavior and the behavior toward language in speech communities, but it also seeks to determine the symbolic value of language varieties for their speakers...[that can] represent educated status, national identification as a result of the attainments associated with their use and their users and as a result of their realization in situations and relationships that pertain to formal learning or to particular ideologies. (p. 6)
This discipline is good for cultural and subcultural analysis because the sociology of language can "help clarify the change from face-to-face situations" to "different language-related beliefs and behaviors of entire social sectors and classes" (Fishman, 1972, p. 53). Similarly, van Dijk (1985) claims that those engaged in sociology of language do so in order to analyze communication and its "relevance to everyday activities of social members, their interactive nature . . . their rule-governed and strategic, and hence orderly, conduct" (p. 5).

Sociology of language researchers begin with speech acts: the more micro-level the analysis the more linguistically oriented the study will be; the more societally oriented the study—"the more concerned with investigating social processes and societal organization"—the more macrolevel analysis (Fishman, 1972, pp. 35-36). A highlight of this type of social inquiry, according to Fishman, is "that methods are selected as a result of problem specifications rather than independent of them" (emphasis added) (1972, p. 53). This is especially important and will be explained in greater detail in the needs analysis section of the ethnography discussion of Chapter 4. Additionally, "sociology of language is neither methodologically nor theoretically uniform" (Fishman, 1972, p. 53); one can use all available social science methods, like ethnography of communication.

In 1962, Hymes created the notion of the ethnography of communication, a relatively new field that synthesizes ethnography--the "description and analysis of culture" - and linguistics--the "description and analysis of language codes" (qtd. in Saville-Troike 1978, p. 1). This created a new discipline which focuses on what Saville-Troike (1978) calls the "patterning of communicative behavior as it constitutes one of the systems of culture, as it functions within the holistic context of culture, and as it relates to patterns in other component systems" (p. 1). This type of method is especially important in genre analysis because in the ethnographic approach, "the function of an utterance resides in its
'text' (i.e. its form and meaning) and its 'context' (i.e. knowledge of the circumstances of a speech event), a relationship that is itself mutually constitutive" (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 152). An analysis of context is important in ethnographic approaches, according to Schiffrin (1994), because discourse in the same culture (or genre) is continually "created, renegotiated and defined" in social interactions, each with their own context (pp. 139, 145).

For composition instructors, this methodology can help them and their students see the relationship between texts, rhetorical conventions, and the context the texts were created in. According to van Dijk (1985), ethnography "parallels the concern in sociology to contextualize everyday interaction" but "the ethnographer is primarily interested in the communicative events in other societies and cultures . . . or in the subcultures of his or her own society" (p. 7). In this manner, and from research by Poole (1990), Hicks (1990) and Heath (1986), its sociolinguistic concerns include gender, race or class and it can be used to look at cross-cultural studies of discourse genres, rhetoric across cultures, and the context-bound nature of these genres by "explicating the specific structural or functional dimensions of discourse and by relating these to detailed analysis of the cultural knowledge" (van Dijk, 1985, p. 8) and community practices. Additionally, ethnography is very valuable for "its detailed description of communicative events in their full complexity" (van Dijk, 1985, p. 8). According to Schiffrin (1994), the ethnography of communication is one of the most integrative approaches; an ethnographic approach to discourse can work with other approaches, such as speech acts and interactional approaches "within a larger framework of inquiry" (p. 143).

We can see this in research conducted using the ethnography of communication with contrastive rhetoric and English in general. In *Comparative Rhetoric: An Integration of Perspectives*, Saville-Troike and Johnson (1994) argue that contrastive
rhetoric requires interdisciplinary consideration, especially the ethnography of communication, because it brings function into focus; establishes "the validity of analysis and interpretation of contrasting texts, no matter what other perspectives are taken" (p. 232); and allows researchers to become aware of the possibility of interpreting cultural differences through implied value judgments and the privileging of one point of view (for example defining a text as "less direct" vs. "more direct") by "situat[ing] interpretation of communicative events within the context of the their host speech communities" and requiring "an internal (or native) point of view as a criterion for validity of interpretation" (pp. 239-240).

According to Saville-Troike and Johnson, there are many studies available with questionable conclusions drawn on the differences in rhetorical strategies employed by students or others because there was no "internal point of view" (1994, p. 240); in contrast to Kaplan's (1966) original claims, researchers have recently come to realize that arguing that a different pattern reflects different cultural values can have questionable validity if this claim comes from an external point of view alone. Instead, studies from a bilaterally internal perspective "satisfy criteria for valid comparative rhetoric" (Saville-Troike & Johnson, 1994, p. 241) and therefore can be used, as I explain later, as a tool to building analytical skills and awareness of cultural-specific rhetorical conventions in students.

2.2.4.1 Sociolinguistics as a Research Methodology

Labov's (1970) research in *The Study of Nonstandard English* was at the forefront of sociolinguistics. Although the traditional view was that nonstandard English (in this case BVE (Black Vernacular English) or what is also called AAVE (African American Vernacular English) is a substandard version of standard English, his research was one of
the first to show that while nonstandard English involves a system of rules that differ from
the standard, it is not inferior, but rather it is "an integral part of the larger sociolinguistic
structure of the English language" (p. 1).

Labov (1966) developed the method necessary to measure both linguistic and
social phenomena so they can be correlated by first looking for "linguistic features that are
known, either from previous studies or intuitively by the linguist as a native speaker, to
vary within the community being studied, and which are also easily countable in some
way" (Trudgill, 1995, p. 31). He did so by employing random scientific samples;
surveying people with tape recorders to acquire four different styles of pronunciation
(ranging from informal to formal speech via story telling, passage reading and word-list
reading) (Trudgill, 1995, pp. 92-93); acquiring a linguistic description of all the types of
English spoken in the area; and "developing methods for quantitative measurements of
linguistic data" (p. 27). Under this method, according to Trudgill, we can now "correlate
linguistic features with social class accurately" (1995, p. 28), know that while the idiolect
point of individuals will vary the "average percentage for each group falls into a
predictable pattern," and that "social-class dialects are not distinct entities [but] merge into
each other to form a continuum" (p. 33).

Labov, like others who advocate sociolinguistics as a methodology, do so for
many reasons, including that it supports the notion that most of the problems of
comprehension in the classroom are caused by cultural conflict between the vernacular or
L1 culture and the standard English or L2 schoolroom, not dialect or grammatical
differences (as we saw with the current-traditionalism of the 1960s) (1970, p. 43).
Personal experience with such conflicts in understanding has been detailed extensively by
such compositionists as Villanueva in *Bootstraps* (1993) where he describes his
experiences in the classroom and his own reaction to Labov's work:
I was taken aback when I learned of Black English in college, that William Labov and his researchers had to come to the block to talk with African American and Puerto Rican kids, discovering that the English we spoke was consistent, was rule-governed. I wasn't shocked at his discovery, but shocked that the brightest of the bright, Ph.D.'s, college professors and scientists, would know so little about the block, could banter in foreign tongues like French and German and know so little about America's Englishes. (p. 8)

What is fundamental for rhetoric/composition and ESL is that ignorance of cultural differences can lead to serious conflicts in expectations and understanding between students and teachers; differences in understanding the rules of academic genres, rules which "show how things are done with words and how one interprets these utterances as actions" (Labov, 1970, p. 54).

If academic English is no one's first language (and I will discuss this in detail in Chapter 3), critical ethnography of communication/sociolinguistics combined with contrastive rhetorical analysis and other multidisciplinary research and pedagogy methodologies are appropriate choices for ESL and rhetoric/composition teacher-researchers because they allow researchers to see discourse located within its sociocultural context; these methodologies have an important relevance to composition research in determining language and literacy competence in both native and non-native speakers in the classroom. They allow insights into cross-cultural communications; discoveries into how language and thinking are affected by specific social contexts; new understandings of the differences in rhetoric (from either cross-cultural or intra-cultural examination); and insights into the insider's point of view and their own outsider's cultural biases in their rhetorical analyses. The findings often lead to new awareness of student writing problems and offer specific pedagogical practices as solutions. For these reasons, I argue for
sociolinguistics (especially ethnography of communication) and multidisciplinary studies to be a basis for rhetoric and composition research and pedagogy.
CHAPTER 3:  
CULTURES CREATE THEIR OWN 
LANGUAGES, GENRES AND RHETORICS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I will show how a focus on culture, writing and sociocultural knowledge (especially discourse and genre knowledge) can help compositionists demystify academic discourse; how, by using sociolinguistics as a basis for rhetoric and composition pedagogy and research, they can create interdisciplinary curricula that will develop in students an understanding of cultural-specific rhetorical conventions and academic discourse and in the process help them become communicatively competent. As I discussed in Chapter 2, in order to do this though, instructors must see academic English as a distinct system of discourse, as a second language. This will then enable them to see that students acquire this discourse like adults acquire a second language, with similar acquisition problems.

One of the best ways to connect student error with sociolinguistics is by applying the second language model to native composition pedagogy. For example, Error Analysis (or EA), researchers compare the linguistic systems of language in an attempt to "describ[e] and explai[n] errors systematically" (Ringbom, 1994, p. 740). According to Ringbom, through EA, researchers hope to be able to "provide feedback about teaching methods and materials" and "throw light on how languages are learned and produced" in the hopes of also "provid[ing] a window for observing what goes on in the second language learner's mind" (1994, p. 740). (For an in-depth discussion of the tensions and eventual reconciliation between the supporters of EA and Contrastive Analysis (CA), with its focus on errors and interference, see Ellis 1994.) Of course, the term "error" has to be used with the awareness that in and of itself, error is not necessarily bad; in fact, it often is
representative of a student's learning of his or her L2 (Ringbom, 1994, p. 741). As Ellis points out, work by researchers such as Corder (1967) show how student errors could be "significant" in three distinct ways:

(1) they provid[e] the teacher with information about how much the learner had learnt, (2) they provid[e] the researcher with evidence of how much language was learnt, and (3) they serv[e] as devices by which the learner discovered the rules of the target language. (1994, p. 48)

In fact, a "desire to improve pedagogy" is what originated this study of errors in second language acquisition. Corder (1974) suggested that in studying errors, researchers should engage in these five steps:

1 Collection of a sample of learner language  
2 Identification of errors  
3 Description of errors  
4 Explanation of errors  
5 Evaluation of errors (Ellis, 1994, p. 48)

I have attempted to follow these steps in the case studies in Chapters 6, 7 and 8. And because of its convenience of use, the term "error" will be used here because "it is convenient for many research purposes, especially when beginners and intermediate learners are studied" (Ringbom, 1994, p. 741)

Once connections are made between student error and sociolinguistics, instructors will see that many student writing problems are not issues of process but truly issues of culture and linguistic socialization. Instructors can then design multidisciplinary pedagogies that teach students how academic discourse is created by specific discourse communities and how, through a genre-based composition curriculum, students can use interdisciplinary tools like contrastive rhetoric, analysis of popular culture texts, and genre
and discourse analysis to rhetorically analyze texts and discourses from different cultures and subcultures. It is hoped that this type of curriculum will teach students how to transfer their newly developed analytical skills and understanding of rhetorical relations to their own specific American academic classroom texts, and in the process expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing not only in their English classes, but in all of their classes.
3.2 ACADEMIC ENGLISH AS DISCOURSE

Earlier, Bizzell's (1992) claims for the necessity of defining writing as "discourse" by borrowing the idea of discourse community from sociolinguistics were discussed. In fact, discourse analysis has historically been connected to the fields of rhetoric and ESL. As Schiffrin (1994), paraphrasing van Dijk, states, "discourse analysis really has a rather long history—if one allows classical rhetoric to be considered as discourse analysis" (p. 9); and in ESL, "text linguistic research . . . has contributed to the notion of contrastive rhetoric by providing useful tools for the analysis of written discourse . . . [and a] theory for coherence in written texts" (Grabe & Kaplan, 1989, p. 267).

Some of the earliest claims for multidisciplinary work were first applied to discourse studies. According to van Dijk (1985) in Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Discourse and Dialogue, in the early 1970s widespread multidisciplinary attention began being paid to discourse studies from such fields as anthropology, linguistics, semiotics, psychology and sociology: "This shared interest for various phenomena of language use, texts, conversational interaction or communicative events soon became more integrated, under the common label of discourse analysis" (p. xiii).

3.2.1 Cognitive Skills and Discourse Communities

In Chapter 2, I described Berkenhotter and Huckin's "Nate" and his struggle to "digest and manage unfamiliar material" and "reconcile a familiar formal style with what he thought were appropriate conventions of formal discourse" (1995, p. 123). Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), relying on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, claim that cognitive skills should be seen against the backdrop of culture and society because the way a culture--and I would add a discourse community--structures its literacy practices "differentially affect[s] the development of cognitive skills such as hypothetical reasoning, modes of
categorization, and memorization" (p. 170). But as discussed in Chapter 2, the impact of
the process movement in composition in the 1970s created many writing teachers and
curricula that focus on the process that students go through to learn rhetorical conventions
instead of developing an understanding in teachers and students of the cultural processes
that created those conventions. As a result, Bizzell (1992) states

> We have not been entirely successful in reforming freshman
> English...because we have not given equal attention to the two neglected
> areas. We have spent much scholarly energy on exploring students' writing
> processes. But we have not sufficiently considered the *nature of academic
discourse as a form of language* use that unites a particular community,
> and we have not examined the relationship between the academic discourse
> community and the communities from which are (sic) students come:
> communities with *forms of language* use shaped by their own social
> circumstances. We have not demystified academic discourse. *(my
> emphasis)* (p. 108)

And yet, in discussing the concept of process-oriented theories, Bizzell attempts to
even-handedly describe what she sees as the two primary camps in composition: the
"inner-directed" and the "outer-directed." She describes the first group, those interested in
process, as people who believe that "universal, fundamental structures of thought and
language can be taught" and that if students do not understand conventions of a particular
rhetorical pattern, they can eventually internalize the pattern through constant practice.
Once students are "capable of cognitively sophisticated thinking and writing, they are
ready to tackle the problems of a particular writing situation. These problems are usually
treated . . . as problems of audience analysis" (1992, pp. 77-79). She then describes the
second group as people who "se[e] writing as primarily outer-directed" and "[are] more
interested in the social processes whereby language-learning and thinking capacities are
shaped and used in particular communities" (Bizzell, 1992, pp. 76-77). Bizzell adds that
they believe that there are no universal structures and even though composition instructors often teach their own discourse patterns as though they were universal, instructors should instead teach students about discourse conventions and genres (1992, p. 79). However, by evenly portraying both sets of ideas, Bizzell herself diminishes the true impact that culture has on the composing process and on the conventions students need to learn.

3.2.2 Cognitive Skills and Genre Analysis

While these topics are covered more in-depth in Chapter 4, here I would like to discuss how through discourse analysis, we can discover genres and their specific structures which Bizzell claims would help students in the classroom more than process-oriented or cognitive psychology theories because

Discourse analysis goes beyond audience analysis because what is most significant about members of a discourse community... [is the] expectations they share by virtue of belonging to that particular community. (1992, p. 81)

These expectations appear in the approach and values different groups place on their styles of literacy and social competence. Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) also believe genre should be examined because "in understanding the socializing process... how the communication is structured must be considered," (p. 167) and "literacy (reading and writing) is... 'a way of taking meaning from the environment'" (p. 181). For example, in Heath's examination of black and white Appalachian communities and the differences in their literacy assumptions, she "demonstrate[s] that literacy activities, like other forms of communication, are culturally organized and vary both within and across cultures according to the ideology in general and specifically in relation to... patterns of socialization" (1983, p. 181).
It is clear that language acquisition and the process of socialization are connected as students attempt to become future members of the academy. Works by Ochs (1996) on language socialization and Schieffelin and Ochs help us understand that, "the process of becoming a competent member of society...is realized to a large extent through language, by acquiring knowledge of its functions, social distribution, and interpretations in and across socially defined situations" (1986, p. 168).

For pedagogical purposes, understanding of discourse communities could possibly negate any heavy-handed reliance on cognitive psychology as another process-oriented means of analyzing writers and their texts, thus preventing teachers from coming to inaccurate conclusions about students' mental and intellectual capabilities. For example, when composition teacher Andrea Lunsford (1980) in "The Content of Basic Writers' Essays" compared basic and more skilled writers, she concluded: "The basic writers I have been quoting, then, seem to represent the egocentric stage of cognitive development and the conventional stage of moral development, to conceptualize and generalize with great difficulty, and, most of all, to lack confidence" (qtd. in Bizzell, 1992, p. 111). According to Bizzell, "In its focus on cognitive writing skills, process-oriented composition studies [sic] prejudge those unequally prepared for school as unequal in mental development. . . . If process analysis tends to strip away social circumstances in favor of [naively assumed] cognitive universals, discourse analysis keeps awareness of the social situation of writing alive" (1992, p. 112).

Language acquisition, socialization and cognitive processes are not independent of each other. All of these facets come into play when dealing with student errors and creating pedagogical approaches to solve these errors. That is why the concept that academic English is a second language is crucial to successful composition pedagogy and research. Wong-Fillmore's (1991) work on successful second language learning situations
for children can be applied here to both ESL and native composition classrooms and shows us why a singular focus on process and/or cognitive approaches to language learning are not adequate; social, linguistic and cognitive processes should be seen as "intricately connected" (p. 53).

It is through social processes that students make contact with their TL (or target language) speakers (and here I add writers) which gives them both motivation and opportunity to learn their community's discourse. As students observe their instructors and professors, or TL speakers and writers, and are exposed to communication in specific academic discourse communities, they are able to gather "the linguistic and social data that eventually allows them to figure out how the language [or discourse] is structured and used" (Wong-Fillmore, 1991, p. 53). Through their contact with their TL, students gather linguistic knowledge--"the phonological, lexical, grammatical, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic knowledge"--that eventually will enable them to understand and use their new discourse in many communicative and social situations (Wong-Fillmore, 1991, p. 54). (Communicative competence will be discussed in Chapter 4.)

According to work by Johns (1986), Connors (1984) and Wong-Fillmore (1991), students can also rely on existing linguistic knowledge to guide them in discovering what to took for to acquire a new discourse. This can also be applied to writing conventions as students make assumptions that the elements that are successful in one form of writing--like citing or topic sentences--can be transferred to another form of writing. Unfortunately, this type of transfer--called interference, which will be discussed in the next section--can also cause students, like the freshman who tries to use the five-paragraph essay in introductory composition, to "draw largely unwarranted conclusions that L2 forms are functionally and structural identical to L1 forms and usages" (Wong-Fillmore, 1991, p. 56). (The term interference, which was "associated with behaviorist
theories of L2 learning" has been rejected as inadequate or even negative by some researchers. The term transfer is often preferred, and yet transfer is also inadequate according to researchers like Sharwood Smith and Kellerman (1986) who prefer the term crosslinguistic influence because it is theory-neutral and lends itself to more crosslinguistic phenomena (Ellis, 1994, p. 301). For proposes of this project, the term transfer will be used and will be especially important when discussing interlanguage theory.)

Finally, students rely on and use many cognitive strategies and skills like social knowledge, inference abilities, and memory as well as analytical skills, to decipher what people are saying and the connections between "forms, functions, and meanings" (Wong-Fillmore, 1991, p.51). Cognitively, there are variations among learners' abilities to pick up a second spoken and/or written language. For example, according to Krashen, Long and Scarcella (1979), older learners can acquire new forms and structures more quickly because they have "better-developed learning strategies and cognitive abilities" (p. 62). On the other hand, other older students may have mental rigidity that can result in an "unwillingness or inability to accommodate new information" or even deal with "things they cannot immediately understand" (Krashen et al., 1979, p. 63). And some students are afraid of risk-taking, or trying out new knowledge (Krashen et al., 1979, p. 65).
3.3 WRITTEN ACADEMIC ENGLISH IS A SECOND LANGUAGE

By seeing the connection between social, linguistic and cognitive processes, and their connection to context and social situation, composition teachers can better explore and explain student errors while creating pedagogical approaches to solve these errors. That is why the concept that academic English is a second language is crucial to this process. While Homing (1987) offers a theory about how basic writers acquire academic writing like a second language, Swales offers a multidisciplinary model (similar to the one I developed and used in Spring 1998) to approach academic discourse through genre and discourse analysis. In essence, this dissertation combines both theories in an attempt to help students master standard academic English because while it "may well be a language that nobody speaks [or writes] . . . it is precisely the 'School' quality, the 'Edited' quality of this English that contributes to its users' credibility. Writers who use Standard English fluently show they have received the necessary training for the academic community's rigorous intellectual tasks" (Bizzell, 1992, p. 140). And those native speakers who do not use it fluently risk failure.

It is very clear that the structures of written English narrative and exposition are very different from the structures one ordinary finds in [English] conversational exchange, as is the vocabulary to some degree, especially at more advanced levels. In fact, from a vocabulary viewpoint, English speakers are at the particular disadvantage of having to learn a genetically disconnected lexicon as they move up the educational ladder. . . . So both structurally and lexically, formal written English is very much a foreign or second language for all English speakers of whatever background, though there are of course degrees of distance from the variety that children bring to school. Much of students' success or failure in school depends on the extent to which they master this second language. (Troike, personal communication, September 5, 1995)
This theory of written academic English as an L2 was presented as early as 1970 in Robert Allen's article "Written English is a 'Second Language'." Unfortunately, his claims were not followed up by researchers because linguistic research was not advanced enough to support Allen's claims (Horning, 1987, p. 13). Yet it was Shaughnessy's work in the late 1970s with basic writers and their unfamiliarity with academic writing in *Errors and Expectations* (1977) that revived this theory.

Silber in "Teaching Written English as a Second Language" (1979) used Shaughnessy's work to support her claims that the more basic writers, in particular the "primarily orally-oriented students of this generation" (and I would add of the current generation as well) have difficulties in written communication because they "attempt to imitate speech in writing without recognizing that two entirely different modes of discourse are in question and that the two have far less to do with one another than we suppose" (p. 296). Silber blamed students' problems with vocabulary, repetition of words, sentence fragments, lack of transitions, simple sentences and organization problems on dialect interference, i.e., "students who have trouble with writing suffer from the interference of their spoken dialects. . . . In a very real sense, these students are coming to written English as a second language and should be so treated" (1979, pp. 297-299).

Bartholomae in "The Study of Error" (1980) also built on Shaughnessy's work, not by asking who the basic writers are, but how basic writing itself is defined. He argued that basic writing is a "variety of writing" used by students who are not less capable, but "who need to learn to command a particular variety of language--the language of a written, academic discourse" (p. 254). He argued that borrowing error analysis and the theory of interlanguage from linguistics would enable composition teachers to better research a "writer's sequence of learning."
Error analysis begins with the recognition that errors, or the points where the actual text varies from a hypothetical 'standard' text, will be either random or systematic. If they are systematic in the writing of an individual writer, then they are evidence of some idiosyncratic rule system—an idiosyncratic grammar or rhetoric, an 'interlanguage' or 'approximate system.' If the errors are systematic across all basic writers, then they would be evidence of generalized stages in the acquisition of fluent writing for beginning adult writers. This distinction between individual and general systems is an important one for teaching and research. It is not one that Shaughnessy makes. (Bartholomae, 1980, p. 256)

Moving from the idea of basic writers to more mainstream writers, Neilsen (1979), in her dissertation, analyzed the writings of white middle-class students at the University of California, San Diego, and concluded that "these writers make many of the same types of errors that basic writers make" (Homing, 1987, p. 15). Making a distinction between formal and informal register, Neilsen concluded that her students made their "errors" when writing in the formal register, suggesting that at that level, "errors" were a result of performance problems, not language acquisition problems (Homing, 1987, p. 15). And yet as Horning points out

the abundant literature in the psychological and linguistic theories that underlie composition pedagogy demonstrates that the written form of language which we expect students to know or to master in the first year of college is a distinct linguistic system, sufficiently different from spoken language to qualify as a distinct language (1987, p. 16).

Unfortunately, as the focus on basic writers began to fade, so did the focus on academic writing as a second language. It was not until a decade or so later that interest reappeared along with the increasing amount and quality of research on L1 and L2 writing problems and a new focus on multidisciplinary approaches to research and teaching. Currently, there seems to be a small but growing resurgence of interest in this theory. An examination of the current research showed a few papers on this topic from the ESL field, in particular Matsuda (1996, 1997) and De Luca (1992), and in composition Vande
Kopple (1996, 1998). That there is not more interest is unfortunate because as Horning claims "[t]he theory that writing is a second language accounts for many aspects of basic writer's [and I would add mainstream writers'] behavior not explained by other theories" (1987, p. 5). For example, according to Esau and Keene in "A TESOL Model for Native-Language Writing Instruction: In Search of a Model for the Teaching of Writing" (1981), the TESOL approach to error analysis "appears to be more precise, more sophisticated in its theoretical support, and more clearly empirically motivated than typical discussions of errors in the field of rhetoric and composition" (p. 709). And perhaps more importantly, "by connecting the fields of TESOL and rhetoric/composition, our hypothesis not only enriches both fields, but also moves our understanding of language, for once, toward a greater unity" (Esau & Keene, 1981, p. 710).

3.3.1 Writing Acquisition Errors: Applying Insights from L2 Research to L1 Composition

In this section, I describe various insights from second language acquisition research that can be applied to research in the acquisition of academic writing including Acculturation Theory and Krashen's Monitor Theory. The theory behind recognizing academic writing as a second language to basic writers and mainstream writers is that, in general, students "develop writing skills and achieve proficiency in the way that other adults develop second language skills;" they do so because "academic, formal, written English is a new and distinct linguistic system" that new initiates to the academy find quite foreign to their native language or variety of English (Horner, 1987, p. 2). In addition, these students must "master both the language and culture of academia, and they face many of the same intellectual and psychological challenges that confront other second language learners" (Horner, 1987, p. 2). Below are some of these language acquisition challenges. After elucidating these problems, which are really issues of culture and
socialization, I will then describe how composition instructors can come to new understandings of student problems with academic writing in the next section.

3.3.1.1 Composition Errors and SLA Theories

As Ellis (1994) points out, besides transfer, other SLA theories attempt to account for ways learners learn an L2. The most well known include Selinker's interlanguage theory, which "refer[s] to the interim grammars which learners build on their way to full target language competence" (p. 30), and theories about implicit (unconscious or intuitive) and explicit (conscious or metalingual) learning like Krashen's Monitor Theory "which seeks to account for the observed character of learner language, and in particular for developmental patterns" (Ellis, 1994, p. 31). Krashen's Monitor Theory is made up of his five hypotheses: acquisition-learning, natural order, monitor, and input and affective filter hypothesis. Through his Monitor model, Krashen claims that "error correction and explicit learning of rules are of significance in conscious learning but have little, if any, impact on subconscious acquisition. Conscious learning is available to the learner only as a monitor; it is used . . . to modify the existing acquired system" (Esau & Keene, 1981, p. 698). However, much of Krashen's Monitor Theory has been contested; for example, other researchers have questioned the rigidness of Krashen's distinction between the two types of knowledge and argue that learned skills can eventually be developed like acquired skills (Esau & Keene, 1981, pp. 698-699). For example, research by Cathcart and Olsen (1976) and others supports the theory that second language learners like "to be corrected by their teachers and want more correction that they are usually provided with," which suggests that correction can be helpful with acquisition (Ellis, 1994, p. 584).


A. Acquisition

Claim: Students develop their second language, including formal academic English, through both acquisition, or unconscious processes, and learning, a conscious process where what a teacher does in the classroom can be crucial. This theory may offer an explanation as to why composition students may be able to learn revising and editing—which are learned skills—much easier than composing or inventing, which are acquired skills. It may be that students cannot be taught these types of processes through drills or overt classroom exercises. In fact, students who may be struggling to do well in class may overemphasize revising and editing during the invention process at the expense of composing and inventing. This may explain why poorer writers spend their time editing their papers instead of coming up with deeper or more relevant ideas or subject matter.

B. Natural Order of Acquisition

Claim: Students acquire their language or writing skills in a particular order or pattern.

If this theory is correct and students acquire academic writing in a "stagelike fashion," researchers and teachers should be able to examine the errors students make, decipher the order of the error occurrence, and then come to an understanding of the acquisition process while clearly seeing how "errors are essential to learning" (Horning, 1987, p. 3). Of course, there have been arguments over developmental patterns and whether they are truly "patterns" or rather "regularities" (see Ellis 1994). But one theory developed in SLA to account for learner patterns is Interlanguage Theory, which will be discussed in the next section (Ellis, 1994, p. 114).

a. Interlanguage

The Interlanguage Theory was developed by Selinker (1972) to provide an explanation of the patterns seen in L2 development. The theory "claimed that learners
construct a series of interlanguages . . . and that they revise these grammars in systematic
and predictable ways as they pass along on interlanguage continuum" (Ellis, 1994, p. 114). Originally, interlanguage theory was developed to explain why adult second-
language learners rarely achieve a level of use of the target language like children achieve
when learning their first language. Psycholinguistically, one difference between adult L2
learners and children L1 learners is fossilization. Tarone (1994) claims that "[a] central
characteristic of any interlanguage is that it fossilizes—that is, it ceases to develop at some
point short of full identify with the target language" (p. 1715).

This theory may explain why a composition teacher has to repeatedly try to "untrain" a freshman from using the five-paragraph essay he or she learned in high school. This type of fossilization is called "transfer-of-training fossilization" and may be apparent in other ways, such when a student trained in personal narratives is unable to adapt to argumentative or analytical discourse. Papers that contain only simple ideas or means of expression may be a result of a student "reduc[ing] the target language to a simpler system," (Esau & Keene, 1981, p. 702), a strategy of second language learners. Students who come to an upper-division course convinced that what they learned earlier is adequate for that current course and refuse to learn more may be engaged in what they believe are "strategies of second language communication," i.e., they believe they have already identified successful means to communicate with the TL "natives" (Esau & Keene, 1981, p. 702). Additionally, according to Esau and Keene, when students write texts using a large number of passives or seem to be trying to adopt an advanced language that is not their own (and continue to make the same "errors" over and over), they may be experiencing a fossilization that can occur through "overgeneralization of target language linguistic material" (1981, p. 702).
At the same time, concepts of interlanguage support Shaughnessy's claims that basic and mainstream writers' errors are systematic and allow that "teachers [to] see that errors represent an interlanguage stage in the development of writing skill and are indicative of progress rather than failure" (Horning, 1987, p. 32). Additionally, Tarone (1994) claims that the IL Hypothesis has been modified since 1972, and while she gives six examples, for this project the two most important modifications are that IL developments may vary depending upon the "social contexts, or discourse domains" and "disagreement among interlanguage researchers as to both the inevitability of fossilization, and (relatedly) the causes of fossilization" (p. 1718). Tarone gives the example of international teaching assistants who may come much closer to the TL when discussing their academic interests than when talking about non-academic issues. In addition, researchers who argue for the impact of "sociolinguistic forces" like identification with the NL or TL claim that "fossilization is not an inevitable process" because, if a student has a great need to identify with the "TL social group . . . they will be able to continue learning the second language until their production/perception is indistinguishable from that of native speakers" (1994, p. 1718).

b. Comprehension Precedes Production

It is possible that second language students, like first language students, need to have time to develop their comprehension of skills and materials before being asked to produce them. This theory may explain the kind of poor writing seen when students are asked to write texts before they have been exposed to enough models of them, before they fully comprehend their responsibilities as writers of reader-based prose, a term which places the responsibility for comprehension on the writer, not the reader. (For example, in
this country if a reader does not understand the text, it is assumed to be the writer's job to clarify the text, while in some Asian countries, texts are often reader-responsible.)

C. Input and Filter

Claim: Students need comprehensible input if they are going to learn. This input must "occur in the context of natural language" use (Horning, 1987, p. 70) as composition researchers like Flower have pointed out. This is necessary because "learners acquire morphological features in a natural order as a result of comprehending input addressed to them" as well as "contextual and extralinguisitic clues" (Ellis, 1994, p. 27). Students also need a lowered affective filter to be receptive to writing; in other words the degree to which students feel positive about writing will determine their success. Krashen (1985) describes the affective filter as a "mental block that prevents acquisition from fully utilizing the comprehensible input they receive for language acquisition," i.e. when the filter is up or high, the "input will not reach the LAD [language acquisition device]" (p. 3). Input and filter are related to acculturation (which will be discussed below).

This theory could explain why a composition teacher may have a room full of motivated students and a syllabus of relevant, comprehensible input but if students do not seem to be acquiring certain rhetorical conventions properly (like organization or citations) and the instructor tells the students who are having trouble to just "keep rewriting," she may be giving these students incomprehensible input, or at the very least not enough input. For many students, a clear example of a citation, or going over the organization of a sample essay in a student writing guide, brings much more success than admonitions to students to "do it over" until they "do it" correctly. This is one of the problems with process approaches to writing pedagogy. On the other hand, this theory shows instructors why tools like popular culture texts can be very helpful in teaching
canonical material: it reduces students' filters which can "make a significant difference to students' success in learning to write academic discourse" (Horning, 1987, p. 81).

(Popular culture pedagogy will be discussed in 3.4.2)

3.3.1.2 Composition Errors and Acculturation

Claim: Students need to see themselves as new initiates to the academic community--apprentices even--and they need to be motivated to do well. At the same time, students need to understand they need not lose their identity in the process of acquiring this second language.

a. Social and Psychological Integration

SLA theorist John M. Schumann (1978) in "The Acculturation Model: The Evidence" defines acculturation as "the social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language (TL) group" (1); or as I would argue, the social and psychological integration of composition students, both L1 and L2, with experienced English academic writers who expect them to adapt to and acquire the expected rhetorical styles of the persuasive paper, lab proposal, etc. Relying on Vygotsky's zone of proximal development, Schumann believes that there is a continuum that the learner can be placed on which "ranges from social and psychological distance to social and psychological proximity with speakers of the TL [target language], and that the learner will acquire the second language only to the degree that he acculturates" (p. 1). In addition, "[v]erbal interaction with those speakers as a proximate cause brings about the negotiation of appropriate input which then operates as the immediate cause of language acquisition" (Schumann, 1978, p. 9).
In discussing how genre teaching is related to sociolinguistics, Schumann discusses many of the social factors that "can either promote or inhibit contact between the two groups" who "speak different languages" (1978, p. 2) resulting in assimilation or pidginization if the speaker maintains a psychological or social distance from the TL. These social factors are what Schumann calls affective variables, i.e., language shock, culture shock, and motivation, especially integrative motivation whereby students want to do well in order to become part of the academy, or instrumental motivation, where students want to do well in order to get good grades, pass writing proficiency tests, etc. This may explain why students are much more inclined to integrate material into their lives when they see how the material will impact their lives. This can be seen in business classes where students see real-world application for well-written resumes and cover letters. It may also account for "the well-known observation that students who love to read and hence are naturally exposed to reader-based prose tend to be better writers" (Esau & Keene, 1981, pp. 708, 709). For composition instructors, knowledge of both of these types of motivation can make teachers aware of the attitudes that students from different ethnic or gender groups have, and the positive and negative "social and affective factors" that will impact these groups in learning to write.

b. Hidden Curriculum

Social factors that teachers need to be aware of include their reliance on "hidden curriculum" assumptions (what teachers do not make explicit they expect students will pick up nonetheless) which negatively affect students whose home culture or high school culture differs greatly from their new educational situation (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995, p. 154). This is because acquiring "advanced literacy" depends on the "learner's ability to integrate subject matter knowledge with a knowledge of situationally appropriate linguistic
and rhetorical conventions" (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995, p. 141). Berkenkotter & Huckin claim that when teachers focus on "issues, 'content,' or 'ideas'" instead of language, students will do well if those patterns of interaction and the language systems they were socialized into at home (or in high school) "correspon[d] with what they will encounter as they move through various school curricula [including college curricula]. But when the patterns of interaction and language system of home and community [differ] from that of the school culture, [students'] receptivity to classroom genres is hindered" (1995, pp. 154, 155).

This is one of the many reasons for explicitly teaching genre, so students who are not from the dominant culture will not be disenfranchised by being denied an understanding of what the "humanities, social sciences and sciences are about" and the "tools those disciplines have developed to understand the world. Those tools are fundamentally linguistic ones. . . . Education cannot make access a viable goal unless it deconstructs the language involved and the ways in which the language can be taught" (Martin, Christie and Rothery (1987) qtd. in Berkenkotter and Huckin, 1995, p. 159).

c. Apprenticeship

Claim: Like an apprenticeship, Schumann claims that students need social and psychological contact with instructors or professors in their disciplines, their TL group, in order to acculturate. And yet, students do not need to lose their identity even when they are in the process of adapting their life styles or values (1978, p. 2). Just as the apprentice to a shoemaker would have to know what a shoe looks like and how it is made to be able to identify its form and function, in the process he or she may come to identify with the shoemaker and the profession—in effect take on a new identity. The same is true in both
native and L2 speech and writing. As Bartholomae points out, in composition classes the students are
told to write from the stance of membership in an academic community. Yet they are not members (and may not even wish to apply for the dubious honor), do not possess authority and have but little expertise about the literary genres about which they are typically asked to write. The successful writers write as if they were members of an academic community. They appropriate that role and its associated style (qtd. in Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995, p. 11)

There is often resistance to taking on a style because of a perceived loss of identity. For example, a student who sees him or herself as a "creative writer" may resist doing analytical writing while a student who likes analysis may be hesitant to "share" personal experiences in a personal narrative paper. Rubin (1995) claims social identification can become an issue. The danger is not so much that students do not "get it," or refuse to try to persuade in the rhetorical manner required in the composition classroom, but for some students, like the creative writing student who claims to be "creative, not analytical" or like Fen Shen, a native Chinese speaker, taking on values of specific patterns of discourse that are antithetical to their own culture can cause students to feel as though they have lost their own identity because "culture-typical rhetorical styles embody particular relations between authors and readers" (pp. 9, 14).

Related to Tarone's claim regarding interlanguage and the impact of social contexts is the theory (Schumann, 1978; Ellis, 1994; Pierce, 1995) that the L2 learner does not have to lose his or her identity when learning a new language. By evaluating the input they receive from the teacher, and determining what is being asked for and why, students can learn to in effect code switch, or switch from one language or variety of language to another depending upon the situation or personal factors in the composition
This would be similar to the way African Americans switch from AAVE (African American Vernacular English) to mainstream English, depending on the situation and the audience.

This theory may explain the strong identifications students had with other groups before coming to the university or resistance to writing in styles that differ from styles they use in other disciplines. But relying on Vgotsky, Berkenkotter and Huckin argue that by teaching genre, using "an activity-based theory of genre knowledge" in the classroom, students become involved in "situated activities of a practitioner-in-training," a training that allows the student to learn the tools of a particular academic trade, like a rhetorician's knowledge of ancient rhetoric (1995, p. 13).

3. Age

Claim: A student's age may affect his or her ability to learn.

It is known that younger students can pick up a second language more easily than adults. As Esau and Keene point out, "there also appear to be certain kinds of language features that cannot be mastered with native fluency once the learner has reached a certain age--usually taken to be the age of puberty" (1981, p. 699).

This may explain why returning students with little formal education do not learn as easily or quickly, or in the same manner as traditional students.

4. Situation-Based Syllabus

Claim: Students learn better with a Situation-Based Syllabus. A situation-based syllabus, unlike a "linear, grammatically/rhetorically based syllabus" allows students to experience a "spiraling of the various grammatical and rhetorical features in a meaningful situational
According to Esau & Keene, this type of syllabus may enable students to learn faster. For example, instructors may teach revising or editing better if they keep revisiting it in different papers throughout the semester (1981, p. 708).
3.4 A FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHING THE DECONSTRUCTION OF GENRES

In the previous section, I argued that by seeing academic English as a second language, the reasons for native students' inabilities to learn cultural-specific rhetorical conventions and recreate them become clearer. Here, I would like to offer a pedagogical model of how students can acquire academic understandings and skills through a combination of pedagogical strategies from both the rhetoric/composition and second-language acquisition fields. The main focus of this model is that teachers can offer appropriate multidisciplinary pedagogical solutions and strategies by teaching students how to use a genre-based composition curriculum and interdisciplinary tools (contrastive rhetoric and popular culture, and genre and discourse analysis) to rhetorically analyze texts and discourses from different cultures and subcultures. While Swales (1990b) has offered a similar approach, I have taken this research and applied it in greater detail to praxis, using the lens of academic English as a second language while adding popular culture and contrastive rhetoric texts as pedagogical tools to develop not only communicative competence but analytical thinking.

3.4.1 The Pedagogical Impact of Seeing Academic English as Discourse

In composition, Bizzell (1992) mirrors many ESL-based ideas on genre teaching, claiming that since an academic discipline is composed of people working together, agreeing on evidence, facts, and formats, there is a rhetorical character to disciplines that students should be aware of (p. 145). Students should be taught overtly how to use disciplinary vocabulary and determine preferred types of evidence relative to disciplines because by "entering a discipline, one commits oneself to looking at experience in a particular way established by that discipline" (Bizzell, 1992, p. 148). For these reasons I, and others like Swales (1990b) and Horning (1987), have advocated linking together the concepts of discourse community and genre (and Swales adds "language-learning task,"
which I will adopt here as a useful label to describe my analysis-building assignments) because

[d]iscourse communities, such as academic groupings of various kinds, are recognized by the specific genres that they employ, which include speech events and written text types. The work that members of the discourse community are engaged in involves the processing of tasks which reflect specific linguistic, discoursal and rhetorical skills. (Swales, 1990b, p. vii)

In addition,

. . . there is a growing interest in assessing rhetorical purposes, in unpacking information structures and in accounting for syntactic and lexical choices. Moreover, the resulting findings are no longer viewed simply in terms of stylistic appropriacy but, increasingly, in terms of the contributions they may or may not make to communication effectiveness. (Swales, 1990, p. 3)

Swales points out that practitioners in ESP and EAP from linguistics and ESL, and composition practitioners focused on WAC, have been moving in the same direction; in fact, there is a vast area to be explored in connecting context with texts. Focusing on Bazerman's and others' work with genre, Swales (1990b) claims

One strength of this emerging work is its successful adaptation of a rhetorical approach originally used for highly-valued literary, political or religious discourse to more mundane academic writing—and one reason for its success has been a built-in assumption that discourse is indeed socially situated and designed to achieve rhetorical goals. Its weakness also lies in its rhetorical and literary origins. . . Issues of representativeness of sample, validation of claims, and possible alternative explanations of phenomena are rarely raised or discussed. (p. 5)

But here I argue that this type of genre-based pedagogy and research offers alternatives to these weaknesses by addressing concerns that both WAC and EAP share: "methods of student assessment and training instructors in discourse analysis, ethnography and methodology" (Swales, 1990, pp. 5-6). In general, I use this type of pedagogy to
develop analytical skills in students, which in turn will help them develop communicative competence. In Chapter 4, I describe my multidisciplinary curriculum for a sophomore composition course that makes overt these connections to students. Here, Swales offers a concise description of the interconnectedness of these elements:

Discourse communities are sociorhetorical networks that form in order to work towards sets of common goals. One of the characteristics that established members of these discourse communities possess is familiarity with the particular genres that are used in the communicative furtherance of those sets of goals. In consequence, genres are the properties of discourse communities; that is to say, genres belong to discourse communities, not to individuals, other kinds of groupings or to wider speech communities. Genres themselves are classes of communicative events which typically possess features of stability, name recognition and so on. Genre-type communicative events (and perhaps others) consist of texts themselves (spoken, written, or a combination) plus encoding and decoding procedures as moderated by genre-related aspects of text-role and text-environment. These processing procedures can be viewed as tasks. The acquisition of genre skills depends on previous knowledge of the work, giving rise to content schemata, knowledge of prior texts, giving rise to formal schemata, and experience with appropriate tasks. Thus, the teaching of genre skills essential involves the development of acquisition promoting text-task activities. (1990, pp. 9-10)

I agree with Swales (1990b) when he claims that tasks should be "relatable to genre acquisition" (p. 76). But I determined these tasks partially through the ESP learner and needs analysis described in Chapter 4. The tasks I developed scaffolded cultural knowledge, beginning with an understanding of the impact of culture on writing and writing conventions; followed by training in discourse and genre-analysis through contrastive rhetoric texts; followed by the use of popular culture tests to activate knowledge of content schemata; and to then the application of these newly developed analytical skills and schemata to formal schemata and experience analyzing and writing disciplinary-based texts. Students also engaged in ethnographic-based tasks of
interviewing experts in their discipline to gathering information on their discipline's participant-trainee initiation and text conventions.

A model for teaching the deconstructing of genres that composition teachers and researchers could adapt for their own purposes is one of the ESL approaches to language teaching: English for Special Purposes (this will be discussed more in Chapter 4). In general, in ESP classes, the teacher must design unusual yet extremely functional syllabi and materials, focusing on teaching the students the ability to master particular "learning skills and strategies, including the skill of knowing how to learn more on one's own" (Lynch & Hudson, 1991, p. 230). Part of the syllabi design should include an understanding that the students may attempt to use their previous L1 instruction to cope with the different cultural expectations.

Reid (1989) and Leki (1992) point out that international students come to the U.S. with a different set of cultural expectations about academic work and try to use their L1 strategies to cope. Teachers need to make students aware of the differences and expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing, and yet persuade students that teachers are not trying to change the way they think, but the way they present their thoughts. In other words, they should make students more rhetorically aware. Teachers should guide their students explicitly in developing strategies to meet their audiences' expectations through a number of pedagogical strategies, including frankly discussing rhetorical differences; asking students to study authentic writing tasks like term papers or proposals in order to learn to identify the purposes and rhetorical conventions expected by the respective audiences; presenting students with rhetorical and syntactic strategies like format, organization of paper, or passive voice; giving students practice in writing academic papers and supplying the research material so they can work on format and not experience information overload; and subsequently explaining to students the
problems that they are having and give advice on how to correct them and train other students on how to do this via peer reviews (Reid, 1989, pp. 220-231).

An explicit development of strategies would include involving students with the concept of discourse community, thereby teaching students to look at a text and ask such questions as "how a particular discourse community uses its discurssal conventions to initiate new members or how the discourse of another reifies particular values or beliefs" (Swales, 1990, p. 22). Hertzberg offers a valuable definition of discourse community as it should be applied to current research in composition:

Use of the term 'discourse community' testifies to the increasingly common assumption that discourse operates within conventions defined by communities, be they academic disciplines or social groups. The pedagogies associated with writing across the curriculum and academic English now use the notion of 'discourse communities' to signify a cluster of ideas: that language use in a group is a form of social behavior, that discourse is a means of maintaining and extending the group's knowledge and of initiating new members into the group, and that discourse is epistemic or constitutive of the group's knowledge. (qtd. in Swales, 1990, p. 21)

This can best be accomplished by asking students to hypothesize about the various discourse communities that they belong to, and then to define the communities' reasons for existing (the needs they meet), their goals, participatory rules, means of transmitting information (verbally or in writing in specific genres), and specialized terms used to transmit this information. Students can make quick connections between their non-academic discourse communities (sports teams, theater groups) and themselves; this leads them then to make connections between academic discourse communities and their respective majors. In this way, students learn to see academic writing not as types of communication in abstract forms, but as specific genres with specific forms and patterns created by their specific cultures. As Berlin (1996) states, "Understanding the generic
forms that texts assume requires an understanding of the textual environment that produces them" (p. 106).

### 3.4.2 The Pedagogical Importance of Genre Analysis

By combining rhetorical and discourse analysis, students learn to deconstruct genres not for the traditional rhetorical purposes of classification (Kinneavy 1971) but to discover the connections that genres have with the society that created them and their function in that society, or what Miller (1984) calls their social action. She explains that in her understanding of genre, there can be no taxonomies because "genres change, evolve and decay" (Miller, 1984, p. 36). As such, Miller describes features of genres in the following way:

1. Genre refers to a conventional category of discourse based in large scale typification of rhetorical action; as action, it acquires meaning from situation and from the social context in which that situation arose.
2. As meaningful action, genre is interpretable by means of rules; genre rules occur at a relatively high level on a hierarchy of rules for symbolic interaction.
3. Genre is distinct from form: form is the more general term used at all levels of the hierarchy. Genre is a form at one particular level that is a fusion of lower level forms and characteristic substance.
4. Genre serves as the substance of forms at a higher levels; as recurrent patterns of language use, genres help constitute the substance of our cultural life.
5. A genre is a rhetorical means for mediating private intentions and social exigency; it motivates by connecting the private with the public, the singular with the recurrent. (1984, pp. 36-37)

By teaching through genres, it is apparent that neither I nor Freedman, Swales, Berkenkotter and Hutchin, Miller or others involved in genre-based teaching are advocating a prescriptive approach to the teaching of writing. Rather, through communication with their instructor, both L1 and L2 students should understand the rhetoric of their own cultures and of the culture they are trying to write in. As Swales
describes it, linguistics, rhetoric, literature and folklore all use the concept of genre for their own purposes, yet there are common stances among them, stances that make it apparent that genre studies can be used without being prescriptive, one of the main complaints about genre use in the classroom. The components of this stance are:

1. a distrust of classification and of facile or premature prescriptivism;
2. a sense that genres are important for integrating past and present;
3. a recognition that genres are situated within discourse communities, wherein the beliefs and naming practices of members have relevance;
4. an emphasis on communicative purpose and social action;
5. an interest in generic structure (and its rationale);
6. an understanding of the double generative capacity of genres—to establish rhetorical goals and to further their accomplishments. (original emphasis) (Swales, 1990, p.45)

As Grabe and Kaplan (1989) explain, different rhetorical patterns may serve different purposes in different cultures and as such, may engage students in different thinking processes (p. 272) as well as understandings of cultural constructs; or enlighten students about the differences in their own intra-cultural communications. As seen in Chapter 2, when academic English is like a second language, writers who seem to be writing "incorrectly" in their academic programs need to be sensitized to "the features of language use in the [academic] community" (Berkenkotter & Hutchin, 1995, p. 86).

3.4.3 The Pedagogical Importance of Developing Analytical Skills

This sensitization can be accomplished by teaching students how to develop their analytical abilities by using discourse and traditional rhetorical analysis to discover cultural constructs apparent in texts of respective genres. For example, using Johns' (1995) work on genres and Ede's (1992) work on rhetorical analysis, and samples of discourse analysis from Tannen (1989), students can be first taught how to examine texts
at the rhetorical or textual level by asking questions about the writer (see Appendix B) such as **Why is the writer writing? What is the goal? What information is she or he trying to convey?** What is the persona/voice of the writer (authority, friend, etc.)?; about the reader, like **Who is the intended audience? What role is intended for the readers to adopt as they read this? What are the demographics of the audience?**; and about the text, such as **What specific or general situation or concern is this text a response to? What is the major claim or thesis of the text?**

Questions regarding structure and argument, like **Is the argument explicitly stated? What kind of information is considered "evidence"? What types of appeals are used?** or **What stylistic or generic conventions does the text follow?**, lead nicely into genre analysis (see Appendix A) where students can use their analytical skills to analyze texts from specific genres and the culture and social factors that created them by hypothesizing about the context and community of the genre; the roles and purposes of readers and writers; text type and variation and features in the texts; what the features tell the reader about the community values and roles of readers and writers; and even the similarities among genre categories.

I believe that through a combination of SLA and compositionist theories, with a focus on genre, we can offer students, both native and international, an understanding of their academic writing difficulties; an understanding which allows them, as Bizzell says, to see their writing difficulties "as the problems of a traveler to an unfamiliar country--yet a country in which it is possible to learn the language and the manners and even 'go native' while still remembering the land from which one has come" (1992, p. 100). As I will show in the next section, it also allows an examination, through the use of contrastive rhetoric and popular culture texts, of the way academic languages can vary from culture to culture. This examination can also lead to an awareness of the connection of genre convention to
social situation and context and, along with discourse analysis and genre analysis, offers students another way to deconstruct genres.

3.4.4 The Pedagogical Importance of Contrastive Rhetoric and Popular Culture in Developing Analytical Skills

Contrastive rhetoric allows students to become aware of cross-cultural conventions while an examination of popular culture allows them to practice their analytical skills on genres from subcultures. By understanding the differences in rhetoric, teachers can come up with exercises that more directly address the problems that native and non-native speakers have, and students can themselves become sensitive to the differences in compositional expectations.

3.4.4.1 Contrastive Rhetoric

As discussed in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2.2), contrastive rhetoric is a relatively new field and Robert Kaplan's 1966 study of about 600 second language student essays was the first of its kind with implications for ESL writing classrooms (Leki, 1991, p. 123). From these texts written by ESL students in English, he concluded that "students from different language backgrounds systematically developed their ideas in writing in patterns different from those that would appear natural in English" (Leki, 1992, p. 89). Practitioners of contrastive rhetoric now recognize that not only is style important and culturally formed, but so is the "purpose, task, topic and audience" (Leki, 1991, p. 133). When culture and previous education enter the picture, the assumption becomes that students are using their first language strategies, which are constructed from their own history, culture, and education, and transferring them to their second-language writing. Thus, what they were once praised for has become "ineffective in the new context" (Leki, 1991, p. 124) of an American university or composition classroom.
That is why a general knowledge of contrastive rhetoric shows composition instructors not only the variety of ways to express oneself through writing, but also lets them know that the errors students make in their L2 are not necessarily because of a lack of intelligence or skill, but rather may be a result of the L1 rhetorical training they have had which was based on their own history, culture and ideology (see section 3.3.1).

As Kaplan claims, contrastive rhetoric can make the teacher aware that:

- In teaching composition, the different composing conventions from different cultures must be addressed; even though a learner can compose in one language does not mean they [sic] can do so in another.

- There are differences in reader and writer responsibilities and audience, and while they may be understood in the L1 it doesn't mean they are understood in the L2.

and teach the student that:

- Just because they understand the rules and expectations in their language doesn't mean they know the rules in another culture's discourse. Text elements such as topic sentences, audience, and formatting are likely to differ.

- Writing is a social phenomenon and it requires more knowledge than just syntactic elements (Kaplan qtd. in Loy, 1988, pp. 28-30).

For example, we cannot assume that our style of critical analysis is universal. As Robert Oliver (1971) in Carolyn Matalene's *Contrastive Rhetoric: An American Writing Teacher in China* reminds us, "The standards of rhetoric in the West which have had a unitary development since their identification by Aristotle are not universals. They are expressions of Western culture, applicable within the context of Western culture values" (Matalene, 1985, p. 789). Even our definition of logic is not shared by all. According to Kaplan, "[Popular] logic which is the basis of rhetoric is evolved out of a culture; it is not
universal. Rhetoric, thus, is not universal either, but varies from culture to culture and even from time to time within a given culture" (qtd. in Constantinides & Hall, 1981, p. 80).

Thus we return to the claim that composition studies and exercises are most useful in teaching when they concern themselves with "the social construction of knowledge within discourse communities" (Leki, 1991, p. 136). One example of this is Eggington's (1987) "Written Academic Discourse in Korean: Implications for Effective Communication." It is unique because in his rhetorical analysis of Korean academic texts, he examines what happens when Korean students come to the U.S. to study and then return home with new rhetorical strategies. He found that Korean academic texts may be written either in a style similar to that of academic English or in a more traditional Korean style, depending on whether the Korean author has been trained in an English-speaking country. Eggington tested 37 recent Korean immigrants (college students and future American workers). He discovered that Koreans not trained in English rhetorical patterns may find it difficult to comprehend the information even though it is in Korean because "optimal information transfer occurs when organizational structure of a written unit of discourse agrees with the reader's preconceived notions of what that structure should be" (Eggington, 1987, p. 160). Eggington was able to suggest that for pedagogical purposes, teachers in Korea should teach both traditional Korean and English-influenced academic styles.

Using contrastive rhetoric, instructors can develop exercises that more directly address the problems that native and non-native speakers have in understanding the differences between cultures' or subcultures' rhetorical conventions. For example, one way to make students sensitive to their acculturation process is to ask them to do ethnographic research on their own discipline's culture (if the students are undecided they
can do research on a major that interests them). Contrastive rhetoric texts can be added (see Chapter 4, 4.5.1.2) as background to ethnographic research to develop meta-awareness in students of rhetorical conventions (like evidence, paragraph structure and essay organization) and how these vary depending upon the specific culture and genre. In this way, students can learn to manipulate the conventions as needed.

3.4.4.2 Popular Culture

Popular culture is another way to deconstruct genres while at the same time allowing students to feel empowered and to see that their own analytical experiences and culture are meaningful in the classroom. Through examining popular culture, instructors can show students that their skills used in critiquing their own culture can be used to understand the basic genre and rhetorical conventions of canonical and non-canonical material in English as well as in other disciplines. Mulcaire and Grady (1990) point out that students have already developed a set of sophisticated skills for reading [popular culture texts—movies, television, and commercial literary genres] against and in terms of one another. These skills . . . are not categorically different from the techniques teachers of composition inculcate or that literary critics employ when they study canonical, high cultural works. [Using popular texts] allows students to draw on skills they possess as students of culture, skills in evaluating the place of a given text within its genre, in recognizing generic characters and departures from the norms of a tradition, and in tracing the affiliation of one text to another. When students then move to canonical material, they bring with them a confidence in their skills and indeed their authority as readers and writers that renders these texts more congenial and accessible, rather than finding themselves staring down the barrel of the canon, they can continue to read and write successfully in ways already familiar to them (emphasis added) (pp. 2-3).
For example, instructors can develop analytical skills in students by teaching a specific genre, literature, with popular culture texts (Culp 1996). Students can be introduced to basic elements of literature by analyzing a half-hour situation comedy.

Once they see how the elements (plot, character, setting, etc.) work together and students have an understanding of elements, the instructor can clearly point out that these elements are very formulaic in television—not so in canonical literary works—but it is interesting to see how they work together. The instructor can then have students deconstruct canonical texts as well, for example, Aristotle's *Poetics*, and in the process see how the analysis they have just done is similar to the long tradition of literary analysis; in fact, Aristotle's claims are still relevant to works of today, and in deed we see them in books, on TV, and in the movies. The instructor can go through this show's (and other shows') elements again, pointing out how writers of today still abide by what Aristotle observed so many centuries ago. For example, in *Poetics*, Aristotle says "Tragedy endeavors to keep as far as possible within a single circuit of the sun, or something near that" (Corbett, 1984, p. 230) and in situation comedies like *Home Improvement* and others they rarely tell a story longer than a day in duration.

Popular culture texts reduce students' fears of canonical and non-canonical texts in various academic genres, and in fact, they can be useful tools to teach students how to transfer their newly developed analytical skills and understanding of rhetorical relations to their own specific American academic classroom texts. In the process, they can expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing not only in their English classes, but in all of their classes.

In the next chapter, I will show how these many components can be put together to create a new type of curriculum. This curriculum which extends the use of contrastive rhetoric from a means of looking at cultural differences to a method of exploring
differences in disciplinary discourse. It also teaches students how to use media analysis from communications studies, rhetorical analysis from composition studies, discourse analysis from applied linguistics, and genre analysis and ethnographic techniques from the latter two fields. The result is a new type of composition curriculum, one designed to develop analytical skills in students that will enable them to discover the rhetorical character and conventions of academic disciplines, master academic discourse, and expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communicating in all disciplines.
CHAPTER 4
METHODS: ESP IN THE COMPOSITION CLASSROOM

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes how I tested my argument that in the composition classroom the development of analytical skills and an understanding of cultural-specific rhetorical conventions can be accomplished more successfully using syllabus design and pedagogical strategies from both the rhetoric/composition and second-language acquisition fields. Here I discuss how I designed a multidisciplinary curriculum based on English for Specific Purposes (ESP) needs analysis methodology for a sophomore English composition class (ENGL 207), and evaluated it with an educational ethnographic methodology (which I will discuss further in Chapter 5).
4.2 ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES

4.2.1 Why Educational Ethnography and ESP in the Composition Classroom?

Composition research itself is interdisciplinary. Beach and Bridwell (1984) describe it as "a hybrid of disciplines, each having something to offer to those who are attempting to understand the extremely complex process of writing" (p. 1). What I argue in this dissertation is that whatever types of interdisciplinary pedagogy and research methods are used in the composition classroom, they must be useful for discovering and describing sociocultural knowledge in that classroom. For these reasons, in my composition classroom study, I chose to borrow from the second-language acquisition field and use techniques from English for Specific Purposes (ESP) to design the curriculum, and from educational ethnography (originally from anthropology) to evaluate this new curriculum.

While I will discuss the ethnographic methods in greater detail in Chapter 5, here I quickly make connections between these two interdisciplinary tools and their relevance to my research. In earlier chapters I discussed how one of the main claims of this work is that written academic English is often a "second language" to native and nonnative speakers of English and it is for this reason that both native-speaking composition students and instructors need to develop greater analytical skills that will enable them to identify cultural-specific rhetorical conventions and successfully recreate them. These skills and understanding of conventions can be discovered and developed through ESP and educational ethnography because both

1. are relevant to second language learning and teaching;
2. allow teachers and students to discover the sociocultural knowledge necessary to do well in the classroom (Johnson, 1992, p. 132);
3. rely on analysis of students' needs and abilities and insider knowledge. In
fact, ethnographic techniques can also be used with ESP-based techniques to create and evaluate an interdisciplinary curriculum.

In addition, ethnographic research allows the focus to fall on the function of a communicative event, and can help the researcher be aware of his or her own cultural biases in analyzing data.

4.2.2 Research Questions

The general research questions that guided this study were as follows:

(1) If both native-speaking composition students and instructors need to develop greater analytical skills that will enable them to identify cultural-specific rhetorical conventions and successfully recreate them, can these skills and understandings be acquired through a combinations of pedagogical strategies from both the rhetoric/composition and second-language teaching fields?

(2) If students learn how to use interdisciplinary tools to rhetorically analyze texts and discourses from different cultures and subcultures (e.g., American vs. Chinese culture or academic vs. popular culture), can they learn then how to transfer their newly developed analytical skills and understanding of rhetorical relations (using contrastive rhetoric, popular culture, and discourse analysis) to their own specific American academic classroom texts? And will this help them expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing not only in their English classes, but in all of their classes?
(3) Can a genre-based multidisciplinary composition curriculum help them in the acquisition of new analytical skills?

A long-term goal is that the model exemplified in this study may aid in the development of composition curricula in secondary and higher education.

4.2.3 What is English for Specific Purposes (ESP)?

According to Johns (1991) in "English for Specific Purposes (ESP): Its History and Contributions," there are two major subcategories of ESP: English for Occupational Purposes, which includes VESL and Professional English (EOP), and English for Academic Purposes (EAP), which encompasses English for Academic Purposes (other than EST) and English for Science and Technology (EST) (p. 71). Like many composition classes for native speakers, ESP classrooms characteristically include students with a wide variety of language backgrounds (here I am using language to encompass academic languages too), mixed English skills (which in the native-speaker composition class can include a range of skills from mechanical to argumentative), and a need to be taught quickly either through self-instruction or in limited classroom time.

While works like Johns (1991), Crofts (1981), and especially Hutchinson and Waters' (1987) English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centred Approach provide more comprehensive histories of ESP, for purposes of this dissertation, a short history will suffice. With the post-World War II boom in world-wide scientific and economic communication (and during the Oil Crisis of the 1970s), English became the lingua franca of business people and scientists who wanted to learn English not for general cultural or academic purposes but for specific business and research-related purposes. At the same time, studies in the linguistics field shifted from basic grammar to how language is used in
real-world communication and to the different varieties of English available to learners (scientific English, business English, etc.). Studies in educational psychology, which focused on student interest in material and motivation as major factors in learning, also contributed to the growth and development of ESP (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 6-8).

Like the composition field, ESP has gone through many developmental stages. Similar to the composition field's earlier Current-Traditionalist phrase, with its emphasis on punctuation and sentence-level structure, ESP went through what was called the "register analysis" phase where the focus on language was also at the sentence level. In the next ESP phase, the focus had shifted above the sentence to how sentences are used in communicative acts, the examination of which was accomplished through discourse and rhetorical analysis. In the third stage, the use of needs analysis (or what Hutchinson and Waters call "target situation analysis") was developed as a means to analyze the reason or situation for learning English and in the process discover the best way for the student to learn the necessary material. Like the process stage in composition, in which the importance shifted from form to how the student thought about and created writing, in the fourth stage of ESP, researchers also looked at how students process language learning (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 9-14).

According to Hutchinson and Waters, unlike the first four phases which are "fundamentally flawed, in that they are all based on descriptions of language use," in the current fifth phase, the focus of ESP is now not only on use, but "an understanding of the processes of language learning," (1987, p. 14) which includes focusing on student needs in the classroom and in non-academic environments.

Unlike General English or even composition, ESP's approach to language learning, syllabus design, teaching methods, or course content, relies not on tradition, intuition, or
edicts from above, but is based on the learner and what he or she needs in order to learn a language (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, p. 19). This is an approach that I believe should be adopted more often in the composition classroom, because as Hutchinson and Waters claim:

What distinguishes ESP from General English is not the existence of a need as such but rather an awareness of the need . . . any course should be based on an analysis of learner need. This is one way in which ESP procedures can have a useful effect on General English and indicates once more for the need for a common approach. (1987, pp. 53-54)

While a Saudi Arabian student may need to learn English for his degree in engineering—thus an obvious need exists for scientific English—specific needs also exist in the native composition classroom. In general, students may need to pass a writing examination, or do well on the LSAT, or specifically, third-year literature students may need to meet the entry requirements to a fourth-year Shakespeare class. Or as in the case of this study, native English-speaking sophomore students (and I would argue all students) need to develop analytical skills which will, in the longer term, allow them to discover the rhetorical character of academic disciplines and genres, understand disciplinary ideology, learn disciplinary vocabulary and standards of evidence, and thus do well in their academic careers.

4.2.4 ESP, Ethnographic Tools, Genre Analysis, and The Development of Competence

In Chapter 2 I discussed how students can come to a clearer understanding of expectations in the classroom through genre studies. ESP makes an excellent model for deconstructing genres that composition teachers and researchers could adapt for their own purposes. It is an excellent model because it allows us to "identify homogenous groups of language users and characterize[e] their uses of language in particular circumstances
together with a representative selection of linguistic usages habitually employed" (MacKay & Mountford, 1978, p. 6). The deconstruction of genres also allows teachers to help students become communicatively competent.

4.2.4.1 Genre Studies

Swales (1985b) was one of the earliest to advocate deconstructing genres in the second-language classroom through discourse analysis and rhetorical analysis. In his detailed definitions of genre, he makes the claim that genre labels name types of recurring communicative events that occur in societies. These events should be examined in the classroom because as members of societies, we work not only through a variety of genres in the educational process (especially the research article, which according to Swales is one of the most prolific English-language text genres) but in the outside world. And we become more proficient in them as we practice them (Swales, 1985b, pp. 9, 11). (See section 3.4.2 for a more in-depth examination of genre and its importance in pedagogy.)

4.2.4.2 Ethnographic Tools

According to Swales, becoming proficient in a genre means knowing that genres do have rules (albeit static ones) in terms of structure and content. To contribute to a genre, students can be creative, yet they need to know that through specific frameworks "communicative activities can be channeled and expectancies shared" (Swales, 1985b, p. 10). Swales suggests that one way to do this is for students and teachers to take on the tools of the cultural anthropologist, specifically an ethnographic tool like discourse analysis, and apply them to academic and non-academic discourse (1985b, p. 14). This teaches both students and teachers invaluable analytical skills because, as Swales (1985b) argues, it gives teachers a more "meaningful framework" in which to design courses, and
gives students "a series of keys" to help them engage in various structured communicative events in academic and non-academic life (p. 19). From the composition field, Bizzell (1992) shares Swales' ESL-based ideas on genre teaching, claiming that since an academic discipline is composed of people working together, agreeing on evidence, facts, and formats, there is a rhetorical character to disciplines which students should be aware of (p. 145). In addition, by knowing that "disciplinary life is rhetorical," students can gain critical consciousness of the ideologies involved which fosters critical consciousness (Bizzell, 1992, p. 150).

Fortunately, genre-based teaching strategies and materials used with second-language students work well in the native composition classroom. Swales (1984) details how, in developing materials for international students on how to write introductions to journal articles, he discovered that not only were many of his textual analysis ESP-type activities "quite well received by native speakers" but international and American graduate students reported finding that the analytical work (color-coding, metaphor finding, referencing, jumbled instructions) made them "more critical and more perceptive readers of both their own work and of articles in journals" (pp. 83,84). This is what I tried to do with my course materials and teaching tools as well.

4.2.4.3 Communicative Competence

According to McKay and Mountford (1978), in ESP and in particular EST, the increase in popularity of discourse analysis coincided with the increased interest and understanding of the notion of communicative competence (p. 19). Since the late 1960s, researchers in linguistics and second-language teaching (Weinreich et al., 1968; Allen & Widdowson, 1978; Jacob, 1987; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975; Mehan 1979) have made the argument for a second-language curricula that focuses on developing communicative and
cultural competence, and later studies advocate instructors using discourse analysis to analyze and then discover the structure of the communication task. In this work, I argue that discourse analysis should be combined with rhetorical analysis and taught to students to accomplish this goal.

Noam Chomsky (1965) was the first linguist to separate competence from performance; while this had a huge impact on linguistic theory and social scientists who studied language, it was Dell Hymes in the early 1970s who challenged Chomsky's slighting of the impact of social and cultural factors on language learners (Cooley & Roach, 1984, pp. 16-17). Hymes (1972) developed what he called "communicative competence" in which he defined competence as "the general term for the capabilities of a person. Competence is dependent on both (tacit) knowledge and (ability for) use" (Hymes, 1972, p. 282). He discussed how children learn to use sentences this way:

He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, in what manner. In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech acts, and to evaluate their accomplishments by others. This competence, moreover, is integral with attitudes, values, and motivations concerning language, its features and uses. (Hymes, 1972, p. 277)

The idea of communicative competence has been addressed in many fields, including rhetoric/composition, second-language acquisition, language development and communication. Although the term communicative competence is not used in the field of rhetoric and composition, the idea of competence was important in the days of the Greek rhetoricians and continues today (McCroskey, 1984, p. 260). Aristotle, in his Rhetoric, was concerned with the rhetorical situation, and with rhetoric that he defined as the available means of persuasion in any given situation. In composition classes the rhetorical
triangle (first introduced by Kinneavy (1971)) is stressed: the inter-connection between the reader, writer and text and the appropriateness of communication between the three.

In the second-language acquisition (SLA) field, competence is defined in many ways: pragmatic competence, which "consists of the knowledge that speaker-hearers use in order to engage in communication"; linguistic competence, which "refers to the knowledge of the items and rules that comprise the formal systems of language"; and communicative competence, which "consists of the knowledge that users of a language have internalized to enable them to understand and produce messages in the language" (Ellis, 1994, pp. 696, 712, 719). According to Ellis, "the main goal of SLA research is to characterize the learner's underlying knowledge of the L2, i.e., to describe and explain their competence" (1994, p. 13).

In the language development field, Schiefelbusch and Pickar (1984) define communicative competence as the interrelatedness of language and contexts, as the ability of "speakers to use language appropriately in environmental contexts" (p. 5). In the communication field, some researchers connect the notions of context and competence with cross-cultural issues. As Cooley and Roach (1984) point out, "communication behaviors are culturally specific from two perspectives, that of the communication source and that of the observer" (p. 13). Thus not only is communicative behavior "culturally specific" and "represent[ative] of cultural values and activities" but instructors must keep in mind that "competent behaviors in one culture are not necessarily salient or relevant to competence in another culture" (Cooley & Roach, 1984, p. 14).

Cross-cultural competence problems are what we often find with students who are entering the academic discourse community. The competence they were praised for in high school is not considered adequate in the college community. According to McCroskey (1984), most students arrive at college with the ability to perform academic
communication behaviors adequately, but they often do not engage in these behaviors in the classroom because they either do not understand the need to do so, are apathetic about how they will be evaluated, or because they are afraid to engage in the appropriate communication behaviors (p. 264). In order to develop academic communicative competence, McCroskey recommends that the classroom needs to be a "learning environment which permits the development of appropriate behavioral and cognitive skills, shapes a positive affect for communication, and provides opportunities for use and reinforcement of those abilities" (1984, p. 267).

But how would the development of skills and opportunities for use of these abilities occur? Allen and Widdowson (1978), who argue that general EFL instruction (and I would add native English instruction) in secondary schools generally does not prepare students for the use of the language needed in higher education, propose that language in the classroom should be "presented in such a way as to reveal its character as communication" (p. 59). They argue that this can be accomplished by using discourse analysis in the creation of teaching materials that show students not only how sentences are used in communicative acts but also develop in students the ability to see how sentences can be manipulated to create the texts and then create these communicative acts on their own (Allen & Widdowson, 1978, p. 76). While these particular exercises focus more on sentence-level activities, I argue that discourse analysis can be combined with rhetorical analysis to provide students with skills necessary to analyze whole texts and then successfully recreate these genre-structured communication acts.

Allen and Widdowson go so far to argue that what is taught in the native English classroom--the creative writing approach or the composition textbooks with traditional rhetorical principles--are limited in their effectiveness because the teaching and learning of academic texts (like journal articles, lab reports) and business/technical texts (like
correspondence, sale proposals) often require some "explicit instruction in the conventions which govern these particular styles of writing" (1978, p. 71). Allen and Widdowson go on to argue that in the case of composition handbooks, having students analyze the writings of others or copy them without recreating these writings on their own, does not make the student a competent writer of a particular genre (1978, p. 71).

4.2.5 Needs Analysis for Syllabus Design

Besides incorporating explicit genre instruction in the composition class as a means to develop communicative competency in students, ESP techniques also offer another important contribution to language teaching: needs and task analysis for syllabus and curriculum design. Many researchers (Johns, 1991; MacKay, 1981; Schmidt, 1981; McKay and Mountford, 1978) have discussed this most important contribution in their work. ESP needs analysis parallels ethnographic practices. In 1985a, Swales was one of the first researchers to overtly call for needs analysis and syllabus design in ESP to be done in an ethnographic manner. Others, like Ramani et al. (1988) and Jacob (1987) have gone on to conduct such studies. Instead of relying on outsider observations, ethnographic practices would allow participants in a genre—the insiders—to more accurately detail what is expected of participants within that genre (Ramani et al., 1988, p. 83).

4.2.5.1 Needs Analysis

Researchers like Hutchinson and Waters (1987) use needs analysis to differentiate between what they call target needs and learning needs. Teachers need to determine "target" needs, or what the student needs to do in the target or educational situation, by looking specifically at the necessities of the target situation (for example, in the upper-
division composition class, the student will need to know how to write an essay); what the student already knows and still *lacks* (the same student may lack an ability to organize his or her work appropriately); and what the student *wants* out of the course, which may not necessarily coincide with what the teacher thinks the student needs (the student may want to be able to write well for her future as a journalism major, while the teacher is more concerned with the format and content of English essays). Using a variety of ethnographic research tools like questionnaires or interviews with students or former teachers, instructors need to determine target needs by first asking the six "who, what, where, when, why and how" questions such as: Where is this language to be used (classroom, office)? How will this information be used (academic texts, discussion groups)? What's the level (undergraduate, graduate) and subject (English, economics)?

In designing the syllabus, the teacher also needs to investigate students' "learning needs" or what will motivate students to learn or develop communicative competence in this learning situation. For this reason is it necessary to ask the same six questions to discover what McKay and Mountford (1978) in their discussion of English for Science and Technology (EST) call the sociolinguistic, linguistic, psychological, and pedagogical factors in syllabus design (p. 10). These would include questions like: Why are these students attending this class (general education requirement, personal interest)? Who are the learners (age, gender)? How would they best learn (what pedagogical or methodological techniques would increase their interest or bore them)? (MacKay & Mountford, 1978, pp. 54-63).

4.2.5.2 Syllabus Design

Once the needs have been determined, the process of course design begins (although in reality both may be going on simultaneously; adjustments are also made as the
data are analyzed). ESP course design can be language, skills or learning-centered. According to Hutchinson and Waters, the ideal approach would be the learning-centered approach because it incorporates the best of language and skills approaches, plus it continually takes the language learner into consideration.

It works this way: the process starts with the learner, followed by various stages of analysis of the situation, and on toward the syllabus (this alone is the language approach). But because no one learns in a literal point-A-to-point-B fashion, the process should take into consideration how the student learns and develops competence. This is a major aspect of the skills-centered approach, or the next level of the diagram (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 65-71), which allows the creation of what Widdowson (1981) describes as a process-oriented course over a goal-oriented one.

According to Widdowson (1981), a goal-oriented approach to learning and syllabus design is inappropriate to English for Academic Purposes (EAP) (and for L1 academic purposes) because it addresses only "what the learner needs to do with the language once he or she has learned it . . . [it] relates to terminal behavior, the ends of learning" (p. 2) not the acquisition of the language or the process of learning. But it is in the process of learning that students develop their own strategies for dealing with new material and "activat[ing] strategies for learning while the course is in process" (Widdowson, 1981, p. 5).

According to Crofts (1981), a question little addressed in ESP literature (and in traditional composition literature), is "how far the ESP course is supposed to teach the students' specialism as well as the English they need in that specialism" (p. 148). This problem appears in the native-speaker composition classroom as well, since not only can a teacher of beginning or advanced composition not teach the writing styles required in each students' major, but even in specialized composition classes like technical writing
instructors are often faced with a number of students demanding that she teach them their disciplines' versions of a proposal—a feat that is not possible. A native-speaker technical writing teacher cannot teach 10 different types of proposals, nor can a sophomore composition teacher prepare students specifically for their particular major's style of writing essays. But if a teacher develops a syllabus that teaches students different tools of analysis, students can continue applying what they have learned in future courses, and in effect continue learning as they discover new rhetorical features and strategies of other texts and styles of argumentation (the goal of Research Question 2). This, I believe, is the best way to develop communicative competence.

Returning to Hutchinson and Waters, ideally, the next step in the syllabus design process would involve the instructor utilizing his or her awareness of how his or her students are developing the desired competence by taking them into account at all stages of the process. What is most important is that composition instructors who are willing to develop learning-centered approaches to syllabi and materials understand "that learning will continue beyond the completion of instruction since the aim of such instruction precisely is to develop a capacity to learn" and as a result will develop syllabi that enable students to become "better processors of information" (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 16, 70). Thus another important aspect of this type of syllabus design is that instructors understand that in terms of creating syllabi for second-language learners—and here I am using academic English as a second language to native English-speaking students—the number one principle of syllabus design according to Hutchinson and Waters (1987) is: "Second language learning is a developmental process. Learners use their existing knowledge to make the new information comprehensible" (p. 128). I addressed this earlier in Chapter 3 when I discussed the use of popular culture in the classroom. Instructors must also be aware that course design is both a negotiated and a dynamic
process. For this reason student feedback is necessary during various stages of the learning process in order to provide information that can enable the instructor to vary the materials and methods as appropriate (and motivating) to the learners. In the learning-centered approach, all factors that may impact a course and students' ability to learn must be considered in the designing of the syllabus (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 74-77).

4.2.5.3 Course Evaluation, Methodology and the Role of the Teacher

Because ESP courses (and ESP techniques-based courses) are concerned with communicative tasks and students' abilities to be able to complete these tasks, assessment of the course and learners is usually done at the beginning and end of courses. Learners can be assessed through placements tests, achievement tests or proficiency tests. Courses can be evaluated in much the same way as ethnographies are conducted, which again is why an ESP course design works so well with ethnographic evaluations of new courses. Both ESP and ethnographic evaluations can be done with questionnaires, test results and interviews, and these can be given in the first week of the course, regularly during and at the end of the course, and even some time after the course has ended (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 144-46, 153-55).

In conclusion, General English methodology does not differ that much from ESP methodology. Techniques that have been used in the General English class can be used in ESP, and techniques from ESP can add new dimensions to the General English class. According to Hutchinson and Waters, the difference between the tasks of the normal English instructor and one who uses ESP, however, is that the ESP teacher will need to spend more time and effort on needs analysis and syllabus and material design, as well as evaluation (1987, pp. 142, 157). I argue here that the extra work is worth it because, like
ESP course syllabi, composition course syllabi could be "used creatively as a generator of good and relevant learning activities . . . at the same time [maintaining] relevance to target needs. It, therefore, [could serve] the needs of students as both users and learners of the language" (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987, pp. 93-94).
4.3 ENGLISH 207: ANALYSIS OF ESP-BASED NEEDS DATA

This section describes the subjects and the instruments used to help create the new 207 curriculum. It also provides a preliminary evaluation of the influence of the ENGL 207 course on students' writing abilities and attempts an initial response to the research questions posed earlier. In borrowing from the needs analysis of Ramani et al. (1988) (who used Kemp's [1977] methodology), I engaged in the following activities (although not necessarily in this order):

1. Specified the learners
2. Gathered information on learners' needs
3. Analyzed the students' target and learner needs data
4. Selected materials and devised a curriculum with appropriate teaching and learning activities to meet these needs
5. Created the syllabus
6. Evaluated the syllabus during the course and revised it accordingly, and evaluated it at the end of the course (pp. 82-83)

After I describe the learners in general in my class, I describe the research instrument used and the results; then I offer an assessment of the needs analysis beginning in section 4.4. In Chapter 6, I describe the participants in the study.

4.3.1 The Learners

Initially 23 students signed up for Section 2 of English 207. After various addings and droppings in the first couple of weeks due to schedule changes and workload considerations, the total number of students enrolled in this class settled at 18. One student dropped out in mid semester for workload-related reasons, and two other students ceased to attend class about the 12th week.

The initial 18 students were split evenly among females and males; two freshman, eight sophomores, five juniors and three seniors. While many English majors take this
course, ENGL 207 is a general education course, so students from many other disciplines enroll in it as well. In Section 2 there were students with a wide diversity of majors, including creative writing, English, psychology, Management Information Systems (MIS), accounting/finance, sociology, business and media arts.

Unlike ethnographers who work within a single speech community, in this class I was working with students from various disciplines within the academic speech community. Therefore, in order to create an effective ESP-based syllabus, I gathered information from the students regarding their own general abilities and strengths and weaknesses in writing, and relied on students to gather further information on their target insider community by interviewing insiders (published professors in their major departments).

4.3.1.1 Student Beginning-of-the-Semester Questionnaire (SBSQ)

The first part of the SBSQ (see Appendix C) was designed to gather student history regarding college education, English courses taken (materials read and concepts emphasized), perceived improvement based on the instruction received, and suggestions for English instructors to prepare students for upper-division non-English and English classes. The second part was designed to gather information on students' attitudes toward writing, perceived strengths and weaknesses, and goals and hopes for this class.

4.3.1.2 Purpose/Design of Instrument

The specific questions used were taken and modified from Shuck's (1995) survey of second-language students attending the University of Arizona's Center for English as a Second Language (CESL) to prepare themselves for academic work at the university. The goals of her survey and this study were the same: to find out how students'
perceptions of previous college courses did or did not prepare them for more advanced academic writing courses. The questionnaire was designed to obtain information which could inform instructors about the needs of new initiates to the academic discourse community and the skills required for advanced courses.

4.3.1.3 Elicitation

The SBSQ was given to students on the second day of class. Eighteen were returned within the next two weeks of class (although one came from a student who dropped soon afterward and one student, who stayed in class but did not complete all of the major assignments, did not turn one in).

This SBSQ was also given to a second 207 section; I visited the class and made a personal appeal for the completion of the questionnaire. Ten questionnaires were returned within approximately three weeks. Originally this study intended to compare the two sections of student responses on the SBSQ, to be followed by a common genre-based writing exercise. But because the other instructor was using an ethnographic writing focus, it was decided that the tasks of the end-of-semester writing exercise, which would include overt questions on genre features in text, would have required explicit genre prompts and definitions of terms, making the responses of the two groups incomparable since these would not have been included in the curriculum for the other section. This task then became the final examination only for my 207 group. However, in future studies, an analysis of both sets of SBSQs could give more information on the type of students taking this course, and as source of comparison to the research group.
4.3.1.4 Analysis and Findings

The 18 student responses from the SBSQ from the English 207-2 class were placed on a chart and averaged to find information under the following categories: General 207 Demographics, Previous Coursework, Preferred Learning Strategies, Self-Assessment of Abilities, and Goals for taking 207. Some students did not answer all questions.

4.3.1.4.1 General 207 Demographics

Of the 17 students who responded, five came straight to the University of Arizona from public high schools; five from Catholic high schools or college preparatories; five transferred here from community colleges or other four-year colleges (one dropped out of the UA, attended a local community college, and returned to the UA seven years later); one returned to college after dropping out of two different bachelor's programs in the Midwest and then spending several years as a hair dresser; and one completed a BA in philosophy, worked for several years in the computer field, and is now attending the UA to obtain a BA in MIS. Initially, there were two freshman, eight sophomore, five juniors and three seniors

4.3.1.4.2 Previous Coursework

To take English 207, students must have taken the English 101 (Introduction to Composition) and 102 (Introduction to Literature) prerequisites at the University of Arizona, or the equivalent from other schools. According to the SBSQ, seven of the 18 students had completed all or part of their prerequisites at schools other than the UA.

When asked to describe the kinds of writing projects they had completed in their introductory English classes, most of the 18 mentioned paper types that seem to make up most basic writing programs: the personal essay, rhetorical analysis or contextual essay,
and the persuasive or argumentative essay (called the research essay by some students). Reading materials (articles, anthologies) were similar as well.

While these classes may have required similar essays and texts, each writing program and the instructors in these programs usually approached texts from different angles (e.g., rhetorical emphasis, literature emphasis). In responding to what major terms and concepts were emphasized, most students remembered that previous classes emphasized (1) rhetorically based analysis and/or literary analysis; (2) clarity of thought and expression; and (3) mechanics. Research and argument skills and the concepts of audience/purpose were mentioned least. And only one person mentioned plagiarism.

4.3.1.4.3 Preferred Learning Strategies

When asked how their writing skills did or did not improve after taking college-level English courses, the overwhelming majority said there had been slight to great improvement, especially in their abilities to write coherent thoughts, in expression, and in mechanics; two students credited their high school Advanced Placement (AP) classes with improving their writing more than their college-level classes.

When asked what techniques helped them to learn to write and what they would suggest instructors do to prepare students for upper-division classes, students mentioned the importance of the teacher in the classroom. Of particular importance were feedback on papers, availability for office hours, open-mindedness regarding students' individual writing styles, and receiving praise and encouragement. Students also said it was important that they be allowed to pick their own topics to write on because topics that personally interested them motivated them to write well, while topics "forced" on them bored them, which made them procrastinate. Chances to practice their writing and peer work were also important.
4.3.1.4.4 Self-Assessment of Abilities

Most students said they enjoyed writing, especially creative writing like fiction, poetry and personal experience essays. But four of the 17 said writing was or could be difficult or frustrating; one was indifferent. When asked about their strengths, most said they were creative and could come up with good ideas, especially for stories. Only one student claimed analytical skills as a strength.

Procrastination, being distracted, and a lack of clarity of thought were named most often as weaknesses, as were mechanics (punctuation and spelling). Only two people mentioned a weakness in analysis, and one said that writing an argument and doing research were weaknesses.

4.3.1.4.5 Goals in Taking 207

Most students said they hoped this course would improve their writing in a number of different ways, like learning to write faster, present ideas more clearly, improve their writing technique, become less wordy, or learn structure. Learning writing skills to pass the Upper-Division Writing Proficiency Exam (UDWPE) and upper-division classes and for the post-college world were named next, and a few students were hoping to learn to be disciplined in their writing instead of procrastinating. Only one mentioned improving analytical skills and two said improving research skills.

4.3.2 Former ENGL 207 Instructors

4.3.2.1 Survey of Former 207 Instructors (SFI)

The first part of the SFI (shown in Appendix D) was designed to gather information on former 207 instructors' number of years of teaching at the UA and the times they had taught 207. The second part was to gather their observations of their
former students' abilities at the beginning of the semester, the assignments they had asked students to complete, their observations of their students' abilities at the end of the semester, and their overall evaluations of students.

4.3.2.2 Purpose and Design of the Instrument

Specific questions were taken and modified from Johns' (1986) survey of community college and university faculty and the differences in their writing task assignments and evaluations in lower-division classes. This instrument works well for the purposes of this study because it provides a means of analysis of instructors' expectations, tasks designed for students, and observations of what skills are lacking in students and their previous writing training in order to successfully complete 200-level coursework. The instrument also allowed me to compare goals and tasks assigned in more traditional courses to my own course goals and tasks, and helped orient me to the potential student weaknesses I would face as an instructor.

4.3.2.3 Elicitation

The SFI was sent to seven former instructors and was returned by five. One respondent was an adjunct instructor with an MFA in creative writing who has taught at this university for 13 years; three were graduate associates in teaching (GATs) from the Rhetoric, Composition and Teaching of English (RCTE) program who had taught here for 8, 5 and 3 years; one was a GAT from the Literature program who has taught here for 6 years. Each GAT had taught 207 either once or twice; the adjunct instructor had taught it five times. The average section had had between 19-20 students.
4.3.2.4 Analysis and Findings

4.3.2.4.1 Observations of Former 207 Students’ Abilities/Beginning of Semester.

When asked to rank student abilities on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 meaning "didn't do well" and 5 meaning "did easily," four instructors gave students an average of 3.9 in reading; a 3.5 in comprehension of feedback on work turned in, suggestions on improvement and learning new types of writing genres; a 3.3 in researching; a 3.0 in writing; and a 2.8 in citing. The fifth, a GAT, said she could not answer the questions as asked because she had "a huge range of students with differing abilities."

4.3.2.4.2 Types of Assigned Writing

In this survey, instructors said that they all assigned an analysis paper, personal experience, and persuasive paper. Other types of writing that were assigned included process logs and journals (four reported assigning these), term or research papers (assigned by three), essay tests (assigned by three), letters or memos (assigned by two), observations/reports (assigned by two), and group writing assignments (assigned by one).

4.3.2.4.3 Number of Writing Assignments Students Generally Asked to Complete

Students were generally asked to complete 5 to 6 major assignments, though two respondents said they asked for many smaller journals or reader response assignments as well.

4.3.2.4.4 Work Students Most Often Asked to Do

When asked which assignments students were asked to do most often, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 meaning "seldom" and 5 meaning "frequently," the five instructors ranked the assignments as follows:
Students were asked most often to argue a position (5), synthesize, i.e., produce something unique from what has been studied or observed (4.8** this question was answered by four instructors because the fifth reported not being able to answer the question as phrased), employ rhetorical analysis (4.6), examine discourses (4.4), analyze, i.e., break down information into constituent parts (4.4), and evaluate, using internal evidence or external criteria (4.4).

They were asked less often to apply models, principles or generalizations to a new situation (3.4), compare or contrast one concept, idea or theory with another (3.3**), and analyze genres (3.2). Rarely were they asked to employ contrastive rhetoric (2.0**), summarize readings or lectures (2**), or make a list of concepts, ideas or events (1.8).

4.3.2.4.5 Important Evaluation Factors

When asked which factors were most important in the evaluation of their students' writing, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 meaning "not as important" and 5 meaning "very important," the five instructors ranked the assignments as follows: ideas (each point was discussed well with clear development) 5; organization (writing was organized well or according to an assigned model) 5; unique viewpoint (a creative approach to the assignment was evident) 4.4; correct punctuation 4; correct or acceptable spelling 4; usage (the sentence structure was correct) 4.2; and wording (correct terms for the discipline or class were employed) 3.2.

4.3.2.4.6 Observations of Former 207 Students' Abilities/End of Semester

When asked to rate their observations of their former 207 students' abilities at the end of the semester on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 meaning "didn't do well" and 5 meaning "did easily," four instructors ranked the skills as follows with the pre-semester abilities in
parenthesis (the fifth, a GAT who earlier had said that she had had many students of differing abilities, said she could not answer this question either because she claimed that "some of my students had improved but I don't have any numbers"): learning new types of writing genres 4.5 (3.5); reading 4.3 (3.9); understanding of feedback to work turned in, suggestions on improvement 4.2 (3.5); writing 4 (3); researching 3.5 (3.3); and citing 3.4 (2.8).

4.3.2.4.7 What Pleased/Displeased Instructors

When asked what pleased and displeased instructors most about the writing of the students in their 207 class(es), the comments reflected the diversity of the classes. Many students were good at some skills, like making the topic their own, while others wrote more "shallow" papers and had poor citation skills. In responding to what pleased or annoyed instructors they said:

ADJUNCT INSTRUCTOR with 13 years teaching experience at the UA:
PROS: "Their [students'] ability to make their assignments their own, i.e., to translate assignments into a meaningful rhetorical situation. Also, development of individual voice and style.
CONS: "The unwillingness of some to move beyond the same old topics and views--the '101 view' of writing."

RCTE GAT with 8 years teaching experience at the UA:
PROS: "Some students were fun, engaged, interested. Their essays reflected this."
CONS: "It wasn't the writing that ever bothered me--even if it turned out shallow. What bothered me [was] if they weren't trying to write more than a shallow paper."
RCTE GAT with 5 teaching years experience at the UA:

**PROS**: "... I think I was most pleased with the conceptual risks they took in their essays, their willingness to revise meaningfully, and their choosing topics that mattered to them."

**CONS**: "Why the hell can't they use MLA style correctly? How many times do I have to say 'No 'p' -- just cite the page number'?! Also, some still summarized more than they analyzed."

RCTE GAT with 3 years experience at the UA:

**PROS**: "They could form more complex thoughts and better respond to [each] other's writing."

**CONS**: "Some mechanical problems [like] 101-102 students, consistent problems with citation."

LIT GAT with 6 years experience at the UA:

**PROS**: "The students moved from a very "static" kind of writing--at the beginning of the semester they were essentially writing five-paragraph essays--to a more fluid style: they put aside thesis statements and the like and realized that professional writing can still be very personal (and vice-versa)."

**CONS**: "A few students seemed to have no grasp of what an essay is--they seemed to feel that any collection of words on a page makes a comprehensive essay."

4.3.2.5 *Observations of Students in Class*

This will be discussed in Chapter 6 where the ethnographic findings are discussed in detail.
4.4 ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS: TARGET AND LEARNER NEEDS

Before and while designing the syllabus, I examined what the course catalogue described as the target of English 207 and compared that with what experts in academic English describe as ideal skills to learn; I then compared this with what the former instructors of 207 reported they had tried to teach students. I also analyzed the target needs of students. In doing the latter, I asked myself what the necessities of the situation were, what students know and yet still lack; and what the students want out of the course. I also analyzed the learning needs of the students, and asked myself such questions as who are the learners in this class, why are they attending this class, what will motivate them to develop communicative competence, and what kind of pedagogical techniques will pique their interest in learning? Section 4.4.1 below summarizes the findings that I concluded should be taken into consideration in my course syllabus.

4.4.1 Needs Analysis for Syllabus Design

4.4.1.1 Target Needs According to the Course Catalogue

According to the 1997 Department of English: Course Descriptions catalogue published by the UA English Department, English 207, Sophomore Composition, should engage students in the "study and practice forms [sic] of expository and argumentative writing"; additionally, the curriculum for this class includes "four to six essays, taking [students] through a process of invention, drafting, and revision, read and discuss examples of professional nonfiction prose, and participate in . . . workshops of class members' writing" (p. 37). Students are eligible to take English 207 if they have completed the freshman composition sequence (101 and 102) at the University of Arizona, or if transfer students have taken the equivalent elsewhere. It is a class that meets twice a week for 75 minutes each for 15 weeks.
Because it is a more advanced class, there is often greater demand to teach it on the part of graduate students and adjunct faculty. According to the catalogue, the syllabus may vary "according to the individual instructor, but all instructors emphasize understanding of the rhetorical situation in both student and professional writing;" additionally, "students may choose their own topics in order to develop writing related to their own individual disciplines, though these are written to a general rather than to a specialized audience" (1997. p. 37).

Examination of five former instructors' syllabi shows that they did address understanding of the rhetorical situation in writing, but for four of them this emphasis was used in the context of analysis of short stories and poems from a literature reader, Kennedy et. al's (1991) *The Bedford Reader*, and discussion of writing skills improvement was supported by a how-to book *On Writing Well* (1995) by William Zinsser. One instructor focused on analytical writing and analysis of language, identity and culture (including academic cultures) by using Rosenwasser and Stephen's (1997) *Writing Analytically* and Buffington, Diogenes and Moneyhun's (1997) *Living Languages: Contexts for Reading and Writing*. All instructors required some daily journals and approximately four to five major assignments including final examinations.

4.4.1.2 Target and Learning Needs According to Former 207 instructors

The following summarizes responses to the survey of former instructors. Based on their experience teaching at the UA and their observations of their former students' abilities, this instrument provides a means of analysis of 207 instructors' expectations and observations of what skills are lacking in students and in their previous academic English training in order to successfully complete 200-level coursework. I was also able to use the instrument to compare tasks and goals assigned in more traditional 207 classes to my own
207 course tasks which would give some foresight into the potential student weaknesses I would face in the classroom.

1. All instructors assigned an analysis paper, personal experience, and persuasive paper and a variety of different types of assignments.

2. In line with the Catalogue description of this course, all instructors did focus on argumentation and most focused on some type of analysis, including examining discourses. However fewer analyzed genres and even fewer employed contrastive rhetoric as a tool for analysis (which my syllabus did).

3. When asked which factors were most important in the evaluation of their students' work, ideas and organization received the highest ratings, followed by the need to see the student's personal mark on the assignment. There seemed to be less importance placed on wording, or specific genre terminology, which may suggest problems for students who get into specific genre writing.

4. Observing students' abilities at the beginning of the semester, instructors said students can read well and understand feedback and learn new types of genres, but this also suggests some weakness in researching, writing and especially citing.

5. When asked to rate their observations of their former 207 students' abilities at the end of the semester, instructors claimed that students had improved the most in learning new types of writing genres and writing, some in understanding feedback and citing, and the least in reading and research. That students are learning different ways to write is
good and bodes well for a genre-based class, but it still supports earlier claims that students' abilities to research and cite, the main skills necessary for academic writing, are potentially weak.

6. When asked what pleased and displeased instructors most about the writing of the students in their 207 class(es), the comments reflected the diversity of the classes. Many students were good at some skills, like making the topic their own, while others wrote more "shallow" papers and had poor citing skills.

4.4.1.3 Target and Learning Needs According to Current 207, Section 2 Students

The following summarizes the analysis of responses to the Student-Beginning-of-the-Semester Questionnaire. This instrument was designed to gather information on students' secondary English writing training and abilities, and their attitudes toward writing. In the process, this instrument enabled me to obtain information about the needs of my students (in comparison to the former instructors' claims) as new initiates to the academic discourse community and the skills they would need to develop for advanced courses.

1. ENGL 207 students have diverse educational backgrounds and majors and varying levels of skills and experience in the academic community. Some will already understand the academic expectations of the community, others will not.

2. Students report being positive about writing; however, most students also report feeling more comfortable with personal or creative writing instead of analytical writing and researching. This is a possible site of weakness, since most academic writing requires
more analytical and argumentative skills. While all students have meet the prerequisites for taking this course (English 101 and 102 or equivalent), each writing program and teacher will emphasize certain skills over others. It seems that most students entering this class have been exposed to analysis (either rhetorically or literary based) but there are potential weaknesses in argument and research skills and citation—major elements of academic writing. (It is also possible that students were exposed to these skills, but since they don't remember them, this still suggests problems.)

3. In general, students seemed to want help in developing various writing skills, like writing faster, presenting ideas more clearly, learning the appropriate structure of texts, and passing the UDWPE and upper-division courses, but few mentioned developing analytical and research skills, even though that is what their background suggests they need.

4. Most students reported that their previous college-level English classes improved their writing, as long as instructors designed assignments that gave them chances to practice their writing alone and work with peers, provided positive and constructive feedback, and gave students some choice in their writing assignments.

4.4.2 The Theory Behind the Materials and Syllabus Design

In Chapter 3 I described how pedagogy skills can be built from an interdisciplinary foundation, which allows teachers and researchers to come up with better strategies to deal with differences in text and students in the classrooms. Since "no single theory from a single discipline can account for the complex and interacting social, cultural, cognitive and linguistic processes" involved in composition (Johnson & Roen, 1989, p. 3), in
creating this syllabus (see Appendix E) I hoped to model how an instructor educated in the links among such fields as rhetoric, discourse analysis, contrastive rhetoric, second-language acquisition, and popular culture could build a strong base in composition pedagogy and research, and develop communicative competence in students.

In addition, I created this curriculum to help students develop communicative competence as they discover how language and thinking is affected by specific social contexts, come to new understandings of the differences in rhetoric, from either cultural or subcultural examination, and gain insights into the insider's point of view and their own outsider's cultural biases in their rhetorical analyses. In teaching them different types of analytical tools, what is very important (especially in genre studies) is for students to see that there is a cause and effect between culture and rhetoric that creates different rhetorical expectations on the part of both composition instructors and students in terms of understanding and meeting the qualifications that make up the definition of a "good academic writer." Additionally, I argue that students should be taught these tools in order to allow them to apply what they have learned to future classes. For these reasons, before completing my needs analysis, I decided to incorporate the following tools into my syllabus:

4.4.2.1 Meta-Awareness

In order to get students to think about writing and culture, specific forms, ideologies, and discourses, I felt that it was imperative that students be taught how to become meta-aware of the styles of writing that were valued in their high-school writing courses, and the styles that are valued in their college composition classes, and how these different styles of rhetoric were formed. Just as in an ESL writing class, when culture and previous education enter the picture, the assumption becomes that students are using their
first language strategies, which are constructed from their own history, culture, and education, and transferring them to their second-language writing. Thus what they were once praised for in high school, like the five-paragraph essay, has become "ineffective in the new context" (Leki, 1991, p. 124) of an American university.

4.4.2.2 Genre Analysis

In Chapter 3 and earlier in this chapter, I discussed the benefits of genre studies in the classroom and how ESP makes an excellent model for deconstructing genres, a process that can develop communicative competence and, according to Schieffelin and Ochs (1986), aid students in understanding the cultures and socializing processes of the academy. As I discussed earlier, one way to develop this understanding is for students and teachers to take on the tools of the cultural anthropologist and use ethnographic tools like discourse analysis, rhetorical analysis, and interviewing techniques (here, interviewing established members of respective disciplines), and apply them to academic and non-academic discourse (Schieffelin and Ochs, 1986, p. 14).

4.4.2.3 Discourse and Rhetorical Analysis

As discussed in Chapter 2, by borrowing the term discourse from the concept of the speech community in sociolinguistics (Bizzell 1992), and rhetorical analysis from the composition/rhetoric community, students can be taught to analyze the conventions of writing systems in the framework of a community of people who share style, format, argument, logic and illogic conventions, all created from social interactions among members of the community (especially academic communities). As discussed earlier, additionally, through discourse analysis students can discover genres and their specific
structures, and values which different groups place on their styles of literacy and social competence.

4.4.2.4 Contrastive Rhetoric

Teaching students how to engage in contrastive rhetorical analysis is also critical in the teaching of American academic writing because it shows students not only the variety of ways to express themselves through writing, but as with international students, it also lets the composition instructor know that the mistakes which native English-speaking students make in their L2 are not necessarily because of a lack of intelligence or skill, but rather may be a result of their L1 or pre-college rhetorical training (see section 3.4.4.1). In addition, by examining differences in styles of writing both culturally and subculturally, instructors can develop meta-awareness in students as they discover that not only are logic, paragraph structure, essay organization and voice choices that they make as writers, but also that "all these systems are conventions" (Leki, 1992, p. 102), and students' academic success will depend on their ability to manipulate their own, and their L2's, rhetorical conventions.

4.4.2.5 Popular Culture

By using popular culture in the classroom (see section 3.4.4.2), I hoped not only to motivate, but, to paraphrase Hutchinson and Waters, to use familiar (and often enjoyable and entertaining) information to make new information comprehensible and interesting. In addition, using items in American popular culture like television shows and magazine and newspaper articles for pedagogical purposes can develop in students an understanding of the American style of critical thinking and its connection to American culture.
4.5 THE ENGL 207-2 SOPHOMORE COMPOSITION SYLLABUS

4.5.1 Syllabus Design: Practical Application of Needs Analysis

From analysis of the course description of the English Department Catalogue, I knew that the course should include work on nonfiction prose and teaching that emphasized the rhetorical situation in students' writing and in professional writing. Paper topics should be related to students' individual disciplines; to this requirement I added analysis of the organizational structure and rhetorical strategies of these disciplines. Revisions and peer reviews of papers were also necessary. While the Catalogue described expository and argumentative papers, like the other instructors I added a personal essay. But in my course this essay (Paper 1, see Appendix F) was used as a vehicle for students to showcase their understandings of the various classroom concepts (like meta-awareness, ideology, culture, etc.). Like the other instructors I did not require four to six essays, but I did require three main essays and at least four smaller writing assignments that helped students develop an understanding of concepts necessary for inclusion in their main essays.

In response to the surveys of both students and instructors, I decided to attempt to improve students':

1. research and citing skills by requiring them to research and cite sources correctly in the evaluative assignment on culture/writing/ideology (Syllabus, see Appendix E) and in all major essays (Paper 1, 2 and 3, see Appendices F, G, and H);

2. analytical skills and knowledge of genre terminology by requiring them to analyze academic and non-academic writing genres by employing genre, rhetorical, and discourse analysis and contrastive rhetoric analytical techniques in Papers 2 and 3 (see Appendix G
and H); in Assignment 3, a presentation of genre analysis (Syllabus, see Appendix E); and in Assignment 4, an interview with a professor in their academic discipline (Syllabus, see Appendix E and Paper 3, see Appendix H).

3. understanding of academic expectations and their abilities to meet these expectations by requiring them in Assignment 1 to write about their experiences coming to the university and the transition in cultures and writing expectations they faced (Syllabus, see Appendix E); in Assignment 5 where they wrote about whether or not they identified with the academic community (see Appendix F); and in an End-of-the-Semester extra credit assignment where they discussed Patricia Nelson Limerick's (1994) claim that academic writing is purposely unintelligible (see Appendix J).

4. motivation in the classroom by giving them the freedom to discuss classroom concepts in Paper 1 using a personal example of their choice (see Appendix F); conduct genre, rhetorical and discourse analysis in Paper 2 on articles of their choice from a genre they were interested in (see Appendix G); and pick from two prompts in Paper 3 (see Appendix H).

I will now summarize the design of the course and how these papers and assignments were implemented.

4.5.1.1 Syllabus introduction

In order to orient students to the idea of culture and its impact on writing styles, I began my 207 syllabus with
The goal of English 207 is to learn how to communicate effectively. . . Part of communicating effectively is understanding that ways of writing (different types of rhetorics) are developed and defined by the cultures in which they are created. Culture, as I use the term here, can be culture in a large, societal sense, such as American culture or Chinese culture. Or culture can be defined in a more compact sense, like academic culture, business culture, sports culture, as it's used in the sense of a discourse community. In this class we'll focus on many different types of writing, or genres, each with specific forms, ideologies, and discourses created by their respective cultures.

I required students to used Charles Bazerman's (1997) textbook, Involved: Writing for College, Writing for Yourself, because this book addresses issues of culture and writing, as well as the concepts of the classroom as a communication system, students as initiates into that community, and the connection between culture, language, rhetoric, and genres. It also offers text information required for the English 207 target situation: expository and argumentative writing, invention, drafting, and revision, and an understanding of the rhetorical situation. The book does this by discussing specific types of papers as genres and provides a step-by-step process of how to write each text (e.g., journals, autobiographies, analytical writing, illustrative writing, exams). For these reasons, I believed a book of this type would work better with the ESP strategy of overt genre teaching, and help students to better understand how to write in their own individual disciplines. I also used On Writing Well (1995) by William Zinsser to discuss writing skills improvement. In hindsight, while I think this latter book is a wonderful easy-to-read "how-to" book, I would not use it again since it offers only general writing advice instead of focusing on academic writing.

4.5.1.2 First Third of Class

In the first part of the course, I introduced the idea of the connection between culture and writing. Students were required to write essays in which they discussed the
writing they did before coming to this class, and how they felt about being newcomers to the academy. Students then examined the definitions and connections between *culture*, *language*, and *ideology*, the textbook *Involved*, and Burke's pentad to discuss how the classroom can be seen as a *communicative event*. At this time the concepts of *meta-awareness* and the terms *rhetoric* and *contrastive rhetoric* and *discourse analysis* were introduced. Students were required to research and define the meanings of the three terms, interview other students about their definitions, and then write an essay making connections between the terms while citing their sources and incorporating quotations from their peers' properly.

I then incorporated the notion of contrastive rhetoric into the syllabus. Students read Carolyn Matalene's (1985) "Contrastive Rhetoric: An American Writing Teacher in China", in order to compare what other cultures do in terms of writing with what we are required to do in the American academic culture. Students read sections of Sharon Crowley's (1994) *Ancient Rhetoric for Contemporary Students*, Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, and Quintilian's *Institutes of Oratory* to understand where the American style of arguing and stylistics came from, and then analyzed their own textbooks to examine how Western rhetorical values have been transmitted to them.

I then introduced the concept of *ideology* to the class and asked them to read sections of Crowley on ideology and Fan Shen's (1989) "The Classroom and the Wider Culture: Identity as a Key to Learning English Composition" and Barbara Johnstone's (1986) "Arguments With Khomeini: Rhetorical Situation and Persuasive Style in Cross-cultural Perspective" and connect ideology with writing and culture. During this time, students also journaled their readings on paper and later on the class listserv where they were provided a contrastive rhetoric and ideology bibliography. The first required paper was a personal illustration essay that allowed students to use a personal example to help
them describe and connect the concepts they learned in class, and help illustrate their meta-awareness of these new concepts (see Appendix f). During this time there were classes on editing (using articles from the *Los Angeles Times*), discussions of writing advice from *On Writing Well*, and peer reviews.

4.5.1.3 Second Third of Class

I introduced this part of the course as a "micro-analysis of cultures and writing", and discussed tools for analysis by introducing students to more complex definitions of genre, the concept of the discourse community, and discourse and rhetorical analysis. Using popular culture, specifically *Glamour Magazine* and *Latina Magazine* as examples of women's magazines, and an article from *SPY Magazine* and a response to a Letter to the Editor in the *New York Sun* ("No, Virginia, There Isn't A Santa Claus" and the classic "Is There A Santa Claus?" respectively), students practiced doing genre and discourse and rhetorical analysis. Students were also given a section of Deborah Tannen's (1989) analysis of Jessie Jackson's speeches in *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Students were then required to pick a genre and go to the library to find two samples of that genre to analyze and find an article on how to write for that genre (most used the Zinsser book since he discusses what makes "good writing" for many non-academic writing genres). The author of *Involved*, Charles Bazerman, also sat in on the listserv and often discussed genre concepts with students.

Students were asked to write Paper 2, an analytical essay which required them to analyze the components that make up the particular genre of their choosing, and include in their paper writing advice from an expert on that genre (see Appendix G). They were, in effect, to "become the expert" on a certain genre of writing. I hoped that by doing so, the analytical skills developed here would help students learn how to analyze and recreate
many different kinds of texts that they will be required to write both on the job and in the academy. Students were also asked to incorporate the concepts of discourse communities, genre, and rhetorical and discourse analysis, as well as context and culture, into the paper, and to prepare a 10-minute presentation on this genre and their findings.

4.5.1.4 Last Third of Class

I introduced the final part of the class as an analysis of "expectations of specific disciplines in American academic culture." Students began by reading Robin Lakoff's (1997) "Groove of Academe" and discussing the "unspoken" rules and expectations and the sharing (or lack of sharing) of disciplinary information with new initiates into the academy. Students were asked to write about whether they considered themselves to be "insiders or outsiders" in the academy. Students also read Schwegler and Shamoon's (1991) "Meaning Attribution in Ambiguous Texts in Sociology" to analyze how one discipline requires texts to be written and what is considered evidence in that text.

For their final paper, the argumentative paper, students were to find a professor in their major and have him or her recommend a well-known journal. They were to get one article and analyze it using the handouts on rhetorical analysis and genre given to them in the second third of the course. They were also to interview the professor about their findings, and also interview him or her on a personal level to discover when the professor began to find him or herself writing as a member of the academic community, whether or not his or her identity or sense of self changed, when she or he began to see themselves as a member of the academic community or identify with it, etc.

Students were then to write their argument paper based on one of two questions posed to them (see Appendix H). The first was based on Fan Shen's experiences learning to write in English and his claim that learning to write in English caused him to create a
new identity. The prompt asked students to examine their own experience of coming to the university—with its different ideology, language, culture and rhetorical strategies—and argue for or against Shen's claims. For example, can learning how to write in a foreign culture be similar to learning how to write in the academy? In a particular major? They were also asked to incorporate their analysis of the journal article and interview material when arguing whether or not they believed that students' (and professors') sense of self and identity change as they take on different styles of writing, arguing, and types of evidence, much like that of a foreign student coming to America.

The second question was based on Robin Lakoff's (1997) "The Grooves of Academe," where she examines the connection between language and power structures in the academy and argues that to be a "competent professional linguist" you have to "know facts, theories, and methods, you have to know how to be a linguist, you have to know how to play by the rules" (p. 184). She also argues that "[w]ithin disciplines, we develop special languages. Like any linguistic code, these play two roles. Toward the outside world, they are elitist; we know, you cannot understand, you may not enter. But for insiders they are a secret handshake" (Lakoff, 1997, p. 190). Students were asked to argue for or against her claims by using their interviews, looking at specific genres of academic writing, and analyzing their journal article to find out what the rules of discourse and the preferred rhetorical strategies are in their particular discipline. They also received an extra-credit opportunity to analyze and respond to Patricia Nelson Limerick's (1994) "Dancing With Professors: The Trouble With Academic Prose" (see Appendix J).

4.5.1.5 Final Examination

Students were required to take a final examination that tested their ability to use their newly developed analytical skills to analyze new genres and recreate materials we had
not covered in class. Since it was also used as an evaluative tool, it will be discussed in greater detail in the case studies in Chapters 6, 7, and 8.

4.5.2 Evaluation of the Syllabus

In order to test the effectiveness of the syllabus with regard to communicative tasks and students' abilities to complete these tasks, I asked students for short evaluations of the course twice during the semester (asking them about the class so far and what they liked, or would like to see changed or improved to help them learn), and again at the end of the course with the department's official course evaluation. (I did not receive a 100 percent return of the evaluations handed out in class. When I asked why there was a problem in getting them all back, most students said they had forgotten or really did not think anything was wrong so they had nothing to say.)

4.5.2.1 Instructor Evaluation

Students' evaluative assignments written on culture/writing/ideology during the second week of class indicated general problems with citations, analysis, lack of topic sentences, summarizing instead of theorizing, and organizational problems. The syllabus was revised to use three to four more class periods to work on editing and skills development for the first paper. In week three it became apparent that students needed work on in-text citing and creating "works cited" pages, as well as introductory paragraphs. In week four, we spent a class brainstorming ideas for their paper topics.

Five weeks into the semester I incorporated editing exercises using material from the Los Angeles Times. Students then applied these skills to drafts of their first paper. Anticipating citation problems from earlier ESP analysis and drafts of Paper 1, in week six I incorporated more topic sentence formulation and how-to-cite information into the
lesson plans. In week seven I redid the syllabus to reorganize the rhetorical/genre
readings for the second third of the course.

4.5.2.2 Student Evaluation #1

Six weeks into the semester I handed out evaluation sheets to students (I did not receive 100 percent return on these evaluations). The most common comment was that students wanted me to give them the paper guidelines further in advance so that they could see how the earlier activities related to the paper much earlier. (Before handing out this evaluation I had spoken with students in my office and asked for feedback; one student suggested this, and when I brought the idea up to the class, it seemed to cause a flood of similar feelings among other students.)

4.5.2.3 Student Evaluation #2

In the student evaluation in the second third of the class, students' most common comment was their lack of interest in the journals. Many just hate doing them or thought they were a waste of time and preferred to put their reading responses on the listserv only. I did allow students from that point on to discuss readings via the listserv instead of in hard copy. Students also reported enjoying the genre/discourse analysis--it was very new to most of them--and they liked the fact that they could pick their own topic to analyze in Paper 2. Some students mentioned that they really felt like they had learned how to analyze material now.

4.5.2.4 Departmental Student Evaluation/TEAD

At the end of the semester students are asked to fill out a standard student evaluation with bubble sheets, and write in comments. The teaching advisor (TEAD)
reads these and makes a TEAD evaluation at the end of the semester. Following are quotations from her evaluation:

Almost all students rated [the instructor] high in effectiveness . . . unusually high numbers rated in-and out-of class activities as effective or highly effective. All students said they would "definitely" or "probably" recommend this class to others. In written comments, students' particularly praised [the instructor's] clarity, helpfulness, ability to cover a great deal of material without rushing, accessibility and willingness to take extra time to explain difficult concepts. One student said, "She explained everything until we understood it." Even students who found the class difficult said they had enjoyed it and found it useful. Most students praised [the instructor] for helping to make him/her "an analytical person."

It appears from this preliminary evaluation that this new multidisciplinary curriculum is successful as it pertains to Research Question 1. From the questionnaires from former 207 instructors and current 207-2 students, it appears that 207 students in general, and these 207-2 students in particular, needed greater analytical skills and understanding of the cultural-specific rhetorical conventions taught in the composition classroom. From the evaluations of both students and the TEAD, it seems that analytical skills and understandings can be acquired though a combination of pedagogical strategies from both the rhetoric/composition and second-language acquisition fields.

But to fully evaluate this preliminary response and the 207 curriculum in general, especially as it pertains to Research Question 2 (can students transfer their newly developed analytical skills and understanding of rhetorical relations to other academic texts and courses?) and Research Question 3 (can a genre-based composition class help students in the acquisition of new analytical skills?), case studies of four students will be discussed in Chapter 6, 7, and 8.
CHAPTER 5
METHODS: EDUCATIONAL ETHNOGRAPHY
IN THE COMPOSITION CLASSROOM

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In earlier chapters I discussed one of the main claims of this work, that written academic English is often a "second language" to native and nonnative speakers of English, and its corollary, that both native composition students and instructors need greater analytical skills and understanding of cultural-specific rhetorical conventions. In this chapter I will explore more deeply ethnography's connection to sociolinguistics and why ethnography, ethnography of education in particular, is especially useful for composition research in discovering the sociocultural knowledge necessary to do well in the classroom (Johnson, 1992, p. 132) and its focus on analysis of students' needs and abilities. In addition, ethnographic research allows the focus to fall on the function of a communicative event, and can help the researcher become aware of his or her own cultural biases in research analysis (discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3). I will also discuss controversies that have arisen in this field between supporters of traditional ethnography and educational ethnography and introduce four case studies.
5.2 ETHNOGRAPHY: INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

Researchers in both the fields of composition/rhetoric and second language acquisition use ethnographic research methods, including case studies, as part of their research. Like much other composition research, ethnographic research is interdisciplinary. It emerged in cultural anthropology and was subsequently heavily influenced by the fields of sociology, psychology, and education, and its main focus is the examination of cultural behavior. The first, and most famous, use of ethnographic description and case studies in the composition field was Janet Emig's (1971) investigation of the writing process, in which she adapted case study methodology based on research advice given by the editors of Research in Written Composition in 1965. Many studies on writing and the composing process which followed (including Pianko, 1979; Sommers, 1980; Flower & Hayes, 1981) expanded her original model while exposing myths about writing (Beach & Bridwell, 1984, p. 3). Similarly, beginning in the early 1970s with researchers like Phillips (1972), many ethnographic studies were conducted in the bilingual classroom (Ellis, 1994, p. 569). In education, the case for ethnographic research over systematic observation in the classroom was initially argued by Delamont and Hamilton in 1974.

In addition to general ethnography, the ethnography of communication is concerned with the communicative behavior of groups and examining how people learn to successfully communicate in specific discourse communities and cultural contexts (Johnson, 1992, pp. 133-34). Using tools of ethnography of communication--specifically genre, rhetorical, and discourse analysis--I taught my students how to examine academic discourse communities (this is covered in greater detail in Chapter 3). And educational ethnography is used to study "educational and enculturative processes that are related to schools" (Johnson, 1992, p. 1). For more ethnographies and case studies used in the

5.2.1 Why Ethnography Works Well in This Research Context

For purposes of this work, I will use the term *classical* to refer to pre-1970 academic ethnography and *traditional* to refer to modern ethnography (as suggested by Rudolph Troike). Educationally oriented ethnography falls under the *traditional* umbrella.

Generally, traditional ethnography is especially useful in composition research because "[c]omposition teaching is a multidimensional phenomenon, one which requires a research methodology that will account for its complexity" (Kantor, 1984, p. 72). Ethnographic research is able to account for varying levels of complexity because the benefits of this type of research in one field can be applied and appreciated by researchers in other fields. For this reason, ethnographic researchers in the composition field like Lauer and Ashler (1988), who call for a *multimodality* to enrich composition studies, emphasize the benefits of using experimental with descriptive research like ethnographies and case studies.

From anthropology, specifically Geertz (1973), we know that ethnographic cultural interpretation with its "thick" description of social actions is one of its most important characteristics, as is its reliance on analysis of the context in which the actions are taking place. From the sociolinguistics field and the work of van Dijk (1985), we know that ethnographic research can enable the researcher to not only discover and understand "communicative events in other societies and cultures ... or in the subcultures of his or her own society," but it can be used to look at sociolinguistic concerns regarding gender, race or class and cross-cultural studies of discourse genres, rhetoric across
cultures and is very valuable for "its detailed description of communicative events in their full complexity" (pp. 7, 8).

From second language acquisition we know that ethnographic research allows researchers to discover students' pre-education culture and get their emic (or insiders') point of view of the learning process. As Donna Johnson describes in *Approaches to Research in Second Language Learning* (1992)

Among the most important uses for ethnographic research for L2 learning has been to inform us about the ways that students' cultural experiences in home and community compare with the culture of the schools, universities, and communities where they study, and the implications of these differences for second language and culture learning. This information helps explain how cultural assumptions and values can shape interactions, can cause cross-cultural miscommunication, and can lead to differing attitudes toward the learning situation and differing approaches to learning. (pp. 136, 149)

Additionally, ethnography works well for the present study because it allows me, the teacher-researcher, to be both an observer and participant in the study. This is an additional benefit of engaging in educational ethnographic research because instead of "detach[ing] themselves from the objects of study, [the researcher's] perceptions become part and parcel of the investigation" (Kantor, 1984, p. 73).
5.3 EDUCATIONALLY ORIENTED ETHNOGRAPHY

Like classical and modern ethnographies, educational ethnographies are also multidisciplinary, described as a kind of hybrid of education, anthropology, sociology and ethnography (Fetterman, 1987, p. 81). And like the fields of composition and second language acquisition, the educational ethnography field has gone through many changes as it has grown and developed.

In compiling an anthropology and education bibliography as part of The National Academy of Education's 1978 report on anthropology and education, Burnett reports that some of the earliest "descriptive accounts of education and the processes of cultural transmission" occurred "from the infancy of anthropology as an official discipline" (p. 60). By the late 1950's, because of the work of George Spindler, and emerging "ethnographic accounts of modern schools", and the new focus on schools as mediums for social change, Burnett (1978) claims that "Educational Anthropology was clearly emerging as a legitimate" new subfield (pp. 65, 66). In the 1960s, anthropologists began focusing on minority groups and educational institutions, and ethnography of communication methods were used to research language varieties of members of subcultures used in the classroom and at home. Anthropological methodology in educational studies was being debated by researchers like Kimball, and more work was being done on studies of cultural transmission, formal education and power structures (Burnett, 1978, pp. 68-69).

By the early 1970s, bilingual and bicultural programs were being examined, as were teachers and staff (Burnett, 1978, p. 71). Like Solon T. Kimball, George Spindler (1955, 1974, 1982) and his wife Louise were among the founders of educational anthropology, and both Spindlers collaborated (1982, 1983) on a number of educational ethnographic studies. In their 1987 edited work, they include a variety of studies of foreign educational systems, and cross-cultural and comparative studies of native, migrant,
immigrant and minority children in the United States (Fetterman, 1987, pp. xii-xiii). At the time that this report was written, it recommended that the next new category for anthropologists to scrutinize was "the educational category of 'evaluation' of educational programs" from both "a cultural perspective and from the point of view of their own research methodologies" (Burnett, 1978, p. 73).

According to Solon T. Kimball (1987), the ethnography of schooling is a multidisciplinary study of school systems, the changes they effect on students, cultural transmission and acquisition, and the impact of television and family and other non-schooling educative forces (p. 13). Later, in "The Transmission of Culture" (1976), Kimball remarks that

[i]f it is our concern to isolate that which is unique to education then we must extend our perspective to include more than is contained within the formal limits of education. In particular we must view formal education as a special aspect of the socialization of the individual. . . .[i]f we view the primary function of education as the transmission of culture, then that which is unique to education are the conditions which govern its process. Process is a variable relationship of two systems, the social and cultural environment which prescribes the method and content of education and the individual in whom experience is organized and internalized. (pp. 257, 270)

Thus this research should examine the "relationship between the teacher and learner, the organic and psychic capacities of the individual to be modified through experience; and the dynamics of the learning process itself" (Kimball, 1976, p. 258).

What is additionally relevant to this research project, because of my focus on teaching students analytical skills (as described in greater detail in Chapter 4), is Kimball's claim that whether instructional content occurs in either a "'bush' school or classroom" there is a "basic similarity in the instructional content . . . there is transmitted not only knowledge and a way of thinking about such, the whole of which we may call world view,
but there is also transmitted the criteria by which events may be analyzed and judged" (1976, p. 267).

According to Kimball, it is not uncommon for research projects using this methodology to include the analysis of questionnaires, the results of examination scores and psychometric tests, and insider's experience, whether that insider is from the group being studied or is in fact a participant researcher actively teaching and participating in gathering the data (1987, p. 97). (See Fetterman (1987) for more details.) In contrast to the usual descriptive ethnographic goals, here methods are used to "assess more accurately the relative merits of a given educational approach, setting, or system" (Fetterman, 1987, p. 82). Educationally oriented ethnography works well in the present project because it allows the success of a new curriculum to be evaluated through an ethnographic case study.

5.3.1 Classical vs Educational Ethnographies

While there are many benefits to using educationally oriented ethnographic research, it has been compared favorably and unfavorably to classical ethnographic research. In one of the more critical examinations of "quicker" ethnographic research projects, Ray C. Rist in "Blitzkrieg Ethnography: On the Transformation of a Method into a Movement" (1980) claims that with the newfound popularity of ethnography (which at the time he attributed to either a rejection of quantitative research methods or the increase in federal funding for more local research projects) "has come the mutation of both [ethnographic research's] epistemological underpinnings and its methodological applications" (p. 8). Some of his concerns include:

The term 'ethnographer' is now being used to describe researchers who neither studied not were trained in the method. . . . ;
... a prolonged field study—has now been bypassed" thereby "allowing the issues and problems to emerge from extensive time on the site has also given way to preformulation of research problems, to the specifying of precise activities that are to be observed, and to the analytical framework within which the study is to be conducted.

Many who are now using the method are far from marginal—either to the educational profession or to the society. The result is that ethnographic research is now frequently done without an emphasis on values or exploring the underlying cultural framework of the organization in question. (Rist, 1980, p. 9)

Commenting on many of these same concerns, Wolcott (1971) lists precautions necessary for doing ethnographic research in schools, advising anthropologists not to "mak[e] references to schools as though they were a single, monolithic structure" or "derogate the educative efforts of the schools by assuming them to be dysfunctional unless proven otherwise" (pp. 100-101).

Over the years and across disciplinary fields, concerns like Rist's have appeared and reappeared: should this type of research be "macro" or "microethnographic" (Johnson, 1992; Hammersley, 1986; Wolcott, 1980; Hargreaves, 1986; and Lutz 1986)? Critical ethnographers ask should the larger political and ideological contexts of educational settings be examined (Sharp 1986)? Researchers like Fetterman (1982), Wolcott (1980) and Atkinson and Delamont (1986) have been concerned about the misuse of ethnography and case studies; while others like Athanases and Heath (1995) have been worried about the misuse of ethnography in the English classroom specifically. For example, unlike Heath's 1983 nine-year documentation of patterns of language in rural black and white Appalachian children, the authors fear that in the recent projects involving "quicker" ethnographic studies, most graduate student researchers are not trained well, and should engage in at least a year of observing before being able to come to valid conclusions.
Yet those who raise concerns about educational ethnography, and those who clearly support it, have addressed these concerns and comparisons of classical with traditional ethnography. While some argue that studying a familiar culture like schools is dangerous because the researcher who studies the familiar is already acculturated to it (and therefore has lost the ability to be objective and to question actions and events that they might otherwise question in a "foreign" culture), Wolcott (1987) argues that the researcher who is immersed in a culture often has insider experience and understanding that can benefit her and her research more than the lack of experience with a culture that an outsider often has. Thus the researcher can better

understand the total complexity of a system . . . identify] pervasive themes . . . recognize[e] cultural influences in their lives, and . . . analyze[e] their own professional expectations and their basis for holding them. (Wolcott, 1987, pp. 51, 52)

While the goal of classical ethnographic research is an explicit description of events without judgment or advice on how a situation can be improved, Walker (1986) points out that this type of ethnography cannot provide the kind of useful information for curriculum change or reform that administrators, department heads, or instructors usually desire. In addressing this issue, Walker claims that classical ethnography can be modified for case study in educational research not only by getting permission from subjects for publishing research based on their material, but by reducing the amount of time in the setting to produce results that can be of immediate, practical use to teachers (Hammersley, 1986, p. xvii).
5.3.2 Meta-Awareness of the Educational Ethnographer

As is the case in many research methodologies, awareness on the part of the researcher about his or her methods and goals and personal interest is the key to a successful research project. For example, while originators and supporters of educational ethnography like Spindler (1955), Wolcott (1987), and Johnson (1992) admit that the educational ethnographer's commitment to long-term field work or "thick" description is not the same as that of a classical ethnographer, they argue that many of these researchers have training in ethnographic methods, and part of their responsibility in undertaking their research is to be honest about "borrowing ethnographic techniques" for use with qualitative and quantitative methods to connect "descriptive research to short-term efforts at change and improvement" (Wolcott, 1987, pp. 53-54).

According to Wolcott (1987), it is important that those engaging in educational ethnographic studies admit that their research "is really educational reform in disguise" (p. 53). This is not a confessionary action however; rather it "reveals far more of the educator's commitment to what is possible . . . than . . . what already is" (Wolcott, 1987, p. 53). In this light, educational ethnographies are more "quick" descriptions designed to gather and evaluate evidence of skills students need to learn and weakness to overcome, educators' expectations, and pedagogical techniques to these ends. Fetterman (1987) describes this as educational ethnographic evaluation.

Finally, to those who argue that educational ethnographies are uncritical and less "scientific" and thus potentially biased, Erickson (1973) advocates that the ethnographer develop a "disciplined subjectivity" whereby she considers her own knowledge and biases during the study (Kantor, 1984, p. 73). Bissex and Bullock (1987) prefer Keller's concept of "dynamic objectivity" as a replacement to the prescribed detached objectivity. This concept would allow teachers to be empathetic and use their intuition while
maintaining a critical eye towards the creation of their studies and work. According to Keller

Dynamic objectivity aims at a form of knowledge that grants to the world around us its independent integrity but does so in a way that remains cognizant of, indeed relies on, our connectivity with the world. In this, dynamic objectivity is not unlike empathy, a form of knowledge of other persons that draws explicitly on the commonality of feelings and experiences in order to enrich one's understanding of another in his or her own right (qtd. in Bissex & Bullock, 1987, p. 13).

Despite their initial concerns and criticisms, even Rist (1980) and Wolcott (1971) acknowledge that in the long run, educational research will benefit anthropology itself in many ways, including providing greater audiences for and financial resources to anthropologists and offering more field sites in schools for research into culture and cultural processes (pp. 111-12).
5.4 CASE STUDIES AND CONTEXT

As I stated earlier, the focus on context is a main characteristic of ethnographic research and very important in composition research. Myers (1980) defined three categories of composition research: rationalism, positivism, and contextualism. In contextualism, ethnographic approaches can be used whereby a researcher employs a pyramid design, starting with "generalizations about large groups and moving upward to collect more detailed information of individual cases; to some degree, it may be possible to generalize from those individual cases back to the initial experimental population, but not always beyond that group" (p. 9).

Some researchers like Beach and Bridwell argue that there is a need for synthesis of research from what they term these three "areas" because in composition research there is a need for generalizations since "composition researchers [generally] attempt to explain their results in terms of relationships or effects apparent in group behavior . . . then try to fit these relationships or effects into a theoretical perspective" (1984, pp. 9-10). Others like Walker (1986) and Bissex and Bullock (1987) address the argument that findings from case studies cannot be generalized to other settings or populations, but add that with ethnographic methods used in the relevant context "researchers can attend to information that is humanly significant though not mathematically measurable . . . and thus understand the meaning of behavior from the [student's] point of view, not just tally it" (p. 11). In this way, case studies may actually be "more true to life in their revelation of individuals in action and their reflection of the complexities of those individuals and actions" (Bissex & Bullock, 1987, p. 11). Fox (1990) concurs with this claim, stating that "[u]nlike statistical comparisons or holistic generalizations, case studies . . . can convey the sense of a real student with idiosyncratic and typical features, one who actively participates in the classroom contexts and disrupts or confirms teachers' expectations" (p. 49).
Others like Delamont and Hamilton (1986) argue that both generalizations and student-specific information are possible because

despite their diversity, individual classrooms share many characteristics. Throughout the detailed study of one particular context it is still possible to clarify relationships, pinpoint critical processes and identify common phenomena. Later, abstract summaries and general concepts can be formulated, which may, upon further investigation, be found to be germane to a wider variety of settings.

(p. 36)

Case studies are able to do this because they allow the researcher to focus on the individual and his or her specific abilities to learn, allowing the researcher to examine such factors as personality, ability, attitudes or cognitive skills and discover the answers to research questions (Johnson, 1992, pp. 76, 134). In other words, case studies can present researchers with student information "that corresponds to the ways teachers experience students" (Fox, 1990, p. 49).

Johnson details the many benefits of case studies in her book on second language research, and work by Ogbu (1987), Cook-Gumperz (1986), and Erickson (1986) explores the influence of second language background on academic achievement (Johnson, 1992, p. 141). But for my purposes here, the specific benefits of using case studies in an educational ethnographic study include: the methodology is flexible and can be "formulated to suit the purposes of the study"; this type of research "has been very important in advancing second language theory"; and "case study research questions . . . may lead to description or to better theory" and improve teaching and understanding of the "nature of individual L2 written . . . development" (Johnson, 1992, pp. 83, 84, 90,
In addition, according to Richterich (1983), case studies of child and adult learners can be made much more effective with an analysis of students' needs, which is what I did in Chapter 4 in showing how ESP methodology was used to develop a needs analysis of the writing class.

One of the main reasons that case study research can provide the teacher-researcher in the classroom with so many benefits is that it gives teachers results they can test more quickly without waiting for reports of someone else's research to be made public or "trickle down to the classrooms" (Bissex & Bullock, 1987, p. 15). Indeed, Armstrong also argues that some aspects of student learning can only be picked up by teachers who are conducting research because they conduct the research in the context of the classroom and not under faux laboratory-like conditions. As such, they have access to additional information that can only be obtained in the classroom through dialogue with students in question-and-answer sessions, pleas for help or advice, or exchanging of ideas, etc. (Bissex & Bullock, 1987, p. 15).

Perhaps Dell Hymes' (1980b) concept of "ethnographic monitoring" describes the benefits of ethnography and case studies most explicitly. In discussing how ethnography can "overcome hidden sources of bias" in the evaluation and goals of bilingual education programs, and I would add, in the evaluation and goals of composition courses, he claims that

one contribution of ethnography has to do with the planning of programs and the need for knowledge of the initial state of affairs. . . . The other has to do with the evaluation and justification of the programs, and ultimately, the evaluation and justification of bilingual education itself. The second and the third contributions can be thought of as ethnographic monitoring. (Hymes, 1980a, p. 104), (original italics)
Like researchers who advocate teacher-researcher roles in composition classrooms, Hymes adds

A member of a given community... need not be merely a source of data, an object at the other end of a scientific instrument. He/she already possesses some of the local knowledge and has access to knowledge that is essential to successful ethnography; he/she may have a talent for sifting and synthesizing it, a specific insight into some part of it. . . . When I refer to ethnography, then, I assume that the person doing the ethnography may be from the same community in question. Indeed, I think it is highly desirable that this be the case in a large proportion of cases. (1980a, p. 105)

In conclusion, Wolcott (1987) claims that the ethnographic "method itself is not all that important: never was; never will be" (p. 54), (original italics). What is important is that the research, like the research conducted here, is directed toward cultural interpretation and to "helping educators better understand both the little traditions of schools and the big traditions of the larger society" (Wolcott, 1987, p. 55).
5.5 DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH TOOLS

The four case studies will attempt to address the research questions by examining the effects of the ESP-based curriculum design using two interviews conducted during the semester, one conducted by a neutral party at the end of the semester, and the final examination. This section describes the purposes and designs of each of these instruments as well as the elicitation procedures and data analysis used.

5.5.1 Research Questions

As discussed in Chapter 4, the three research questions I attempted to answer are

1. If both students and teachers in the native composition classroom need greater analytical skills and understandings of the cultural-specific rhetorical conventions taught in the composition classroom, can these skills and understandings be acquired through a combination of pedagogical strategies from both the rhetoric/composition and second-language acquisition fields?

2. If students learn how to use interdisciplinary tools to rhetorically analyze texts and discourses from different cultures and subcultures (e.g., academic vs. popular culture, or American vs. Chinese culture), can they learn and then transfer their newly developed analytical skills and understanding of rhetorical relations (using discourse analysis and contrastive rhetoric and popular culture texts as tools) to their own specific American academic classroom texts? And will this help them expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing not only in their English classes, but in all of their classes?
(3) Can a genre-based composition class (both popular culture and academic genres) help them in the acquisition of new analytical skills?

5.5.2 Overview of Interviews

Besides the pre-semester questionnaire described in Chapter 4, this part of the study involved three sets of interviews which were elicited from those students who agreed to participate in this study. This action presents a discussion of the purpose and design of the first three sets of interviews and final examination, as well as the selection of four students' interviews for detailed investigation (see Chapters 6, 7, and 8).

As occurs in many volunteer research projects that deal with students, due to sickness, withdrawal from the course, or just plain absentmindedness, over the course of the semester 12 were interviewed for the first 20-minute interview, 11 for the second 20-minute interview, and 8 for the 30-minute end of the semester interview. While students were told the general interviews would last their respective 20 or 30 minutes, students were encouraged to continue discussions with the interviewer if they felt comfortable doing so. Most students extended their 20-minute interviews to 25 or 30 minutes and some talked for 45 minutes or more on the final interview.

Broadly speaking, the goal of the Early and Middle-of-the-Semester interviews were to elicit student perceptions of their text and genre analysis abilities before they received any genre or text analysis training in class, and their receptiveness to this type of training; the second interview was designed to elicit student response to learning these skills and their use in the classroom. The End-of-the-Semester interview was designed to reveal students' impressions of whether or not the genre, rhetorical, and discourse analysis training in the course had impacted their analytical abilities.
5.5.3 Early Semester Interview

5.5.3.1 Purpose of the Instrument

The purpose of this interview was to gather personal information from students about the types of writing they were familiar with and liked to write, elicit a self-description of their text analysis abilities, and identify areas of writing weakness they hoped this course would address. In that respect it attempted to address Research Question 1 and whether greater analytical skills and understandings of the cultural-specific rhetorical conventions need to be taught in the composition classroom.

5.5.3.2 Design of the Instrument

The Early Semester interview (see Appendix K) was modified from Hyon's (1995) dissertation on genre and ESL reading. The first part tested students' text analysis abilities by asking them to first give out-loud descriptions of letters to the editor from two different periodicals: Glamour, a popular women's magazine, and Lingua Franca, a popular magazine for academics. It was estimated that the women's magazine would be familiar enough for easy analysis, and that analysis could be transferred to the academic journal (see Chapter 3). All identification was removed from the copied pages except the titles "Letters from Readers" and "Letters to the Editor." For the second set of readings, students were asked to analyze two essays on legal discourse and the pros and cons of the use of "legal-ese." The first essay was called "The Invisible Discourse of Law" by James Boyd White; the second "It May Not Be English, But It's Strictly Legal" (1998) by George Gordon Coughlin. Coughlin's piece was originally written for Parade magazine and he uses informal language to argue that legal jargon is confusing and intimidating; White's article came from one of his books and he argues for a degree of "legal literacy" in all citizens. This descriptive information was included at the beginning of each essay in the
paragraph that describes the authors. These two sources were chosen from composition readers for their contrasting points of view.

Of particular interest was the students' ability to describe and identify what the texts were. And their responses were used as a gauge of their abilities that would be compared to their ability to identify textual characteristics and genres later on the final examination (direct comparison of the two instruments was not possible because the textual materials were very different).

The second part of the interview dealt with students' reading and writing habits. First, students were asked about their reading and writing habits, in particular, about the types of reading and writing that they liked to do; their previous experiences with high school and college writing; which kind of writing they found the most easy or most difficult and why; and how they approached writing something for fun and for academic classes.

Students were then asked questions about their background in writing analysis and their observance of specific structures and genre requirements beginning with whether or not they rely on the structure of a piece (like organization) of writing to help recreate it; their awareness of the differences in language styles between different types of writing in English such as newspapers versus research articles (and if they were aware of the differences whether they describe some); and most importantly, whether they thought that knowing the language styles of different types (or genres) of writing could help their understanding of them or recreation of them.

Lastly, students were asked about their expectations for the course. Of interest was whether or not students' goals in taking the course were compatible with the course had to offer.
5.5.3.3. *Elicitation and Analysis*

On the first day of class, students were introduced to the course via the syllabus. They were told that this course was an unusual sophomore composition class in that the teaching strategies were both from the fields of composition and ESL. There was a brief discussion of the needs for them to learn different types of genres for their academic and employment fields, but there was no description of how to analyze genres. Students were also told about the study in progress and the need for volunteers. It was made expressly clear to the students that they were under no pressure to volunteer.

When students who had signed up came for the interview, they were given a brief overview of the research project and asked if they had any questions regarding the project or their Human Subjects agreement form.

Later, after the interviews were completed, the audiotapes were transcribed and examined for patterns that would reveal students' perception of their textual analysis abilities, their actual ability to do analysis, and their perception of their reading and writing habits and what they hoped to gain from this class.

5.5.4 *Middle-of-the-Semester Interview*

5.5.4.1 *Purpose of the Instrument*

The purpose of this interview was to gather personal information from students about their families and the amount of education their siblings and parents had, and their experiences learning rhetorical, discourse and genre analysis in this course (specifically as it applied to their writing of their second paper which required these types of analysis). In that respect it attempted to address Research Questions 1 and 3, in particular how students experience the learning of different types of analytical skills and the impact of genre analysis on this type of learning. Of interest were the similarities and differences
between students' experiences in learning these skills and putting them into practice in the classroom.

5.5.4.2. Design of the Instrument

The Middle-of-the-Semester interview (see Appendix L) was modified from Hyon (1995). Conducted after most students had finished their second paper (or were soon to turn them in), the instrument was divided into three parts: family history, the learning of the analytical skills, and the implementation of the skills into their second paper. In the first part, students were asked about their siblings and parents (how many brothers or sisters they had, family members' education level, the parents' occupation). And they were asked where they were born (and if not Tucson, were they transfer students).

In the second part of the interview, students were asked about their previous contact with and understanding of genre and writing analysis. They were asked if they had before this class ever heard of or read about discourse communities, or heard about or done any genre, rhetorical, or discourse analysis, and if so, where and when. Students were also asked if they (1) thought the teaching materials (handouts) and readings and class discussions had been helpful, and (2) if they had read all of the readings (if students said "no" that would be a cue for the interviewer to ask if that was due to lack of interest or degree of difficulty, etc.)

The third section of the interview dealt with students' experience actually doing the analysis and incorporating that analysis (plus new research skills) into the draft of their second paper. Students were asked to describe their experience: understanding genre, discourse, and rhetorical analysis; picking genre topics; finding articles; doing the analysis; finding demographics (of the magazines they got their articles from); finding an
expert on that type of genre writing; combining all of the elements into the paper; and organizing the paper in the form of an analytical essay.

Questions on the final draft were available, but many students had not yet turned in their final version. If they had turned in the final version, students were asked to describe how they decided on the amount of genre, discourse and rhetorical analysis information to include in the paper; whether or not they were satisfied with the final version of the paper; and if not, what would they have changed.

5.5.4.3 Elicitation and Analysis

The students were told that these interviews would have no effect on the grades on their second paper. The transcriptions of the interviews were completed and then analyzed to compare students' lack or familiarity with genre and discourse analysis and their ease or difficulty with actually doing the analysis. The family information was used to compare the education levels of the households of students in the survey, and to see if there was any correlation between analytical skills and the education levels of people in the household.

5.5.5 Final Interview

5.5.5.1 Purpose of the Instrument

The purpose of the final interview was to elicit students' perceptions about the influence of this course on the development and/or improvement of their writing and analytical abilities (see Appendix M) and was based on Hyon's (1995) End-of-Semester Interview. Specifically, the goal of the interview was to examine students' perceptions of the changes since the beginning and middle of the semester in their writing habits, writing and text analysis abilities, and rhetorical awareness. Students' beliefs about which classes,
assignments and textbooks were most and least helpful were also elicited. Of interest were the differences among students' reactions to the course compared with each other and in relation to their previous (or lack of) genre and analytical training.

In other words, this interview attempted to address from another angle Research Questions 1 and 3: can greater analytical skills and rhetorical awareness be acquired in a genre-based composition classroom through a combination of pedagogical strategies from the rhetoric/composition and second-language acquisition fields. But more importantly it also attempted to answer Research Question 2: if students learn how to use interdisciplinary tools to rhetorically analyze texts and discourses from different cultures and subcultures, can they learn then transfer their newly developed analytical skills and understanding of rhetorical relations (using discourse analysis and contrastive rhetoric and popular culture texts as tools) to their own specific American academic classroom texts and in turn expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing not only in their English classes, but in all of their classes.

5.5.5.2 Design of the Instrument

The first part asked students to evaluate the impact of this course on their writing abilities. They were asked to describe whether or not their writing skills or habits had changed since the beginning of the semester. "Skills" and "habits" were not defined so that students could report what changes in their abilities were most important to them, or if there had been no changes at all. Students were then asked individualized questions about comments they made about their writing in the early interviews and asked to compare those statements with their perceptions of their writing now.

Students were then asked about the course itself. First, to determine if the materials had met their learning needs, students were asked if there were any classes and
assignments in this course that were particularly useful or not particularly useful. This question was revisited later in another form in hopes of eliciting other views on this issue. Questions were then individualized to ask students about what they hoped to learn in this course based on what they had written on the beginning-of-the-semester questionnaires (SBSQ) in order to find out if they had received help with the writing, analytical and research skills that they had been seeking. Students were then directly asked about the impact of the course and curriculum on their writing. Specifically, did they think the work done on specific types of genres influenced the way they read and wrote other types of materials (types that were not covered in class)? Students were then asked direct questions about their analytical skills: did this course improve their understanding the concept of audience and different kinds of organizational structures? And did this course improve their ability to analyze texts?

Questions then focused back on the course and students' perceptions of its effectiveness, and areas of writing they still wanted to work on. Students were asked if the course was what they had expected it to be, or not; was there anything they had felt was lacking in the course or wished the course had covered but did not; and the kinds of writing skills they still wanted to work on.

5.5.5.3 Elicitation and Analysis

These interviews were conducted in the last two weeks of the semester since there was a better chance of interviewing students at this time, before they left for summer break. These interviews were conducted by Rich Hansburger, a fellow graduate student and graduate associate in teaching (GAT) in the Rhetoric, Composition and Teaching of English program with a strong background in ethnographic research. It was felt that students would feel more comfortable discussing the course with a person not affiliated
with it. The instructor assured students before they signed up for the interview that she would not listen to the tapes until grades were turned in, and this message was repeated by Hansburger before he conducted the interviews.

After the interviews were transcribed, they were examined for self-reports of changes in writing and textual analysis abilities as a result of this course. The interviews were also examined for student responses to the teaching materials and textbooks (i.e., which they found most and least helpful); the goals they believed they had met during the course; and the areas of writing they believe they still needed to work on.

5.5.6 End-of-the-Semester Writing Exercise/Final Examination

5.5.6.1 Purpose of the Instrument

The purpose of the End-of-the-Semester Writing Exercise/Final Examination was to assess the impact of the course and instruction on students' genre and textual analysis abilities through their ability to identify rhetorical features of three texts and then recreate one of them (a newspaper article, an article from a criminal justice journal and business memorandum). For those not involved in the study, this exercise was based on course training (what most final exams are based on); for those participating in the study it was a chance to quantitatively test the effectiveness of the course training.

5.5.6.2 Design of the Instrument

The writing exercise/final examination was divided into two parts: Part I, Analysis and Part II, Applying the Analysis (see Appendix N). It was based on the End-of-Semester reading Exercise by Hyon (1995). The students had not seen any of these articles during the course, and they were not informed about what genres would be analyzed. The first two parts (A and B) presented students with two texts about student
drinking. "A" was a short newspaper article about riots that occurred at Michigan State University when drinking restrictions were ordered by the president. "B" was an article from a criminal justice journal describing the phenomenon of drinking on campuses across the country. "B" had been edited by the instructor because of reading time constraints; however, this editing affected only the amount of information given under some of the subheadings of the article, the original headings and subheadings and their meanings were not altered.

Students were asked the same questions about "A" and "B." The goal of the first part of the questions (nine questions in all) was to determine students' ability to use their new skills to analyze and identify texts not examined in the classroom. Students were asked to describe the differences they saw between these two articles and to use examples to support their points regarding the major claim or thesis of the text and where it was located; the structure of the piece and its organization; the kind of information considered "evidence"; the kind of language used; and the demographics of the writers and readers and how their values were apparent from the language. Students were also asked what kind of information was appropriate for the writer to include or not include in this genre; the tone of the writer; the type of genre; and whether or not this passage reminded them of other types of writing they had read or written before.

If students reported that they had read or written this type of material before, they were told to go on to answer questions 10 and 11, which asked them what other types of writing this passage reminded them of and what specific similarities they could see between passage A and other types of writing.

In Part II, students were asked to first analyze a memorandum (C) as they had analyzed texts A and B. Then they were asked to recreate this memorandum format in their response to the directions below. The main goal of this part of the exercise was to
test students' general analysis capabilities by asking them to analyze a specific type of material they had not analyzed in this course before. Because part of the course's goal was to develop in students the ability to analyze different texts, and this goal had been made clear in the first part of the course syllabus, it was repeated here to give students a context for this part of the examination.

The final examination also served as a means to address Research Question 2, i.e., has training in new analytical skills helped students become aware of the differences in rhetorical expectations; expanded their repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing; and helped them successfully employ these strategies not only in their English classes, but in all of their classes and in a business scenario.

First students were told to read a sample memorandum. This memorandum was from the National Writing Program, but the official letterhead was removed. The memorandum format itself was not created by the instructor so as to be more impartial. Students were told that in this real-world scenario, they were now new employees working for the Dean of Students at Michigan State University and this memorandum was a "sample" of the type of memorandum used at the university. Students were told that the following was their boss' verbal directions:

As Dean of Students here at Michigan State University, it has become apparent to me that our students are obviously having problems with alcohol abuse. I want you to write a memo to the faculty for me, encouraging them to set aside a class to talk with their students about the use of alcohol on campus and in their lives. Using the information I've given you (articles A & B) please convince the faculty that this class discussion is a good idea, ask them to write a report about their class discussion, and ask them to offer suggestions about how to eliminate these types of violent protests and alcohol abuse on campus, suggestions that I can bring to the president of the MSU. Please don't deviate from this memo format—we've borrowed it and it's the department's favorite style—and use my name and today's date. Thanks, Jan Smith.
Asking students to use all three articles (A,B,C) was also an attempt to see if they could incorporate different research materials into a single essay, and was a means of comparing their End-of-the-Semester research and writing skills with the research and writing skills of their second and third papers.

5.5.6.3 Elicitation and Analysis

This exercise/examination was given on the day reserved for this course's final examination. The examinations were initially graded for general accuracy (as examinations are generally graded). Later, they were analyzed for patterns.
5.6 SELECTION OF FOUR CASE STUDIES

5.6.1 Analyzing the Data for Patterns

After transcribing the three interviews, I began my selection by analyzing the data collected in the analysis exercise in the Early Semester interview and comparing it to the analysis exercise in the End-of-the-Semester Writing Exercise/Final Examination. After coding each of the eight students' labeling and description of passages as "appropriate" or "inappropriate," I examined the results for patterns. I then examined the transcripts of all three sets of interviews for patterns.

5.6.2 Patterns Discovered

Upon analyzing the accuracy of responses from the Early Semester and End-of-the-Semester Interviews, the following patterns emerged:

1. The students with the most consistently accurate responses were Barbara, Melinda and Sharon, the three self-described creative writers (poetry and fiction) who disliked doing analysis. Besides their creative writing backgrounds, all three (1) accepted the use of structure (Barbara and Sharon had claimed to rely on structure in their first interview; Melinda had claimed to not rely on structure but by the final interview she reported to have accepted using structure); (2) reported having a middle-to-high awareness of the differences in different types of language styles in genres; (3) improved their writing by writing constantly on their own; (4) believed themselves to be somewhat "intuitive" when writing (although one could argue that many types of creative writing (poetry, scripts) are structured writing); (5) claimed that this class improved their analytical abilities.
Of this group, Sharon was selected as a case study as she as able to more lucidly express herself and explain her personal and educational background. She received a "B" in the course.

2. The students with the most inaccurate responses to the analytical exercises were Mark and Chad. While Chad was also a creative writer (scriptwriter) and claimed to be aware of the differences in different types of language styles, unlike the other creative writers, both he and Mark claimed not to rely on structure in both the first and last interview, and Mark said he had little awareness of language differences. (Yet Mark claimed to have had some five-paragraph teaching, and script writing certainly is structured.) Both claimed to focus on ideas first, then eventually structure (if it was stressed by the teacher upon return of their rough drafts). Mark also claimed to be "bad with definitions" which might also have affected his answers to questions that required labels. Both claimed that this course increased their analytical skills.

Mark was chosen as a case study for this group as he attended class on a more regular basis than Chad. Mark received a "B" in the course.

3. Two of the strongest writers and analytical thinkers in class were both the most and least improved in their analytical exercises. Gail showed the biggest improvement in analytical abilities when the Early Semester analytical results were compared to the End-of-the-Semester interview/Final Examination; Andrea showed a drop in abilities. And yet both claimed to have an awareness of different types of language styles and that this course improved their organizational abilities but not their analytical abilities (as those were developed before they came to this class).
Yet their experiences with structure and organization differed. Early on, Gail claimed not to use structure while Andrea claimed to rely on structure and had a series of very structured high-school English classes at a Catholic school. Like the creative writing group, Gail had a fond memory of mimicking poetry in one of her English courses in high school and she claimed to be "intuitive" about genre requirements. Andrea admitted that her abilities are dependent upon her interest and motivation (which could be a possible explanation for the results of her final examination analysis).

Both Gail and Andrea received "A"s in the course and both will be used in two smaller case studies.

5.6.3 Profiles of the Case Studies

The responses of the four case study students will be presented in the format of the course design as described in Chapter 4 (4.5.1.2) in order to examine their responses to the research questions posed earlier in this study. At the end of each case study an evaluation section is used to discuss how the students' writing errors can be seen as second language acquisition errors and the impact of this multidisciplinary curriculum on the errors is addressed.

1. First Third of Course: Learning the Connection Between Culture and Writing

The students' responses to the Student Beginning-of-the-Semester Questionnaire (SBSQ) and abilities demonstrated in the analysis exercise in the Early Semester Interview and first assignments and the draft and final version of Paper 1 will be used to examine the four students' need for greater analytical skills and understanding of rhetorical conventions;
ability to learn the connection between culture, language and ideology; and student 
reliance on structure and understanding of language styles.

2. Second Third of Course: Microanalysis of Cultures and Writing

Student responses to the Middle-of-the-Semester interview and Paper 2 will be used to 
examine the four students' abilities to learn how to use interdisciplinary tools (genre, 
rhetorical and discourse analysis) with contrastive rhetoric and popular culture to analyze 
texts; apply these skills to texts from American subcultures; and discover how receptive 
students were to learning and implementing these tools.

3. Last Third of Course: Expectations of Specific Disciplines in American Academic 
Culture

Student responses to their End-of-the-Semester Writing Exercise/Final Examination, and 
final assignments and Paper 3 were analyzed to determine if students can transfer their 
newly developed analytical skills to their American academic texts and cultures.

4. Student Perception

Student responses to the Final Interview were analyzed to discover if students 
themselves believe that the use of genre, rhetorical and discourse analysis tools improved 
their understanding of rhetorical conventions and the skills they claimed to lack upon 
entering this course (research skills, analytical skills), and if they believe they can apply 
their new repertoire of skills to other classes.

Student responses have been reproduced here as transcribed, although things like 
hesitations and false starts have been omitted. Texts written by students and reproduced 
here include original mechanical errors and tone in order to present each students' voice 
and abilities as accurately as possible. And all names have been changed.
6.1 SHARON: INTRODUCTION

Sharon was a 34-year-old mother of two children, one of whom is a special needs child in whose care she is very involved. A fourth-year senior in the Creative Writing Program, Sharon returned to school after dropping out of the University of Arizona 14 years ago. She has one older sister and brother. Her brother has an associate's degree and is in the military. Neither her sister or parents has a college degree; she and brother were the first in her immediate family to attend college at all and she's the first to attend a university.

Sharon took her English 101 and 102 courses at Pima Community College and finished 101 at the UA the following semester in order to "G. R. O. a pitiful showing 14 years ago." At Pima she journaled and wrote persuasive and personal essays in her 101 class. In 102 she wrote responses to readings and in both classes engaged in creative writing. In her course at the UA, she did the usual persuasive, personal and rhetorical analysis essays.

Based on her responses in the course questionnaire, writing is something that Sharon has done all her life and greatly enjoys. "I love to write, it is what I am here for (at the UA). I have been writing for most of my life, since grade school... I have always been a daydreamer and carry that over to my writing. I want my writing to grow with me, and I feel that it has."

Developing her skills is a constant theme for Sharon. "I believe that I have grown with each class I have taken, even non-English classes, each time I grow I feel that my writing improves. Obviously in classes where writing is the focus I have more opportunity
to practice, and so growth is more evident. I think that improvement is a gradual thing, as what I write as a 'writer' becomes more interesting to my reader."

In reflecting on her weaknesses (which later become apparent from her writing), Sharon wrote

I have to say that my biggest weakness is my run-on sentence habit... . When I first go over a rough draft I would say that a lot of my sentences are run-ons. I write like I speak, when I'm talking I don't stop a lot. I get going on a thought and keep going. I am learning how to change this, with help from the computer grammar checker. Now I write a lot of long sentences, that could be confusing, but they are not all run-ons.

It is not a surprise, then, that one of Sharon's goals was learning how to better edit her work. "I hope to develop a keener eye at proofreading, or editing my own work. Possibly I can develop a better idea of what I want to write, where I would be best suited to focusing my energy."

Yet creative writing remained her main focus. She liked to write poetry, especially for herself and her family. In high school she had "one class where we had a lot of creative writing . . . and lot of standard research . . . . But I enjoyed the creative stuff and poetry . . . I prefer to do self-expression, personal experience stuff because it's easiest for me and I'm very open, it's easy to put myself on paper." For Sharon, the most difficult writing she had done prior to this course was the rhetorical analysis she did in ENGL 101 at the UA. "I didn't enjoy it, I don't know why. Probably the more structure stuff is more demanding and guided . . . probably my least favorite."

6.1.1 Pre-Course Analytical Abilities

On the analysis section of the Early Semester interview (see Appendix K), Sharon scored the highest, appropriately describing passages, readers and writers, text strategies,
and genre categories of "Letters to the Editor" for *Glamour* and *Lingua Franca* and two articles on "legalese". The only thing she did not answer correctly—which in fact no student answered correctly—was the request to recreate passages; students responded with how they would correct the passages or improve them instead of actually recreate them.

At certain times, Sharon did rely on the structure of a piece (like organization) to help her recreate it. "... if it was something really serious then I'd look at the structure because I'd assume there was a reason behind the structure. If it was something more personal then I'd assume the structure wasn't so important."

When asked to what degree she was aware of the difference in language styles between different types of writing (such as literature, persuasive essays, newspapers, textbooks, research articles), she said "When I'm thinking about it I tend to be very aware, but day-to-day actually somewhere in the middle." Sharon was able to describe some of the differences in language styles. "Newspaper articles don't rely so much on the emotional information early on; they do after they've got the ideas across. Whereas a personal persuasive essay is probably going to be more emotional throughout..." Sharon also thought that knowing the styles of different types of writing could help her understand them when she read them and needed to recreate them.

Sharon's description of her pre-course writing experiences and preferences indicate a possible receptiveness to developing her skills through a new type of curriculum. As Sharon claims, she wants her "writing to grow" and she believes she grows with each course. From her own description of problems with writing, it appears a curriculum designed to improve analytical skills used in papers could benefit her, especially since her background and preference in writing seems to be creative writing and poetry. Sharon may also be receptive to genre-based training since she occasionally relies on structure to recreate texts that she is not familiar with. At the same time, Sharon's history of constant
reading and writing seems to have developed an innate ability in her to see differences in text analysis as evident from her very accurate analysis of the passages in the Early Semester analysis exercise.
6.2 FIRST THIRD OF COURSE: CULTURE AND WRITING

6.2.1 Learning the Connection Between Culture, Language and Ideology

In the first third of the course, students were introduced to the ideas of culture, language, and ideology using a description of a TV script and Bazerman's textbook *Involved* to discuss how the classroom can be seen as a communicative event that can be analyzed through Burke's pentad of scene, purpose, act, agents, and agency (1996, pp. 29-31). At this time the concepts of *meta-awareness* and the terms *rhetoric* and *contrastive rhetoric* and *discourse analysis* were introduced. Students were required to write essays in which they discussed the writing they did before coming to this class, and how they felt about being newcomers to the academy. I hoped to use this discussion to foreground my later discussion of students as initiates into the academic discourse community.

In discussing the concept of college students as "strangers in a strange land" to use Bazerman's description and the Burke's pentad, Sharon, because she had been out of school for a long time, chose to discuss her life as a former sales associate at a department store and her return to college. It was in this exercise that her lack of use of terms or definitions emerged.

While Sharon addressed the *setting* of the sales floor and the *purpose* of the work, her use of the specific terms diminished and her proclivity to write about personal issues emerged as she went into great detail to describe her role as a mother of a child with special needs, and full-time classes at Pima. She wrote "I was a full time sales associate at a department store. The setting was fairly consistent, the sales floor or the stock room... The overall purpose was to sell merchandise, and insure customer satisfaction so that they would return. . . . Full time classes at Pima were at first odd, uncomfortable. I had to deal with instructors, some of whom were younger than I am, and a class full of students, most of whom are quite a bit younger than I am."
Yet Sharon was able to "develop a comfortable relationship with the majority of my teachers because I participated fully, and because I stay quite focused. I believe that because my life at home is that of a mother and wife, I have fewer reasons to "wander" mentally during class." She returned to the use of setting in the conclusion of this assignment: "As a mother I find I have to play a lot of roles, playmate, nurturer, disciplinarian, teacher, nurse, the list keeps growing. The setting is always changing, with my daughter it is often at school or a doctor's office that I find myself becoming a specialist in her development. I am a partner with her medical specialists."

To develop a deeper understanding of the connections between culture, writing and ideology and begin to develop those skills in which students appeared weak (based on the students' and former 207 faculty's questionnaires), students were required to research and define the meanings of the three terms, discuss their research with other students, then make connections between the terms while citing properly.

Sharon's stream-of-consciousness writing began to appear in this assignment. The comments I put on her three separate definition papers included "it's more free-flow than research . . . but it shows you have good ideas on your own which you could support with research" and "important topics here, but they're not connected very well." Sharon had some good insights into the connections between writing and culture as shown in her first paragraph:

In my reading I stumbled upon the idea that writing is conversation. I like this idea, it conveys the notion that communication is key, that [sic] connects writing directly to culture, because communication is a vital part of culture and it keeps culture alive.

But as with other students, Sharon had problems with citing. Specifically, she had a large bibliography but no quotations or citations in the paper itself. She also had sentences with
multiple commas connecting multiple ideas and her topic paragraph did not address the topics she would cover in the paper.

6.2.2 Developing An Awareness of American Academic Culture

Moving from the general concepts of culture, writing and ideology to a more specific examination of American academic culture, students read about their culture from other people's perspectives using contrastive rhetoric texts. Specifically, students read Carolyn Matalene's "Contrastive Rhetoric: An American Writing Teacher in China," Fan Shen's "The Classroom and the Wider Culture: Identity as a Key to Learning English Composition," and Barbara Johnstone's "Arguments with Khomeini: rhetorical situation and persuasive style in cross-cultural perspective." They also read excerpts of Sharon Crowley's Ancient Rhetoric for Contemporary Students, readings from Aristotle and Quintilian, and analyzed their own Student's Guide to Composition (used in their 101 and 102 courses) to examine how western rhetorical traditions had been transmitted to them. They did additional citing work and editing work using newspaper stories. I especially focused on topic sentences—which most students claimed to have never heard of or focused on before. For their first paper, a personal illustration essay, they were required to use a personal example to describe the concepts they learned in the first third of the semester (culture, writing, ideology, meta-awareness and persuasion styles of American and other cultures, and knowledge transmission (see Chapter 4, Appendix D)).

In her paper "The Effects of Cultural Expectations on the Role of the Individual," Sharon began to see her connection to different subcultures and how their conventions affect rhetorical choices. Here she endeavored to show how

The role of a writer will change according to the culture of the intended audience.

. . . I have always been aware of the different roles I cast myself in, but I had never associated those differences with the cultural expectations of the moment of
interaction... I identify myself as many different people; I am a wife, mother, student, writer, and daughter, within the confines of each of these roles I interact with people differently. These differences in interaction techniques are due not to how I see myself, as much as what is appropriate for the audience I am performing for.

Sharon made insightful connections when discussing Matalene:

So to be successful as an American teacher in China, Carolyn Matalene had to become meta-aware, or acutely aware, of both the expectations of her culture and of the culture of her students... Being aware of these differences, Matalene became a teacher of not only English, but also of culture and ideology. Matalene played two separate roles within the classroom, based on the needs and expectations of the audience she was performing for.

She was also able to draw parallels between her experiences and those of Shen:

To continue to be successful Shen must maintain two writing identities, his Chinese self and his English self... Shen is able to identify his audience, and then meet the demands of that audience, in doing this he successfully fulfills two roles.

I have just recently experienced a situation similar to the one Shen describes. I have been writing poetry, or what I consider poetry, since grade school... My poetry has always been very personal, and I believe very intimate in expression... I have not intended for others to read my work, at least not immediately, so I have been free to say anything...

This semester I am enrolled in an introduction to poetry class, and I am not the poet I have been in the past. For this class I must write my poems with an audience other than myself in mind. This is a difficult transition for me, and has made my poetry sound awkward and stiff. I feel very much like Shen describes many Chinese writers who have adopted American styles of writing.

In contrast to her draft and other assignments, Sharon's citing had dramatically improved as had her run-on sentences. She still needed to do some work on her introductions and conclusions to make them stronger. She received a B+ on the paper.

While Sharon has innate textual analysis abilities and quickly developed an awareness of the connections between cultural and rhetorical conventions, her unfamiliarity with
academic writing was apparent in her difficulty in using terminology and tendency to segue her writing back to personal issues. Her weaknesses in editing her own work, reliance on free-flow writing over research, and lack of citations suggested her lack of familiarity with academic English's rhetorical conventions. And yet, the work with contrastive rhetoric texts seemed to have helped her make connections between culture and audience and rhetorical conventions, and this combined with additional citing work and editing work with popular culture texts (newspapers) appeared to improve her citing and stream-of-consciousness writing.
6.3 SECOND THIRD OF COURSE: MICROANALYSIS OF CULTURES AND WRITING

6.3.1 Using Interdisciplinary Tools (Genre, Rhetorical and Discourse analysis) with Contrastive Rhetoric and Popular Culture to Analyze Texts

In the second third of the class, students were introduced to the concepts of genre and discourse community. Students were given handouts detailing what to look for in doing rhetorical analysis and genre analysis and were also given a section of Deborah Tannen's analysis of Jessie Jackson's speeches in *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. An article from *Spy Magazine* and a response to a Letter to the Editor in the *New York Sun* on the existence of Santa Claus were used by students to practice doing genre, discourse and rhetorical analysis. The author of *Involved*, Charles Bazerman, also sat in on the listserv and often discussed genre concepts with students.

Before this class, Sharon claimed in her second interview that she "had heard about genre, but not really worked on genre analysis, not that in-depth." She had heard about it "probably just in other English classes. Not going over it specifically, but it being mentioned." She had done rhetorical analysis in her earlier English 101 course. But she had not talked about discourse communities or done discourse analysis before.

When asked if the various readings, handouts, and class discussions had been helpful in learning the material, Sharon said "I think it was helpful, I don't think I was having a difficult time understanding the concept, but I think it was still helpful to take a look at it in-depth in class. . . . I don't think there was anything I read that I didn't get, I may not have read it as in-depth as I should have necessarily or could have, but I don't think there was anything I read that raised more questions than it answered (laughs)."
6.3.2 Analysis of Popular Culture Texts

In writing Paper 2, an analytical essay (see Appendix G), students were asked to pull apart a type of writing and analyze the components that make up that type of writing; in effect to become the expert on a certain genre of writing. Students were allowed to pick a genre they were familiar with—popular culture ones were encouraged—and to include in the paper two articles of this type of genre, advice on writing for this type of genre, an examination of connections between cultures, and description of how discourse communities create genres and styles of writing.

In discussing her draft of paper 2 and her understanding of genre, rhetorical, and discourse analysis going into the draft, Sharon claimed "I felt pretty good about it. I'm not necessarily that strong writing analysis papers. I can get it and carry on a conversation about it but then when I sit down to write the paper I don't think that I'm as effective writing an analysis as I am actually maybe mentally preparing to write the analysis. But that's not for a lack of understanding of what I'm supposed to be doing, that's as much the way I write, I think."

Not surprisingly, Sharon chose to write about personal experience articles from two parenting magazines: Parents and Parenting. Picking her topic was fairly easy for her because "[i]t was something I was interested in doing so it was pretty simple."

Finding articles to analyze was also fairly easy because "I knew where to look, I was picking a topic that interested me that I'd like to write on. . . . Deciding on which specific articles I wanted to do, I put some additional thought into that, I read them maybe because I was looking more specifically for them to do exactly what I wanted them to do."

Finding demographics was not hard "because of the magazines I chose, picking magazines I was familiar with. Plus having the Writer's Market book helped because both of them were listed in there. Picking magazines I read before that I was familiar with
really made it easier. . . ." Finding an expert was also fairly easy because Sharon was interested in free-lance writing so she has books at home about magazine article writing. So that was easy for me because I didn't have to do anything to find it. But there are other sources that I knew that I could turn to on the web and stuff. AOL has a writers club that you can go into, so I was already familiar with a lot of with places I could go to look for stuff. . . .

Doing the analysis and combing all the elements of the paper was a little more difficult for Sharon because of her creative writing background.

. . . again, I would prefer to be writing creative stuff, not necessarily analytical. So probably [I didn't feel as] comfortable . . . as other things I might write, but I don't think it was so difficult that I felt overwhelmed. I did go change from the rough draft . . . to the final paper . . . I started almost over in how I presented the work of the paper . . . when I read it I realized I was going at it all wrong (laughs). I mean in the sense that I felt like it wasn't doing what I was intending to do when I read through it again later. . . . [I was doing some summarizing] and I changed the way I started and the way I opened and everything. . . . I have a difficult time taking out my voice . . . I don't think I took out my voice, but I tried to make it sound a little more like I had at least analyzed instead of read it.

In her draft, Sharon did indeed write almost a "grocery list" of what writers "did," without much analysis. She also did not mention any of the terms we had been working on, like genre or discourse. In end comments she was encouraged to see herself as a scientist, someone doing an analysis of the articles and strategies. Even having the option of using a strict outline of an analytical paper from the Bazerman book did not seem to help very much.

I think that most of what I read in Bazerman is really really helpful. I think my problem is that when I just sit down to write something that's analysis it just feels so queer to me that it doesn't matter what other people are telling me to do, and I'm not sure why that is, it's not the same for me. So I think he's very useful in that sense in trying to guide students without pounding them into the ground but I'm not sure whether in the long run I really did what he was telling me to do or not.
But in her final draft it appeared that she had indeed gotten a better handle on analytical papers. Analysis had emerged from her descriptions of the writers' strategies, and her organization and tone much better matched that of an analytical paper. But she still was hesitant to use terms in her paper: *Genre* was used sparingly and she described persuasive techniques instead of using rhetorical terms like *pathos*, *ethos*, or *logos*. She received a B+ on the paper.

Yet when asked if she felt the amount of information she gave on genre was equal to the level of comfort she felt with the concept or topic, Sharon said:

> I feel very comfortable with the topic as far as, I mean I understand what genre is. So I'm not sure if it was equal to or not because not being an outside reader I'm not sure how effective the paper was in that sense. But as far as understanding what genre is I feel real comfortable with that . . . I feel like I can read something and . . . tell you if it was the kind of genre I like (laughs). But I mean I could probably pick out sports writing and other things in genres I was interested in, I could identify [them].

In addition, it appeared Sharon had learned how to cite works as her citations and Works Cited page were correct. When asked if she was satisfied with the final version of her paper, Sharon said:

> I'm sure that there are things that I would change, anytime you go back and read anything you've written . . . an essay especially, you could find things to change. But I think I was satisfied with the paper over all. I have a difficult time liking anything I do that's analysis--in 101 that was the one I thought was my least competent piece of work. And it got a good grade but I think in the realm of papers that would be the one that I would not expect, you know, that would not be my best.

While Sharon had probably heard of genre in her literature and creative writing courses, she had not done this type of in-depth genre or any discourse analysis. Yet she
seemed comfortable with the concept of genre. And the popular culture articles seemed to ease her into the analysis, allowing her to pick a familiar topic to work on. She did however, need to restart her paper as she had fallen back on her creative writing approach to an analytical paper, summarizing more than analyzing, and omitting terminology. And yet this multidisciplinary approach to analytical papers (combined with overt comments by her instructor to see herself as a "scientist" writing, doing analysis), seemed to help her do analysis and adjust her organization, citations and tone accordingly; yet she still sparingly used terminology. Now the question was whether or not she could transfer these skills to academic texts.
6.4 LAST THIRD OF COURSE: EXPECTATIONS OF SPECIFIC DISCIPLINES IN AMERICAN ACADEMIC CULTURE

6.4.1 Transferring Analytical Skills from Popular Culture to American Academic Texts and Cultures

In the final third of the course, students applied their analytical skills to academic genres, determining expectations of specific disciplines in American academic culture. Students began by reading Lakoff's "Groove of Academe" and discussing the "unspoken" rules and expectations and the sharing (or lack of sharing) of disciplinary information with new initiates into the academy. Students were asked to write about whether they considered themselves to be "insiders or outsiders" in the academy.

Sharon wrote about how she really became aware of the level of discourse she needed to adopt to feel like a part of the academic community.

As a college student I know that I need to enter conversations with some knowledge or familiarity with a subject. I can't just discuss or write without putting some thought into what I will say, and into how others may respond to what I am saying. If I make a point, I must feel confident in my ability to explain that point. In past college classes I realized that I needed to write to meet the expectations of my instructors. The class that I was mostly aware of this was last semester in History and Religion of Ancient Israel. . . . The student dynamic of this class was different from many of the others I had taken; this class included history majors, undergraduates as well as graduate students. For the first time I was writing for a higher level of expectation, my writing would be read along side the work of students with more experience in this type of writing.

The experience in this class raised my expectations of my own writing, and changed the way I saw myself. I feel more confident with my ability to express my knowledge in ways that meet the expectations of my instructors and fellow students.

Yet, like many second language students who learn to write in the American academic style while they are here, Sharon may just be "visiting" this culture for now.

I still may fill many other roles; those roles will not disappear. . . . A part of me feels like a part of the academic community, but at times I feel detached from others within this community. Perhaps because my other roles are still so vital to
who I am, I am never just a student. I am always a mother. That role always
effects (sic) the way I see the world around me, and my place within the world. . .
. I guess I see myself as part of the academic community, but after reading the
article by Lakoff, I don't see myself ever joining that elite portion of the community
that requires a secret handshake."

6.4.2 Memberships to Specific Academic Disciplines

From the personal, students moved on to read Schwegler and Shamoon's (1991)
"Meaning Attribution in Ambiguous Texts in Sociology" to discover how disciplines
require texts to be written and what is considered evidence in different texts. For their
final paper, the argumentative paper, students were to find a professor in their major and
have him or her recommend a well-known journal. From the journal they were to get one
article and analyze it using the handouts on rhetorical analysis and genre given to them in
the second third of the course. They were also to interview the professor about their
findings, and also interview him or her on a personal level to discover when the professor
began to find him or herself writing as a member of the academic community, whether or
not his or her identity or sense of self changed, when she or he began to see themselves as
a member of the academic community or identify with it, etc.

Students were then to write their argument paper based on one of two questions
posed to them (see Appendix H) from either Fan Shen's experiences learning to write in
English and his claim that learning to write in English caused him to create a new identity,
or Robin Lakoff's claims regarding the connection between language and power structures
in the academy.

Sharon began her paper, titled "Discourse Communities, Language and the Identity
of Self," by describing how a writer has to adjust to specific audiences. While she
introduced the topic with a quote from Shen, it became apparent by the second paragraph
that she did not have an argument, but had written a personal essay comparing her
experiences to Shen's: "Like Shen, I recognize many roles that I fulfill in my life, each role
is defined as much by the people I interact with in that role as by my feelings or actions. One of these roles is that of student. As I entered classes in the university, I found that my role as a writer shifted, depending on my audience."

She then moved on to discuss entering the academic discourse community and how she identified with the creative writing academic community in particular. "As a creative writing major, I belong to an academic subgroup: (sic) I am no longer identified solely as a student, but as an English major, most specifically as a creative writing major. Once identified as such, I enter a new community that is built and defined by the language used. . . ."

In her interview with a literature M.A. student about his experiences in the academy and his shift in identity, Sharon did use terminology like discourse community and discuss how academic English discourse conventions might be creating "clones:"

"[Tom] and I discussed the concepts of discourse community, and he had some definite opinions about the idea of specialization. [Tom] didn't feel like he was part of the community, he felt as if he was on the fringe. . . . He is afraid that the community at the highest level is becoming almost stagnant."

Since most MFAs have poems or short stories published, not academic articles, a problem with this assignment for creative writers turned out to be the requirement that they find an expert with an article in a journal. Sharon then reviewed an article by University of Arizona Professor Gerald Monsman in the journal Studies in English Literature 1500-1900. He would have been a better person to interview.

Unfortunately, Sharon's analysis of the article fluctuated--at times she offered analysis of Monsman's work with other people's citations, at other times she made claims without support ("Monsman left no stone unturned in his article. . . . He used language that showed his intelligence and did not waste words."). And she did not tie her
conclusion back to Shen; instead, she discussed discourse communities and her need to develop of "an entirely different self" in order to join them and learn a second language.

This article [by Monsman] just confirmed for me what I already believed about discourse communities. If I wanted to join the discourse community made up by (sic) the target audience of this article I would have to develop an entirely different self. I would need to put in years of study, just leaning the basics, to survive within this discourse community. It would be very much like learning a foreign language.

(I assume she means the literature community, not the creative writing one.) However, her citing was generally correct. Her final grade was a B-.

6.4.3 Transferring Analytical Skills to Other Genres

The purpose of the End-of-the-Semester Analysis Exercise/Final Examination (see Appendix N) was to assess the impact of the course and instruction on students' genre and textual analysis abilities by assessing their ability to identify rhetorical features and recreate texts common to them, in particular the major claim or thesis of the text and where it was located; the structure of the piece and its organization; the kind of information considered "evidence"; the kind of language used; and the demographics of the writers and readers and how their values were apparent from the language. Students were also asked what kind of information was appropriate for the writer to include or not include in this genre; the tone of the writer; to identify the type of genre; and whether or not this passage reminded students of other types of writing they had read or written before.

The examination was divided into two parts: Part I, Analysis and Part II, Applying the Analysis. The first part presented students with two texts about student drinking. "A" was a short newspaper article from the Arizona Daily Star (May 3, 1998) about riots that occurred at Michigan State University when drinking restrictions were enacted by the
president. "B" was an article titled "Boozing and Brawling on Campus: A National Study of Violent Problems Associated with Drinking Over the Past Decade" from the Journal of Criminal Justice describing the phenomenon of drinking on campuses across the country (see Appendix N). In Part II, students were asked to first analyze a memorandum (C) as they had analyzed texts A and B. Then they were asked to analyze and recreate this memorandum in order to test their general analyzing abilities by asking them to analyze a specific type of material they had not seen in this course before. For those not involved in the study, this exercise was based on course training (what most final examinations are based on); for those participating in the study it was a chance to quantitatively test the effectiveness of the course training.

Despite the weak analysis and lack of an argument in her third paper, in the final examination Sharon was able to appropriately identify claims, structure, evidence, language, demographics, and genre of the newspaper text and the criminal justice article as well as the respective writers and readers. For example, "The [news] article is an informative piece about an incident at MSU [Michigan State University] involving students and police. It is the first sentence of the article that tells readers what the article is about." She recognized similarities between the criminal justice article and psychology texts (e.g., "The use of references, or citations. The layout of the paper... and the results section") and appropriately identified similarities between other news articles and the one used here. And she recognized the memorandum format from other memoranda she wrote at work, claiming they all gave "[J]ust the facts... no superfluous details... " She was also able to recreate the memorandum quite well in the correct format and with appropriate information.

Sharon's description of her role in the academic discourse community showed her awareness of her role as an initiate and the need for her to adopt a certain level of
academic discourse to do well, and yet she had a resistance to becoming a full-fledged member. It also appeared that transferring her analytical skills to academic texts was harder for her—at least she had not analyzed her academic tests as well as she had the popular culture texts—and she had not entirely adopted argumentative writing conventions, instead she slipped back into a personal mode instead of argument. And yet, she was able to identify the textual conventions (structure, evidence, etc.) of different texts in the final examination (identify elements of the popular culture, academic and business texts equally).
6.5 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

6.5.1 Influence of this Course on Students' Writing and Analytical Abilities

The purpose of the final interview was to elicit students' perceptions about the influence of this course on the development and/or improvement of their writing and analytical abilities (see Appendix M). The first part asked students to evaluate the impact of this course on their writing abilities, comparing comments they made about their writing in the early interviews with their perceptions of their writing now. Students were then asked about the course and if the materials had met their learning needs and whether or not they had received help with the writing, analytical and research skills that they had been seeking. Students were then directly asked about the impact of the course and curriculum on their writing. Specifically, did they think the work done on specific types of genres influenced the way they read and wrote other types of materials (types that were not covered in class)?

Students were then asked direct questions about their analytical skills, specifically, had this course improved their understanding of the concept of audience and different kinds of organizational structures, and did this course improve their ability to analyze texts? Final questions focused attention on the course and students' perceptions of its effectiveness, and areas of writing they still wanted to work on.

6.5.1.1 Impact on Personal Writing Habits

When the interviewer asked if her writing skills or habits had changed since the beginning of the semester, Sharon claimed that her analytical and organizational skills had become stronger, and again she returned to the idea of how practicing one's writing improves it.
I feel a little stronger with the analytical stuff. I'm a creative writing person. Delving into the analysis for me is not what I want to do but I feel a little more secure with it now. I've taken a number of writing classes and I think with each one my skills improved just from the virtue of practice. You know, the more you write the more comfortable the better your skills are going to be as far as organizing papers and things like that. So I think sure they've improved and I think that's a direct result of being in this class because I'm also taking an intro to poetry class and a lit class and obviously the intro to poetry class doesn't do anything for my lit class as far as skills go. But I think this class has helped as far as organizing and taking a better look at what I'm reading.

In the SBSQ questionnaire, Sharon had said she wanted to improve run-on sentences, proofreading and editing skills, and develop a better idea of what she wanted to write. Her perception was that there had been an improvement.

I have a tendency to focus a little better on what I'm going to put down instead of just putting down anything. As far as run-ons go, I think that's improved a bit just by virtue of being a little more aware over time. I think I still do run-ons, I'm using my grammar check a lot more. It tells me when I have run-ons, it also tells me I use very wordy sentences a lot. It could be confusing, but I don't really cut those down as I go through it and look for the run-ons, I cut those but, but the wordy sentences I keep (laughs).

In her Middle-of-the-Semester interview, Sharon had claimed to look at the structure of the text depending on the seriousness of the assignment, and if she was thinking about it at the time. It seemed that she still did this.

I think about what I want [the text] to end up looking like quite a bit. When I sit down to write I have an idea of what I want to say but also how I want it to be said, to appear, especially if you're sitting down to write an essay test. You know, a lot of times I'll write the notes to myself, write an outline, so I know what I want to say and how I want it to be said. So I think that that's important, whereas if you're just writing for the sake of free-floating writing then obviously you don't want to plan where you want to go. So I think for this class I put a lot more thought into the end result even before I started writing anything.
6.5.1.2 Impact on Academic Skills

When the interviewer asked if there any classes and assignments in this course that were particularly useful to her, Sharon claimed that

I think for the intention of learning to analyze that they were all useful. Since I don't like to do analysis I wouldn't say they were like "joyous" to do (laughs) but they were useful. . . . I think that especially if it's something you don't enjoy doing and you take it and practice it, doing something that you really dread, that's got to have value because you're going to be honing skills that you aren't necessarily gonna' go out and hone on your own. I mean I'm not going to pick up a magazine and analyze it for the sake of analysis, but maybe now I'm more consciously aware of what being done and how I'm being manipulated--which isn't a bad thing especially raising kids. I mean there's a lot of advertisements and stuff like that, and the more analysis I do in general, I think the more aware I am of that kind of manipulation so in life I think it's useful. And for being a creative writing major, I have to take literature classes, analysis is going to be something I need to be able to do, I need to be able to identify what's happening so in that respect they're useful. So for the long-term goals I have for myself and the course I think they built on themselves; I don't think any of them were a waste of time or energy by any means.

In fact, the work she did on specific types of genres (in Papers 2 and 3) in some ways seemed to have an influence on the way she now reads and writes other types of materials.

. . . I think I am more aware of identifying where things fit . . . it has probably changed the way I look at things . . . if I'm going to read an article that's supposed to be authoritative, maybe I am looking for the things that I expect to see there. And if the person doesn't set themselves up as an authority pretty early on I might not take it as seriously so in that respect I suppose it does change the way you read things because you anticipate certain things from specific categories of genres that you're reading.

Sharon also told the interviewer that the course also seemed to make her more aware of the differences in rhetorical expectations of audiences, at least it may have built on earlier skills.
I think it built on skills that were started in earlier classes. I think that now when I read something I'm more aware of who the audience is and where I fit in, if I'm part of the audience... I can identify how I'm part of the audience. Which is think important because then you can see what they expect of you as the reader as well.

The course also seemed to have some type of impact on her ability to more clearly see the different kinds of organizational structures in texts.

... I'm probably aware of the fact that you need to, before you start writing, know what you're going to write, who the audience will be and things like that. . . . the whole way you organize is going to shift to why you're writing, not just what you're writing, but specifically why and who. Are you writing it for a class grade, are you writing for yourself, and all the different things that play in it. I think this class has made me more aware of this shift; I write differently for this class than I do for my other classes I think because it's more structured; analysis in this class is different than my other class. Because in my other class I can bring in more "I thinks" (laughs) and you can't be wrong with "I thinks" in a lit class (laughs) but in this class you can't "think" (laughs), you have to know and you have to know why you know.

But when asked about the textbook *Involved*, again she brought up the sense of intuition that comes to play in her writing.

I think... Bazerman basically gives you guidelines on how to write different types of papers and he brings up a lot of things that you may have done without thinking about them, without being consciously aware of them before but now they're brought up more into the light, you know these are the issues you're actually thinking about when you set out to write. And we went over a lot of that in class, knowing who you're writing for and knowing why your writing and what your point is.

Sharon believed that this course expanded her repertoire of options and strategies for communicating through writing; at least it gave her some interesting strategies to use in other courses.
... I have more awareness of what I'm reading and of maybe [what] an audience wants too. So it's not just from my perspective but maybe I know a little more about what I need to put into something for a specific audience and I'm better able to define that. Like I said I write differently for my lit class than I do for this class, in a lot of ways. My lit instructor likes to use colorful words that are interesting . . . so [when I write] a paper for him . . . after I'm done I go through the thesaurus on the computer and change the words . . . [from] a common word [to] something really bizarre, an offshoot. But I do that purposely because I'm consciously going through it saying "well he likes fun quirky words" so we're going to change our boring common words anytime we can and then when he reads it he'll . . . even if he's not consciously aware that I'm doing it, at some point he'll go "you know she's using the language that I like to use, she's finding things that are fun for me" and that's got to affect the way he reads it.

The course seemed to be different from what Sharon expected, but not so in a negative way, and it seemed to satisfy her writing needs in general.

I had no expectations coming originally. I had no idea what we were going to be doing, so it couldn't fail (laughs). It satisfied my needs in that I got to work on writing skills that I needed to work on, I knew that it wasn't going to be creative writing, so in that sense I wasn't let down. But I think that I was allowed to write, I think that she really considers who you are as a writer; I mean I didn't feel like being a creative writer was a detriment to me, which is nice. I think she considers who the writer is when she's reading what they've written when she's giving you advice on the rough drafts, she knows where you are going into it, that's helpful.

One criticism Sharon did have was that "I think we were always rushed, which wasn't her fault. I think the problem is that there's so much information that you want to cover and there's so much out there that's important . . . it's always a shame that the semester's not a little bit longer. When there's too much to cover it's always nice to have more time, in general."

It appears that this new type of genre-based multidisciplinary curriculum had improved Sharon's organizational and especially analytical skills by making her more aware of the strategies being used by others on her and other readers (by advertisers especially) and preparing her for analysis she will have to do in literature classes. And it
had helped her somewhat with her run-on sentences. The genre work also seemed to
develop expectations in her of rhetorical conventions she now expects to see in specific
genre texts. While the course did expand her strategies for communication through
writing, it seemed that perhaps this course built on Sharon's already existing intuitive
audience awareness and knowledge of strategies to be used.
6.6 EVALUATION

Sharon's writing, interview responses and the analysis of her texts offer insights into the benefits of seeing her problems in academic writing as second language errors in L2 acquisition; and the affects of a multidisciplinary curriculum on correcting these errors (while developing analytical skills). In the process, these observations aid in discovering answers to this study's research questions.

Sharon's extensive training in creative writing instead of analytical writing or argumentative writing (and since she would have been in high school in the 1970s, she probably received process-oriented training as well that would have required her to "produce only a limited range of texts" (Hyon, 1995, p. 94)) seems to, as work by Schifflin and Ochs (1986) on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis would suggest, have developed her cognitive skills against the backdrop of that particular discourse community. This is not necessarily bad because as Johns (1986), Connor (1984) and Wong-Fillmore (1991) point out, that existing linguistic knowledge can help students discover elements of a new discourse.

For example, while creative writing may seem antithetical to structured analytical writing, in fact creative writing, especially poetry, Sharon's favorite, can be very structured. This training may explain her abilities and recognition of the importance of structure and awareness of the differences in language styles between different types of writing, and her awareness of the difference in language styles between different types of writing.

In fact, it may be this previous training in creative writing that explains why Sharon is a creative writing student who, despite not having a background in formal analysis and openly stating she dislikes analytical work, has the ability to analyze texts. In analytical exercises requiring either a verbal response or short answer response (like the
final examination) Sharon did very well, even before receiving training in this course.
Sharon's experience may support the theory that "some students may have a rhetorical awareness without genre-specific instruction" which supports Freedman's (1993) claims that secondary-level students do not necessarily need explicit genre instruction to "master the formal features of text types" (Hyon, 1995, p. 275). Sharon claims to have an innate analytical ability, a form of intuition of what a text should look and sound like. Sharon's intuition regarding audiences and strategies may also intuitive—developed from her years of writing—as she already had an understanding of the differences in rhetorical expectations of audiences and organization before coming to this course.

And yet, while Sharon has a deep awareness of rhetorical structures, her ability to reproduce them and other conventions is not as well developed. There may be a number of factors that contribute to this, such as age. Krashen, Long and Scarcela (1979) describe how older students can learn new forms and structures more quickly because of their developed cognitive and learning abilities. At the same time, they may also experience mental rigidity, which may explain Sharon's reluctance to deal with material she did not feel comfortable with—like terminology in Paper 1.

That Sharon could learn to cite well while continuing to struggle with argumentative styles of writing and organization may be explained by Krashen's theories on acquisition and learning, i.e., citing is a learned activity while organization and argumentation are unconscious process that need to be acquired overtime (the comprehension before production theory). Perhaps much more time is needed than one semester of coursework. Interlanguage issues may also be at play here, in particular fossilization, specifically what Selinker (1972) calls transfer-of-training fossilization where, in this case, excessive training in personal narratives interferes with a student's ability to adopt a more academic style of writing. This was apparent when Sharon seemed
to have to make a conscious effort to successfully engage this analytical ability in formal analytical papers in the classroom. In two of the three major papers in this class, she had a hard time shifting from personal essay to argumentative essay. She did do well on the analytical paper itself (Paper 2) but only after comments on the rough draft refocused her attention to the necessary elements in an analysis (perhaps supporting Cathcart and Olsen (1976) and others who suggest that corrections by teachers can be helpful with second language acquisition).

And yet Sharon's work on the popular culture texts in Paper 2 showed that she could analyze the parenting articles quite well; then she stumbled in analysis of the academic texts and the writing of Paper 3. And explanation for this may be related to the filter theory: Sharon's affective filter was low because she was excited about analyzing the parenting magazines in Paper 2 because (1) she's very involved in her parenting role, especially with a handicapped child; and (2) she wants to write free-lance articles for popular magazines. At the same time, as she claimed in her identify paper, she does not feel as though she'd like to be a permanent part of the academic community--her need to identify with that discourse community is low. Therefore, her filter may be higher when it comes to writing academic analysis.

This may be related to Sharon's lack of desire to acculturate with the target group (Schumann 1978). The interview with her discipline's expert (or a related discipline expert) did what most ethnographic techniques do--allow students to see their discipline's acculturation process, which Sharon saw and concluded that she was not interested in becoming a member of an English discourse community that favors analytical and argumentative writing. Her motivation to write more creative texts (like the magazine articles) or belong to the creative writing target group, seems to be much higher, which causes her to want to integrate this type of material and community values into her life.
And yet, as a writer, she did claim to be very interested in learning new types of writing skills and structures; in fact she often mentioned how she sees all types of writing as practice that improves her writing.

This curriculum did positively impact her in several ways, for example, this course did seem to expand her repertoire of strategies for communicating in writing that can be used in other classes. The genre-based work seemed to have increased her awareness of the skills she already employed subconsciously. And she claimed that the course increased her analytical skills, perhaps it built on existing skills or improved her ability to express these abilities on paper. This may be a result of the overt discussions of genre and discourse communities (Reid, 1989; Leki, 1991; Swales, 1990) that teach students to ask themselves how discourse communities use their rhetorical conventions to initiate students or value particular conventions over others. And yet like other students, Sharon resisted overt instructions on how to write papers for specific genres as used in Bazerman's textbook, preferring instead to use her own judgment about what works or does not work.

The use of contrastive rhetoric and popular culture texts as analytical tools (Leki 1991, 1992; Mulcaire and Grady 1990) built on her innate analytical abilities, which allowed her to see how knowledge is socially constructed as are rhetorical conventions and how she could manipulate them. As Sharon claimed, the work on specific types of genres (in papers 2 and 3) influenced the way she writes other types of materials. This is evident from her claims in the final interview where she said, "... if I'm going to read an article that's supposed to be authoritative, maybe I am looking for the things that I expect to see there. And if the person doesn't set themselves up as an authority pretty early on I might not take it as seriously so in that respect I suppose it does change the way you read things because you anticipate certain things from specific categories of genres that you're reading."
In summary, Sharon came to this course with latent analytical abilities developed through her creative writing experiences. This course seemed to help her develop more communicative competence in written academic English by familiarizing her more with academic conventions and lessening her resistance to analyzing and creating analytical texts.
7.1 MARK: INTRODUCTION

Mark was a slightly nervous student who spoke quickly and in short sentences when first interviewed. A sophomore from California, he was still undecided about his major (but leaning toward psychology). Both of his parents had college degrees (his mother graduated from the UA) and his older sister graduated from UCLA.

Mark had taken his English 101 and 102 courses at the UA. He had journaled and written persuasive, rhetorical analysis, and personal essays. In his classes he claimed to have read "a lot of journal articles about the weight loss of wrestlers and Love In the Time of Cholera by Garcia Marquez." And his instructors had emphasized analysis, not summarization.

Based on his answers to the course questionnaire, writing can be frustrating for Mark, but one of his strengths is that he is persistent.

I believe that writing can be frustrating and difficult sometimes. A major problem comes up for me now and then when I work on papers and I don't know where I am going with a paragraph, or something that I really like in the paper just won't seem to fit in. The fun for me is getting through all of these frustrations and completing a great paper. It is truly fulfilling to write a paper which contains things that you would think were out of your reach.

In contrast to Sharon who did not enjoy doing analysis, Mark sees analysis as one of his strengths.

The only strength that I have as a writer is that I can get interested in things and keep analyzing and trying to discover something about them. I can generate some good ideas after writing for a while and base my papers on those ideas.
Like Sharon, Mark believed that some of his weaknesses included long sentences. In addition, he believed that he needed to improve his vocabulary and learn structure, and in the process leaner how to more quickly produce material.

It takes me a long time to write anything that is good. What I find is that I have to just keep writing for a while before I can catch onto a main theme that I like. I tend to waste a bit of paper. This class is a great opportunity for me to be able to get some structure going into the paper so I can save a lot of time. I believe this class will teach me how to be more disciplined as a writer. Hopefully I will be able to do research papers more effective [sic] and faster after learning techniques in this class. I will get plenty of opportunities to try this out in my other classes, so I will know if this can help me.

Mark does not have any particularly favorite type of reading. "I'll read anything like fiction, or nonfiction. No favorite authors, I bounce around." But like Sharon and many others in class, Mark prefers more creative writing. "I don't mind doing that analyzing stuff, but I like free writing. Just writing about something, like emotional."

In fact, he felt that he received too much structure in his high-school English classes. "I didn't like writing in high school at all because I had teachers that pretty much said this is how you have to write. I had a teacher who pretty much wrote our papers for us . . . gave us everything we had to do. Five-paragraph essay."

Mark believed that the easiest writing for him "is something I can just go off on . . . if I like what I'm reading, what I'm doing, I can write fairly easy. But if I'm struggling to say what I want to say, it's really tough for me. I can analyze some things really good, other topics are a little tougher, just depends on if I get it going or not."

In his Early Semester interview, Mark claimed that freedom to write on topics that he likes in a manner that he finds comfortable is very important. Perhaps for these reasons, Mark felt that his college writing experience differed greatly from high school. "College
writing was a lot different. Last year when I was freshman and I had a teacher and he said you could write anything you want . . . and how I wanted to write it . . . it was easier for me than writing in high school. I did like rhetorical analysis, personal experience and persuasive [paper] and 102 was similar, text in context and stuff like that."

But like Sharon, personal writing is easier for Mark. When writing "[s]omething for fun I just go and do it. The hardest thing for me is like finding a thesis, like the intro, so usually I'll just start writing and stumble upon something and go back and it's a big mess (laughs) . . . because of the way I was taught to learn . . . when I was writing for fun I just did it, [while] the whole teaching thing was kind of hard. I've learned a lot in school but it wasn't much fun . . . the structure was probably the big thing."

7.1.1 Pre-Course Analytical Abilities

On the analysis section of the Early Semester interview (see Appendix K), Mark had one of the lowest scores. While he appropriately described passages, writers, and text strategies, he stumbled over most genre identifications and one reader category.

While Sharon sometimes relied on structure to help recreate it, Mark believed that "I probably don't use structure that much. I can look at the structure a little bit but I like to go after the whole points, like the main ideas." When asked to what degree he was aware of the difference in language styles between different types of writing (such as literature, persuasive essays, newspapers, textbooks, research articles), Mark claimed to be "somewhere in the middle." While Sharon did not often use it, Mark was somewhat confused on terminology when asked if he could describe some of the differences in language style between types of writing. Yet he had a basic idea of the differences in style in the Early Semester analytical exercise.
The style or the structure? The tone's a lot different for the newspaper where they're trying to cut down on space than like a literary piece where they're trying to get abstract thoughts. For me the tone is the biggest thing, because of the different audiences [they're] going after. . . . I think it's easy to pick up on it when you go from a newspaper to a text book, it's going to be different.

Mark also seemed a little confused when asked if knowing the styles of different types of writing could help him understand them when he read them and needed to recreate them. "Well, the information you get out of them, I think the tone can be different but the information, if you brought in two different, say there was a similar article in a textbook and newspaper, it would have the same main points hopefully. I don't know, I think I read past the structure and go for the idea."

Mark's description of his pre-course writing experiences, like Sharon, indicates a receptiveness to developing his skills through this new multidisciplinary curriculum. He claims to be persistent in trying to develop new ideas through analysis; expressed a need to use this class as a means to achieve his goal of writing more efficiently; and was eager to try his new training out in other classes. Because he had one of the most difficult times with the textual analysis in the Early Semester interview, this type of training would seem to be something he needs. Yet, in contrast to Sharon, Mark may or may not be receptive to genre training. While Sharon spent more time on less structured (compared to academic) writing and training, Mark seems to have gotten too much rigid—one could argue prescriptive—training. Additionally, perhaps in rebellion, Mark prefers not to have much interest in relying on structure and he claims to be only moderately aware of differences in language styles; instead he focuses first on the main idea, which could explain his problems with textual analysis.
7.2 FIRST THIRD OF COURSE: CULTURE AND WRITING

7.2.1 Learning the Connection Between Culture, Language and Ideology

In the first third of the course students were introduced to the ideas of culture, language and ideology using popular culture, the textbook *Involved*, and Burke's pentad to discuss how the classroom can be seen as a *communicative event*. At this time the concepts of *meta-awareness* and the terms *rhetoric* and *contrastive rhetoric* and *discourse analysis* were introduced.

Students were required to research and define the meanings of the three terms, interview other students about their definitions, and then make connections between them while citing properly.

Mark began this assignment by discussing culture using texts from an anthropology course he took the previous year. In general, Mark had good ideas and expressed them clearly. However, at times he would have benefited from rereading his writing. While he was able to rely on external sources, it was apparent that he needed to work on citing and distinguishing plurals from possessives. For example, in the last paragraph of his definition of culture he wrote:

> What Terry Eagleton's definition of a culture is [sic] basically the difference between different society's. Everything that makes up the society and sets it apart is part of its particular culture. This especially is true for the accepted works of art. This definition is not surprising because it comes straight from authors in the literary community.

Yet Mark failed to cite Eagleton and had a book listed in the Works Cited that was not cited in his text.

On the positive side, in line with his Early Semester interview claim, Mark has a good understanding of tone and has interesting ideas and did a good job of using his peers' quotations. But comments I made on the final draft included suggesting the need for him to tie his culture and language concepts together using some of his research; using
quotations and examples to support his claims (e.g., "[A teacher he had in high school] would often come up with analogies about writing that would mean the act of writing is a way to make people immortal"--what kind of analogies?); correcting his possessives, in-text citations (e.g., "Garrett, Allison. Personal Interview 22 Jan. 1998") and works cited; watching the awkward phrases and use of slang-like expressions (e.g., "society keeps moving along"); and tying the introduction to the conclusion.

7.2.2 Developing An Awareness of American Academic Culture

Moving from the general concepts of culture, writing and ideology to a more specific examination of American academic culture, students used contrastive rhetoric texts from Matalene, Shen, and Johnstone in order to read about their culture from other people's perspectives. For their first paper, a personal illustration essay, they were required to use a personal example to describe the concepts they learned in the first third of the semester (culture, writing, ideology, meta-awareness and persuasion styles of American and other cultures, and knowledge transmission (see Appendix F)).

Titled "Culture Shock," Mark's essay endeavored to show how culture shock can impact writing. Mark's rough draft, although only one and a half pages, showed some semblance of potentially sophisticated thought as he tried to connect Paul Pederson's "The Five Stages of Culture Shock" with writing and communication in a different culture. In my comments, I suggest ways he could use Matalene and Shen to build connections between his claims, his personal experiences, and the terms we discussed in class. It was also apparent from this draft that he needed to work on his introduction and sentences and citing. For example, in the draft of his introductory paragraph he wrote

Facing a new situation where the surroundings change drastically forces stress on an individual. When normal activities are forced to change in a new world, the
individual has to make adjustments in order to fit successfully in the new culture. This adaptation is what is known as "culture shock." Culture shock is defined by Paul Pederson in The Five Stages of Culture Shock as "the process of initial adjustment to an unfamiliar environment (1)." The impact of the emotional, psychological behavioral, cognitive and physiological adjustment reflect the culture shock on the individual (1).

In his final draft, Mark had made some good connections between his experiences and those of Matalene and Shen, and had, unlike Sharon, incorporated all the terms we discussed in class. For example, in discussing the changes Shen had to make in order to create a new identity for himself when he came to this country, Mark described his transition from high school to college this way.

... One major change was that my writing had been freed from the over-structured high school writing where everything had to be one certain way. I vividly remember my junior year, our teacher forced a five paragraph persuasive essay on us that didn't allow us to say anything without a citation. When I was confronted with a new way of writing [at college], I struggled in the beginning of the year, but as I started to adjust, I learned to enjoy the work that seemed previously intimidating and difficult. The new challenge that I was faced with was working on a rhetorical analysis. ... I went through some of the stages of culture shock in this new way of writing. I felt at first like it could be easy. Then I got frustrated and didn't want to do anything. ... I kept asking myself "is this what the teacher is really looking for?"

And yet it was apparent that Mark really needed to work on a number of mechanical and organizational problems and word choice, and rework his paragraphs so that the main topic did not appear at the end of paragraphs, in order to make his papers easier to read. While he had worked on the draft of his introductory paragraph, the newer version was too packed with terms and concepts, which made it hard to follow. For example, half of the introductory paragraph read
Culture shock can be [sic] major influence on an individual's ideology and identity. Culture shock is defined by Paul Pederson in *The Five Stages of Culture Shock* as "the process of initial adjustment to an unfamiliar environment (1)". The change of cultures has an effect on the ideology of the person. Webster's Dictionary defines ideology as the "set of ideas, beliefs and opinions about the nature of people of [sic] society, [which provides] a framework for a theory about how people should live, as well as how society is or should be organized" (668). The beliefs that someone has from their culture can be altered from the exposure of the new culture. Identity of an individual is also prone to change from culture shock.

On the positive side, like Sharon, his citations and Works Cited page was generally more correct. His final grade for this paper was a B-. Mark's earlier training in analysis and his academic writing was apparent here in his abilities to rely on and cite external authorities like Terry Eagleton and willingness (unlike Sharon) to use terms discussed in class. In fact, his writing resembled that of someone who focused on the bigger picture or main idea and analysis of sources while neglecting organization (which he claimed to be weak in, which was apparent in his unconnected and often over-packed introductions and conclusions) and stylistics like citing and possessives. Like Sharon, Mark made good connections between culture and writing with the contrastive rhetoric texts and his citing ability had improved. However, because of his strong analytical background, it is hard to determine the influence of popular culture texts on his analytical abilities.
7.3 SECOND THIRD OF COURSE: MICROANALYSIS OF CULTURES AND WRITING

7.3.1 Using Interdisciplinary Tools (Genre, Rhetorical and Discourse analysis) with Contrastive Rhetoric and Popular Culture to Analyze Texts

In the second third of the class, students were introduced to the concepts of genre and discourse community and they practiced analyzing popular culture texts. Before this class, Mark said in his second interview that he (like Sharon) thought he might have heard the word *genre*, but had not done a genre analysis; not heard of discourse or done discourse analysis either; but had done rhetorical analysis in ENGL 101.

When asked if the various readings, handouts, and class discussions had been helpful in learning the material, Mark said "The Jesse Jackson one I thought was really good to see what we were going to do; the discussions were effective to prepare us for what we needed to do."

7.3.2 Analysis of Popular Culture Texts

In writing Paper 2, an analytical essay (see Appendix G), students were encouraged to analyze two articles from a popular culture genre, include in the paper advice on writing for this type of genre, and make connections between cultures and how they create genres and styles of writing.

In discussing his draft of paper 2 and his understanding of genre, rhetorical, and discourse analysis going into the draft, Mark claimed

The rhetorical analysis, I just pretty much tried to do everything what we did last year. The genre, I just basically went down the list [see Appendix A] that you gave us and tried to look at that kind of stuff and the community discourse I just got that from the reading ... so [I] went in there with a fair understanding and it kind of got better as I wrote.
While Sharon was able to pick her topic quickly, as he mentioned earlier, Mark had a hard time picking topics. He ended up analyzing web sites.

It's [sic] was really tough for me, it's usually pretty tough for me to pick topics. I changed it a lot of times. At first I thought I'd do like a sports article but a lot of people [were] doing that. So then I changed it to, I was thinking about doing some kind of computers, something like that, so I was looking up like computer manuals and stuff and that was really boring and so someone suggested doing something on the internet. So I thought that would be a better idea.

Mark admitted that he does not know that much about web sites or have one, but he "was just interested in [the topic]." Finding his sites took him awhile too because

... I'd look around and I'd see something that interested me and I didn't really know what I was doing my paper on, so I ended up finding two [sites]. I found one that I really liked and it was tough for me to find another one that was equal to it. Took me a long time looking through everything.

Finding an expert was also a bit difficult, but Mark is one of the few students who knew how (or would willingly) do research in the library.

I couldn't find anything on the web so I looked on SABIO... It was like a book on these two guys who were experts in making web sites and stuff, so they said 'here's how you do it and here's what the final results should be'.

Unlike Sharon, Mark enjoyed doing analysis. "I thought it was pretty fun for me to do it because I was interested in the stuff, the two [Pink Floyd sites] I was looking at." He had to do some "educated" guessing regarding the sites' demographics and concluded the audience was definitely Pink Floyd fans or people interested in Pink Floyd and their music.

It was kind of tricky, but... I just figured that people who didn't want to look at [the site]... wouldn't want to even bother looking at it... The [first] one was like a complete analysis [of Pink Floyd's album "The Wall"] so if they didn't really want to know, if they weren't interested they wouldn't bother with it. So I figured
with a web site they'd just click in and if they don't like what they see they'd just click out right away.

That Mark enjoyed the analysis was clear from his paper titled "Pink Floyd's 'The Wall'." Had he not tried to come in under the page limit by using very small font, this nine-page paper would have easily been at least 15 pages long. Combining all the elements of the paper was a "was kind of tricky, I don't know, it's kind of hard 'cause you'd get going on something and you're trying to get everything in to it; I thought it was pretty tough." The harder parts included "the community discourse and stuff. I don't think I put it in as well as I should have (laughs). Looking back on it I think I could have gotten a better job of getting it in there."

His first paragraph described his paper fairly well (although the writing itself needed improvement) but again it was clear that he was having problems using terminology correctly, referring to a "genre of Pink Floyd fans" and how the word "Floydian" gives in "effect genre to the audience." Here he refers to the "Pink Floyd genre." He also still had problems with possessives.

The internet is an effective tool to locate information about things which are impossible to find anywhere else. I am interested in looking at two different web pages in the Pink Floyd genre that show different aspects of what can be found by using this new tool. More specifically, I want to look at two writings on the web that deal with the specific album of "The Wall." The first web site is a through [sic] analysis on each song which explains how all the songs form a story which includes the explanation of many hidden meanings. The second web site gives a lot of information about the band, along with a specific text that I will take a look at. The second text that I am going to use on "The Wall" is an explanation of a concert given by the former singer of Pink Floyd, Roger Waters, at Berlin in 1990. Each site is formatted its own individual way that I will analyze by looking at an experts' keys to success in forming effective web sites. The texts themselves can also be rhetorically analyzed to see how they catch the audiences' attention. The analysis should give information about who the audience is who reads these texts and also make it possible to compare the two articles which are based on Pink Floyd's album "the Wall."
In the paper, Mark's organization was generally adequate, although there were places where several paragraphs could have been placed earlier in the essay for better comprehension. In my end comments, I noted that this essay would have been easier to read had he used headings and subheadings. Like Sharon who does not work well with overt guidelines on how to write for particular genres, Mark too seemed to have his own style of writing a paper that did not include working well with overt organizational instructions:

I looked at Bazerman, I don't know if it helped so much. I looked through the papers that you gave us and tried to get as much analysis as I could, I kind of worked from the middle and went back to the intro and conclusion, that's what I do.

When prompted about Bazerman his claims mirrored Sharon's:

I remember reading the book, like how he said to put the paper, and I just couldn't do it that way. I don't know, I tried to make sure everything was as he said, I just couldn't go step-by-step. I have a tough time; if I do an intro, I start going into analysis, then I'll go off on something and then I'll have to go back. [On the other hand it's] good to look back on [it] in terms of the list

While Sharon felt comfortable with the concept of genre, Mark was not so sure how comfortable he felt:

I don't know . . . I guess I tried to put it in in the beginning and then I kind of got away from it. Then I tried to stick it back in after the analysis. I don't know, I was just trying to get it in, I don't know . . . I think I had a lot more analysis of the actual text . . . because it was just easier to see that on the internet.

In my end comments I noted that this was a very good effort in terms of analysis, but that he needed to work on organization and citing both in the text and in the bibliography. When asked if he was satisfied with his final draft, or if he'd make changes, Mark said "I'd probably make changes, I'd probably try to get more genre in and I might
cut some of the analysis up. I had a tough time, I had like 10 pages and I was trying to cut it down and I still had more stuff, so I'd probably take some analysis out." His final grade was a B+.

Like Sharon, Mark had heard of genre before but had never done genre or discourse analysis. While Sharon felt comfortable with the concept of genre, yet was a bit wary of using terminology, Mark was the opposite; he took risks using the terminology although he did not quite understand it. While the popular culture articles helped Sharon with analysis, it was the Tannen discourse analysis text that aided Mark. Mark's earlier training in analysis and academic writing were apparent here, and he really put a lot of effort into analyzing the web sites. And yet, because he focused on "the big ideas" more than structure, his weaknesses in that area were easy to see. While this multidisciplinary curriculum helped Sharon make overt improvements in writing and doing analysis, Mark may have relied on the familiar by going into even more analysis while working less on terminology and organization. That Mark could transfer his analytical skills to academic texts was not a question--but could he adopt specific stylistic conventions of academic texts (like citing and organization) was the question.
7.4 LAST THIRD OF COURSE: EXPECTATIONS OF SPECIFIC DISCIPLINES IN AMERICAN ACADEMIC CULTURE

7.4.1 Transferring analytical Skills from Popular Culture to American Academic Texts and Cultures

In the final third of the course, students applied their analytical skills to academic genres to determine rhetorical conventions and expectations of disciplines in American academic culture. Students read Lakoff's "Groove of Academe" and discussed the sharing (or lack of sharing) of disciplinary information with new initiates into the academy. Students were asked to write about whether they considered themselves to be "insiders or outsiders" in the academy.

True to his claim that he often focused more on the ideas than structure, Mark began his essay with an 18-sentence paragraph with five topics in it.

The college world that I live in today is completely different than the world that I lived in when I went to high school. The everyday lifestyle is similar in many ways, but overall I still have a hard time comprehending how different the world is that has formed around me in these past couple years. There is constant influence from new people. . . . The quicker schedule change gives you new teachers to learn from. . . . It is like the old world had an old mold of people that I would see everyday. . . . I didn't have to leave my house to get the picture of what went on on a specific day in high school. This patterned life is contrasted with the world that I experience today. . . . I don't know who I will see during the period of a day. . . . The stakes seem to be a lot higher in college. . . . The college system wants people to achieve a higher standard of work that is more individualistic. . . . Writing was repetitive in high school with the emphasis more on structure than anything else. In college, there is a different way to write.

But Mark did try to apply information he had learned in the course to newer situations. In the second paragraph he discussed how a new way of thinking is required for membership to the academy.

the tools that I had received from this course helped me be able to analyze texts in a way that I could actually use my brain and try to see how a person uses strategies to persuade the audience . . . more than anything. This gave me insight to why authors write the way they do as well as be able to resist arguments that
don't hold the complete truth more effectively. . . . Entering the academic academy in my mind is to be able to show others (mostly teachers) that you can think. Whether you end up being right or wrong, my personal experience is that you need to be able to show original ideas. I broke into the academic community in my mind when I discovered that a new way of writing was necessary to be successful in the new world.

Similar to second language students who learn to write in the American academic style while they are here, Mark has learned to adopt styles that he may or may not believe in.

. . . I believe that I have had the same identity with the same values that I had back in high school, but that today I have adjusted the way that I write to the academic world. I will still say what I am thinking, but the way that I say it is the way that the academic world needs to see it.

And unlike Sharon and others who may just be "visiting" this culture to later return to the working world, Mark seems to feel that there is a possibility that he will be a part of it someday. In his conclusion he wrote

I do not see myself as a member in the academic community as of right now. This is probably because I have not declared my major. It seems to me that in the American culture that I live in, specification is the key to success no matter what field the success comes from. Being aware of the way to write in an academic community is much different than actually being able to write in that community. I don't believe that I will be a member of the entire academic community until I am part of a specific one.

7.4.2 Memberships to Specific Academic Disciplines

From the personal, students moved on to discover how disciplines require texts to be written and what is considered evidence in different texts. For their final paper, the argumentative paper, students were to find a professor in their major and have him or her recommend a well-known journal; analyze an article from the journal; interview the professor about their findings; and discover when the professor began to find him or herself writing as a member of the academic community (whether or not his or her identity
or sense of self changed when she or he began to see themselves as a member of the academic community). Students were then to write their argument paper based on one of two questions about (see Appendix H) either Shen's claim regarding writing and new identities, or Lakoff's argument about language and power structures in the academy.

Mark wrote quite a good draft examining writing in the psychology field. Unlike other students, he chose to analyze two articles instead of one. In the process of writing it, he told the interviewer that he had questions about the best way to organize his paper in the form of an argument, and from the variety of topics he brings up, it is easy to see why he claims to have some problems picking a thesis and organization.

I think it's going to be the one difficult thing that I have to keep in mind when writing this paper--that I'm arguing for something. Every point that I find . . . I gotta' apply that to the argument and I'm still thinking about playing with the actual argument that I'm making because I'm finding some other stuff. Like I was going to argue that there are rules and I definitely think that there are definitely rules that you have to play by . . . but it might change to arguing about whether the . . . format is effective for the audience and maybe look at the audience and see if [the articles are] really reaching the people that need this information.

In end comments of the draft, he was reminded that this was an argument paper and he needed to be clear about whether or not he was agreeing with Lakoff's claims. And he was reminded to tie his conclusion to his introduction. In his final paper, "The Psychological Writing Genre: Structure and Vocabulary Analysis," Mark began his paper by describing how "experts in the field can publish texts while making it difficult for an amateur to be able to get an article published . . ."

By rhetorically analyzing a psychological text that was published by my psychology professor, as well as another text from a well respected psychology journal, I intend to find rules that an individual must play by in order to get published. (Both texts are the write-ups of experiments) Having interviewed my psychology
professor, Dr. Christopher Taylor, I plan to see why the text is formed the way that it is, and if it is effective for the purpose that it serves.

Following the structure of an argument paper, Mark did let the readers know what his goal was in writing this paper and what his position was on the argument.

My goal is to learn about publishing in the field so that I will know how I must go about writing a research paper that can be published in a psychology journal. . . . Lakoff's view is that it is necessary play along to be successful in writing in a specific academic community but I believe that the advantage is for the ones who are keeping the information on the inside, while there are those who could use the information don't receive it.

Learning from his last paper, Mark did attempt to organize this paper with subheadings: "Structure," "Analyzing Texts," and "The Modern Psychology Text." Unfortunately, they were not parallel to each other. For example, he analyzed the first psychology journal under the "Analyzing Texts" section and the second one under "The Modern Psychology Text" section.

Interestingly, strains of rebellion against structure appear in his analysis of the psychology articles. For example, in the first sentence under the "Structure" heading, Mark wrote "I have noticed in the past that psychology research articles seem to have a tight structure that appears to force the authors to write the text in a certain way." In describing the organization, he used an expert on APA style to address the placement of the title and authors' names, the abstracts and what was contained in them, and then he went on to describe the various sections of a research article ("Methods," etc.)

Later, Mark addressed this issue of structure again, this time referring back to his Pink Floyd analysis in Paper 2.
Briefly, I want to bring in a different style of writing that lacked a uniform structure which was given on the Internet to people who are interested in the band Pink Floyd. The insight that I got from being exposed to this different type of text is that without structure, the text on a single topic can still be effective. I analyzed two web sites on Pink Floyd that were completely different, but were efficient in their own ways. As long as the information works on the audience so that they can gain knowledge about a topic, I believe that the structure isn't as important as what is inside the text.

In contrast to Sharon's paper in which the depth of the analysis fluctuated, Mark was very consistent in his analysis. Under the "Analyzing Text" section, Mark began analyzing his first article "A Method for the Measurement of Cooperative Behavior in Albino Rats" published in *The Psychological Record* in 1971 (written by his professor Dr. Taylor and a colleague), by counting the number of citations used in the introduction and the psychology vocabulary used (which he termed "psycho babble"). However, he was able to identify some of these words with words he had learned in his psychology classes and give a non-academic explanation for a sentence laden with psychological terminology.

Mark tied his analysis back to his identity paper and his identity in writing. He concluded

I don't think that I am ready, at this point, to write such a journal article because of the restricting style and the vocabulary that would keep me from creating my own identity in this kind of writing. . . . Identity for me, is the ability to form new ideas on a topic that has been written on before. Right now, I don't think I would have the ability to create an identity in this field because I wouldn't be comfortable with the experiment or the write up.

Mark seemed to have somewhat of an ally in his expert, Dr. Taylor, who, according to Mark, also does not like the APA style. "His main reason for not liking the style besides the fact that it is boring is that he feels that the psychology field is a useful field that produces helpful information that could reach a broader audience. . . . He
attempted to write in an effective way to reach the people on the outside, but could not get published."

Mark then contrasts Lakoff's claims that there are special rules to writing in each community with Dr. Taylor's. Like a few other students, Mark does not seem to pick up on Lakoff's subtle use of sarcasm in her article, and so he concludes that she does support the phenomenon of keeping the "insiders in and the outsiders out."

Under his last heading, Mark effectively analyzes the second article "Psychophysiological Detection Through the Guilty Knowledge Technique: Effects on Mental Countermeasures" published in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*. In his conclusion, he addresses his concerns and Dr. Taylor's again, but while he does tie back to Lakoff, he does not clearly address her argument.

What I have discovered about the psychology texts is that it goes right along with Lakoff's claims about having a specific structure and a certain vocabulary that keep outsiders on the outside while the insiders can understand the material. . . . If the information was truly targeted for the ones who could use it, then I have a hard time with the use of an unnecessary vocabulary. The information is [sic] can guide people to a better understanding of why they behave the way they do, and help them make decisions in their lives.

But while he did not directly address Lakoff's argument in his conclusion, unlike Sharon, he did have an argument that was acceptable for an academic audience. And his citing was generally correct. His final grade was a B+.

7.4.3 Transferring Analytical Skills to Other Genres

The purpose of the End-of-the-Semester Writing Exercise/Final Examination was to assess the impact of the course and instruction on students' genre and textual analysis abilities by assessing their ability to identify rhetorical features of a newspaper and
academic article and recreate a memorandum. Despite his interest in and ability to do analysis, Mark was one of two students with the most inaccurate responses to the final examination. Not surprisingly, what tripped him up was inaccurately defining and almost correctly defining where the major claim was explicitly stated in the newspaper article and research article respectively (e.g., "End of the abstract"); the structure of the newspaper (e.g., "The article has ten short paragraphs which deal with the incident. The article as a whole is short"); clearly defining what was considered evidence (logos/pathos/ethos) in the memorandum (e.g., "Evidence has to be taken from the authors [sic] words. There are no other ways. The authors [sic] logos are used to get results from the evidence"); and he was a bit unclear on how to define the language (terms) used in research article ("The vocabulary is not as difficult as I anticipated. I could read through the article surprisingly easily"). On the other hand, for the most part he was able to accurately describe the specific genres.

Yet he did recognize similarities between the newspaper article and other newspaper articles, and between the criminal justice article and psychology texts while appropriately identifying similarities, for example, "The APA style and the use of mathematics, [sic] is similar to the previous journals." His recreation of the memorandum was organizationally correct, as was his tone, but he had some odd sentences, such as "Having been exposed to an article about the recent riot on our campus...."

Mark's description of his role as initiate in the academic discourse community demonstrated his awareness of his need to adopt a new way of thinking that included coming up with more "original" ideas that need to be expressed in a more structured way, a structure he has internal conflicts with which might keep him from identifying with members of the academic (in particular psychology) discourse community. What is also interesting is that while Sharon can analyze the components of texts visually (such as on
an examination) she has a hard time doing analysis for a paper and writing that paper. In contrast, Mark seems to be quite able to use his analytical skills in writing academic texts--in fact analyzing is a very natural act for him--but he has a harder time identifying components of texts (like structures) in examinations. And yet, perhaps because of the genre training he received, he did correctly identify each genres in the final examination which he did not do in the Early Semester exercise.
7.5 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

7.5.1 Influence of this Course on Students' Writing and Analytical Abilities

The purpose of the final interview was to elicit students' perceptions about the influence of this course on the development and/or improvement of their writing and analytical abilities (see Appendix M).

7.5.1.1 Impact on Personal Writing Habits

In the SBSQ (questionnaire), Mark had said he wanted to improve structure and do more effective research papers. In the final interview, he told the interview that his perception was that there had been somewhat of an improvement in structure. But how he writes has not necessarily improved:

...I think it's gotten a little better, like the structure and everything has helped me, knowing where to go from the beginning, but it's getting more efficient, it's not changed the way I do things.

He also commented on his problems using definitions--something which was also apparent in his papers, Early Semester interview analysis and Final Examination.

...I've got problems with the definitions of academic discourse and that's always been my major problem--the definitions of things we're working on in class, getting the true understanding of what's going on. ...I know what they mean [discourse community and genre] but it's hard to apply them to what I'm writing about the way I want to do it, see I have a hard time saying exactly what I want to say about making the connection.

Not surprisingly, in his Middle-of-the-Semester interview, Mark had claimed to focus on the idea of a paper instead of relying on structure. It seemed that he still did this.

Still true. I think that the main thing that makes papers interesting is the ideas in them and I don't think I've had the best ideas in the papers that I've written compared to last year. I don't really know why, I just haven't been able to get great
ideas going. I think that makes a paper and I think the structure comes after that. Making the structure comes through after making the ideas.

And yet when asked if he had taken a different approach for the second two papers, he replied "... it's been pretty much the same but I think I worked more on looking at the outline for the last two papers." And like other students, he mentioned how an interesting topic is more motivating. "... I liked the stuff I was writing about in the last paper and in this last paper. The first paper I kind of felt restricted and I didn't like the material I was writing about, so I found it more difficult to write about that."

7.5.1.2 Impact on Academic Skills

When asked if there any classes and assignments in this course that were particularly useful to him, Mark focused on one of the results of the in-class student evaluations and told the interviewer that

I'd say the whole class was very useful but in the very beginning we worked on stuff to build up to the paper and then [the teacher] changed [the process by giving us the paper assignment early], so we started off looking at the paper and [then] looking at how the material that she gave us could fit in and I think that was better for most people.

In fact, the work he did on specific types of genres (in Papers 2 and 3) in some ways seemed to have an influence on the way he now reads and writes other types of materials.

I'd say yes for genres that are close to each other, like telling the difference between them ... this last paper I've been working on psychology journals. ... If you go from that to like a magazine that has the same material ... I'd say I could tell the difference like two different magazines. ...

When asked what in this class about genre has been useful to what he's reading in other classes, Mark responded it has helped when "doing research papers and knowing
exactly what you had to do to play the game to make the format and get the right vocabulary."

While the course may not have made him more aware of the differences in rhetorical expectations of audiences because "... I had a teacher that was way into the rhetorical analysis last year so I got a whole lot of that stuff" the course did seem to have an impact on his ability to more clearly see the different kinds of organizational structures in texts.

Yeah I'd say I learned that there's a lot more, especially from high school where there was one way that you wrote everything. So yeah I've learned from this class that when you're writing in different genres you have to write differently 'cause ... I found there's different rules for writing in different places.

While his high-school training included heavy emphasis on the five-paragraph essay, Mark claims that now that he's writing for college he would not

... even bother doing that, I would never do a paper like that ... I think the only time I'd ever do something like that is maybe for Spanish ... it would just be easier to do it that way, you wouldn't have to think so hard about it. But I think when you move on and you're doing analysis and stuff it just doesn't work for me to do it that way, it's just way too limited.

And while he still seemed resistant to overt instruction (like Sharon), he still seemed to want to increase his organizational abilities. When asked again about the textbook *Involved*, again Mark felt that Bazerman's advice was too structured but it could be useful as a guide during the editing of the paper.

I thought that it was just too specific. It was like it said 'here's how you have to do it' and ... pretty much like one way, one effective way of going through the paper. And I think that it would be helpful if you had a pretty strong rough draft, and then look back ... to see if you have everything in there, and if you didn't maybe you could do some more work to get that stuff in.
And yet later, when asked what skills he'd still like to work on, Mark said vocabulary and structure.

I'd say vocabulary . . . I just think if my vocabulary was stronger [both a general vocabulary or a vocabulary in a discipline] I'd have an easier time writing the papers, I'd be more effective. . . . [And] even more work with structure cause I got to find a way to just get a paper written and not try to waste too much time going back and cutting too much stuff out and putting stuff back in. . . . I think if I knew the structure better it would make it a lot easier on myself . . .

Like Sharon, Mark said that this course improved his ability to analyze texts and he believed that this course had also expanded his repertoire of options and strategies for communicating through writing; at least it could have given him some strategies in other courses.

Yeah I'd say so because we started looking at the [demographics and genre of] journal[s] and the magazine[s] . . . instead of just looking at the text so that did help . . . you can get a better sense of the audience, you can see other texts in there and see how they got published.

. . . I think you could go about writing a paper in a couple different ways. . . . I just think that you can look at different aspects of the information that you're getting and analyze one specific part of it [or] you could analyze different parts and try to make connections back to other outside sources. I think that the tools are mostly looking at the whole picture and then looking at the specific and tearing it apart. And if you find connections between the analysis inside the text and the whole picture you can pretty much understand it. . . . I remember in-context writing [last year where we looked] at the author's life and how it applied to a book that he [wrote] . . . I think I could have done a better job if I'd known . . . some stuff I learned . . . here.

With a prompt, Mark also made connections to his possible future major:

". . . I'm undecided, but right now I figure I'll have to take a lot of upper division psychology classes so I'm looking at the psychology field. Yeah, I could definitely see the major thing is being able to play along, to be able to write a paper that they'll accept in that community."
The course seemed to be different from what Mark expected, but not so in a negative way and it seemed to challenge him and teach him to make connections.

I really didn't know what to expect, I thought it was just going to be I guess I thought it was just going to be more compositions, similar to 101, but I really didn't have any idea about what would happen. I liked the course, I thought it was good because I'd say it was a challenging course because . . . [of] the connection you have to make in the writings. That's one thing I've taken out of this class is that you have to make connections; if you're talking about three different things in your paper the more connections that you can make between them the better your writing's going to be.

It appears that this new type of genre-based multidisciplinary curriculum had bettered Mark's organizational skills and understanding of genre to some degree. This curriculum built on his existing analytical training and this seemed to improve his ability to see the different organizational structures in texts (at least it made him aware that different genres have "different rules for writing"). While he resists a lot of overt structural instructions, he claims to still want to develop better organizational skills to help him write more quickly. Like Sharon, Mark claims this course did expand his strategies for communication through writing; what he really seemed to get out of it was the importance of making connections between elements both inside and outside of texts.
7.6 EVALUATION

An analyzation of Mark's writings, analytical exercises, and interview responses offers insights into how the errors he makes in his academic writing may be explained like those made by students learning an L2 and why this multidisciplinary curriculum may help correct these errors.

Mark is a student who, in contrast to Sharon, likes doing analysis and analyzes material for papers well (he even analyzed two web sites in Paper 3 instead of one required text). Yet he does not do well on the analysis in exercises. This may partially due to his problems with academic terminology. If this is so, applying Berkenhotter and Hucken (1995) and Bizzell's (1992) theories that genre analysis can be used to "demystify" academic discourse should work well here. In a sense it did because while Mark claims to still have some problems applying definitions, by the final examination he was correctly using terminology like genre.

Mark's earlier training in analysis and his ability to apply this analysis - especially in the popular culture texts and in academic texts--suggests a low filter to academic analysis (or an openness to writing in this academic style). And Mark himself claims to be "persistent" in writing--which would suggest high motivation to do well. Unlike Sharon (who may have experienced age-related mental rigidity), he was also willing to risk incorporating terms in papers even though he has problems understanding them and applying them. This would suggest he has a desire for a close proximity to speakers of the target language (academic English) and therefore as Schumann (1978) theorizes, desires a high degree of acculturation.

And yet, there is something that seems to be "a mental block" that keeps him from fully employing organizational strategies. Unlike Sharon, who probably received a lot of process-oriented training, Mark's training seemed to have had too strong of a structural
bent to it, in particular too much emphasis on the five-paragraph essay, so much so that it raised Mark's affective filter to things structural. Thus he focuses on main ideas first despite his many claims to want to learn structure so he can write more quickly. (Perhaps his preference to go for the main idea first may also be a contributing factor to his claim that he is only somewhat aware of the differences in language styles between different types of writing and why he mis-identified where the major claims were located in the final examination.)

This heavy focus on structure in his past may be causing him to have unconscious concerns about acculturating (Schumann 1978). Perhaps he is afraid of losing his identity --after all, he claimed his high school teachers practically wrote his papers which could be interpreted as a means of losing one's identity. If Rubin's (1995) claim is correct, that taking on a social identity may mean students have to "tak[e] on values of specific patterns of discourse that are antithetical to their own culture" (p. 14) it is possible that Mark feels as though he could lose his identity again if he engages in a heavy structural approach to writing. It is not a surprise that he managed to find a psychology professor to interview who also spoke against rigid requirements in form and content in academic papers.

But I would argue that the genre training in this class has helped Mark with his resistance to structure because he seemed to see rhetorical conventions as things which could be manipulated to his advantage. For example, Mark claimed that the work on specific types of genres (in Papers 2 and 3) may have influenced the way he wrote other types of materials by teaching him to "play the game" and get the format and vocabulary correct. This course helped Mark see more clearly the different kinds of organizational structures and expand his repertoire of options and strategies from communicating through writing. (On the other hand, from his papers it was apparent that his focus on ideas helped him make important connections between new ideas and concepts in his
papers.) And he tried to improve the organization of his papers, e.g., he used subheadings in Paper 3 after he understood how it could have helped him improve his second paper. Although he was not entirely successful in doing so, the effort was there.

In the final interview it was apparent that Mark is now perhaps unconsciously playing with the ideas of resistance to structure while wanting to understand structure to do well on his papers and make his writing process itself much easier. For example, while he claimed in the final interview to still focus more on the ideas of a paper than the structure, he also said he had worked more on outlines for the last two papers. Because of his proclivity for analysis and his training in rhetorical analysis in previous courses, he did not think this course had made him more aware of the differences in rhetorical expectations of audiences, but it had improved his ability to see different kinds of organizational structures in texts. Like Sharon, Mark's citing ability also improved. Mark also claimed that this course improved his analytical abilities by expanding them through an examination of not only texts but of demographics and genres of journals. And he claimed that he would still like to work on vocabulary.

Perhaps these events can be explained by acquisition and learning theories. Acquiring structure may be an unconscious or acquisitional process that occurs over time while citing is a learned process. Perhaps it would take a lot longer than one semester for Mark to not only acquire a solid understanding of structure but lower his filter as well. For example, like Sharon, who also exhibited a resistance to following strict outlines of papers or genre instructions, Mark preferred to use his own judgment about what works or does not work. And yet by the end of the class, Mark claimed that while he thought Bazerman's instructions were "too specific," he liked the idea of using the book after finishing a draft as a checklist to see if all the elements of a particular type of paper had been included.
In summary, Mark came to this course with overt analytical abilities but a resistance to structure. This course seemed to help him develop more of a familiarity with, and lessen his resistance to, organization and structure.
CHAPTER 8
CASE STUDIES AND INTERPRETATIONS:
CASE STUDIES 3 & 4: GAIL AND ANDREA

8.1 GAIL AND ANDREA: INTRODUCTION

Gail, a woman in her mid-twenties, was in her second semester at the UA. Originally from New York, she had completed her BA in Philosophy at Kent State University (KSU) and was now working on a BS in Management Information Systems (MIS). She had been away from college for two years after working as a network analyst for a large corporation. Her older brother was getting his MCSC certificate from Microsoft and slowly working on a BS in computer science. Her mother had a BFA in Music and her father had a Ph.D. in music and mathematics.

From Phoenix, Andrea, was in the second semester of her second year at the UA majoring in psychology. Her brother, who's 12 years older, works in international management in NYC. Her father graduated from the UA. Her mother went to college for the first two years and did not go back.

Gail

Gail had taken two English courses at KSU: Composition 10002 (second semester freshman English) and the Bible as Literature (a junior/senior level English course). In the course questionnaire she reported that in the composition course she had written "short essays on literature, mostly analysis and argumentative" and two research papers. In the Bible course she had written two research papers and three argumentative short papers. Her readings included "good literature" (her emphasis) and various philosophy texts. She claimed that her two English courses had not improved her writing, that rather
philosophy courses helped my writing the most. Logic assisted in developing persuasive arguments and drawing conclusions. [The] best technique of instruction: limiting in-depth analysis to a few pages to improve [the] ability to condense and summarize effectively.

Interestingly, what Gail was hoping to get out of this course was better organizational skills, but more importantly, grammar instruction.

One of the main problems I've experienced in foreign language classes and in writing is not being well-versed in the principles of English grammar. It's not as if I have a problem speaking incorrectly, but knowing terms, concepts, and good sentence structure helps improve writing tremendously.

Unlike Sharon and Mark, Gail did not enjoy writing about personal experiences. "I like to write about . . . philosophy, [things] similar to my own reading and writing style and thought processes, which are convoluted. I don't like writing in the journalistic style and emotional . . . writing [with] lots of personal examples unless [it's] relevant. " When asked why she thought personal writing was hard for her, she responded "philosophy is really very heavy and I think it's easier for me to write detached from my own [personal experiences] . . . [I have a ] real bias against that type of writing. I guess that's how I speak; when I speak about personal experiences I'm very detached. I tend to be very methodological [sic] and logical about things."

But she did enjoy reading certain types of fiction and especially alternative magazines. "[I like reading] interesting fiction, with [an] historical or sociological [focus] like Joan Didion, and magazines like the Utne Reader and Mother Jones . . . They pull articles from all over . . . that's interesting." She also liked "anthropology and philosophy texts without ethics."
In high school English courses, Gail remembers being trained to mimic the writing style of others, including poets (poetry being the one connection between her and the other creative writing females in class) and not doing very well on an AP essay.

One that I remember and thought was a great exercise, we were reading poetry and I don't read much poetry, and the exercise was to mimic a poet . . . write in the style of [the poet's]. I found it very difficult but it was very interesting. My senior year, when I was taking the advanced placement, [there] was a terrible essay on Henry the 4th . . . describe Henry's state of mind. [I] did horribly on it because I had no idea what to say. I also remember another comparative essay, write a short story about a rapture (religious) experience. [There was no] research on this but [I] mimic[ed] this style.

She also did a "little bit of research, not so much in English but in history."

Andrea

While Gail had a background in analysis, like Mark, Andrea's formal training was in structure and she claims to have a natural analytical ability. Andrea had attended Xavier College Preparatory before coming to the UA. At the Arizona she had taken ENGL 101 and 102 and 261. In these classes she wrote a variety of essays including rhetorical, persuasive, and personal. She also had "a bit of creative writing and some research but not very much." The books she read for class were "mostly novels with a bit of non-fiction (magazine articles, journals) for research."

But her high school courses were highly structured. "Structure was very much emphasized in my writing. Eight-sentence paragraphs, five-paragraph essays." But, like Mark, in college she broke away from that type of structure. "In college, topic sentences and the ability to support them without fluff writing was emphasized. Along with true depth being emphasized in my writing and personal thought combined with actual facts that lacked excess, unnecessary aspects."
Practice, praise and freedom were what Andrea believed made her writing in college greatly improve. "The freedom to write more how I wanted and less under a strict structure helped me. Good criticism and a lot of patience and praise from teachers encouraged me in college because in high school, the teachers (nuns--go figure) were very harsh and condescending in their criticism."

Andrea's attitude toward writing was one of self confidence.

First off, my attitude towards writing is this: I love it, and I want to be great at it. I know the importance of being an articulate and tactful writer and I know that I have the ability to be one.

My strengths, I am intelligent. I don't care how good of a writer you are, an intellectual and witty voice make one a good writer; I believe I am both.

My weaknesses that could effect [sic] my writing? Well, the main one is procrastination. I never give myself enough time to be excellent, and often settle for "good" because I procrastinate too much. In terms of other weaknesses, I haven't had a class that required extensive writing in over a year, so I'm a bit out of practice --that isn't really a "weakness" though in my opinion.

I hope to learn the essential skills necessary to be an excellent writer for my remaining year and a half here, and in the career world beyond.

My goals are to work with what I am taught and really apply the skills that are presented before me . . .

Thus her hopes for this course seem fairly wide open.

8.1.1 Pre-Course Analytical Abilities

On the analysis section of the Early Semester interview, Gail did fairly well, while Andrea did a bit better. Gail twice inaccurately described both genre and writer questions. Andrea only inaccurately described one genre and one writer question.
Gail

Like Mark, Gail thinks she "probably" does not rely on the structure of a piece (like organization) to help her recreate it because "when writing for philosophy you can't rely on organization . . . you have to form ideas about what the philosopher is saying." When asked to what degree she was aware of the difference in language styles between different types of writing (such as literature, persuasive essays, newspapers, textbooks, research articles), Gail said she was "very aware" and described some of the differences in language style.

One in particular in my own area in MIS. It's important to keep sentences very short and minimize use of adjectives, get to the point, and organization is very important, the top down approach from what I've read. Personal experiences don't have anything to do with it, [it's] more academic. Versus something like a sociological novel like Dorothy Slessinger I really admire; she writes really intelligently and clear and uses a lot of emotional language. You can sort of put yourself . . . in the situation, unlike academic [writing] where you're just sort of observers . . .

Gail also thought that knowing the styles of different types of writing could help her understand them when she read them and needed to recreate them.

Andrea

Like Sharon, at certain times Andrea relied on the structure of a piece (like organization) to help her recreate it, but she only does this if she is not interested in what she is writing.

It would depend. If it was something I was interested in, I'd do it my own way. If it was something I had no idea or interest I'd probably have to follow the structure . . . If it was something I knew a lot about, a personal experience, I'd have my own structure [and] plug their stuff in, but if I had no interest in it I'd follow their structure.
When asked to what degree she was aware of the difference in language styles between different types of writing (such as literature, persuasive essays, newspapers, textbooks, research articles), Andrea said she was still aware but she used to be more aware. "I used to be very aware when I was in a government class in high school and we had to bring in articles to class everyday . . . yeah, I'm very aware I think." Andrea also thought that knowing the styles of different types of writing could help her understand them when she read them and needed to recreate them. "Yes definitely. If you're recreating someone's work you need to know what tone they're using, stay somewhere in the realm . . . if you mix styles it won't run smoothly and the whole style will probably change."

Both Gail and Andrea's description of their pre-course writing experiences indicate a openness to developing their skills through a new kind of curriculum (in the final interview Gail said that she had been very open to the course). Like Mark, Gail wants help with organization. On the other hand, she also wants help with grammar—but from the final interview it appeared that the kind of help she was seeking here would best be found in an upper-division grammar course. It would seem that a multidisciplinary genre-based curriculum could help her with organization, especially since she's doesn't rely that much on structure, but is very aware of language styles. (Unlike Mark who didn't rely on structure and was resistant to it and wasn't that aware of differences in language styles either.) Her BA in philosophy and work on logic and argument would suggest that this course might build on her existing skills in analysis especially since she only did fair on the Early Semester exercise.

Andrea seems fairly open to what she will learn in class--perhaps because she's very confident about her writing abilities. What is interesting is that like Mark, she may or may not be receptive to a genre-based curriculum because she too, to a lesser degree, is rebelling in her writing against a very structured high school background. At the same
time, she does rely on structure to recreate something she is not interested in. And like Gail, she is also aware of differences in language styles and both believe knowing the style of different types of writing could help them recreate texts.
8.2 FIRST THIRD OF COURSE: CULTURE AND WRITING

8.2.1 Learning the Connection Between Culture, Language and Ideology

Gail

In the first third of the course, students were introduced to the ideas of culture, language and ideology and concepts of *meta-awareness* and the terms *rhetoric* and *contrastive rhetoric* and *discourse analysis*.

To develop a deeper understanding of the connections between culture, writing and ideology, students were required to research and define the meanings of the three terms, discuss their research with classmates, then make connections between them while citing properly.

Gail's earlier training in philosophy was apparent here as she attempted to explain the connection between culture, writing and ideology using quotations and theories of Burkert and Nietzsche. Her writing was much more advanced than most of the students in the class. Her conclusion in discussing writing was

Burkert elucidates two seminal points within this brief discussion of the development of writing: the communication between teacher and student, and the ability of the common individual to communicate simply via literal record. Writing marks the beginning of a literal tradition that can be interpreted today. This type of communication is crucial to the comprehension and disclosure of cultures and time periods.

And yet she did not actually define the terms as much as address them. In end comments, I suggested she not add new information at the end of a paper, clear up small citing errors, but most importantly, define her terms and bring them and the argument back to the original question being asked. And, I reminded her that, unlike the norm for
philosophy writing, she needed to tie the introduction and conclusion back to each other and not ask the reader to infer connections.

Andrea

In her assignment to make connections between culture, writing and ideology, Andrea's earlier admissions to procrastination seemed to be true. Her first definition of writing was rather short and it seemed as though she was quoting from sources without citing them. Her second definition contained more quotations than her own ideas, and her third definition lacked an introduction. But she seemed to get into the discussion with other students and used a lot of quotations from them, either clearly agreeing or disagreeing with their stances on the concepts.

For example, in responding to Gail's comments on writing, Andrea wrote "It is a rare event when I have fallen into agreement with a statement of Nietzsche's drastic comments or ideas, and this is not one of them." In discussing Mark's claims, she said "I don't know if Mark agrees with this statement, but I do not at all. I think that a powerful writer can effectively, and quite possible more effectively, portray whatever they wish." She was one of the few students to cite everything correctly in the final text and in the final works cited except for a web source.

8.2.2 Developing An Awareness of American Academic Culture

Gail

Using the personal experience paper for a more specific examination of American academic culture and to demonstrate the concepts she learned in the first third of the semester (culture, writing, ideology, meta-awareness and persuasion styles of American
and other cultures, and knowledge transmission), Gail wrote about her experiences with a Korean teacher in an American philosophy classroom.

After reading her two-page draft of "An Examination of how Culture and Ideology affect Writing Style in Korea and in America," I advised Gail to use topic sentences; work on organization by making a list of her discoveries in the body of the text; incorporate the discoveries into her introductory paragraph to avoid a "grocery list" of discoveries; and use topic sentences. She did so in her final draft, used other contrastive rhetoric texts as sources, and made very good observations of cultural dynamics in her paper:

- Korean instructors are satisfied that the students have comprehended the texts when they incorporate the correct quotes in their writing.

- I quickly learned that incorporating original thought in my writing was not encouraged in Dr. Lee's class. . . . His [sic] stated that students who discussed new ideas, who introduced new interpretations or personal opinions within their papers were trying to escape from actual work.

And yet the paper lacked an in-depthness that it would make it a superior paper; part of the problem was, like Sharon, that Gail did not define terms or support her claims with sources. And she still needed to do some work on her introductions and conclusions to make them stronger. She received a "B" on the paper.

Andrea

The impact of Andrea's tendency to procrastinate and her lack of motivation unless she was interested in a topic was apparent in her draft. Andrea set out to compare American and Chinese expectations in academic writing and use her own experiences in school as the personal example.
In her first draft there was no sense of "her," other than a running commentary where she told the reader what she was going to do next, e.g., "The next definition that I will make sure is understood by the reader is writing" (her italics). She also needed to add quotations from external sources and her personal experience.

Her final draft was more complete but it was apparent that had she given herself more time it would have been a better paper. In my end comments I told her this and suggested she also make her introduction and concluding paragraphs stronger, overtly show how her terms connected, eliminate very passive sentences, and again use strong examples used to support her claims. In general her citing was correct in the Works Cited, but not in the text. She received a "B-" on the final draft.

Gail and Andrea quickly developed an awareness of the connections between culture and rhetorical conventions. And both were able to use the contrastive rhetoric texts well in order to explore cross-cultural differences in audience expectations. Both were also quite familiar with academic writing, and yet there were problems.

Like Sharon's interference from her creative writing training, Gail seemed to be using strategies from philosophy in this course. She used philosophers like Burkert and Nietzsche as authorities to make connections between culture and writing and ideology (which there was really no problem with) but in the process she did not define her terms (just used them) and did not support all supporting claims with sources; she also had problems tying her argument back to the original question asked and tying her introduction and conclusion together; and she was really writing a reader-responsible text. However, by the end of the first paper, she had improved all but her defining terms or and using sources to support all her claims.

While Gail experienced interference from philosophy discourse training, which in effect made academic English discourse an L3, Andrea faced interference from her own
motivational processes. While she was able to insert quotations from other students and engage in a dialogue with them as well, her procrastination was apparent in her papers, resulting in weak connections or a need to support her claims with strong evidence. Her citing was generally fine in the Works Cited, but not in the text.
8.3 SECOND THIRD OF COURSE: MICROANALYSIS OF CULTURES AND WRITING

8.3.1 Using Interdisciplinary Tools (Genre, Rhetorical and Discourse Analysis) with Contrastive

Gail

In the second third of the class, students were introduced to the concepts of genre and discourse community and practiced their analytical skills using popular culture texts.

Before this class, Gail claimed in her second interview not to have heard of or done genre analysis but she had done some rhetorical analysis and a lot of discourse analysis in philosophy courses: "Definitely in the philosophy classes--they talk a lot about that [when talking about] Plato and Aristotle."

When asked if the various readings, handouts, and class discussions had been helpful in learning the material, Gail said the handouts had been particularly helpful. "What was really helpful was the two handouts [see Appendices A and B]--rhetorical and genre analysis. When I was doing some recent editing for my boyfriend I was using some of the text analysis." The genre packet handouts were also "pretty helpful . . . and also the two different Santa Claus articles, that was interesting. I'd never done that before. I think it helped focus the analysis a little bit . . . ."

As with Sharon and Mark, Gail did not appreciate the overt instructions on writing for specific genres in the Bazerman textbook. "I'm not thrilled with the Bazerman book altogether. I'm just not used to that kind of reading. The way he has everything laid out in a list, I hate that, I just hate that style of writing. It's useful, I see it has a lot of merit but I just don't like reading it." When asked to be more specific, Gail said
It's the rigidity of it that I just can't stand. It's very dry to me. . . . Bazerman, it's great, it gives a definite outline and I've used it. But it's like you do this and do this and this is an example of this and blah blah blah it's very dry to me. I find when I'm reading that that I'm skimming . . . I'll skim it twice . . . and I kind of feel too, and this might be an [unkind thing] but I think it's lowest common denominator. And maybe it's appropriate, I'm not sure . . . it's really an elementary book, maybe that's needed for teaching genre with lists and all.

Andrea

Before this class, Andrea not heard of or done genre or discourse analysis but had done rhetorical analysis in 101 and 102.

When asked if the various readings, handouts, and class discussions had been helpful in learning the material, unlike the others, Andrea found Bazerman helpful but said she believed there were too many handouts.

Some of the handouts got confusing, I think Involved was the best at explaining and defining genre and discourse community. When I went to the handouts I didn't know what was going on but I got the basic layman's terms from Involved then I went back and understood the handouts.

Because some of the handouts were confusing to her, she read selectively.

I basically went over them the first time . . . then if I had a problem I went back and went over them [again]. . . . Since I understood rhetorical analysis I [didn't] go back . . . But when I had a problem with genre and discourse I went back and really thoroughly went over the readings.

8.3.2 Analysis of Popular Culture Texts

In writing Paper 2, an analytical essay (see Appendix G), students became the experts on a certain genre of writing, particularly a popular culture one. In discussing her draft of Paper 2 and her understanding of genre, rhetorical, and discourse analysis going into the draft, Gail claimed "I haven't had a problem understanding any of the concepts."
None of the readings have been very difficult to grasp." Gail chose to write about political
magazine feature writing by comparing two feature articles from conservative and liberal
magazines: PINC (*Politically Incorrect*) and *The Progressive*. Like Sharon, picking her
topic " wasn't too difficult; I just picked something I liked, that I was interested in."
Finding her articles to analyze "was very easy."

Finding an expert was a little difficult because Gail "could not find an expert on
political feature writing, just regular feature writing. I looked under ERIC and EBSCO. . .
That's where I found the *American Editor Journal* [which] according to the librarian is
good for feature writing."

Like Mark, doing the analysis was easy for Gail because of her analytical
background. "... because my genre was on political features, on the opposing political
spectrum, [both the liberal and conservative magazines] were so similar it wasn't difficult
either, it was pretty obvious." And combining all the elements of the paper was also "no
problem. It was pretty specifically detailed in the handouts and the exercises in class and
what we need to do and it was basically the exercises we did in class applied to our own
materials."

Gail did a very good job of analyzing the two journals and their respective articles.
Her introduction and description of genre were good and the organization made it easy to
read and follow her claims. Although she still needed to correctly cite in her text, and
could have used more examples of her claims to be more persuasive, she had moved away
from the "philosophy way" of writing (making claims without external sources) to
adopting (perhaps begrudgingly) more of the English analytical style of writing. Not
surprisingly, she did not use Bazerman's examples for this analytical paper, rather she
relied on an example of a paper in the *Student's Guide*. 
I didn't really follow the Bazerman at all for the paper. I used the PETA article as an example and the discourse analysis a little bit, and the handouts; I made an outline based on the handouts on genre/discourse analysis and I'm trying to practice the "I'm doing this . . ." statement in the introduction. I hate that!!

When asked if she felt the amount of information she gave on genre or discourse analysis was equal to the level of comfort she felt with the concept or topic, Gail said, "I didn't make a definite decision, I just started outlining and I probably had more discourse analysis than I do genre analysis. That's just the way it worked out. Actually I probably find discourse analysis more interesting. . . ."

When asked if she was satisfied with the final version of her paper, Gail said

I was pretty satisfied with it . . . Something I was trying to decide to do, what I ended up doing with my paper, was talking about one thing entirely then talking about the other thing and then doing the conclusion. I kind of had a difficult time deciding on whether I wanted to integrate it more . . . the analysis of both things. The expert I intentionally wanted to wait until later; I thought that would be more effective.

Andrea

In discussing her draft of paper 2 and her understanding of genre, rhetorical, and discourse analysis going into the draft, Andrea claimed "Before I wrote it, I didn't have much of an understanding, then writing it, well, I had had more difficulty because I had decided to do more than compare one article with one article." Like Mark, who also enjoyed doing analysis, Andrea compared eight texts instead of two. "I was comparing four with four and so that got hard and I wasn't going as in-depth but in terms of the whole genre and understanding I noticed a complete difference . . . in one genre because of the discourse and discourse community . . . because I used more articles. The difference was more noticeable than if I had just used one of each."
Again, like Mark, after getting her draft back with comments on her inaccurate use of terminology, Andrea understood the concepts better.

I understood them more after I got my rough draft and the comments that were on there. I realized what I had done and I went back and looked at it, I think I have a pretty good understanding now.

Like Gail and Sharon, picking her topic—a comparison of how American and British newspapers covered the death of Princess Diana—"was easy, I picked that right away. I don't know why [it] totally sparked my interest. I wanted to see and I did find a total difference between the British and American papers, so I liked it." Akin to Mark and Gail, who also felt comfortable doing research, finding articles to analyze was also easy for Andrea because "I just went to the microfilm and looked at the dates of Princess Di's death (September 1 through 15). I don't have any trouble finding research." (And yet, Andrea was the loudest complainer about going to the library.)

Just like Gail, who could not find a very specific expert on political feature writing, Andrea was not able to find a specific type of journalism article either, but I suspect she was looking for too specific a topic. "[I] just put in 'newspaper writing' in SABIO and it gave me 3 million things [on that topic]. [But] everything I pulled up seemed to have everything to do with normal newspaper articles and not dealing with one specific huge event . . . it was a struggle finding what went right with what I was doing, like dealing with a tragedy or major event."

As with Gail, analysis came easy to Andrea, but because she was incorporating eight instead of two required texts into the paper it made analyzing and incorporating all the elements into the paper harder:

I felt like I was jumping around . . . at first I was just going to do a rhetorical analysis of American and English [newspapers], then I was going to do the genre [analysis] of both, then I decided just to look at the English and analyze those, then
look at the American and analyze those, and then compare the two. So it was hard
to decide which route to take but that seemed to be the easiest instead of jumping
back and forth.

... [since] two out of the eight were editorials, I had to kind of weave those in
knowing that they are different. That's where I had the most difficulty... I was
comparing so much... I thought I was digging myself a hole there for a while but
it came out well.

Unlike her first paper, for this paper Andrea handed in an eight-page draft. It was
obvious that she was very connected to this event, which might have been a strong
motivating factor in her work (in contrast to her first paper). She still needed to work on
going more in-depth in the analysis and move away from summarizing and editorializing
(e.g., "but their content is so disrespectful I would not want anyone from England to see
how poorly my country treated their hardship"). And she needed to work on correctly
using "genre" and "discourse community"; reorganizing her introduction better; giving the
titles and authors of the articles and going to SABIO or ERIC for an expert; and
describing more clearly what she was analyzing.

Her final paper—all 13 pages—took much work and was a great improvement over
the draft. She still needed to be sure that all of her citing was done correctly and she could
have done even more reorganization on her descriptions of each article. But her
introduction was very good because she began it with a quote from one of the British
newspapers and then described exactly what she would cover in the paper and hinted at
her findings.

It was apparent that Bazerman had been useful in helping her organize her paper in
the form of an analytical paper.

Bazerman was helpful. I'm more accustomed to doing personal narrative than the
analytical but I picked up the rhetorical analysis—that's exactly what we had to do
in 101 or 101—really easily. I mean you take two things and look at them... objectively and at their core elements and you keep your personal opinion out.
That seemed pretty easy to me.
When asked if she felt the amount of information she gave on genre or discourse analysis was equal to the level of comfort she felt with the concept or topic, Andrea said...

...I took one of the involved definitions and two from the handouts...they were really simple...I took it like the reader didn't know what it was so I defined it for them. ...I understood [genre] but I didn't feel that that was what I was discussing, I was looking more into the articles than genre and discourse itself and so I showed I knew it and then went into what I was doing.

Like Gail, when asked if she was satisfied with the final version of her paper, Andrea said she was.

I had a plane layover, I was planning on having more time than I did, but I had a good start and so it wasn't that difficulty to shape it up and put it into the final version. I actually put more into the first paper and didn't feel that I did as well. I put less time into this paper but I had a better start...I was satisfied with it, I was just rushed.

Both Andrea and Gail's papers received an "A."

Unlike the other students, Gail had done both rhetorical and discourse analysis before this course. But like the rest, she had not done in-depth genre analysis. Not surprisingly, she preferred discourse analysis to genre analysis, yet felt she understood all the concepts clearly.

As with Sharon and Mark, Gail wanted to work on structure, but felt the overt instructions in Bazerman were too much, too rigid. The popular culture Santa Claus analysis seemed to help her focus her analytical abilities, allowing her to pick a familiar topic to work on in Paper 2--this all seemed to help her improve her introduction and organization. In general, this multidisciplinary curriculum seemed to have helped her make
the transition from philosophy to academic English writing (although she still needed to work on using more examples to back up her claims and cite correctly).

Like most students, Andrea hadn't worked in-depth on the concepts of discourse analysis or genre. She found Bazerman helpful in understanding the genre and discourse community definitions, then went to the handouts to read the more complex definitions. Akin to Mark, Andrea enjoyed doing analysis and analyzed more popular culture texts (newspaper articles) than was required in Paper 2, which she believes gave her more opportunity to see differences in genres and discourse communities. The newspaper articles really kept her interest in her topic and paper, and this was one paper she didn't procrastinate on. She still needed to work a bit on her citing and could have reorganized some of her descriptions of the articles, but for Andrea, the popular culture texts really enthused her to do quality work and showcase her abilities.
8.4 LAST THIRD OF COURSE: EXPECTATIONS OF SPECIFIC DISCIPLINES IN AMERICAN ACADEMIC CULTURE

8.4.1 Transferring Analytical Skills from Popular Culture to American Academic Texts and Cultures

Gail

Students applied their analytical skills to academic genres in the final third of the course, determining expectations of specific disciplines in American academic culture. Students began by reading Robin Lakoff’s "Groove of Academe" and discussing the "unspoken" rules and expectations of new initiates in the academy. Students were asked to write about whether they considered themselves to be "insiders or outsiders" in the academy. In this assignment, Gail described how she learned to write in her philosophy classes, the influence of which had been apparent in her early papers.

I was required to take only one English course for my degree requirements... I was somewhat shocked at the minimal expectations the instructor imposed on us. There were no hard-lined rules, no demands for clarity, structure, or insight, and I felt myself bored. I felt confident about my writing, yet I knew I needed to learn some basic organization and structure. I wanted to improve my writing, to match the style that is so characteristically academic.

I decided to study philosophy... I felt a part of the academic community very quickly as I adopted the styles of philosophical writing. The professors rarely discussed the actual mechanics of our writing, because content was much more important. I learned to write in long sentences, to utilize impressive vocabulary, and to mimic the ways in which the professors communicated with us. I found that they wanted us to write in a style very similar to how we discussed ideas in class.

... I was nervous about joining the U of A business school... I do not feel a part of the academic community, nor do I write in a style that is acceptable for the department. I'm working on changing, once again, my approach to the texts, my analysis, and my style of writing.

Andrea

In this assignment Andrea described the very strict structure she had had to use in the prep school:
The pattern consisted of an essay with five, eight-sentence paragraphs: the first being an introduction paragraph; the second, third and fourth being the body paragraphs; and the final paragraph being the conclusion. The sentences were to be as follows: first sentence—topic sentence, second was to be a concrete detail (in fact, third and fourth were to be commentaries (opinions)) on the second sentence, the fifth was another concrete detail, the sixth and seventh were to be commentaries on the fifth sentence, and the final sentence was a conclusion to the paragraph.

While Gail began to feel like a member of the academic community when she adopted a structure, Andrea (like Mark) felt the opposite.

I began to see that my work was not something that needed to fit into a mold set by someone else, it needed to be unique and show my personal intellect. That was when I felt that I was a member of the academic community, when I felt like an individual.

8.4.2 Memberships to Specific Academic Disciplines

From the personal, students moved on to discover how disciplines require texts to be written and what is considered evidence in different texts. For their final paper, the argumentative paper, students were to find a professor in their major and have him or her recommend a well-known journal, analyze an article from it, interview the professor about their findings and discover when the professor began to find him or herself writing as a member of the academic community and whether or not his or her identity or sense of self changed when she or he began to see themselves as a member of the academic community.

Gail

Students were then to write their argument paper based on one of two questions posed to them (see Appendix H) from either Fan Shen's experiences, or Robin Lakoff's claims regarding language and power structures in the academy respectively.

Gail used this paper to analyze the Management Information Systems (MIS) academic discourse community. By the time of the third paper, her organizational skills
had really improved (perhaps because this class had made her more aware of her MIS textual conventions). Her organization in this paper was very good; her paper was broken into the following sections: "Review of Lakoff and the 'Secret Handshake'"; "Discourse Communities and Genre"; "Academic Management Information Systems as a Discourse Community"; "Rhetorical Analysis of MIS Quarterly"; "Expert Testimony"; and "Conclusion." She analyzed an article from MIS Quarterly and the journal itself in great depth. Her expert was a Ph.D. candidate in international business who turned out to be her boyfriend which probably explains the answers to even sensitive information. For example, "When discussing research interests, junior faculty, as [Ed] describes, are competitive and defensive. Their comments can often be scathing and demeaning to a student. [Ed] believes this stems from the pressure junior faculty must endure during the process of establishing themselves." Her paragraphs all began with topic sentences and claims were backed up with examples and sources. The only thing she needed to be aware of was an occasional lapse in citing correctly.

Andrea

Andrea used this paper to analyze the psychology academic discourse community. She analyzed an article from the OD Practitioner, an organizational psychology journal. What I realized later was that she and Mark had interviewed the same source as the phrase "techno-babble" appeared again when reading Andrea's paper. What is interesting is that while Professor Tyler told both students that the psychology discourse community had many conventions that often close the field to non-members, Mark really picked up on the "antistructure" comments, while Andrea addressed the issue but also offered a more well-rounded picture.
While her draft had some of the same problems as earlier papers (inaccurate genre and discourse definitions, inaccurate citing), in her final paper she had accurately defined terms and incorporated her expert's quotations wonderfully. For example, her second paragraph began

'Before you heat up the frying pan and make sauce, make sure you have a fish.' In my interview with him, Professor Taylor claimed that this is quite possibly the best advice he has ever been given in terms of writing in the academic community. He added, 'I think in writing this makes a huge difference. Writers are writing in the right format, or what editors think is the right format, but the problem is that [academic writers] are writing about dribble; they don't have fish.'

She had also adopted a more objective tone, instead of the earlier editorializing. She still needed to work on her lapses in citing correctly and stop putting new ideas into the last paragraph. As is apparent from the above quote, there were also a number of spelling errors, which for Andrea usually meant she had not given herself enough time to truly clean up her paper.

Both papers received a "B+.

8.4.3 Transferring Analytical Skills to Other Genres

The purpose of the End-of-the-Semester Analysis Exercise/Final Examination (see Appendix N) was to assess the impact of the course and instruction on students' genre and textual analysis abilities by assessing their ability to identify rhetorical features of newspaper and criminal justice articles and recreate a memorandum.
Gail

Gail showed an improvement in analytical abilities when the Early Semester analytical results were compared to the End-of-Semester interview/final examination; in the early analytical results, twice she was not able to identify genres and accurately describe writers. In the final examination, Gail was able to appropriately identify claims, structure, evidence, language and demographics and genre of the newspaper text (e.g., "... the words are simple, common, and the article is written in such a way to [sic] that most people, beyond a 6th grade reading level [indecipherable] would be able to understand it"), and just missed correctly identifying the major claim and the values demonstrated by readers and writers of the criminal justice article. She recognized similarities between the criminal justice article and psychology texts (e.g., "The structure of the article, abstract, intro, lit review, methods, etc. is in keeping with psychology academic writing") and appropriately identified similarities between other news articles and the one used in the examination, but not the memorandum. She was also able to recreate the memorandum quite well in the correct format but misunderstood one of the requests of the writer of the memorandum and wrote that the students should write the report instead of the faculty members.

Andrea

Andrea showed a drop in analytical abilities when the Early Semester analytical results were compared to the End-of-Semester interview/final examination. In the early analytical results, she did very well; only once she was not able to identify a writer. But in the final examination, Andrea attributed motives when asked to described the major claim and its location and the demographics and values of the readers and writer of the newspaper article (e.g., "the values would be those of people who do not believe that..."
excessive alcohol usage or lack of structure and control are at all acceptable. . .."; and she was somewhat incorrect with information for the genre of the criminal justice article and major claim and information on the memorandum/business writing genre. But she recognized similarities between the criminal justice article and psychology texts:

"Passage B uses the form of scientific articles (Abstract, Intro, Methods, Results, Discussion). I had to write with this structure in my chemistry lab for all my reports, and I know it is used in mostly all scientific areas when something is being experimented on or tested.

And she appropriately identified similarities between other news articles and the one used here, and while she claimed not to be reminded of any similarity between the memorandum and other texts, she wrote "listserv assignments" in the next box asking for a description of similarities. She was also able to recreate the structure of the memorandum in an adequate manner, but her tone bordered on inappropriate; like her earlier papers, it bordered on emotional, e.g., "Please, for the sake of MSU and its valued student body . . . ."

Gail's description of her role in the academy showed her awareness of becoming a member of the philosophy discourse community when she adopted their way of writing. For this reason, she still does not feel a part of the business school because she has not yet adopted their style of writing. But she was now very aware of the required conventions (due to her analysis) and the initiate rites (due to her interview) and it appeared from her third paper that she had indeed adopted the academic English style of writing (which is a major step toward business writing). So she had indeed been able to transfer her analytical skills to this type of academic writing and to her final examination, where she had improved her analytical abilities in identifying textual and rhetorical conventions from different genres.
In contrast, Andrea began to feel like a member of the academic community when she dropped the strict high school structure and began expressing her own individuality in writing. And yet she easily transferred her analytical skills to her third paper. She also had adopted a more objective academic tone—this may have been a concession to her attempts for "individuality." At the same time, she had still not quite given herself enough time to edit her work. And what got her in trouble in the final examination was her inappropriate editorializing in answers—perhaps she fell back on the familiar tone. Perhaps her interest level and thus motivation was low so her effort was too. This may be her way of "rebelling" like Mark's rebellion against structure.
8.5 STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

8.5.1 Influence of this Course on Students' Writing and Analytical Abilities

The final interview was used to elicit students' perceptions about the influence of this course on the development and/or improvement of their writing and analytical abilities (see Appendix M). Students were then asked direct questions about their analytical skills, specifically had this course improved their understanding the concept of audience and different kinds of organizational structures, and did this course improve their ability to analyze texts. Final questions focused on the course and students' perceptions of its effectiveness, and areas of writing they still wanted to work on.

8.5.1.1 Impact on Personal Writing Habits

Gail

When the interviewer asked if her writing skills or habits had changed since the beginning of the semester, Gail claimed that her style is slowly changing from philosophy (less defining of terms and focus on organization and writer-responsiveness) to analytical writing appropriate for English and business courses.

Probably a little bit . . . I came out of a philosophy degree so the writing for that is very different that what's expected of a business degree, so I've kind of been converting my style a little bit for that purpose in the class, which was pretty instrumental in helping me do that.

Basically, the best examples would be the organization of the writing, or organization period. In philosophy there was never really much stress on organization and so concisely defining in the beginning what topics the thesis is going to be and then following a rigid outline makes things very clear and is basically some of the things I learned in the class . . . organization, writing clearly, effectively, sort of condensing and not using so much superfluous language--that's a lot of what I learned.
When asked with regard to her writing habits whether she had noticed if the actual physical things that she had to do have changed at all because of this new focus, she replied:

Basically yes because if I know that I'm going to write using information from a particular article how I read the article is very different; I'm almost placing it in my mind into a specific outline. And we went over in class rhetorical analysis and had lists of things that we look at so when I'm reading the material for the class I'm thinking along these guidelines which obviously I never did before because that's a new approach for me.

In the SBSQ questionnaire, Gail had said she wanted to improve her grammar, especially her knowledge of terms and concepts, and develop good sentence structure. Her perception was that there had been an improvement.

I would say so, my biggest issue is really organization I think. And so I feel, it's a strange thing to think, but I feel very differently writing now, from these experiences, because of the more rigid guidelines.

She explained further:

... writing for philosophy is a lot of free-flowing, it's not "I feel this, I think this," it's not overwhelmingly passionate at all, it's very analytical, but it's taking things and just sort of bursts of thought or analysis and just plopping them on the paper, whether it's systematically or something else, and that's really not any kind of organization. And the organization I was wanting to achieve was really just breaking things down and making things really readable by anybody and I feel that this class was really able to kind of refine that...

She did not seem that disappointed that the class had not focused on grammar.

... I think I write grammatically correctly, but my grammar is poor with respect to knowing certain things; seven or eight years ago I took the foreign language classes for college and I didn't know what a gerund is, that kind of thing. This class didn't really go over much of that but it wasn't really designed to... I think you have to seek these out for yourself because there's an assumption that you know these if you write grammatically correct.
In her Middle-of-the-Semester interview, Gail had claimed she did not really look at structure but was aware of the importance of structure. Unlike the other three, it seemed that now she was looking more at structure.

Well, that wasn't necessarily my belief as far what I think should be (laughs) it's just what my approach was. You know, I never really looked too much at the structure of my writing outside of "does it sound good" and "does it meet the guidelines of the paper" that kind of thing. But now I'm looking a lot more at structure just simply because of the assignments that she has given in the class, they really focus on structure. So my writing for the class, you know I attempted to keep them really structured and she made the comment that the difference between my first paper and my second, there was a tremendous improvement in the second paper because I was really trying to employ all of these guidelines that I picked up in class. . . . I have a lot of work to do definitely but you know but I think I have made some improvement as far as that's concerned.

Andrea

When asked if her writing skills or habits had changed since the beginning of the semester, Andrea (like Sharon) claimed that her analytical and organizational skills (like Mark and Gail) had become stronger.

Yeah, I've stopped padding my work so much with B.S. I guess (laughs); she like makes sure you cut that out. I didn't have a real problem with grammar or spelling or anything like that before the class and I don't really know, but yeah, just getting to the point, I'm starting to do more and organizing my papers has improved.

In the SBSQ questionnaire, Andrea had said she wanted to improve her writing skills to help her in the rest of her college career and post-college career. Her perception was that there had been an improvement.

Yes, definitely. She gave us all the handouts and I figured out how to . . . pick out the vital points in a lot of reading . . . that I plugged into my work in order to support my points. I think I've gotten a lot of practice in that; instead of just
plugging in a quote and not supporting it and not introducing it I've gotten better at doing that. . . . I used to say "hey this will look valid" (laughs). . . . I'm more focused and know what I'm looking for and where to plug it in and how to introduce it.

When asked by the interviewer if she thinks this will help her do what she wants to do after college, she said

Well, psychology is my major . . . with my interview with . . . my psych professor he said he had two different worlds of writing. The lab writing, this won't help me with that, that's just really technical, techno-babble, but in terms of the world writing I think this will help. World writing is what he described as after you get out of the laboratory life. Where you're not doing all the empirical work, somebody else is, you're plugging it in using your own words and opinions and theories. So this will help with that I think.

In her Middle-of-the-Semester interview, Andrea had claimed to be very aware of structure and used it to recreate writings she had not seen before (like Sharon who used structure if the assignment was important), but she used her own structure to recreate something she was interested in. It seemed that she still did this, but from her response it's possible to see how motivation is connected to her writing, and possibly explain what happened on her final examination.

. . . . when I'm not interested in something it's hard for me to get my mind going and get really creative with it. . . . Because the first paper . . . I just felt like it was just facts and stuff like that and I got a B on that, but I got an A on the second one and it was on Diana's death, and I was covering how a British newspaper covered it as opposed to an American newspaper . . . they were so different it was really cool. And so I was really interested and I was finding a lot of things that just sparked my interest and I got an A because the structure just fell right into place. . . . But when I don't care and when I don't understand it's just kind of like jotting down whatever, just trying to get it out and meet the . . . [deadline]
8.5.1.2 *Impact on Academic Skills*

When the interviewer asked if there were any classes and assignments in this course that were particularly useful to her, Gail said that she enjoyed the presentations students did and the interviews with the experts, but again, like Sharon, she did not like the Bazerman book.

I thought there were a couple of very useful [things]. She had us present before our second paper, what the second paper was going to be about, give everybody a copy of a handout, with an outline form, you know something you do in a graduate seminar, and I thought that was really effective. It was really effective because it forced the people who did the assignment to not only just make an outline of their writing but make a detailed outline of their writing and I think that really was what helped my second paper . . . organizing it in such a way as where I had to present it clearly and effectively to people. So that enabled me to really write about it. I thought that was really excellent. The other assignment that I thought was really useful was for the last paper she had us interview somebody who has done quite a bit of research and publishing in our field and that was pretty effective, it also gave a lot of very good information but also the person whom I interviewed basically said it was very helpful for him as well because he had never considered a lot of these things that were being addressed.

What I didn't like about the class was . . . the Bazerman book . . . I felt that was really geared toward the 9th grade reading level. It was structured in such a way that there where lists and explanations and [while] it did offer some very helpful advice but it wasn't very helpful to me.

Akin to Sharon, Andrea and Mark, the work Gail did on discourse analysis (in papers 2 and 3) in some ways seemed to have an influence on the way she now reads and writes other types of materials. As with Sharon, she claimed that intuition plays a part in genre analysis.

I don't know so much about the genre analysis; I think the discourse analysis is what really what probably helped a little bit more, as far as just organizing in my mind as I'm reading it. Genre analysis, I think most people in a sense do that automatically, they ingest their interpretation and their way of approaching a text when they read it. I mean, I think what happened in this class was we defined what
we'd been already doing, but the way I read an article from the *Times* or something like that versus a book . . . I automatically make the adjustment before I read it, and sort of my expectations are geared toward whatever genre the text is presenting.

As with Sharon and Andrea, this course also seemed to make her more aware of the differences in rhetorical expectations of audiences; at least it may have built on intuitive skills. "Yes and no. I think no because I'm aware that you obviously do write for different audiences, sort of the same thing as the intuitive approach to reading." The change is that now she's more conscious of what she does. "In philosophy I wrote for an audience definitely, but that was my one big audience (laughs) and now I'm learning a little bit more to write for other audiences and learning how to appeal to [them]."

When asked if she will use this awareness of audience in her work in the business field, Gail replied

"Definitely, because my plans are to do graduate work and stay in the research and writing area in the business field . . . I wasn't aware of all of these different expectations and stages of the game, but certain exercises and certain things we talked about in the course really made me aware. And so in a sense I feel as if I'm walking in prepared to be a neophyte and prepared to have to walk the same walk as every one else. If anything it did prepare me, it brought a lot of awareness of what that's about.

When asked if she could think of some of the exercises that gave her this understanding, she pointed to the interviews with their experts.

". . . the interviews that we had to do with the persons in the field was probably the biggest thing because they've gone through this and they can relate exactly to what happened and how they dealt with it and I think that was probably just about the most helpful assignment . . . It really gave me an awareness of what I was to expect. And you know, some people get to that point and say "Well, really do you want to compromise yourself for the next 5-6 years?" and maybe you don't want to do that and so it's a good thing to think about it, I think, before entering a program."
When the interviewer asked if this course helped her see more clearly the different kinds of organizational structures, she said it had.

Yes, definitely, because . . . the articles [the teacher] presented were quite a range, anything from something out of a pop magazine, to an academic sociology article, to writers in the fields of . . . genre and composition . . . you know a very broad range of things plus she gave us the freedom to pick through our own materials and [use] whatever we wanted, so . . . we were sort of forced in a way to be confronted with different genres and characteristics.

Gail believed this course had broadened, rather than improved, her ability to analyze texts,

. . . I wouldn't say improved, it broadened it a little bit so in that sense it improved because I was analyzing text in a different way than I had previously analyzed; so more breadth than depth. In philosophy you get enough analysis, you know you can take the most common piece of writing after four years of that and get something from it, but it always helps to have different strategies again, it expands the breadth of what you can do, so in that sense it improved.

But she did believe that this course expanded her repertoire of options and strategies for communicating through writing, and like Mark she could employ these strategies in her English class and in other courses.

I think so . . . I keep going back to that interview, especially being able to analyze the genre of writing, the word choice, the structure, you know, for a journal article because you have to learn that kind of thing if you want to be accepted.

The course seemed to be different from what Gail expected, but not so in a negative way and it seemed to satisfy her writing needs in general.

. . . I had no idea what to expect out of it, I didn't think I'd have to take it until two days before I registered actually . . . for my other degree . . . they only wanted one [English] class out of you instead of two, so here you have to take two no matter what, so I fell short . . . it had been nine years from taking that freshman comp class so I had no idea what to expect. . . . And I didn't walk in with the
attitude that there's nothing this person can teach me, not at all, I mean I was very
open-minded to the idea that this would probably be a very good way to improve
my writing and then go back and learn some things that I didn't.

One suggestion Gail had for the courses was to incorporate more paper presentations.

I think the only thing I would say besides getting rid of the Bazerman book
(laughs) I think it would be a very good idea . . . to have everybody present their
ideas before they turn in their research paper . . . it helped me organize my paper a
lot better, because it really forced me to write a detailed outline.

When asked what kind of skills Gail would still like to work on in her writing, like
Mark, she went back to organization.

Well I think still the organization. It doesn't come very natural to me to organize
things in some sort of systematic fashion; I still need to really work on that, I still
need to do it but it's not quite second nature. And again, I still have a lot to work
on in terms of cutting out superfluous stuff. Those are the two big things. [It's
hard] especially if you get used to writing a certain way for so long and your
writing is received very well, obviously it's like that in any kind of situation if you
transfer one paper to a different area of study, it's obviously not going to be
accepted, so translating and converting that's what I have to work on.

Andrea

When asked if there were any classes and assignments in this course that were
particularly useful to her, Andrea claimed that getting feedback on drafts was helpful
(something she had described in her questionnaire that helped her do well in class) and
group work.

. . . I assume you would apply "useful" to what we're going to get graded on [so
that] would be the rough drafts, you know getting the feedback and making sure
the rough drafts got in on time because I didn't get one in on time and didn't get
the right feedback and it didn't help me doing my final draft, so having the rough
drafts in really helps. The group work in class, I liked how we had to get up in the
front of class and like reality explaining the points because whatever my group did
helped me write such a good paper because I wasn't really paying attention . . . and that would help me understand what we were doing. (Laughs).

The work Andrea did on specific types of genres (in papers 2 and 3) in some ways seemed to have given her a better understanding (if not influenced her) of the way she now reads and writes other types of materials.

It's given me a better understanding but it hasn't influenced me because I've always been a certain type of writer, like I have a certain voice in my writing and that doesn't change through any class I've ever taken. I either get graded up or down on it (laughs). Teachers usually like it. I've never had problem to where I had to just totally readjust to do an academic paper; I've just kept the same kind of voice and altered it to different expectations. . . .

But she was able to see the different types of genres and recognize that they are there. Although she did not call it so, like Sharon, it may be intuition or her previous training in structure that enabled her to do this. At least it appeared so from her review of the Bazerman book.

Yeah, I know that I have to write differently for different classes, like scientific for something and something for English—it's not really difficult to switch between the two for me. Because I had two papers due on one day and I did both the night before and I got As on both of them and one was English and one was psych, so you basically know how to switch back and forth. . . . Science and English which is my major and minor, are so different, and I can write so I don't have to worry about it.

When asked what her opinion of Involved was and whether the explicit instructions it gave on how to write specific types of papers helped her writing or hinder it, she replied

I don't know because I opened it up and used all the assignment readings for the first paper and I got a B, and it totally wasn't a strong paper--I didn't even crack the book or do anything she assigned for the second paper and just went all on my own intuition and got an A.
And her procrastinating was still apparent.

I don't know how it's going to go for the third paper, I don't know if I'm going to use it or not, I've still got an hour and a half left to work on it then I'm going to turn it in . . . but I don't know if I'm going to use Bazerman or not . . . . Maybe it helped other people in the class, I don't know maybe it was my high school education that helped me. But it's like I had the same feeling as when I read "Men are from Mars" --it's like you're reading it and it's like that's a good point but I already knew this stuff, you know this, this is common knowledge and I know a lot of [that] stuff . . . just from writing and getting teachers saying this is wrong and this is right just in the past seven years.

. . . I mean I'm the same in my cognitive psych class. I just ended off with a 96% in the class and I opened the book twice. I go to class, I listen, I know what the teacher wants, I write down my notes and do it. I don't know, if it's just because I'm [do the] bare minimum, I don't feel like excess work, but it works for me . . . . But for this class she made it clear what she expected, what she wanted, the handouts gave me basically everything I wanted, and I didn't use the book. And I'm keeping my copy of the psych book in case I need it before graduation next May. But I don't use them. I just go to class and listen.

The course also seemed to make her more aware of the differences in rhetorical expectations of audiences. On the other hand, Andrea seems confident in her abilities to "psych out" the teacher, so perhaps the course just built on previous skills:

Yeah, definitely it was more like a reminder though because my freshman comp teacher really really went into that when we were doing our rhetorical analysis . . . . Since that was two years ago it was helpful definitely.

When the interviewer asked how an audience plays into what she writes and reads, she said

. . . I just feel out the teacher the first couple of weeks and you just figure out whether or not you can throw something funny in, or if you can put more opinion in. I mean the teachers are the audience, that's all I've ever had, I'm not writing for journals or anything yet. The only audiences I'm accustom to are the professor [sic] . . . . so I just kind of figure what kind of teacher it is.
Andrea claimed that she has always been able to see the different kinds of organizational structures in texts, but like Mark, Gail and Sharon, this course helped with it. Here she learned to incorporate subheadings into her papers:

Except for this third paper, I'm doing subheadings, so that's different, I'm totally breaking it down into sections, which is totally different for me, this is the first essay I've done like that. But all of the other essays I've ever written for this were basically the intro paragraph, three-to-four body paragraphs and your concluding. Kind of five paragraphs give or take a few body, you know you just add them in... .

She decided to go with subheadings because she had

Too much information... . I have to analyze the article, I have to discuss the interview, I also have to discuss past papers, I have to bring in past papers, I have to bring in past writing experience I have to talk about his writing experience (the professors'). There's just to much to do body paragraphs, it's just easier to do the subheadings, hit the topic and go on. I still have the intro and conclusion but a lot more in-between. . . .

Andrea believed that this course expanded her selection writing strategies.

[The teacher's] shown us different aspects of what to look for in your writing and how to analyze it but yet in terms of the structure and organization it's about the same... . subheading is different for me... . I'm using [quotes] correctly instead of just plugging them in to fill space, now I know how to use a quote and support it with what I've found. Basically intertwining my opinion with theirs instead of just plugging theirs in and saying this is what they think.

Andrea said she has employed these strategies in her psychology classes and like Gail,

Andrea believes this course has helped her broaden her analytical abilities:

... I've always been over-analytical. I mean that's been the complaint from friends, family, teachers, "you analyze everything way too much."... . I've always looked ten layers too deep, to a bizarre level. It's helped me do it in a more academic way, instead of just sitting there and reading way into it; it's showed me what to look for, and how to analyze quicker.
The course seemed to be better than what Andrea expected, partially because it kept her attention.

It was better than what I expected it to be. I thought it was going to be really dry and really boring because sophomore comp just sounded boring to me. I expected it to be like running through the blahblahblah rules, this is how we write papers, then just crank them out . . . because that's how the freshman classes seemed to be. [Here] she keeps your attention, she keep the class moving. With the group activities, we're always doing something with the groups and peers, I like that. It went beyond my expectations. Because it was easy for me to figure out what she wanted, give that, and then I enjoyed class time.

When asked what kind of skills Andrea would still like to work on in her writing, she mentioned her procrastination and her need to be challenged. In fact, she mentioned Gail in her explanation of peer competition.

I'm a good writer, my only problem is that I procrastinate. When I don't procrastinate I crank out "A" work no problem . . . I mean I still get A's on procrastinated work, but I myself know I could have done better. Because I think in terms, just going to a private high school, the expectations were so high and my peers were so intelligent . . . here there's no grindstone, it's like everyone seems really laid back and they're not trying as hard . . . . There was one girl in the class, Gail who's really smart, right on top of things and I liked working with her because I could get good feedback from her and I felt inspired to work harder by her. But the rest of the class I just felt "Oh my God," there was nothing (laughs) so I just . . . . same thing happens at Pima . . . I didn't feel as much pressure as in other classes to work harder . . . . First paper I wasn't prepared at all, the second one I was, this last one I had my whole idea ready . . . but I think I would be much more motivated if I had top people around . . . . my level of motivation would have been higher if we had a bunch of people like Gail in the class. So my level of motivation and procrastination is what I need to work on. That's a personal thing though, that's not a writing skill, it's personal, it's a habit.

It is clear that this new type of multidisciplinary curriculum had improved Gail's organizational abilities and helped her change her style of writing from philosophy which in turn helped her meet the conventions and organization of academic English. Through
the genre and discourse analysis, she was able to learn to organize, condense her
sentences, use appropriate or as she called it less "superfluous language," and see
audiences as individual groups that need to be appealed to on an individual basis.

In fact, she feels the more "rigid guidelines" of the writing in the course plus the
variety of texts (from popular culture to academic) helped her, and now she was looking
more at structure (which she claims dramatically improved her adoption of English
academic writing conventions). She claimed that this work and the interview will help her
in the business field in terms of her role and understanding their expectations of initiates.
Like Andrea, it also broadened her analytical abilities.

Gail would still like to work on organization as it "doesn't come very natural to
me" and editing her wordage. As she said, "if you transfer one paper to a different area of
study, it is obviously not going to be accepted, so translating and converting, that's what I
have to work on." This phrase supports the theory presented in Chapter 2 that academic
English is a second language; here you could argue that Gail is learning a third language.

This curriculum helped Andrea focus her analytical abilities and made her
organization skills stronger too. The work Andrea did on genre perhaps gave her a better
understanding of materials, but like Sharon, she has always been able to see the differences
in texts in different disciplines. Andrea believes this course also expanded her repertoire of
strategies for communicating in writing; in particular, how to use quotations and
subheadings effectively. In the future, Andrea would like to keep working on her
procrastination--not a problem even the best multidisciplinary curriculum can completely
fix.
8.6 EVALUATION

Gail and Andrea’s writings, interviews and analytical exercises offer insights into this study’s research questions while addressing second language acquisition errors seen in students learning written academic English (errors addressed by a multidisciplinary curriculum).

They were similar students. Both claimed to have an awareness of different types of language styles, strong backgrounds in analysis, an "intuitive" sense about genre requirements, believed that the Bazerman text was a bit "too amateur" for them, needed to improve their citing, and needed to improve their use of terms in their papers. They both thought the course broadened their ability to analyze texts and improved their organizational abilities, broadened but not improved their analytical abilities (as those where were developed before they came to this class), and increased their repertoire of options and strategies for communicating through writing. Both received almost the same grades on papers, and received the same final grade ("A"). Yet while Gail showed an improvement in analytical abilities when the Early Semester analytical results were compared to the End-of-the-Semester Analysis Exercise/Final Examination (see Appendix N), Andrea showed a drop in abilities.

Gail’s experience of moving from an L2 (philosophy) to an L3 (English) and/or an L4 (business writing) demonstrates this study’s claim (see Allen, 1970; Horning, 1987; Bizzell, 1992; Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995; Swales, 1990) that written academic languages are really discourses that should be examined and taught like languages.

Initially, Gail, was stuck in a form of interlanguage where she kept attempting to use the discourse rules of philosophy in her English papers; a kind of transfer-of-training fossilization. Yet, her filter was low and she was receptive to changing her style of writing because of her motivation, i.e., her need to acculturate (Schumann 1978) was high.
Perhaps because of her work in the corporate world in computing, combined with her interview with her boyfriend who introduced her to the "secret handshakes" (to use Lakoff's phrase) of the business school discourse community, she did not have a problem seeing herself in the MIS department or adopting their TL and style of writing. Unlike Sharon, who did not want to identify with communities outside of creative writing, Gail wanted and did identify (and yet expressed an interest in writing philosophy-type articles in the future). Younger than Sharon, she also did not seem to experience any form of mental rigidity or fear of trying new things.

Still, Gail claims to struggle with organization. Like Mark, it may be because, as explained through SLA acquisition and learning theories, structure may be an unconscious process that can only be acquired over time, while citing—which she and Sharon and Mark improved in—is a learned activity.

Andrea also shared experiences with Mark in some ways: she claimed to rely on structure and had a series of very structured high-school English classes at a Catholic school. But she also admitted that her abilities are dependent upon her interest and motivation, and procrastination is a problem for her. Like Mark's breaking away from structure, Andrea also believed she belonged to the academy when she was allowed to "be an individual." (In contrast Gail felt more of a member of the academy when she learned a specific structure).

Yet she did not share Mark's high filter to structural issues, and she felt comfortable acculturating in the academy. However, it appears she wants to do this on her terms, rebelling against structure but doing so consciously and therefore not constantly. Perhaps what is more important in Andrea's case is motivation. She showed more of an interest (Schumann 1978) in work involving integrative learning. The popular culture paper where she explored Princess Diana's death and the psychology article analysis in
Paper 3 held her interest and offered real-world application respectively (her long-term goals include graduate school in organizational psychology).

This may explain why she did not do as well on the final examination as she did on the Early Semester exercise: not only did she have less motivation but perhaps she uses her voice to act out a form of rebellion, allowing her voice to be inappropriate for the assignment. In this way, perhaps she is trying to reclaim some of her identify that the rigid rules of structure (and I would assume voice) imposed by the nuns took away. Schumann (1978), Ellis (1994), Pierce (1995) and others would point out that she does not have to lose identity, just see switching her tone as a form of code-switching (Labov 1970), like Gail has learned to do.

In summary, Gail and Andrea came this course with similar capabilities, yet the differences between them had more to do with motivation and acculturation issues than skill levels.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

9.1 INTRODUCTION

This concluding chapter discusses the implications of the four case studies to this approach to teaching written academic English. The chapter begins by briefly revisiting the claim that academic written English is an L2, and the need for sociolinguistics to be a basis for rhetoric and composition. The next section looks at the relationship of the four cases studies to the research questions posed in this study and offers suggestions for future studies of this kind. The final section discusses areas of further research for these types of multidisciplinary composition studies, and is followed by an Epilogue.
This study has argued for sociolinguistics to be foundational to an adequate theory of rhetoric because in this way, teachers and students could more easily develop sociocultural knowledge (Labov, 1970; van Dijk, 1985; Bazerman, 1991; Farr & Nardine, 1996) that would make them aware of the differences in rhetorical conventions; differences not only between different cultures (e.g., American vs. Chinese culture or academic vs. popular culture), but between academic discourse communities and their respective genres (Miller, 1984; Swales, 1992).

Borrowing the concept of discourse from speech community in sociolinguistics (Bizzell, 1992; Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995) allows composition teachers to view academic written English as a second language. This theory benefits both students and teachers. Students learn that while they may understand the rules of communication and are communicably competent in one form of discourse (perhaps the one used at home, or in the high-school English class), because the discourse rules have changed, their competency levels may differ in the academic discourse community. This knowledge gives students an understanding of the need to either adopt academic discourse as a second language, or at least learn how to manipulate conventions or code switch in order to do well in the classroom.

Instructors learn that by viewing academic written English as a second language, it is easier to see native students' problems learning genre or cultural-specific rhetorical conventions as second-language acquisition issues (Allen, 1970; Silber, 1979; Bartholomae, 1980; Esau & Keene, 1981; Horning, 1987; Leki, 1992). By adopting this theory, instructors will find it easier to develop appropriate multidisciplinary and sociolinguistically oriented pedagogical solutions (Johnson & Roen, 1988; Saville-Troike

One such pedagogical solution was examined in this research project. Using rhetoric/composition and second-language acquisition pedagogical techniques, specifically discourse and genre analysis (Allen & Widdowson, 1978; Swales, 1990), and contrastive rhetoric (Leki, 1991, 1992) and popular culture texts (Mulcaire & Grady, 1990) I created an interdisciplinary sophomore composition curriculum that was evaluated through an educational ethnography, including case studies. Based on English for Specific Purposes (ESP) needs analysis methodology (Johns, 1991; MacKay, 1981; Schmidt, 1981; MacKay & Mountford, 1978), this curriculum attempted to directly address problems students, initiates into academic communities, are having in the composition classroom.
9.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This type of study has an important relevance to composition research in determining language and literacy competency in both native and non-native speakers in the composition classroom and offers a basis for new research in this arena. The four case studies offer a number of insights into this study's research questions and in the process, support the need for more examination of multidisciplinary approaches to teaching academic English as a second language.

For purposes of this discussion, I have summarized the research questions this way:

If native-speaker composition students need to develop greater analytical skills that will enable them to identify cultural-specific rhetorical conventions and successfully recreate them, can these skills and understandings be taught to students using genre and discourse analysis and contrastive rhetoric and popular culture texts? And can students then transfer their newly developed analytical skills and understanding of rhetorical conventions to their own specific American academic texts, and in the process, expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing not only in their English classes, but in all of their classes?

9.3.1 Insights Gained from This Study

The following insights describe how a combination of rhetoric/composition and ESL pedagogies and research allow teachers to see academic English as a second language, which then enables them to offer better explanations for native students' problems both learning cultural-specific rhetorical conventions and recreating them.

If written language is actually a form of "discourse" borrowed from sociolinguistics (Bizzell, 1992), then the first insight gained from this study is that a student's written work may be significantly shaped by the first language they learn, which in turn was shaped by the cultural, political or social values (Berlin, 1990) of the
particular discourse community's members. For example, in the case studies it became apparent that Sharon's L1 training was shaped by the creative writing discourse community and Gail's writing reflected the values of the philosophy community.

Teachers need to understand that students' previous language training will have created interesting challenges for each of them to overcome. Sharon's creative writing background was the catalyst for the development of a kind of innate analytical ability that she could use to analyze texts well in analytical exercises; at the same time, her previous training, combined with little interest in acculturating to a discourse community that focuses on analysis, interfered with her ability to do analysis for, and write, a traditional argument essay. Because of his structured high-school English course, Mark came to this sophomore English course able to do analysis quite well on paper, but at the same time he had a high affective filter to learning organization, and a reluctance to identify with the psychological academic community, a community which he believed valued a rigid structure in its texts.

Like Mark, Andrea also received heavily structured writing training, had identity issues, and often rebelled against organization. Yet she was able to rein in her rebellious tone and "play the game" when she was sufficiently motivated to do so. And Gail, although highly motivated to acculturate to the academic English discourse community (on her way to learning the language of the business community), for a while was trapped in a type of interlanguage caused by her training in philosophy and her learning of academic English discourse.

To help students with their second language acquisition problems, instructors need to see academic discourse as it is located within its sociocultural context in order to offer appropriate multidisciplinary pedagogies designed to develop language and literacy competency in both native and non-native speakers in the classroom. The curriculum in
this study used contrastive rhetoric as a means to explore differences in disciplinary discourse. And it used rhetorical analysis from composition studies, discourse analysis from applied linguistics, genre analysis and ethnographic techniques from the latter two fields, and popular culture texts as a means to develop analytical skills. The goal was to teach students how to analyze the rhetorical character and conventions of academic disciplines so that they could begin to master academic discourse, while expanding their repertoire of writing strategies for communicating in all disciplines. The contrastive rhetoric texts used in the first third of this course enabled Sharon to see how readers' expectations of her work differed depending upon what audience she was addressing. The texts helped Mark understand the connections between writing and culture and the difficulties students may face when learning new rhetorical conventions. By examining cross-cultural pedagogical methods described in contrastive rhetoric texts, Gail and Andrea were able to develop a good understanding of how different cultural-based conventions are valued.

In making conclusions about his three case studies, Swales (1990b) suggests "that there may be pedagogical value in sensitizing students to rhetorical effects, and to the rhetorical structures that tend to occur in genre-specific texts. . . . It is likely that consciousness-raising about text-structure will turn out to be as important as it has been shown to be for grammar" (p. 213). This research project supports this fourth insight. Learning how to do genre analysis, and spending time analyzing different types of genres (from popular to academic), helped Sharon broaden her innate analytical abilities by increasing her awareness of audience and rhetorical conventions and directing her attention to how knowledge is socially constructed, which in turn, she claimed, influenced the way she writes other types of materials (besides creative writing texts). She also claimed in her interviews that this type of training made her put more thought into the
structure of the papers she wrote. She said she was more aware of how she looks at texts and now has higher expectations of other writers as she consciously looks for conventions that should be in particular text.

Gail reported that genre analysis also improved her intuitive analytical abilities, which allowed her to organize her papers better and improved her ability to identify textual and rhetorical conventions from a variety of genres. Like Gail, for Andrea, this type of training expanded her ability to analyze texts and see the differences in organizational structures of texts. Genre analysis helped Mark to identify genre structures in the final examination, structures that he had not been able to identify in the Early Semester analysis exercise. It also helped him demystify academic vocabulary and become more aware of preferred textual conventions. To this end, it seemed to make him aware that he could manipulate rhetorical conventions to his advantage, as a means to "play the game" in academia.

Gail's background in philosophy and discourse analysis, when combined with the discourse analysis she learned in this course, had more of an impact on her than the genre analysis. Through discourse analysis, she was able to learn to condense her sentences and use genre-appropriate language (or "less superfluous" language as she called it). As Ronald (1988) points out, "Much of our teaching then is directed to getting students to understand how and why discourse is important, to getting them to see that 'sounding right' is the key to admittance [to the academy]" (qtd. in Swales, 1990, p. 215). Additionally, Gail's work with rhetorical analysis caused her to change the way she reads texts; now as she reads, she claims to be thinking of ways to use information from that particular text in her papers.

Through discourse analysis (and my comments on drafts) Andrea was able to improve her selection of quotations and to use them properly to back up her claims.
Through discourse analysis, Sharon's run-on sentences were improved, and Mark's work with discourse analysis helped him to analyze texts in a more in-depth manner.

The use of popular culture texts and ethnographic techniques in the classroom really helped students as well. The parenting magazines Sharon used in Paper 2 seemed to ease her into analysis, probably dropping her affective filter. In addition, the editing exercises done before Paper 1 (using newspaper articles) improved her run-on sentences and stream-of-consciousness writing. The Princess Diana topic motivated Andrea to analyze eight newspaper articles, and as she claims, come to a better understanding of genre because of the variety of discourse communities to which she was exposed. Because Gail was able to analyze a familiar topic (political magazines) in Paper 2, she claimed she was able to improve her introductions and organizational abilities, while the Santa Claus articles used to learn rhetorical analysis helped her focus her analytical abilities.

In her final interview, Gail described the interviewing of the disciplinary expert as the "most helpful assignment" for her because it gave her "an awareness" of what she would encounter as a new initiate into her discipline. As she pointed out, this type of information can help students decide if they really do want to become a member of a particular academic discourse community. Gail was ready to be a member of the business academic discourse community; Andrea and Mike were interested in becoming members of the psychology discourse community, but had reservations about adopting the stricter organizational requirements of their conventions. Sharon was clearly not interested in belonging to a community that valued analytical writing over creative writing.

It is apparent that a curriculum like this can improve students' analytical abilities and teach them new ways to view and manipulate disciplinary conventions. And generally, as discovered in the case studies, students were able to, in varying degrees, transfer their
newly developed analytical skills and understanding of rhetorical relations to their own specific American academic classroom texts and expand their repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing to other courses. For example, Mark reported transferring skills gained from this course to his psychology courses, while Gail said this course had prepared her for business writing courses. But there are also limitations to any curriculum, limitations that future research in this arena may be able to address.

9.3.2 Limitations of This Pedagogy

High affective filters were experienced by some of the students in this course. While the popular culture texts reduced the filter in Sharon, allowing her to be receptive to analyzing materials that she felt familiar with and excited about, her filter was still high when it came time to analyze the academic texts in Paper 3. Although in general Sharon's analytical abilities did improve, these abilities did seem to fluctuate at times, and she had difficulty writing an argument for her third paper (she reverted to writing a personal essay). Perhaps this curriculum, and others like it, need to incorporate a specific timeline of assignments that gives students like Sharon more time to acquire the new language (and students like Gail more time to acquire organizational skills). A series of courses like this one could be created to give students time to develop comprehension before they are expected to reproduce the conventions. In addition, perhaps introductory composition courses should begin with assignments that require students to focus on analysis and argumentation, instead of making these assignments "part" of a curriculum that often begins with personal essays.

Another problem in the classroom is the issue of acculturation. Sharon did not want to identify with or become a part of an analytical discourse community (like
literature), while Mark truly struggled to acculturate because his filter was very high regarding issues of organization and structure (since he, like Andrea, had identity and acculturation issues caused by his previous high-school training). The genre training helped somewhat, letting Mark know that rhetorical conventions can be manipulated. But concepts of identity and code-switching need to be addressed in the classroom where students, asked to work with specific patterns of discourse that are contrary to their own preferred patterns, find themselves unconsciously (or consciously) struggling with that request.

Motivation is another issue that needs to be dealt with. Perhaps a more integrative learning environment could be created to encourage students to participate in their education (instead of procrastinating). For example, Andrea was very motivated to write her second paper on Princess Diana—the topic interested her, and in the end, her effort showcased her analytical abilities. Of course, not everything students need to learn in the academy is going to be presentable in an integrative, or motivating, fashion. Students need to put effort into learning material they find "dull" or "irrelevant." But perhaps if instructors worked on making connections between their courses in composition and in other fields (as was done here when students interviewed experts in their own disciplines) there would always be a thread of integrative learning in many courses (Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) addresses this to some extent).
9.4 FURTHER INVESTIGATION

This study has attempted to revive an interest in the theory that written academic English is a second language to most native and non-native speakers of English. And in the process, this dissertation has provided an evaluation of a new multidisciplinary-based pedagogy designed to address the problems students experience in acquiring this second language. However, there are still areas open to further investigation, and three will be suggested here.

A future study could include a second sophomore composition class as a source of comparison to the research group. This was almost attempted here (see section 4.3.1.3). Originally, this study intended to compare two sections of student responses to the SBSQ, to be followed by a common genre-based writing exercise. But because the second instructor had developed a curriculum that focused solely on ethnographic writing, it was decided that the End-of-the-Semester writing exercise for the second section would have to include overt questions on genre features in texts. This would have required explicit genre prompts and definitions of terms, rendering the responses of the two groups incomparable. However, a comparison could provide valuable information about the success of this type of curriculum.

Since written academic English is often a second language to both native and non-native speakers of English, another area that could be investigated is the effect of this type of curriculum on a mixed group of native and non-native speakers of English. As Swales (1990b) claims, "case-by-case studies of student academic writing . . . can have a certain contribution to make. . . . [The] boundaries between the writing itself and the impinging contextual factors are rarely clear, [yet] . . . multiple sources of evidence are available" (p. 203). For example, I used an adjusted version of this curriculum in the Fall of 1998 at the UA with a group of native and ESL students in an introductory composition course.
(ENGL 101/107). Due to time constraints, a full-scale ethnography was not conducted, but the end-of-the-semester TEAD evaluation of the standard student course evaluations suggested the following:

Student evaluations were generally good very good . . . a more careful look at the percentages revealed that 90% of [the] class rated [the instructor] in the A-B category in terms of instructor's effectiveness and respect shown to students. These are high marks and I consider them to be especially important areas where international students are concerned. . . . The percentages were lower in the area of class assignments and most students felt the course was somewhat difficult (lower marks, but not necessarily bad ones). The student evaluations reflected general satisfaction with the course.

Of the 22 respondents, seven students wrote comments about how the course had improved their writing abilities. For example, one native speaker wrote "[The course] has helped me learn how to write for any situation. . . . I liked how [the instructor] chose to make the topics of the last paper toward [sic] our major. This makes the course cross-curricular and gives the paper more value, as it points to our overall direction in our education." A non-native speaker wrote "Since English is not my first language it was very important for me to take this class. I think that my writing improved a great deal during this semester." But like five other students (and three of the case studies in the sophomore class) this student added "I did not like the textbooks used in this course. The readings were not very helpful."

In addition, a longitudinal study is needed of the impact of this course on students' analytical abilities and how this course may or may not have prepared them for work in their disciplines. A follow-up study is being planned with the students in the four case studies.
At this time, however, the four case studies and the dissertation itself have explored the claim that written academic English is a second language, and contributed to multidisciplinary composition research by offering an in-depth evaluation of the approach used in the multidisciplinary classroom. Hopefully, it has also helped to fill in the void in empirical educational research through an examination of the conditions under which analytical skills can be developed in students, skills that they can later transfer from one genre or discipline to another. This research project has also suggested new directions for continued developments in the fields of composition research and pedagogy, and in the process, it has attempted to demonstrate the importance of combining rhetoric/composition and second-language acquisition pedagogies and research methodologies in the teaching of writing.
EPILOGUE

As I discussed in Chapter 1, I too have had to straddle different academic discourse communities and, like my students, learn to code-switch between the languages of these communities. Writing this dissertation has reminded me of the difficulties students like Mark, Gail, Andrea and Sharon face as they crossed disciplinary boundaries.

Like Sharon and Gail, my earlier written languages were developed outside of the English academic community. My MA in communications management and my work in free-lance writing (magazine, technical and investment writing) continue to impact the way I write and what I value in writing. Like my students, my previous language training created interesting challenges here for me to overcome. In writing this dissertation, I realized that I had developed a kind of interlanguage as a result of my pre-doctoral program training, and my later simultaneous training in both the rhetoric/composition and ESL fields. For example, in writing this study, I found myself citing in both APA and MLA styles (used in the ESL and rhetoric/composition fields respectively), and formatting this dissertation as one would a technical or social science document (which is not done usually done in rhetoric). This interlanguage was made even more apparent when the comments I received from my dissertation committee (made up of three readers from the fields of classical rhetoric, linguistics, and rhetoric with a specialty in ethnography (from anthropology)) often reflected different preferences in rhetorical and stylistic conventions of the respective discourse communities.

In the end, I chose to format this dissertation in APA style, using the APA conventions appreciated by the ESL and linguistics fields. And this narrative that I am relaying is a familiar conventions in the rhetoric/composition field. In addition, the four case studies exhibit a balance between the expectations of members of the linguistics and rhetoric discourse communities in terms of the amount of student narratives offered and
analysis of the narratives. It is a multidisciplinary dissertation that talks about a multidisciplinary approach to teaching writing. As such, I believe it reflects what a teacher, educated in the links between rhetoric/composition and ESL, can offer to the composition classroom: a new, more effective approach to the teaching of writing that better accounts for the impact of social and cultural influences on the learning of written academic English.
In analyzing genres, do the following:

1. Establish the name or genre category.

2. Hypothesize about the context and community. What do you think are the values, backgrounds, statuses, education, and needs of the writers and readers of this text? How are their values apparent from the language?

3. Hypothesize about the roles and purposes of readers and writers. Why would someone write this text and why would others read it?

4. Hypothesize about text type and variation. Are there repeated features in the texts? What do these features tell us about the community values, roles of readers and writers, and persuasion techniques? What is the language of the texts? How is the language used to achieve the writers' purposes?

5. Every text in a specific genre will be slightly different because there is no identical rhetorical situation, reader or writer. How do these texts vary?

6. Hypothesize about the similarities among genre categories. How are particular texts from different genre categories alike in argumentation, use of discourse features, tense, etc.?

7. What can a person learn by analyzing a genre? If someone was to recreate this genre in their major or outside of school, how could analyzing it help answer the following questions: What do I already know about the text I am to produce? Do I know how and why it is organized in a particular way? What do I know about the register or style of the text? Can I negotiate a text or task that is appropriate for my purposes as well as for the assigned task? What goals should I set for accomplishing this task? How can I use my various resources (discourses, instructors) in accomplishing these goals?
APPENDIX B—RHETORICAL ANALYSIS HANDOUT

Lisa-Anne Culp
Engl 207-2
Rhetorical Analysis Handout (from Ede 1992)

To analyze the rhetorical situation (reader/writer/text triangle):

WRITER:
1. Why is the writer writing? What is the goal?
2. What information is she or he trying to convey?
3. What is the persona/voice of the writer (authority, friend, etc.)?
4. Who is the writer? What are his or her credentials?

READER
1. Who is the intended audience?
2. What role is intended for the readers to adopt as they read this (change-maker, sympathizer, etc.)?
3. What are the demographic characteristics of the audience—race, gender, religion, income, education, occupation, political preference?
4. Does the writer assume readers know a great deal about this subject already or not?

TEXT
1. When was this text published?
2. To what specific or general situation or concern is this text a response to?
3. How much freedom does the writer have in terms of types of information included?
4. What is the tone?

The Argument
a. What is the major claim or thesis of the text? Is it explicitly stated? Where?
b. What kind of information is considered "evidence" here?
c. How will does this essay appeal to the reader? Consider the writer's appeal to logos/ethos/pathos: what kind of evidence does the writer present? How does the writer establish his or her credibility? Does he or she use emotional appeals appropriately?
d. What kind of information is not included? Are opposing sides given or not?
e. What stylistic or generic conventions does the text follow?

The Structure:
a. How is the introduction created? What is the organization?
b. How is the body organized? How is the conclusion organized?
c. Sentence lengths? Are key terms italicized or bolded in the text? What are the choice of words for titles?
d. What style is used for citations and Work Cited sources (MLA, APA)?
APPENDIX C—Student-Beginning-Of-The-Semester Questionnaire (SBSQ)

Personal Data

Student Name: ________________________________
email address: ________________________________

I. How long have you been at the U of A?
   Where did you attend school before the U of A?

Previous Coursework

Please do the following on a separate piece of paper:

a. list your previous English courses and where you took them

b. describe the kinds of writing and projects you did in each class (journals, persuasive essay, personal essay, rhetorical analysis, research, business memos, creative writing, conferences, in-class writing, etc.)

c. describe what kind of materials you read (stories, magazine articles, journal articles, books, etc.)

d. What major terms and concepts did your UA and other instructors emphasize?

e. describe how much you believe your writing improved (or didn't) because of these classes?

f. if your writing improved, was there a particular person or technique that played a major role in this improvement? What did they/it do?

g. what suggestions would you give to English instructors to help prepare students for writing in upper-division classes in English and for writing in non-English classes?

2. In 1 to 3 pages, please reflect on your attitudes towards writing, your strengths and weaknesses, and goals/hopes for this class.
APPENDIX D--SURVEY OF FORMER 207 INSTRUCTORS (SFI)

NAME: __________________________

I. Class Information

1. How long have you been teaching at the U of A? ____________

In reference to your former 207 class(es), please answer the following:

2. How many times have you taught 207? ____________

3. How many sections ________/year(s)__________?

4. About how many students per section?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section year</th>
<th>Section year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-15 students</td>
<td>10-15 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 students</td>
<td>16-20 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 students</td>
<td>21-25 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(If you've taught 207 more than twice, please continue on the back of this page)

II. Classroom Work

5. What were your observations of your former 207 students' abilities at the beginning of the semester? Circle one number for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Didn't do well</th>
<th>Did easily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. writing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. researching</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. citing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Which type of writing did you assign to your 207 class?

a. analysis paper
b. summaries of readings
c. term or research papers
d. laboratory reports
e. case studies
f. group writing assignments
g. letters or memos
h. instructions
i. observations/reports
j. personal experience paper
k. persuasive paper
l. process logs/journals
m. essay tests
n. other

(if you assigned different types of writing in different sections, please comment on that)

7. How many writing assignments were students generally asked to complete?

1-3 4-6 7-9 10 or more

8. When completing their written work, which of the following did you ask students most often to do? Circle one number for each item.

seldom frequently

a. make a list of concepts, ideas or events

b. summarize readings or lectures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>compare or contrast one concept, idea or theory with another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>apply models, principles or generalizations to a new situation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>argue a position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>examine discourses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>analyze (break down information into constituent parts)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>synthesize (produce something unique from what has been studied or observed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>employ rhetorical analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>evaluate, using internal evidence or external criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Continued: When completing their written work, which of the following did you ask students most often to do? Circle one number for each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>seldom</th>
<th>frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k. analyze genres</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. employ contrastive rhetoric</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. other</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. When teaching 207, which factors were most important in the evaluation of your students' writing? Circle one number for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not as important</th>
<th>very important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ideas: each point was discussed well with clear development.</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. organization: writing was organized well or according to an assigned model</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. wording: correct terms for the discipline or class were employed</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. unique viewpoint: a creative approach to the assignment was evident</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. usage: the sentence structure was correct</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. correct punctuation</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. correct or acceptable spelling</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. other</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. What were your observations of your former 207 students' abilities at the end of the semester? Circle one number for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Didn't do well</th>
<th>Did easily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. writing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. researching</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. citing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. understanding of feedback to work turned in, suggestions on improvement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. learning new types of writing genres</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What pleased you the most about the writing of the students in your 207 class(es)?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

12. What annoyed or bothered you the most about the written work of your 207 students?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

13. Would you be willing to share a list of your writing assignments or criteria for grading them? If so, please enclose or allow me to ask for them at a later date.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much!
ENGLISH 207 SYLLABUS

Instructor: Lisa-Anne Culp
Spring 1998: Section 2, T/TH 9:30-10:45 ML 201
Office Hours: Babcock Building TBA; email: XXX@XXXX

REQUIRED TEXT

Overview of Class Goals

The goal of English 207 is to learn how to communicate effectively through writing; to develop writing skills that will carry you through your undergraduate and graduate studies, from entry-level jobs into management, or into a life in academia. Part of communicating effectively is understanding that ways of writing (different types of rhetorics) are developed and defined by the cultures in which they are created. Culture, as I use the term here, can be culture in a large, societal sense, such as American culture or Chinese culture. Or culture can be defined in a more compact sense, like academic culture, business culture, sports culture, as it's used in the sense of a discourse community. In this class we'll focus on many different types of writing, or genres, each with specific forms, ideologies, and discourses created by their respective cultures.

Because of my background as a free-lance and on-site writer (marketing desktop publisher, documentation specialist, personnel training specialist, etc.), I am most concerned with those things that make you an effective writer: knowledge of your audience, a clear purpose for your writing, strategic organization of the written material, and plenty of revisions so that whatever you're writing says what you want it to say in the most skilled manner possible. *In this class you will also learn that no one ever writes anything perfectly the first time.* In this class, the goal is to help you develop new analytical skills (using contrastive rhetoric, popular culture, and discourse analysis as tools) that will help you 1) become aware of the differences in rhetorical expectations; 2) expand your repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing; and 3) successfully employ these strategies not only in your English classes, but in all of your classes.
Grading Policies
Your work will be seen as excellent (A), when your specific assignments show an outstanding understanding of purpose, audience, content, expression, organization, development of ideas, mechanics and maturity of thought. You are doing good (B) work when you have a good sense of audience and organization and other basics, but the content could be more specific and there needs to be some stylistic changes. Acceptable (C) is writing that is weak in content and arrangement, there is little concept of the audience, the style needs improvement, and there are mechanical and usage problems that a college student should not be making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Assignments</th>
<th>% of final grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing Assignments</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper #1 on Culture, Writing and Ideology</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper #2 on Genre and Analytical Tools</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper #3 on Analysis and Specific Disciplines</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Journals/Discussion Prompt</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Format and Computers
All material must be typed, except for the response journals. Do not use fonts larger than 12. (If you don't have a typewriter or computer, use the university computer centers.) Smaller writing assignments should be between 2-3 double-spaced pages, with adequate margins so that I have room to write comments. Keep a portfolio, or collection, of all work done for this class. Also, there will be in-class writing (be sure to have a paper pad that allows you to tear paper out without leaving scraggly ends), and we will be using a listserv for class discussions, so you'll need to have access to a computer. Also, please be aware of the status of your computer supplies and plan ahead. Please do not tell me that you did not do your work because you had to finish an assignment for someone else (read: another class), your roommate took his/her computer home, your disk crashed, or your printer ran out of ribbon.

Discussion Prompts:
Everyone will get a chance to generate a discussion on a daily assignment. Please offer the class your analysis of the reading and pose a question(s) to the class about it. If you were unclear about some part of the reading, bring that up to, perhaps in the context of other readings. Please don't summarize the readings or offer simplistic questions like "did you like it?" Make us think!

Response Journals
In order to write well you need to practice. And in order to come up with interesting ideas to write about, it is necessary to write down the ideas that come to you while reading or walking or even listening to the radio. I would like you to write down responses to the
readings that we do in class. You can write down your response emotionally or intellectually to the piece; feel free to express yourself and relate it to your personal experiences. Experiment with your writing if you wish. These journals will not be graded on accuracy (finding the "right" answer), but rather on your analysis of how and why it was written, how affective the writer was, and your response to it. And they will be of great help to you in class discussions and for generating major paper ideas. So please bring them to class with you.

Attendance Policy and Conferences
In accordance with University policy, you get two absence days. If you know you will be absent, write a memo to me detailing the date and reason. If you have an emergency, or are sick, let me know by leaving a message at XXX-XXXX (the English Dept.) or sending me an email. This is critical! Otherwise, you'll be dropped with an "E" for non-attendance; if you are doing passing work, you will be dropped with a "W". If there are extenuating circumstances, and I allow you to stay in the class despite your two absences, I will deduct one point from your final grade average for each subsequent absence. If you need additional time on an assignment, contact me and we'll discuss it. Don't just turn it in late. Any material more than three days late from the due date will not be accepted. You cannot pass this class with any assignment missing. When I hold conferences, come prepared to discuss your work. A missed conference or showing up without your paper counts as an absence. Please make every effort to be on time. If you do come in late, take the first available seat as quickly and quietly as possible. Since I take attendance, if I mark you absent, it is your responsibility to remind me to mark you present. Two late arrivals or early departures count as an absence.

Tutoring, Office Hours and Library Research
I encourage you to come during my office hours to discuss material you don't understand, and to work through parts of assignments. If you'd like additional help, tutoring is available on campus and I highly encourage everyone to use the services. We'll discuss it more in class, but suffice to say that even the most advanced writers need feedback on their work. That's why every magazine and newspaper has an editor, copy editor and proofreader. Also, I believe that there are many different ways to research materials, and while the web is certainly the most convenient, it is not always the best source. For some assignments I will ask that you use library sources only, web sources only, or a combination of both.

Plagiarism and Class Conduct
Last but certainly not the least important. All of you are responsible for upholding the Code of Academic Integrity regarding prohibited conduct, including rules governing plagiarizing, harassment, and discrimination in the classroom.
WEEKLY SYLLABUS
(Subject to Change)

Culture and Writing

Th/Jan 15
Discussion of syllabus and goals of course. In-class writing exercise.
HW: Read Chapters 2 and 4 from Involved. Read information on summarizing on pg. 129. Then find an extended definition of "culture" from a source in the library and summarize it (one single-spaced page). Be sure to cite the source MLA style (see pg. 242). Then find an extended definition of "writing" in the library and summarize and cite it as well. Then review your definition of "culture" and look for connections and similarities between it and the definition of "writing." Finally, write a synthesis where you establish a connection or relationship(s) between both concepts.

T/Jan 20
Go over Chapters 2 and 4 and do an in-class group writing assignment (Assignment #1) with the previous homework.

American Academic Culture

Th/Jan 22
Turn in group assignment from Tuesday. Discuss Chapter 1 and Matalene. Begin in-class analysis of classical rhetoric.
HW: Find an extended definition of "ideology" from a source in the library or the web and summarize it on a single-spaced page (being sure to cite the source).
Read Chapter 1 and pg. 49-54 from Sharon Crowley (Ancient Rhetoric for Contemporary Students. NY: Macmillian College Publishing Co., 1994). Read Chapters 1-5 in On Writing Well.

T/Jan 27
Bring in an old copy of your Comp 101 Student Guide or any other writing textbook you have used in the past. (Borrow one if you need to.) We will use it to discuss Crowley and classical rhetoric pieces.
HW: Read Fan Shen ("The Classroom and the Wider Culture: Identity as a Key to Learning English Composition." College Composition and Communication 40.4 (1989): 459-466.) and John Clifford ("The Subject in Discourse."
Contending with Words: Composition and Rhetoric in a Postmodern Age.

Th/Jan 29
Discussion of classical rhetoric in current times continues and discussion of ideology. How are culture, writing and ideology related? Group assignment #2. If there's time, in-class editing practice.

T/Feb 3
Discussion of Johnstone and Paper #1. In-class editing practice.
HW: Work on paper.

Th/Feb 5
Bring in response journals and any questions or comments you may have on the readings we have read. Use this as a brainstorming session for your paper.
HW: Draft of paper due on February 10.

T/Feb 10
Peer review of Paper #1. (Due February 17).
ENGLISH 207 SYLLABUS (REVISED 1-27-98)

Instructor: Lisa-Anne Culp

Culture and Writing

Th/Jan 15
Discussion of syllabus and goals of course. In-class writing exercise.
HW: Read Chapters 2 and 4 from Involved.

T/Jan 20
Go over Chapters 2 and 4 and do in-class group writing assignment (Assignment #1 on "Strangers in a Strange Land").
HW: Read information on summarizing on pg. 129. Then find an extended definition of "culture" from a source in the library and summarize it (one single-spaced page). Be sure to cite the source MLA style (see pg. 242). Then find an extended definition of "writing" in the library and summarize and cite it as well. Then review your definition of "culture" and look for connections and similarities between it and the definition of "writing." Finally, write a synthesis where you establish a connection or relationship(s) between both concepts.

American Academic Culture

Th/Jan 22
Work on group assignment from Tuesday.

T/Jan 27
Discuss Chapter 1 and Matalene.
HW: Read Chapter 1 and pg. 49-54 from Sharon Crowley (Ancient Rhetoric for Contemporary Students. NY: Macmillian College Publishing Co., 1994). In journal use an old copy of your Comp 101 Student Guide, or any other writing textbook you have used in the past, and examine how Western rhetorical values have been transmitted to you.

Th/Jan 29
Discuss homework and Crowley.
HW: Find an extended definition of "ideology" from a source in the library or the web and summarize it on a single-spaced page (being sure to cite the source). Read Aristotle and Quintilian readings.

T/Feb 3
Discuss different definitions of ideology and Aristotle and Quintilian.

Th/Feb 5

Discuss Shen and Johnstone. Bring in your journals, especially your analysis of your old English textbooks, and any questions or comments you may have on the readings we have read. Use this as a brainstorming session for your first paper on the connection between culture, writing and ideology (building on the material you have already read and written in/for class).

HW: Read *Involved* Chapters 7 and 8.

T/Feb 10

What kind of paper will you write? Discuss Chapters 7 and 8 and decide on writing about real-life situations or a more autobiographical focus for your paper. Design an outline that details your topic, argument, issues you will address, and how you will support them and refute others. Post this on the listserv. Ask for comments and respond to other people's outline. HW: Start Writing!

Th/Feb 12

No class. Use the time to write and come to my office on 2/11, 2/12, 2/13 for one-on-one help (you must come by at least once or you will be marked absent).

HW: Read Chapters 1-5 and 14 in *On Writing Well*.

T/Feb 17

ENGLISH 207 SYLLABUS (UPDATED 3-2-98)

Instructor: Lisa-Anne Culp
Spring 1998: Section 2, T/TH 9:30-10:45 ML 201

REQUIRED TEXT

Micro-Analysis of Cultures and Writing
Developing Tools for Analysis

T/Mar 3
Go over handouts on genre/discourse community and Involved, p. 209.
Discuss rhetorical analysis (RA).
HW: Give Santa Claus/Virginia handouts for genre/RA. Read Zinsser, Chapter 9.

Th/Mar 5
Discuss genre/RA findings. Discuss discourse analysis handout. Discuss Tannen handout in class.
HW: Apply discourse analysis to Santa Claus/Virginia handout. Pick a genre to analyze and go to library to find two samples of that genre to analyze (see list) and find an article on how to write for that genre (use Zinsser or an article or book from the library). Read Involved, Chapter 3. Remember to journal, think of questions for Bazerman.

T/Mar 10
Go over discourse analysis findings. Bring in your articles to be analyzed. Go over Chapter 3.
HW: Read Involved, Chapter 9. Remember to journal.

Th/Mar 12
Go over Chapter 9. For assignment #2, discuss the analysis of your articles; what have you discovered so far?
HW: Write a draft of Paper #2. Read Zinsser, Chapters 6-8, and 14.

Spring Break March 14-20

T/Mar 24
Bring in a full draft of paper #2 for peer reviews. Discussion of intros and conclusions.
HW: Read Zinsser, Chapter 13 and *Involved*, p. 185. For Assignment #3, prepare a 10-minute presentation on your genre. Please prepare a handout for everyone in class detailing your analysis. You can use bullet points and samples of the text to prove your claims. This doesn't need to be in full paragraph form unless you wish to do that.

**Th/Mar 26**
Three presentations. Bring in drafts of paper (one for me and one for others in class). More peer reviews/editing work.
HW: work on paper.

**T/Mar 31**
Seven presentations of genres/analysis.
HW: work on paper.

**Th/April 2**
Seven presentations of genre/analysis.
HW: work on paper. Paper due April 3 at 3:00 in ML 445. Read Lakoff's "Groove of Academe" and Schwegler and Shamoon's "Meaning Attribution in Ambiguous Texts in Sociology."

**Expectations of Specific Disciplines in American Academic Culture**

**T/April 7**
Revisit Burke's pentad. Discuss readings. Talk briefly about paper #3.
HW: Read *Involved* p. 228-239 and Chapter 15, Arguing Your Case. Note full circle of class here.

**Th/April 9**
Go over readings and discuss interviewing.
HW: Pick an issue and get two academic articles on it from your academic field. Find an article on how to write for your field (look in SABIO and ERIC especially). Read Zinsser, Chapter 10 on interviewing. Decide which of your professors you'll interview about publishing in your field.

**T/April 14**
Discuss interviewees and when you'll interview. Go over the beginnings of your genre and rhetorical analysis of these academic articles in class.
HW: Begin to analyze these articles like you did for the articles in paper #2.

**Th/April 16**
Go over discourse analysis of your articles in class.
HW: Write a draft of paper #3; focus on your academic articles and interview material.

T/April 21
Assignment #4 due: a transcription of your interview. Bring in draft of paper #2 (one copy of it for me to read, one for others in the class) and bring in your first two papers. Peer review and discuss merging of material from papers 2 and 3 into paper #3.

Th/April 23
No class.
Read Zinsser, Chapter 21 and draft, draft, draft! Paper due May 5.

T/April 28
Peer review of paper #3. Bring in draft to share in class.

Th/April 30
TBA.
Read Involved, Chapter 6 on exam taking.

T/May 5 Paper due. Discussion of final exam. Final Exam on Tuesday, May 12 from 8:00 to 10:00.
APPENDIX F--PAPER 1: ESSAY OF PERSONAL ILLUSTRATION

Lisa-Anne Culp
ENGL 207-2
Spring 1998

PAPER 1: ESSAY OF PERSONAL ILLUSTRATION

I. CONTENT
The personal illustration essay is one that allows you as the writer to use a personal example which helps you described the concepts you have learned in class. In the first third of the semester, you have worked with the concepts of culture, writing, ideology, meta-awareness and persuasion styles of American and other cultures. You have also worked on the concepts of knowledge transmission, here the transmission of culturally created rhetorical preferences. In this paper I want you to use a personal example to help illustrate your meta-awareness of at least four out of six of these concepts. This means that you must define and address these four concepts, but you can do so in varying degrees as they relate to your paper, e.g. some people may work a lot with culture, while others only mention it briefly as is relevant to their paper topic.

On the board in class, I told you that the following could be a paper topic: "Looking at the different ways we've seen people persuade across the globe, write a paper on what is expected in American culture and other cultures. How is this information transmitted? How does it manifest itself in our textbooks, classrooms? Why is it important to be meta-aware of cultural expectations, if at all?" And we also went over other ideas that you all presented and wrote on the board.

We have also done research on these concepts and that too is expected in this paper. Examples from researched sources (sources I gave you in class and those you found on your own) should be used to back up your claims. You need to paraphrase, direct quote, and cite correctly in text and in the bibliography page.

II. FORMAT
The format of this paper follows the format of most academic writing. Your introductory paragraph should introduce the reader to your argument and list what you'll address to support your claim. The paragraphs of the body of the paper support your claims with examples. And the conclusion ties back to the introduction. As we talked about in class, your textbook, Involved, in Chapter 8 gives overt instructions on how to write this particular type of academic paper. Please reread this section and rhetorically analyze (look at the structure) of the first couple and last couple of paragraphs of the Young example. And remember, unlike the Young example, you must have citings in your paper.
Also, remember the analysis you did in class of the Zinsser chapters and what American academic audiences look for (and therefore what I will look for) in your papers: directness, writer-responsible text, an avoidance of clichés, smooth transitions between sentences and paragraphs, strong topic sentences, and "tight" (edited) text.

Your paper should be between 5-10 pages long and double-spaced. Please include all drafts that I have commented on with your paper. The paper is due by 3:00 on Friday, February 27 in ML 445. If you have any questions, please ask! And remember, come to my office hours if you need help.
APPENDIX G--PAPER 2: ANALYSIS ESSAY

Lisa-Anne Culp
ENGL 207-2
Spring 1998

PAPER 2: ANALYTICAL ESSAY

I. CONTENT
The analytical essay is one that requires you, as the writer, to pull apart a type of writing and analyze the components that make up that type of writing; it also allows you as the writer to become the expert on a certain genre of writing. Using the handouts on rhetorical analysis and genre, and any and all materials used so far in class, you will analyze two similar texts for "those things that are not obvious on the surface, that seem to be hidden to casual inspection (Bazerman 194). The analytical skills you develop here will help you learn how to recreate many different kinds of texts that you will be required to write, both on the job and in the academy.

So far in class we have talked about discourse communities, genre, and rhetorical and discourse analysis. And by now you should have picked a genre that you're interested in analyzing, found two articles of this type of genre, found an article or book that talks about this type of writing and how to do it (from Zinsser or any other source), and prepared a 10-minute presentation on this genre and your findings.

You will now take your findings and turn them into the analytical paper. In the process, do not forget our earlier discussions of culture. Cultures create genres and styles of writing and impact them as well. And more sophisticated papers will make connections, for example, between economies, politics, or demographics of readers and the texts. For example, an editor of a liberal magazine will include certain articles that will appeal to the liberal readers. He or she will take into consideration the age, race, gender, and income of the readers. And at the same time, an editor needs to please advertisers as well, which can also impact the choice of articles. In the library's reference section, you can look up advertising books that list demographics of magazines and newspapers; the sales departments of magazines and newspapers have this type of information as well. And by examining the texts, you should be able to discern this information too. Also consider analyzing the differences in layout--what pictures and fonts are used? Why? And remember your "expert"--do you agree with all of his or her advice? Some of it? Why? Why not?

II. FORMAT
Like the first paper, the format of this paper follows the format of most academic writing. Your introductory paragraph should introduce the reader to your argument and list what you'll address to support your claim. The paragraphs of the body of the paper support your claims with examples. And the conclusion ties back to the introduction. As we
talked about in class, your textbook, *Involved*, in Chapter 9 gives overt instructions on how to write this particular type of academic paper. Please reread this section, especially pgs. 210-211.

I will be looking for the information that should be included in an analytical paper as discussed on pg. 210 of *Involved*: evidence of your claims (e.g., if you say the author used pathos, then back up your claim with a quote or example of pathos) and definitions of terms (genre, culture, etc.) you use in your paper. You need to paraphrase, use direct quotes, and cite correctly in text and in the bibliography page. I also look for directness, writer-responsible text, an avoidance of clichés, smooth transitions between sentences and paragraphs, strong topic sentences, and "tight" (edited) text.

Your paper should be between 5-10 pages long and double-spaced. Please include all drafts that I have commented on with your paper and peer review sheets. The paper is due by 3:00 on Friday, April 3 in ML 445. If you have any questions, please ask! And remember, come to my office hours if you need help.
APPENDIX H--PAPER 3: ARGUMENT ESSAY

Lisa-Anne Culp
English 207-2
Spring 1998

PAPER 3: ARGUMENT ESSAY

1. When Fan Shen came to this country—with its different ideology, language, culture and rhetorical strategies—he had to learn to write in English. In "The Classroom and the Wider Culture: Identity as a Key to Learning English Composition," he describes his meta-awareness of the difficulties and different expectations he encountered in the classroom. In the process he argues that "[t]o be truly 'myself,' which I knew was a key to my success in learning English composition, meant not to be my Chinese self at all" (461) and "the process of learning to write in English is in fact a process of creating and defining a new identity and balancing it with the old identity" (466). In examining your own experience of coming to the university—with its different ideology, language, culture and rhetorical strategies—argue for or against Shen's claims. For example, can learning how to write in a foreign culture be similar to learning how to write in the academy? In a particular major? In analyzing a journal article in your major, describe what is expected of a new initiate in this field in terms of rhetorical strategies, organization, and evidence (see Schwegler and Shamoon's "Meaning Attribution in Ambiguous Texts in Sociology"). In interviewing your expert, find out how he or she struggled with these new expectations. Compare them to your own. Can students' (and professors') sense of self and identity change as they take on different styles of writing, arguing, and types of evidence, much like that of a foreign student coming to America?

2. Robin Lakoff, in "The Grooves of Academe," examines the connection between language and power structures in the academy. She argues that to be a "competent professional linguist" you have to "know facts, theories, and methods, you have to know how to be a linguist, you have to know how to play by the rules" (184). She also argues that "[w]ithin disciplines, we develop special languages. Like any linguistic code, these play two roles. Toward the outside world, they are elitist; we know, you cannot understand, you may not enter. But for insiders they are a secret handshake" (190). Argue for or against her claims, looking at a specific discipline (a specific genre of academic writing) and analyze a journal article to find out what the rules of discourse are, and the preferred rhetorical strategies. In interviewing your expert, find out about this discipline's "secret handshakes" and how your expert learned them. Compare the "secret handshakes" here to those in the previous genres that you analyzed for paper #2.

Writing an argument is like entering a conversation, discussing new ways to solve problems, or encouraging others to look at issues in different ways (Bazerman 345). In this paper you will pick either #1 or #2 above and argue for or against the writers' claims
(feel free to modify these questions somewhat). The evidence you need to use to do this successfully will come from your own analysis of texts (just as you did in paper #2), the information you gather from your interview with your expert, the readings and writings you have done in class this semester, and library sources you have gathered in the past or will gather now. The goal of this paper is for you to not only synthesize your ideas from this semester, but to develop a critical eye towards the academy and what is required of you and your writing in your particular field or major. Asking yourself "Where do these requirements come from?" and "Why and how do people meet them" before completing any writing assignment will make you a stronger writer—in academia and the business world.

I would suggest you take the following steps (though not necessarily in this order) to complete this paper:

1. Find a professor in your field who has published (all of them have) in a major journal in your major.

2. Have him or her recommend a well-known journal. Get one article (or if you want, two articles on similar topics from two different journals) and analyze it using the handouts on rhetorical analysis and genre, and any and all materials used so far in class.

3. Talk with the professor about your findings, and also interview him or her on a personal level. For example, ask the professor when he or she began to find themselves writing as a member of the academic community; whether or not his or her identity or sense of self changed; when she or he began to see themselves as a member of the academic community or identify with it, etc.

4. If you want additional expertise, look in ERIC or SABIO to find an article written on papers in your discipline (like the sociology paper analysis for example).

5. Look back on your previous papers and readings and journals for additional material and personal revelations.

II. FORMAT
Like the first paper, the format of this paper follows the format of most academic writing. Your introductory paragraph should introduce the reader to your argument and list what you'll address to support your claim. The paragraphs of the body of the paper support your claims with examples. And the conclusion ties back to the introduction. As we talked about in class, your textbook, *Involved*, in Chapter 15 gives overt instructions on how to write this particular type of academic paper. Please reread this section, especially pgs. 356-358.
I will be looking for an argument supported by claims that are backed up by evidence, e.g., if you say in a certain discipline specialized words are used, then give examples of these words. You need to paraphrase, use direct quotes, and cite correctly in text and in the bibliography page. Be sure to give the journal article's title, author, and author's credentials. Be sure to describe the journal, its aims and purpose, what types of articles it publishes (look at the contributor's page for these details). I also look for directness, writer-responsible text, an avoidance of clichés, smooth transitions between sentences and paragraphs, strong topic sentences, and "tight" (edited) text.

Your paper should be between 5-10 pages long and double-spaced. Please include all drafts that I have commented on with your paper and peer review sheets. The paper is due by 3:00 on Wednesday, May 5 in ML 445. If you have any questions, please ask! And remember, come to my office hours if you need help.
APPENDIX I--IDENTITY ASSIGNMENT

Lisa-Anne Culp
Assignment 5
ENGL 207-2

In discussing academic communities, Patricia Bizzell (1992) defines writing as discourse developed in a community of people who share format styles, persuasion strategies, etc., all created from social interactions among members of the community. She goes on to state that scholars need to examine the relationship between the communities that students come from (before they get to college) and the academic discourse community (which they now live in). In other words, examine how students learn the genre of academic writing and its rules and expectations.

Bartholomea points out "the successful student writers write as if they were members of an academic community. They appropriate that role and its associated style" (qtd. in Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995, 11). In becoming college students, some scholars argue that students often leave their old selves behind and take on a new identity as they begin to identify with their new world, a new world with its own discourse and rhetorical strategies.

Please write a two-page (or longer), double-spaced essay on a) the relationship between your pre-college world and college world; b) when and how you began to find yourself writing as if you were a member of the academic community; and c) your identity or sense of self--did it change or not? Do you identify with the academic world? If so, how? Do you now see yourself as a member of the academic community? Or do you not yet see yourself this way? Explain.
APPENDIX J--EXTRA-CREDIT ASSIGNMENT

Lisa-Anne Culp
EBGL 207-2
Extra-Credit Assignment

This assignment is for those who feel they might be on the border between two grades, have missed more than the allotted two classes, or have missed a short assignment. I will take this work into consideration when determining the final grades. It is strictly optional.

Limerick's article "Dancing With Professors: The Trouble With Academic Prose" seems to address many of the major concepts we've worked on this semester: culture and writing, ideology, meta-awareness, knowledge transmission, genre and rhetorical analysis, identity and "rules of writing."

In this article, Limerick seems to conclude that it is fear of attack by peers that makes academic writing what it is, what she calls "unintelligible prose", which is a kind of self-defense maneuver. Do you agree with her conclusion or is it too simple? Use direct quotes and explain why you agree or disagree—or have mixed feelings. Feel free to use any material covered in this course and write a 1-2 page response.
APPENDIX K--EARLY SEMESTER INTERVIEW

Student Name:

II. Text Analysis Abilities
Show students two passages from different journals ("A" and "B") on the same subject:

1. How would you describe the writers in A?
2. How would you describe writers in B?
3. About the readers in A, who would you assume they are?
4. About the readers in B, who would you assume they are?
5. How would you describe the text strategies in A?
6. How would you describe the text strategies in B?
7. What would you say is the genre of A?
8. What would you say is the genre of B?
9. If you had to recreate A, how would you go about doing that?
10. If you had to recreate B, how would you go about doing that?
11. Now I'd like you to do the same with another series of readings. (Repeat 1-10.)

II. Experience Writing

12. Is there a particular type of reading that you like to do?
13. Is there a particular type of writing that you like to do?
14. What are your previous experiences with high school writing?
15. What are your previous experiences with college writing?
16. Is there any type of writing that you find the most easy?
17. Why do you think it is easy/hard for you to write?

18. How do you approach writing something for fun?

19. How do you approach writing for academic classes?

20. Do you think you rely on the structure of a piece (like organization) such as a news article, or textbook description or example from another student paper to help you recreate it?

21. How aware are you of the difference in language styles between different types of writing in English, such as literature, persuasive essays, newspapers, textbooks, research articles. Not aware, very aware, somewhere in the middle?

22. (If aware) Can you describe some of the differences in language style between these types of writing?

23. Do you think knowing the language styles of different types of writing can help you understand them when you read them and recreate them?
APPENDIX L--MIDDLE-OF-THE-SEMESTER INTERVIEW

Questions for Interview 2

1. Can you tell me a little about your family:
   
a. how many brothers or sisters do you have
b. are they in college?
c. are they working, what do they do?
d. do your parents have college degrees
e. what do they do?
f. where were you born?
g. if not Tucson, where? are you a transfer student?

2. Before this class, had you ever heard of or read about
   
a. genres or genre analysis? If yes, where/when?
b. rhetorical analysis? If yes, where/when?
c. discourse communities or discourse analysis? If so, where/when?

3. Before this class had you ever done a
   
a. genres or genre analysis? If yes, where/when?
b. rhetorical analysis? If yes, where/when?
c. discourse communities or discourse analysis? If so, where/when?

Before the Santa Claus analysis

4. Did you find the readings (Jesse Jackson, genre, rhetorical, and discourse analysis handouts, Student Guide readings) and class discussions helpful? Or did you not do all of the readings?

5. DRAFT
Describe your experience:

a. understanding genre, rhetorical, and discourse
b. picking your genre topic
c. finding articles
d. doing the analysis
e. finding demographics
f. finding an expert
g. combining all of the elements into the paper
h. organizing your paper in the form of an analytical paper

6. FINAL
Please describe:

a. how you decided on the amount of genre, rhetorical, and discourse information to include in your paper
b. whether or not you're satisfied with the final version of your paper
c. what you would change or not change

-final comments?
APPENDIX M--FINAL INTERVIEW

Rich:
Here are the questions for the post-semester interview.

Please tell students:

** This information will not be listened to or read by the instructor until after grades are posted.

Course Evaluation

1. Do you think your writing skills or habits have changed at all since the beginning of the semester or not? If yes, how so? If no, why do you think they haven't changed?

2. Questions based on the Early Semester interview/SBSQ.

3. Were there any classes and assignments in this course that were particularly useful to you? Any that were not particularly useful?

5. Questions pertaining to Middle-of-the-Semester interview.

6. Do you think the work we have done on specific types of genres (newspaper, essays, etc.) has influenced the way you read and write other types of materials, types that we may not have covered in class?

7. Did this course improve your understanding the concept of audience and help you see more clearly the different kinds of organizational structures? Can you explain how?

8. Did this course improve your ability to analyze texts? Can you explain how?

9. Was the course what you expected it would be or was it different from what you expected? Could you explain how?

10. Is there anything you felt was lacking in the course, anything you wish the course had covered but didn't?

11. What kinds of skills would you still like to work on in your writing?
Part I - Analysis

Both of these texts, A and B, are about student drinking. Describe the differences you see between these two articles. Be as explicit as possible, using examples to support all your points.

ARTICLE A - please answer the following in the spaces provided.

A1. What is the major claim or thesis of the text? Is it explicitly stated? Where?
A2. What's the structure of the piece? How is it organized?
A3. What kind of information is considered "evidence" here? (logos/ethos/pathos).
A4. What kind of language is used (terms, choice of words)?
A5. What do you think are the demographics (values, backgrounds, education, and needs) of the writers and readers of this text. How are their values apparent from the language?
A6. For this genre, what kind of information is appropriate for the writer to include or not include?
A7. What is the tone of the writer?
A8. What kind of genre is this?
A9. Does this passage remind you of other types of writing you have read or written before?
   If yes, answer A10 and A11. If no, stop here.
A10. What other types of writing does passage A remind you of?
A11. What specific similarities can you see between passage A and other types of writing? Explain using examples from passage A.
ARTICLE B - please answer the following in the spaces provided.

B1. What is the major claim or thesis of the text? Is it explicitly stated? Where?

B2. What's the structure of the piece? How is it organized?

B3. What kind of information is considered "evidence" here? (logos/ethos/pathos).

B4. What kind of language is used (terms, choice of words)?

B5. What do you think are the demographics (values, backgrounds, education, and needs) of the writers and readers of this text. How are their values apparent from the language?

B6. For this genre, what kind of information is appropriate for the writer to include or not include?

B7. What is the tone of the writer?

B8. What kind of genre is this?

B9. Does this passage remind you of other types of writing you have read or written before? If yes, answer B10 and B11. If no, stop here.

B10. What other types of writing does passage B remind you of?

B11. What specific similarities can you see between passage B and other types of writing? Explain using examples from passage B.
Part II - Applying Your Analysis

The goal of this class was to help you develop new analytical skills that will help you (1) become aware of the differences in rhetorical expectations; (2) expand your repertoire of options and strategies for communication through writing; and (3) successfully employ these strategies not only in your English classes, but in all of your classes and in the workplace (even if you've never seen the specific type of material before). Attached is the format of a memo—pretend that your boss just gave you this as a sample of this company's preferred style of memo writing. Here are your boss' verbal directions to you:

As Dean of Students here at Michigan State University, it has become apparent to me that our students are obviously having problems with alcohol abuse. I want you to write a memo to the faculty for me, encouraging them to set aside a class to talk with their students about the use of alcohol on campus and in their lives. Using the information I've given you (articles A & B), please convince the faculty that this class discussion is a good idea, ask them to write a report about their class discussion, and ask them to offer suggestions about how to eliminate these types of violent protests and alcohol abuse on campus, suggestions that I can bring to the president of the MSU. Please don't deviate from this memo format—we've borrowed it and it's the department's favorite style—and use my name and today's date. Thanks, Jan Smith.

Begin this assignment by analyzing the text provided: Article C.

C1. What is the major claim or thesis of the text? Is it explicitly stated? Where?
C2. What's the structure of the piece? How is it organized?
C3. What kind of information is considered "evidence" here? (logos/ethos/pathos).
C4. What kind of language is used (terms, choice of words)?
C5. What do you think are the demographics (values, backgrounds, education, and needs) of the writers and readers of this text. How are their values apparent from the language?
C6. For this genre, what kind of information is appropriate for the writer to include or not include?
C7. What is the tone of the writer?
C8. What kind of genre is this?
C9. Does this passage remind you of other types of writing you have read or written before?
   If yes, answer C10 and C11. If no, stop here.

C10. What other types of writing does passage C remind you of?

C11. What specific similarities can you see between passage C and other types of writing? Explain using examples from passage C.

Please write the memo in the correct format.
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