

Sustaining Writing in a Time of Crisis

Appuyer l'écriture en temps de crise/ L'écriture de soutien en temps de crise

the 2024 conference of the / la conférence 2024 de la
Canadian Association for Studies in Discourse and Writing
Association Canadienne de Rédactologie



part of the / dans le cadre du
Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences
Congrès des sciences humaines

June 15-17, 2024
McGill University and Online

Program and Guide

Guide

Conference schedule

Our conference takes place all day, each day, on Saturday, June 15th through Monday, June 17th. Please see the detailed schedule beginning on page 3 of this document.

Arriving in person

For directions and recommendations for getting to McGill University's downtown campus, and for parking on campus, visit the [transportation / voyages et transports](#) page of Congress's "[Plan your Trip](#)" / "[Planifiez votre voyage](#)" sites. Transit is recommended. If arriving by subway, get off at Station McGill on Line 1. Trains on Line 1 run every 6-12 minutes on weekend mornings and every 2-4 minutes during the week.

Go first to the registration desk in the Congress Hub in the McLennan Library. Register and/or collect your badge. The registration desk is open between 7:30am and 5pm and will be busiest in the morning. Only credit cards are accepted for registration payments.

Then proceed to our greeting table, located just outside our primary conference room, room 276, in the Macdonald Engineering building, which is at the northern corner of the green space across from the library.

For complete Congress maps, visit "[Finding your Way around Congress](#)" / "[S'orienter dans le congrès](#)"



Attending virtually

Virtual participation in our conference is available to CASDW/ACR members who have registered to attend either in-person or virtually. Once you have registered to attend our conference, you may join virtually using Zoom (link TBA). Please do not share the Zoom link with anyone who is not registered to attend CASDW/ACR's 2024 conference. To register for the in-person conference with the option to join virtually, please visit [this page](#) / [visitez ce site](#) pour s'inscrire, s'il vous plait. To register to attend virtually only, please select the relevant registration page according to your status as [employed full time](#) or as [employed part time/sessionally/on contract](#). If you are a student, a K-12 educator, retired, or unemployed, please register to attend virtually only by emailing sbanting@mtroyal.ca.

You will need to have [Zoom](#) installed on your device to join. Please make sure that the name associated with your Zoom account clearly resembles the name you registered under.

Our conference Zoom room will give virtual participants access to most of the in-person and all of the virtual presentations. It will allow limited opportunities to participate in Q&A discussions after each session. Questions in the chat will be relayed to participants by session chairs. You will be able to hear the presenters' responses, but not the in-person audience's comments.

Accessing presentation materials

Presenters may choose to upload materials for attendees to view in the shared Google folder [here](#). Sharing is not required.

Detailed conference schedule

View presentation abstracts after the schedule

SATURDAY, JUNE 15 All individual papers will be no more than 15 minutes long; a short Q&A period will immediately follow each paper			
ROOM 1 MacDonald Engineering 276 In-person and virtual			ROOM 2 MacDonald Engineering 279 In-person only
8:30-8:50	Coffee and tea available outside room 276		
8:50	Welcome to CASDW/ACR 2024! Sarah Banting, Joel Heng Hartse		
9:00-10:00 Rhetorical Genre Studies for a Sustainable Future	9:00-9:20	What ChatGPT Threatens and Enables Tosh Tachino, he/him, virtual	9:00-10:00 Fostering Equity and Inclusion through Graduate Writing: Strategies, Challenges, Imaginings (roundtable) Fiona Coll, she/her, Katie Fry, she/her, Nadine Fladd, she/her, Donetta Hines, she/her/elle/ella, Yvonne Hung, she/her, Keith O'Regan, he/him
	9:20-9:40	Rhetorical Genre Analysis and Social Justice: The Public Inquiry Genre as a Record of Accountability Diana Wegner, she/her, in person	
	9:40-10:00 am	The Rhetoric of Rhetorical Genre Studies Research in Indigenous Contexts Shurli Makmillen, she/her, in person	
10:00-10:20			
10:20-11:20 The Power and Rhetoric of Storytelling	10:20 – 10:40	Shifting Ethos: The (Re)shaping of Leaders' Debates through Social Media Monique Kampher, she/her, winner of the 2022 Joan Pavelich CASDW Award for Best Dissertation	10:20 – 11:20 Counteracting Deskilling in Students' Use of ChatGPT (workshop) Jane Freeman, she/her
	10:40 – 11:00	Gender, Life Writing, Vulnerability: Violence and Difference in the Post-Secondary Classroom Melissa Jacques, she/her/they/them	

	11:00-11:20	Armed-conflict and displacement: the role of writing in sustaining and (re)building identities Jennifer Chinenye Emelife, she/her		
11:20-11:30	Short break			
11:30 – 12:30	Plenary 1	Graduate writing futures: Resisting domestication, negotiating possibilities (Room 276) Cecile Badenhorst, she/her		
12:30 – 1:20	Lunch break: Lunch provided by CASDW/ACR			
1:20-2:20 Panel 2: Writing Support	1:20-1:40	Sustaining Creative Inquiry: Graduate Student Writing Support at a Canadian Art & Design University Leah Burns, she/her, Heather Fitzgerald, she/her, and Sara Ostenton, she/her	1:20 – 2:20	Inclusive Teaching of Writing: Ten Characteristics and More Questions about Sustainable Practice (workshop) Laila Ferreira, she/her, Rebecca Carruthers Den Hoed, she/her, Jennifer Walsh Marr, she/her, Katja Thieme, she/her/they/them
	1:40 – 2:00	Reading for research: Uncovering expert writers’ read-to-cite practices Jonathan Vroom, he/him, Aisha Mir, she/her, and Angelina Siew, she/her		
	2:00-2:20	Belonging in the Library: A mini-assignment for first-year writing courses (virtual) Loren Gaudet, she/her		
2:20-2:40	Break			
2:40-3:40 Panel 3: Innovative Approaches to Teaching	2:40-3:00	Shifting the Paradigm of School-Based Writing Instruction to Seed Civic Possibilities: Teacher Candidates Learning Digital Multimodal Composing Through Journalistic Learning Celeste Kirsh, she/her	2:40-3:40	Collaborative Modelling: Close Reading Workshops for Writing-intensive Courses (workshop) Kala Hirtle, she/her, and Vanessa Lent, she/her
	3:00-3:20	Sustainability Through Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Writing Courses and Undergraduate TA Education Srividya Natarajan, she/her		

	3:20-3:40	Empowering EAL students' voices through arts-based writing Eunhee Buettner, she/her, and Sreemali Herath, she/her		
3:40-4:00	Break			
4:00-5:00		Navigating Writing Support for Graduate Students in the Age of AI: Faculty Perspectives (roundtable) Antoinette Gagné, she/her, Sreemali Herath, she/her, Elena Danilina, she/her, Jade Kim, she/her, Victorina Baxan, she/her, Phoebe Kang, she/her, Wenyangzi Shi, she/her	4:00-5:00	How we learned to write: Approaches from Lifespan Writing Development Research (workshop) Dana Landry, she/her/they
5:30-	Optional 5 à 7 social outing! Stay tuned for details			

SUNDAY, JUNE 16
All sessions in MacDonald Engineering 276

All individual papers will be no more than 15 minutes long;
a short Q&A period will immediately follow each paper

Panel	Paper times	Title and presenter
9:00-9:20	Coffee and tea available outside room 276	
AI: Impact and Affect	9:20-9:40	Prompting and Transforming AI-Generated Text: Towards an Ecological Framework for Mapping Intrapersonal and Contextual Constraints during the Research Writing Process Stuart MacMillan, he/him
	9:40-10	"I'm not worried about robots taking over the world, I guess I'm worried about people": Emoting, Teaching, and Learning with Generative AI Michael Cournoyea, he/him, and Sarah Seeley, she/her
	10:00-10:20	"Because of ChatGPT...": The Socio-Material Impact of Generative Artificial Intelligence on L2 Instruction and Assessment Eugenia (Gene) Vasilopoulos, she/her
	10:20-10:40	Navigating Emotions and Challenges: Impact of GenAI on First-Year Writing Instructors Phoebe Kang, she/her, and Amanda Paxton, she/her

10:40-11:00	Break	
11:00 – 12:00	Plenary 2	Naviguer les mers du numérique et des plurilittératies : Affronter les vagues du changement en mettant le cap sur la diversité Jérémy Séror, he/him/il/lui (slides in English; simultaneous translation offered in the virtual meeting)
12:00-1:00	Lunch break	
Genre/ Discourse Analysis	1:00-1:20	'Shadow CVs' and what they reveal about scholarly failure and epistemic (in)equity Brittany Amell, she/her, and Katja Thieme, she/her
	1:20-1:40	The role of cultures in Professional and Technical Communication? An exploratory content analysis of the Journal of Business and Technical Communication Wenbin Liu, he/him, and Saul Carliner, he/him
	1:40-2:00	An "Exercise in Avoiding Red Flags": How Medical Students Approach CaRMS Personal Statements Michael Cournoyea, he/him, and Boba Samuels, she/her
2:00-2:20	Break	
Transfer and Self-Efficacy in Writing Instruction	2:20-2:40	Tracing Transfer: Preliminary Results of a Longitudinal Study of Teaching FYW for Transfer Mark Blaauw-Hara, he/him, Sarah Seeley, she/her, Amelie Desroches, she/her, Sabeen El Mougabatt, she/her, Shona Goodkin, she/her, Amber Richardson, she/he
	2:40-3:00	Writing Transfer in an AI World Chris Eaton, he/him, and Erin Vearncombe, she/her, and Kaitlyn Harris, she/her
	3:00-3:20	Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy for Teaching Writing in a Multidisciplinary Sample of Canadian Faculty Kim M. Mitchell, she/her
3:20-3:40	Break	
Multilingual Students and Linguistic Justice	3:40-4:00	"Small" Strategies for Introducing and Sustaining Linguistic Justice in Classroom Conversations Craig Stensrud, he/him, and Moberley Luger, she/her
	4:00-4:20	Predatory publishing as a pedagogical problem: the uneasy globalization of sources used by novice academic writers Joel Heng Hartse, Ismaeil Fazel, he/him, and Bong-gi Sohn

	4:20-4:40	Racialized graduate student experiences of unintentional plagiarism: Exploring de/colonization Kelvin Quintyne, he/him, Arif Abu, he/him, Priscilla Tsuasam, she/her, Seitebaleng Dintoe, she/her, Constance Owusu, she/her, and Cecile Badenhorst, she/her
	4:40-5:00	Antiracist and Anti-oppressive Writing Pedagogy for Multilingual Students (virtual) Xiangying Huo, she/her

MONDAY, JUNE 17
All sessions in MacDonald Engineering 276

All individual papers will be no more than 15 minutes long;
a short Q&A period will immediately follow each paper

Panel	Paper times	Title and presenter
8:40-9:00	Coffee and tee available outside room 276	
9:00-10:00		What is, or might be, trans writing studies? Sustaining community through writing studies (Roundtable discussion) Katja Thieme, she/her, Mary Ann Saunders, she/her, Andrew Legge, he/him, Jamie Takaoka, they/she/he, and Hillary Pimlott, she/her
10:00-10:20	Break	
Teaching Writing in Canada	10:20-10:40	L2 Writing in Canada: Current Trends and Future Directions James Corcoran, he/him, Joel Heng Hartse, and Ismaeil Fazel, he/him
	10:40-11:00	Reckoning and Reconciliation: The Strengths and Weaknesses of Writing Studies in Canada Sara Humphreys, she/her, and Jason Collins, they/them
11:00-11:20	Break: Refreshments provided by Congress	
11:20-12:20	Plenary 3	Beyond The Code: Unpacking Generative AI's Impact on Writing and Bias (Open Congress event hosted by CASDW/ACR) Laura Allen, she/her
12:20-1:20	Lunch break	
Writing Centers: Sustainability and Crisis	1:20-1:40	Modeling sustainable collaboration between ESL instructors and writing centers: affordances and constraints Ibtissem Knouzi, she/her, and Jacqueline Ng, she/her, virtual
	1:40-2:40	Which crisis are you responding to? A roundtable featuring the McGill Writing Centre Team Yvonne Hung, she/her, Ross Sundberg, he/him, Mehdi Babaei, he/him, Donetta Hines, she/her, and Aaron Bartels-Swindells, he/him

2:40-3:00	Break
3:00-5:00	<p>CASDW/ACR AGM – All welcome and encouraged to attend!</p> <p>Executive positions will be elected at this meeting, award winners will be announced, and discussions will give you a chance to weigh in on future directions for CASDW/ACR!</p>

Abstracts

PLENARIES

Graduate writing futures: Resisting domestication, negotiating possibilities

Cecile Badenhorst, she/her

In writing studies, we know we are on the cusp of enormous transformation. Changes are coming fast, and every day we are faced with new technological innovations. Since Open AI released ChatGPT in November 2022, the artificial intelligence (AI) architecture has expanded rapidly and is used by millions of people all over the world. Generative text AI has the capacity to engage in intellectual tasks, to learn and innovate, and to produce human-like text. These are proving to be highly successful products. It's fair to say, these systems have the potential to disrupt higher education as we know it because they not only assist human authorship but potentially replacing it (Walczak & Cellary, 2023). For scholars like myself who have developed a career centred on helping masters and doctoral students to write theses and dissertations, and publish in research contexts, these are perplexing times. We know writing can be challenging, for graduate students but it is also crucial to their scholarly expression and identity development. Proponents of AI suggest that systems like Chat GPT can produce every aspect of research writing from developing research questions, to generating and revising the research paper. What does this mean for research writing? Is the future hopeful with possibilities or are we facing the domestication of our writing practices? Perhaps the way forward is less clearly bifurcated and more chaotic. How do we embrace this chaos? How do we find a way beyond the narrow view where the deeper issues, the geo-politics and the material bodies, drop from sight (Healy 2023; Stahl & Eke, 2024). How can we hold on to our risky vulnerabilities, the ones that direct us to passion and poetics in research writing? What narratives do/can we create to accommodate these challenges and contradictions? How can we help graduate writers navigate these complex, uncertain spaces?

Naviguer les mers du numérique et des plurilittératies : Affronter les vagues du changement en mettant le cap sur la diversité

(Navigating the digital seas of pluriliteracies: Embracing disruption and steering towards diversity)

Jérémie Séror, lui/il

(English version follows)

Dans un contexte où les interfaces numériques et les interactions interlinguistiques s'infiltrent de plus en plus au cœur de notre quotidien, des notions telles que le plurilinguisme, le translanguaging et les plurilittératies numériques s'imposent en tant que vecteurs redéfinissant le paysage de l'évolution de la compétence scripturale (Vallejo &

Dooly, 2019). Cette conférence propose une exploration de l'impact de ces concepts sur notre compréhension du développement de l'écriture et du rôle que peuvent jouer les éducateurs sur les processus de reconnaissance, de valorisation et de mise en œuvre des pratiques d'écritures créatives, hybrides et plurilingues rendues possibles au sein d'espaces numériques (Payant & Kim, 2022 ; Van Viegen & Zappa-Hollman, 2020).

La présentation examinera l'évolution des cadres théoriques liés au développement de la bi/plurilittératie (Hornberger, 2003 ; Lau, 2020), soulignant leur pertinence pour l'étude et la réinterprétation des pratiques discursives dans des environnements d'écriture numériques (Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2018). Elle mettra en lumière ces recherches qui illustrent les affordances uniques des plurilittératies numériques, incluant l'impact d'outils de pointe tels que la traduction automatique (Jolley & Maimone, 2022) et l'intelligence artificielle (Yang & Kyun, 2022). Cette analyse révélera comment les environnements numériques, au-delà de faciliter les pratiques interlinguistiques des scripteurs plurilingues, servent également d'espaces transformateurs, ouvrant de nouvelles perspectives sur les processus complexes inhérents à l'écriture et remettant en question les paradigmes monolingues prédominants en didactique de l'écriture (Séror, 2022). Les implications se concentreront sur l'impératif d'un accompagnement explicite pour les étudiants lorsqu'ils expérimentent et apprennent à naviguer l'écriture numérique et à exploiter l'interaction dynamique entre leurs divers répertoires sémiotiques pour s'exprimer à l'écrit. Cet accompagnement sera également présenté comme réponse possible aux inquiétudes associées à l'émergence de « l'apprenant augmenté numériquement » pour qui l'on craint qu'une dépendance potentielle à la technologie puisse entraver le développement de ses compétences rédactionnelles.

La conférence terminera en mettant en lumière la nécessité de reconnaître et d'engager délibérément l'écriture numérique et les plurilittératies qu'elle rend possibles dans le but de promouvoir un environnement d'apprentissage et d'écriture dynamique, inclusif et transformatif, valorisant des parcours diversifiés vers la réussite en littératie à l'ère numérique.

At a time when digital interfaces and cross-linguistic interactions permeate our daily lives, concepts like plurilingualism, translanguaging, and digital pluriliteracies are reshaping the landscape of writing development (Vallejo & Dooly, 2019) . This talk delves into the impact of these concepts on our understanding of writing development and the roles educators play in documenting, valuing, and engaging with the creative, hybrid, and plurilingual practices found in digital spaces (Payant & Kim, 2022; Van Viegen & Zappa-Hollman, 2020) . The presentation will examine the evolution of theoretical frameworks in bi/pluriliteracy development (Hornberger, 2003; Lau, 2020) and their significance for the study and redefinition of discourse practices in digital writing environments (Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2018) . It will highlight research that underscores the unique affordances of digital pluriliteracies, including the impact of advanced tools such as machine translation (Jolley & Maimone, 2022) and artificial intelligence (Yang & Kyun, 2022) . The presentation will further showcase how digital environments not only facilitate plurilingual writers' cross-linguistic practices but also serve as transformative spaces, offering new insights into the intricate processes associated to writing and challenging prevailing monolingual paradigms in writing education (Séror, 2022) . Implications will focus on the necessity of explicit guidance for students as they experiment with and learn to navigate digitally mediated writing and harness the dynamic interplay between their diverse semiotic repertoires to engage in textual meaning making. This guidance will also be explored as a means of addressing concerns associated with the emergence of the 'digitally augmented learner'; whose potential overreliance on technology may impact their capacity to develop effective writing skills.

The talk will conclude by advocating for the recognition and deliberate engagement with digital writing and the pluriliteracies to foster a dynamic, inclusive, and transformative language learning and writing environment, valuing diverse pathways to literacy achievement in the digital age.

Beyond The Code: Unpacking Generative AI's Impact on Writing and Bias

Laura Allen, she/her

Artificial intelligence (AI) continues to shape our experiences within and outside of academic spaces. Thus, unraveling bias in AI-driven writing tools becomes not just an academic pursuit, but a crucial step towards safeguarding the authenticity and inclusivity of our collective stories.

This talk is for writing teachers and researchers who are eager to stay abreast of the rapidly evolving AI technologies and their implications on biases related to race, gender, class, and disability. This speaker will foster a communal exploration of how generative AI shapes writing practices beyond the code, encouraging an exchange of ideas between scholars, students, community members, and industry experts. The session will be a convergence point for practical strategies, scholarly insights, and real-world implications, all geared towards preparing for an inclusive and critically aware academic writing environment in Fall 2024. This approach underlines the belief that understanding and addressing AI-induced biases in writing is not a solitary endeavor but a collective social justice journey, enriching the educational landscape through shared wisdom and collaborative effort.

PRESENTATIONS AND ROUNDTABLES

In alphabetical order by first author/presenter's last name

'Shadow CVs' and what they reveal about scholarly failure and epistemic (in)equity

Brittany Amell and Katja Thieme

This presentation is part of a broader project which examines the friction early career researchers encounter between creating vs. valuing non-traditional research. We pay particular attention to the consequences of this friction when it is referred to as "failure." Failure is often presented as either something to avoid or an opportunity to try again (Brien et al., 2012). Failure can be understood as a concept (Brien et al., 2012), a feeling (Walsh, 2019; Werry & O'Gorman, 2012), a pedagogy (Carr & Micciche 2020; Graham, 2019), intervention (Amell, 2022; Burford, 2017), and as a way of being (Halberstam, 2011; Johnson, 2015). Failure can also be grasped through the concept of uptake. If the antonym of scholarly failure is scholarly success, and if scholarly success includes being taken up in a way that creates feelings of being welcome and of having one's work accepted (Tardy, 2016), this raises the question of what scholarly failure and the absence of uptake reveals about scholarly belonging and the potential costs associated with this belonging (Ahmed, 2012; Denny, 2010). In this presentation we conduct a rhetorical genre analysis of a corpus of 'shadow CVs'—loosely defined as dossiers that focus on failures, missed opportunities, and rejections. We ask: (1) How are experiences of failure conceptualised and recontextualised through other genres such as the shadow CV? (2) What do shadow CVs reveal about academic social practices, particularly with regards to maintaining or subverting the status quo? We argue that understanding how failure figures in researchers' narratives represents a critical and necessary element in identifying alternative measures, practices, and infrastructures that are required to sustain non-traditional research.

(Continued)

Tracing Transfer: Preliminary Results of a Longitudinal Study of Teaching FYW for Transfer

Mark Blaauw-Hara, he/him, Sarah Seeley, she/her, Amelie Desroches, she/her, Sabeen El Mougabatt, she/her, Shona Goodkin, she/her, Amber Richardson, she/he

In 2020, the University of Toronto Mississauga began offering a required first-year writing (FYW) course intended to teach transferable knowledge on which students could build discipline-specific writing skills. Studies in other countries have explored the importance and difficulties of teaching FYW for transfer (Driscoll et al., 2020; Wardle, 2009; Wolfe et al., 2014; Yancey et al., 2014), yet a required FYW course is relatively new to the Canadian university system and remains under-researched.

In 2022, we began a four-year study wherein a cross-disciplinary group of students is interviewed each semester about the writing in their degree programs and how FYW has supported their disciplinary writing journeys. Since year two of this study coincided with the rise of generative AI technologies, we have also integrated a focus on human-computer interactions. A crucial part of the study methodology is the involvement of undergraduates as research partners who not only interview the study participants but also participate in coding and analysis of the data.

This research presentation will discuss the research methodology and report preliminary results from the first two years of the study. The presenters include the two faculty PIs as well as the four current undergraduate members of the researcher team. The presentation will be of value to conference attendees who are interested in (1) teaching for transfer, (2) developing research designs integrating students as partners, (3) learning student-centred insights into how writing studies might adapt to contemporary technological advances.

Empowering EAL students' voices through arts-based writing

Eunhee Buettner, she/her, and Sreemali Herath, she/her

In recent years, there has been a large body of research that critiques the teaching and assessing plurilingual students' writing using approaches adopted to teach and assess native speakers (Payant, 2020; Van Viegen & Zappa-Hollman, 2019; Xu, Zheng, & Braund, 2023). Contrary to these empirical findings, plurilingual students speaking English as an Additional Language (EAL) continue to be taught and assessed using monolingual approaches that overlook the rich linguistic repertoires they bring to the classroom. Most often, these deficit practices result in the failure to leverage on students' multilingual resources that can enhance language learning and the overall educational experiences for plurilingual learners.

Informed by the plurilingual turn in applied linguistics (May, 2014; Payant & Galante, 2022), this presentation focuses on supporting plurilingual students to articulate their voice through arts-based writing. We draw in data from a longitudinal study we carried out with ten K-12 English as an Additional Language teachers who participated in the TEAL Manitoba's EAL Student Showcase—an arts-based writing programme that invites submissions from EAL students from across the province of Manitoba. Through a series of conversations that take place over the school year, we aim to understand 1. how K-12 teachers implement arts-based writing in their classes, 2. the support they provide their learners to articulate their voices, 3. how culturally and linguistically diverse students articulate their identities through arts-based?; and, 4. the potential of arts-based writing in supporting culturally and linguistically diverse learners to express themselves.

We aim to push mainstream debates about second language writing and highlight the urgency to adopt asset-based and plurilingual pedagogies and instructional practices that can foster inclusivity and empower EAL students' repertoires.

Sustaining Creative Inquiry: Graduate Student Writing Support at a Canadian Art & Design University

Leah Burns, she/her, Heather Fitzgerald, she/her, and Sara Ostenton, she/her

Under the broad banner of academic writing in higher education, arts and design is one of the more under-researched (inter)disciplinary areas (Lockheart, 2018; Patridge et al., 2012). Though there has been a recent uptick in attention paid to the role of graduate writing support at post-secondary institutions in Canada (e.g., Gagné et al., 2023; Handford et al., 2021; Stouck & Walter, 2020; Tremblay-Wragg et al., 2021), little work – empirical or otherwise – has focused on the potential and limitations of such support at Arts-focused institutions. Even more specifically, there have been few, if any, attempts to better understand the Canadian landscape of graduate writing support at Arts-focused institutions, or the role of writing centres therein. How do we motivate art and design students to engage with writing as a means for enhancing their creative practice rather than perceiving it as an academic burden? In this presentation, we share perspectives on providing graduate writing support at a Canadian art and design institution, including the importance of framing writing not only as a means for communicating about research but also as medium of inquiry that sustains creative exploration and representation. As we consider the role of our writing centre at supporting the diverse population of graduate students at our institution, we delineate a potential research agenda for Canadian researchers and forward recommendations for ethical and effective discipline-specific practice. We conclude our talk with questions for consideration by the audience regarding the pros and cons of broad-based versus discipline-specific writing support at the graduate level.

Fostering Equity and Inclusion through Graduate Writing: Strategies, Challenges, Imaginings (Roundtable)

Fiona Coll, she/her, Katie Fry, she/her, Nadine Fladd, she/her, Donetta Hines, she/her/elle/ella, Yvonne Hung, she/her, Keith O'Regan, he/him

Students are enrolling in graduate programs in greater numbers than ever, bringing increasingly diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds to those programs. Recent research into the graduate-student experience has linked overall student success with self-reported confidence levels in scholarly-writing competencies, especially for students in historically excluded demographics (Chakraverty 2022; Acker and Haque 2015; Berdanier and Zerbe 2018; Hradsky et al 2022). Graduate writing-skill development, in other words, seems to be fundamental to equitable, inclusive student learning. At the same time, graduate writing support is often unevenly distributed across institutional units, priorities, and budget sheets, leaving nascent its emancipatory pedagogical possibilities.

This roundtable takes as its starting point the idea that graduate writing is an under-recognized site for fostering institutional equity and inclusion. To develop some contours of this discussion, six graduate-writing practitioners will each contribute an example of equity-enabling writing in action, then reflect on the limits or challenges also apparent in that example. <Presenter 1> will describe her negotiation of the tensions inherent in teaching graduate students the language norms that will enable them to succeed, despite her knowing that these norms perpetuate oppressive, colonial forms of expression. <Presenter 2> will explain how writing assessment imposes a limit on the anti-racist, agency-building impact of her graduate student programming. <Presenter 3> (McGill) will share the benefits and drawbacks of a sustainability-themed thesis-writing program intentionally situated outside of departmental cultures. <Presenter 4> will offer a complicated account of a graduate-writing framework that centers neurodivergent experiences. <Presenter 5> will discuss how her writing centre works with Indigenous students whose relationship to standard written English may be fraught with pain and alienation. <Presenter 6> will explore how the pandemic precipitated a productive rethinking of presuppositions that inadvertently occluded some graduate voices from writing communities intended to support them.

L2 Writing in Canada: Current Trends and Future Directions

James Corcoran, he/him, Joel Heng Hartse, and Ismaeil Fazel, he/him

Second language writing emerged as a field or sub-discipline in the United States at the nexus of the fields of rhetoric and composition (the name of the academic discipline whose members most often teach what is called “college writing”), applied linguistics, and TESOL, whose members often teach second language (L2) writing under the labels of EAP, ESP, or ESL. While L2 writing is more or less a discernible field of study in the US, theory, research, and practice about it is less clearly defined in Canada. Further, although Canada has been a home to a number of important scholars in this area, there has yet to be a comprehensive overview of this important field in Canada, and many questions remain: Where do its boundaries begin and end? What scholarship is occurring under this banner? What innovative pedagogical approaches exist in the field? Who is doing this work, and do they view themselves as L2 writing researchers and/or practitioners? How might we best understand the liminal space(s) between L2 writing and English for academic purposes? The 2023 special issue of *TESL Canada Journal* sought to explicitly address L2 writing as a construct, a discipline, and an area of research, practice, and teaching in the Canadian context, while bringing to the fore cutting-edge research and pedagogy that fall under the potentially contested, dynamic, and fluid label L2 Writing. In this presentation, the editors provide an overview of the special issue, introducing some of the contributions and contributors of articles therein, and invite discussion about current trends and future directions for the field.

An "Exercise in Avoiding Red Flags": How Medical Students Approach CaRMS Personal Statements

Michael Cournoyea, he/him, and Boba Samuels, she/her

Personal statements provide applicants to academic programs with an opportunity to create compelling narratives that supplement their portfolios. Writing such statements, however, is often associated with anxiety and uncertainty. Our research explores how final year medical students writing personal statements for the Canadian Resident Matching Service (CaRMS) approach this high-stakes task to demonstrate their experience, skills, and fit to a specialty in response to program-specific prompts. The first phase of our research rendered a genre analysis identifying the typical structures and rhetorical moves made within CaRMS personal statements. We report now on the second phase of the project: semi-structured interviews with 12 medical students during the writing of their statements and then after the CaRMS Match. These interviews examined students’ perspectives on the genre, their decisions to include certain moves, and how they prepared these statements. Together, the two phases of research provide an opportunity to explore the role of personal statements in developing professional identities and how writing pedagogies may support students writing in these or similar persuasive genres.

Genre analyses of personal statements have been conducted in the context of medical school admissions (Ding, 2007, Wright, 2015) and medical residencies in the United States (Barton et al., 2004; Chandran et al, 2020; Osman et al, 2015; Zhang et al., 2019). No similar work has been published about Canadian residency statements. In recent years, concerns about mental health self-disclosure in medical programs (Aggarwal et al, 2020; Hauer & Hung, 2022) and gender bias in residency personal statements (Babel et al, 2019; Demzik et al, 2021) have highlighted the complexity of such statements. We highlight unexpected perceptions of this obscure genre, identify themes from our analyses, and consider how generative AI technologies are likely to disrupt the genre of personal statements and writing instruction more broadly.

(Continued)

“I’m not worried about robots taking over the world, I guess I’m worried about people”: Emoting, Teaching, and Learning with Generative AI

Michael Cournoyea, he/him, and Sarah Seeley, she/her

Our project responds to the sweeping uncertainties and anxieties across higher education caused by generative AI technologies (genAI). These technologies are evolving rapidly and being adopted widely, while educational institutions increasingly debate their effective and illicit uses. Many educators feel frustrated that students are using genAI indiscriminately. Some have used them to demonstrate the need to act (e.g., Cotton et al., 2023). Others have expressed curiosity, enthusiasm, and a willingness to adapt to new technological challenges (e.g., Cooper, 2023; Denny et al., 2023; Dobrin, 2023). Whether it is the ethical dimensions of modeling human emotions within these technologies or the authentic emotional reactions to these technologies, emotionality is at the centre of these conversations.

Our research presentation will highlight how university instructors have responded to genAI: their emotional responses and visions of the pedagogical future. Drawing on ongoing semi-structured interviews with multi-disciplinary faculty and sessional instructors at the University of Toronto Mississauga (in writing studies, communications, computer science, and geology), we plan to outline their perceptions of shifting pedagogical responsibility, and the associated ethical implications, arising from the broad availability of genAI. Faculty and student sentiments towards genAI have largely been gauged through surveys, rather than interviews (e.g., Amani et al., 2023; Kiryakova & Angelova, 2023; Petricini et al., 2023). Our interviews have already uncovered a surprising diversity of perspectives, ranging from excitement to dread. Some have noted their concerns about the environmental sustainability and hidden labour of Big Tech, the hypocrisy of academic integrity when Large Language Models are trained on vast corpuses of publicly available text, and the challenges of precarious instructors compelled to rethink coursework. Our project contributes to emergent conversations about genAI in higher education. It is relevant to those who teach with various written assessments and those worried about the future of writing pedagogy.

Writing Transfer in an AI World

Chris Eaton, he/him, and Erin Vearncombe, she/her, and Kaitlyn Harris, she/her

The sudden and prominent influence of generative AI in writing classrooms has significant implications for writing pedagogies. How learners learn to write and adapt their writing for new contexts has long been a focus for writing studies, particularly research focused on writing transfer (e.g., Moore, 2017; Driscoll et al., 2020; Yancey et al., 2014). AI tools have added another layer to how learners can acquire writing-related knowledge and repurpose that knowledge for other writing situations. The influence of digital tools is not new in writing studies (citation generators, Grammarly, etc. have existed for years), but generative AI has taken this influence to a new level.

Given AI’s influence, how can writing instructors who teach for transfer ensure that students are acquiring the requisite writing knowledge to repurpose this knowledge in other contexts? What skills do students need to properly adapt their writing skills to new contexts that may require them to use AI tools? So far, little information is available about any of these large questions. Some scholarship has explored the potential AI uses for academic writers, from brainstorming and revision (Lingard, 2023; Ranade, 2023), to research support (Holmes et al., 2019), to generating multiple versions of a genre (Mollick & Mollick, 2023), and for feedback (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015; Cope et al., 2021). However, research on writing transfer in an AI environment is still developing.

This project aimed to contribute to this early conversation. This presentation reports on a grounded theory research (Breckenridge et al., 2014; Charmaz, 2017) with 35 learners at a university in Ontario. These learners were former learners from my first-year writing class. I will present results about how learners transferred prior knowledge about writing processes to their work with generative AI tools. I will highlight the writing skillsets writers can develop to

critically use AI as part of their writing processes. The goal is to not just demonstrate particular writing competencies but rather to open a conversation about potential ways these skillsets and mindsets can be taught to meet an AI-mediated pedagogical landscape.

Armed-conflict and displacement: the role of writing in sustaining and (re)building identities

Jennifer Chinenye Emelife, she/her

Stories have been argued to create safe spaces, particularly for young people in uncertain situations caused by natural disasters, armed conflict, forced displacement, or poverty (McAdam et al., 2023). This research, informed by critical and decolonial frameworks, argues for the adoption of stories as a mode of inquiry within a critical storytelling methodology in research with displaced youth in global south context, particularly Nigeria. This is important because persons in the context of displacement confront issues of conflictual citizenship and identities. For those from the global south, the problem is more pronounced as they deal with not only the issue of being displaced but with problems associated with racism and discrimination. Because critical storytelling methodology views stories as modes of inquiry, it acknowledges that relationships and contexts influence how stories are created, shared, transmitted, and remembered. Furthermore, by emphasizing particularity, complexity, and relationality, storytelling as methodology has the power to subvert prevailing narratives and expose a number of opposing viewpoints (Chazan and Baldwin, 2021, p.78).

This presentation will show examples of how (writing) stories can be used as a methodology in research with displaced youth from Nigeria, Egypt and Syria as a counternarrative to deficit representation of displaced and/or refugee youth.

I think that this presentation is significant to the association as it studies the place of writing as an act of resistance in building a sustainable future for the displaced in an unstable world that continues to otherize and marginalize them.

Inclusive Teaching of Writing: Ten Characteristics and More Questions about Sustainable Practice (Workshop)

Laila Ferreira, she/her, Rebecca Carruthers Den Hoed, she/her, Jennifer Walsh Marr, she/her, Katja Thieme, she/her/they/them

While writing as a tool for learning and assessment is central to university teaching, its application can be fraught with difficulties that negatively impact student experience, learning, and well-being. Research in writing pedagogy calls for richer, more inclusive approaches to teaching writing and for more critical views of writing histories and ideologies (e.g., Condon & Young, 2016; Inoue, 2019; Martinez, 2020; currie & Hubrig, 2022). Inclusive writing instruction necessitates a comprehensive and ongoing conversation about what sustainable practices of such instruction might involve across Canadian universities.

The team of facilitators for this proposed workshop represent a working group of UBC writing and language faculty who have developed a conceptual framework that includes ten characteristics of inclusive writing pedagogy. These characteristics are ones that guide our own practice: 1. Indigenous ways of knowing and decolonization, 2. critical engagement, 3. compassion, 4. transparency, 5. ethics and power, 6. authenticity, 7. multiplicity and diversity, 8. accessibility, 9. agency and voice, and 10. belonging.

This workshop serves two purposes: to audit the sustainability of our conceptual framework and to inquire if it aligns with current practices in other classrooms and institutions in Canada. Through stages of guided discussion, the workshop will:

- Introduce participants to a working definition of inclusive writing instruction and our ten characteristics
- Invite participants to share how they mobilize inclusive writing instruction in their own classrooms.
- Explore how these practices align with or challenge our framework
- Envision strategies that might sustain inclusive writing studies into the future

Through this workshop we hope to offer participants and facilitators alike a forum to reflect on our inclusive writing pedagogies and the obstacles and opportunities we face to make them sustainable in the long term.

Counteracting Deskilling in Students' Use of ChatGPT (Workshop)

Jane Freeman, she/her

The activities of this workshop will be guided by questions raised by Prof. Ursula Franklin in her work on the social impact of technology and applied in this context to students' uses of ChatGPT in academic writing. Together we will address the following questions: What specific skills do students need/cultivate when using ChatGPT and what needed skills are potentially not developed because of the use of this new technology? We will consider a range of specific types of writing assignments/tasks (such as generating reading lists, summarizing, essay writing, etc.) the specific purposes of those tasks in terms of intended skill development, the ways in which use of ChatGPT may support or prevent that development, and ways we as teachers can work to counteract the deskilling that may occur as a consequence of students' use of generative AI. The goal of the workshop is to foster greater metacognitive awareness of the ways in which use of generative AI in academic writing can support or prevent the very sorts of skill development students came to university to cultivate.

Navigating Writing Support for Graduate Students in the Age of AI: Faculty Perspectives (Roundtable)

Antoinette Gagné, she/her, Sreemali Herath, she/her, Elena Danilina, she/her, Jade Kim, she/her, Victorina Baxan, she/her, Phoebe Kang, she/her, Wenyangzi Shi, she/her

This panel brings together the voices of seven educators working with plurilingual graduate students in Canadian universities. Set against larger debates on artificial intelligence (AI) and its revolutionizing impact on higher education (Mallow, 2023), they engage in a critical discussion about how AI is shaping graduate writing and how they navigate the writing support for their students. With the availability of generative AI tools, such as ChatGPT, university educators have raised concerns about the ethical and pedagogical implications of using AI-mediated writing support in university courses (Cope & Kalantzis, 2023). While universities have started creating policies and resources to address some of these concerns, few resources offer support for students to reflect critically on AI-generated writing assessing AI content for hegemonic views and bias (Bender et al., 2021). Moreover, there is little discussion about how AI can be utilized in ethical ways to support plurilingual students struggling with academic writing.

Drawing from their teaching contexts, the presenters talk about 1) how the writing support they provide their students has changed with the emergence of AI tools, 2) aspects of AI-mediated writing that concern them and 3) promising practices for supporting plurilingual graduate writers through the use of AI. Conceptually, our discussion is informed by positive psychology (Dewaele & Afawazan, 2018). Viewing academic writing from an affective lens helps to broaden our understanding of academic writing and the subjective realities of students and professors (White, 2018). We use emotion labour and feeling rules (Benesch, 2018) as tools of agency to explore areas for resistance and change in the support we provide our students.

This panel aims to generate an open conversation among faculty working with graduate students about the possibilities and challenges of AI in academic writing and the support for our plurilingual students.

Belonging in the Library: A mini-assignment for first-year writing courses (Presentation of innovative approach to teaching)

Loren Gaudet, she/her

UVic's first year WAC course, ATWP 135, provides students with an introduction to using the library. For example, UVic Library offers 50-minute tutorials in the library as part of class instruction. However, librarians consistently report that students are reluctant to seek help from librarians because they assume that their questions are not important enough (M. Huculak, Personal Communication, September 18 2023). I have created a low-stakes writing assignment that incentivizes students contacting a librarian and seeking help as part of their scaffolded research project.

Creating a sense of belonging is a crucial element of UVic's Strategic Plan, and research has shown that students who use the library have a greater sense of belonging and retention at the university (Scoulas, 2021; Stemmer & Mahan, 2016; Clink, 2016; Soria, Fransen & Nackerud, 2013). While there are documented instances of first-year composition classes collaborating with libraries to build skills (Walsh et al. 2018; Smith & Brown 2011), these approaches require extensive institutional and financial support not currently available at UVic. Other published collaborations detail relationships between writing centres and libraries (Meglan & Drexler 2020). However, this assumes that students will take the initiative to seek out support in the library or the Writing Centre.

In this presentation on teaching strategies, I describe low-stakes assignment, "Belonging in the Library," which asks students to seek out a librarian and reflect on this process. Data from these assignments provide a clear sense of which tools the students felt comfortable using and offers a narrative description of their experience accessing services. I created this assignment to encourage students to use the library, but I also want to gather evidence to assess whether or not this is a useful assignment that should be then scaled up for all sections of ATWP 135 (of which there are anywhere from 10-15 per term). In this way, I also seek feedback and suggestions from colleagues at CASDW who might offer suggestions on how to make this a sustainable and ongoing practice across a large scale.

Predatory publishing as a pedagogical problem: the uneasy globalization of sources used by novice academic writers (Innovative approach to teaching or assessment)

Joel Heng Hartse, Ismaeil Fazel, he/him, and Bong-gi Sohn

Over the last few decades, there has been an explosion of open access publishing, potentially allowing for greater dissemination of scholarly research and the possibility of "democratizing publishing" (Canagarajah, 2022). However, the ease with which freely available open access journal platforms has allowed so-called "predatory" publishers (those who charge high fees and engage in questionable peer review practices) to publish low-quality work by scholars around the world whose careers depend on "international" publications in English. While the problems this poses for marginalized and novice scholars has been discussed at length (e.g., author, 2018, 2022; Habibie & Fazel, 2023), there has yet been little discussion among teachers and scholars of academic writing about how the explosion of potentially low-quality academic publishing may affect novice academic writers. It is becoming increasingly clear that student writers often lack the training to distinguish "legitimate" from "non-legitimate" scholarly sources, and furthermore, that attempts to distinguish these further leads to dilemmas of marginaliation. and geopolitical inequality in academia.

This presentation looks at the global proliferation of what I call “lower-quality regional open access journals” (LQROAJs) from an academic discourse socialization (Duff, 2010) perspective. In it, I take the position that the question of LQROAJs’ legitimacy cannot be understood outside questions of academic discourse socialization, and that the explosion of global open-access publication must be understood in relation to the academic socialization and pedagogies of source use and citation of undergraduate and graduate students as well as novice scholars. I reflect on ten years of experience as an instructor and advisor to both first and second language-using English undergraduate and graduate students, exploring students’ selection of sources and citation practices. I argue that novice undergraduate and graduate students cannot be expected to distinguish ‘illegitimate’ international open-access sources from those more widely accepted in a given disciplinary community without explicit instruction and mentorship. I also discuss the paradoxical relationship between the expressed desire for internationalization and promotion of marginalized voices in disciplines like applied linguistics and writing studies on the one hand with socialization into dominant academic discourses on the other.

Collaborative Modelling: Close Reading Workshops for Writing-intensive Courses (workshop)

Kala Hirtle, she/her, and Vanessa Lent, she/her

Close reading is a skill that is often asked of students taking writing-requirement courses. While not explicitly a writing skill, it is a deeply integrated component of meeting the assignment requirements and therefore is often a skill students come seeking help for in Writing Centre appointments. Students often come with a wide range of experiences with close reading and, consequently, Writing Centre advisors must often find ways to model and teach this skill explicitly. The varied learning experiences of students in first- and second-year courses due to the COVID pandemic have further increased potential gaps in close reading and writing strategies. Further, international students, domestic EAL students, and other multilingual students often bring cultural frames and counter-stories that may require a more complex and deep level of collaborative modeling.

The Writing Centre [university redacted] has addressed the need for reading skill development by offering supplemental classes on close reading for writing-requirement courses. These classes are tailored to the needs of each course and model close reading using course materials. The classes then offer the students the opportunity to practice their close reading skills in a low-stakes setting (through Padlet) that encourages collaboration and offers immediate and targeted feedback from Writing Centre advisors. The success of these close reading workshops has highlighted the strengths of recognizing the interconnectedness of reading and writing skills. Further, these workshops offer a generative space for students from all backgrounds to attain an equal level of reading and writing skills.

This interactive workshop will provide background into the development of our close reading workshop, demonstrate how the process works, and encourage participants to try out the process for themselves. Participants will leave with a series of strategies for helping students from a wide range of backgrounds harness their multiple perspectives within the close reading process.

Reckoning and Reconciliation: The Strengths and Weaknesses of Writing Studies in Canada (Presentation of innovative approach to teaching or assessment)

Sara Humphreys and Jason Collins

John Swales coined the term “occluded genres” in 1996 to describe academic genres that inform and even produce academic identities (such as reference letters).(1) At the 2023 CASDW plenary address, Dr. Katja Thieme explained the problematic social actions occluded academic genres perform, such as silencing debate. Building on Thieme’s

work, we argue that the occlusion of writing studies in Canada has been a quiet, systemic means to reinforce privilege and drive marginalization. Identity, the need to be a “respected and valued member of a group,” is fundamental to the postsecondary experience.(2) Yet, for many multiply-marginalized students in postsecondary contexts, identity and belonging remain elusive. (3) (4) For example, many multilingual international students face specific barriers in their postsecondary education pursuits that are often the result of monolingual pedagogical approaches. (5)

At the 2021 CASDW Annual Conference, keynote speaker, Dr. Vershawn Ashanti Young, noted that forms of Canadian writing instruction further Canadian Exceptionalism, in part, by stereotyping (or perhaps scapegoating) marginalized, multilingual students – particularly Chinese students – as the figureheads of weak writing. In a 2020 interview, Dr. Jay Dolmage noted that the persistent under-resourcing and deprofessionalizing of Canadian writing instruction and writing centres points to systemic xenophobia in the academy. Often academic writing in Canada is mostly or entirely focused on meeting a standard of apparent academic excellence that erases Indigenous identity. (6)

Yet, the strength of current pedagogical modes of writing instruction is the ability to build belonging in the classroom. (7) By teaching students to use writing as a form of empowerment rather than academic writing serving as a colonial partner, writing scholars (primarily in the U.S.) have shown the strength of writing instruction to give students agency and voice. (8) Our goal is to provide strategic resources and tools that instructors and writing support staff can use to build belonging in their classrooms. For example, portfolio assessments demonstrate to postsecondary administrators (such as Chairs and Deans) the crucial role writing studies praxes plays in student academic success.

Antiracist and Anti-oppressive Writing Pedagogy for Multilingual Students

Xiangying Huo, she/her

Multilingual students are often disadvantaged when their writing proficiency is judged against hegemonic standard norm with monolingual English as the frame of reference. Such deficiency models other linguistically minoritized students and devalue their languages leading to linguisticism which perpetuates inequality and negative stereotypes in writing classrooms.

The liberatory, anti-racist, anti-oppressive writing pedagogy was implemented at a major university in Ontario. Qualitative methods were employed, including students’ academic journal entries, reflections, and instructor feedback. The study shows the great impact of the application of this antiracist writing pedagogy (e.g., multimodality—multiple means of representation and expression, cultural responsiveness, constant encouragement, high motivation, personalized feedback, learner autonomy, humanistic teaching, as well as the instructor’s focus on sharpening learners’ critical perspectives and raising critical contrastive rhetorical awareness) to empower students. This emancipatory approach has dramatically improved learner confidence and satisfaction, enhanced their writing and critical thinking skills, as well as developing agency, identity, academic voice, a greater sense of belonging, and inclusive transformation.

There are some pedagogical implications to inform future writing pedagogy and sustainability: implementing the critical writing pedagogy to problematize power and injustice, building equitable and reciprocal dialogues between writing instructors and student writers, providing customized feedback, developing students’ authentic voices, training writing instructors’ intercultural competence and culturally responsive teaching skills, and treating multilingual students’ languages as assets instead of deficiencies. By attending this presentation, participants will gain a good understanding of the antiracist writing pedagogy, better support multilingual students by stressing diversity and inclusion, and think about alternative pedagogies from grammar to critical thinking, from skills to communication, “from a hierarchical approach” to “a more collaborative approach,” from monolithic English to

pluralism of English, from dichotomized pedagogy to pluralized pedagogy (Canagarajah & Said, 2010, p. 163), and thus to teach writing in a more inclusive, democratic, and ethical way.

Gender, Life Writing, Vulnerability: Violence and Difference in the Post-Secondary Classroom (Presentation of innovative approach to teaching or assessment)

Melissa Jacques, she/her/they/them

In June 2023, Dr. Katy Fulfer, a Canadian philosophy professor at the University of Waterloo, was physically assaulted in front her class by a recent graduate of the university, as were the two students who attempted to defend her. The assailant was not a member of the class, nor had he ever been enrolled in either of the programs for which the course was cross-listed: Philosophy and Gender and Justice Studies. Witnesses were clear that both the professor and the course were the intended targets of this violence. University presidents across Canada identified the attack as a hate crime, expressing their continued support for the goals of equality and diversity on Canadian campuses even as they cautioned us against giving into fear.

In my presentation, I will explore the “real life” vulnerabilities and strengths specific to teaching life writing—as both a practice and an academic field—within gender and sexuality studies. I want to think about the ways in which we might meet the threat of violence without issuing such threats ourselves, and about the ways in which we might encourage students to represent and share their personal experiences with others across a range of differences. Without making the mistake of guaranteeing a “safe space” (something the attack on Dr. Fulfer exposes as a false promise), I want to focus on the following question: How we might encourage vulnerability within the writing classroom even as we remain cognizant of the threats, real and imagined, that discourage us from acts of “becoming with” others both like and different from ourselves? I will approach this question and the concerns it addresses through gender and affect theory as well as theories and rhetorics of life writing that foreground these concerns.

Navigating Emotions and Challenges: Impact of GenAI on First-Year Writing Instructors

Phoebe Kang, she/her, and Amanda Paxton, she/her

In this research presentation, we plan to share the preliminary findings from a study we are currently conducting. The study examines the emotional impact of the tumultuous change and potential crisis posed by the impact of generative AI (gen AI) on instructors of first-year writing courses in Ontario Universities. The impacts of genAI have been felt across postsecondary campuses, but with widely varying implications from discipline to discipline. With that in mind, this study focuses solely on genAI’s affective effects on professors of first-year writing courses. Since genAI’s primary utility is the production of fluent prose, its use or abuse in composition courses poses a specific set of challenges to instructors who are already faced with the demands of marking-intensive, often high-enrollment classes. The added cognitive load of adapting to the reality of genAI and demonstrating the value of writing courses when chatbots and paraphrasing tools are available in abundance warrants attention. The preliminary findings we will share are collected from semi-structured interviews that we are currently conducting with first-year writing instructors in select Ontario universities. The research seeks to answer the following questions:

- What are the emotional responses of first-year composition instructors to the availability of genAI?
- How does students’ potential use of genAI influence the time spent on course planning and assessment, and how does it impact the emotional/cognitive load of those tasks?
- How do first-year composition instructors describe their level of job satisfaction and engagement since the appearance of ChatGPT compared to before its introduction?

The study aims to help guide institutions and departments in tailoring responses to faculty needs in the wake of genAI. This presentation invites discussions on the evolving landscape of teaching writing amidst the emergence of genAI tools.

Shifting the Paradigm of School-Based Writing Instruction to Seed Civic Possibilities: Teacher Candidates Learning Digital Multimodal Composing Through Journalistic Learning

Celeste Kirsh, she/her

We are in the midst of a digital revolution and school-based writing practices must catch up to the ways that students compose outside of the classroom. Digital multimodal composing allows people to create and share content with massive audiences and can involve podcasting, blogging, creating videos, or crafting memes (Freedman et al., 2016). While scholars are contributing important research on how teachers can adopt digital multimodal forms of writing (see Turner & Hicks, 2011; Rowsell & Decoste, 2012; Lenters, 2018), journalistic learning—when journalism is used pedagogically—as a digital composing intervention has not received scholarly focus. This paper shares empirical research from a qualitative doctoral project that is guided by critical practitioner inquiry. In this project, teacher candidates (TC) engaged with journalistically-inspired digital multimodal composing as part of their English teaching methods course and then reflected, both in-class and with follow up one-on-one interviews, about their experiences and perceptions of journalistic writing and digital composing. Through the words of TCs, I make a case that it is not enough to simply include more digital writing experiences in the classroom, we have to reimagine the purpose and function of school-based writing and that journalistic learning can make this possible. At a time when generative AI makes the mechanical process of writing more accessible, teachers need to shift towards seeing writing as a form of thinking. Instead of mastering, for example, the hamburger paragraph structure, students can use writing to engage with different discourse communities and deeply explore how these communities use words and writing to see the world and address civic problems. If “curriculum is a design for social futures” (New London Group, 1996, p. 73), then teachers need more socially situated learning themselves to realize this future for their students. This project and this presentation aims to address this need.

Modeling sustainable collaboration between ESL instructors and writing centers: affordances and constraints

Ibtissem Knouzi, she/her, and Jacqueline Ng, she/her, virtual

Developing expertise in second language (L2) academic writing is a social activity (e.g., Bhowmik, 2017; Prior & Thorne, 2014) that requires effective and sustained collaboration of institutional services/agents in support of students as they negotiate the academic standards of postsecondary education (Maldoni, 2018). Institutional services, such as writing support centers (WSCs), can assist students acquire the language skills necessary to attain academic and social learning goals (Ma, 2018). However, such additional learning assistance is not widely acknowledged or utilized, and a concrete model that defines the potential role of WSCs and articulates mechanisms to integrate them in curriculum planning and course design is still lacking in the literature. This study addressed this gap by developing and evaluating a WSC-EAP model of collaboration for EAP students at a large Canadian English-medium university.

Drawing on multiple sources of data collected over two academic years, this study examined the affordances and constraints experienced by EAP students, WSC staff, and EAP course instructors in a collaborative project, which is designed to support multilingual first-year students adjust to the expectations of post-secondary academic practices by creating tools to: a) document the feedback provided to students who visited the WSC at different stages of developing a research inquiry report and b) streamline communication between WSC staff and EAP instructors to facilitate information exchange on EAP course learning outcomes, major assignment requirements, and students' progress.

Interviews with three WSC staff and four EAP students as well as analyses of multiple drafts submitted by 30 EAP students before and after visiting the WSC and students' feedback summaries provided invaluable insights on the participants' perspectives on the successes and limitations of the WSC-EAP collaboration. The findings and implications for such collaboration will be discussed to offer EAP instructors pedagogical implications to support multilingual students' L2 learning and academic success.

How we learned to write: Approaches from Lifespan Writing Development Research (workshop)

Dana Landry, she/her/they

I propose a workshop that uses approaches from Lifespan Writing Development Research to engage participants in telling their own stories of writing development through their lifespans. A second objective is to examine the possible utility of lifespan memoirs by writers who are experts in writing and discourse studies for Lifespan Writing Development work.

The Lifespan Writing Development Research group originated in 2016 in response to Charles Bazerman's call for longitudinal approaches to studying ways in which writers learned to write throughout their lifespans, from infancy to death. This call was taken up by Collaboration Chairs, Talinn Phillips and Ryan Dippre, who in the 8 years since have gathered research collaborators, organized and hosted conferences, meetings, work in progress sessions, and published two edited collections through the Writing Across the Curriculum Clearinghouse. Currently, they are editing a Lifespan Writing Research Series, the first of which is Bazerman's, *How I Became the Kind of Writer I Became: An Experiment in Autoethnography*. My memoir in progress, *Colouring with Pencil: How I learned to write (and teach writing)*, was included in the editors' proposal to WAC Clearinghouse, and I am in the process of finalizing my formal proposal.

The role of cultures in Professional and Technical Communication? An exploratory content analysis of the Journal of Business and Technical Communication

Wenbin Liu and Saul Carliner

Research background and purpose

With the advent of globalization starting in the 1980s and 1990s, culture came to play an increasingly important role in the work of technical communicators. In addition to communicating with global audiences (Hoft, 1995), technical communicators increasingly worked with colleagues in other countries through arrangements like outsourcing (Thatcher & Evia, 2017) and with increasingly diverse colleagues in their own organizations with general diversification of the population and workforce (Jones, Moore, & Walton, 2016). Professionals in the field must adeptly navigate these cultural landscapes and, as a result, need to develop cultural competence in both communicating with their audiences and interacting with work colleagues. Cultural competence is a set of cognitions, behaviors, and attitudes required to achieve on-the-job success when faced with different values, ideologies, and behaviors. The peer-reviewed literature on technical communication can play an important role in addressing the cultural competence needed by professional technical communicators. This presentation reports an exploratory content analysis of one such peer-reviewed publication to get a sense of the insights it might provide. The study is guided by these questions: To what extent does a peer-reviewed journal in technical communication address culture? What aspects of culture does it address? How do these articles define culture? Study it?

Methodology

Because this was an exploratory study, we first chose one journal to study to determine the feasibility of continuing: one of the six top journals identified in professional and technical communication (Lowry, Humpherys, Malwitz, &

Nix, 2007). When doing so, we would limit the review to peer-reviewed articles. Editorials, book reviews, and other non-reviewed content would not be included. Keeping with the exploratory nature, we would only review the articles published over a 5-year period. Each article was read, abstracted, and characteristics tracked including: a) the types of culture covered in the article such as national, organizational, and occupational cultures; b) the roles culture played in the study, such as the primary focus or the secondary one; and c) the research methods used such as ethnography, observation, interviews, or discourse analysis. Findings were analyzed to identify recurring themes and reported based on pattern strength, categorized as strong pattern (appearing in over 50% of the articles), weak pattern (33%-49%), interesting pattern (10%-32%), and noteworthy pattern (lower than 10%).

Results

The journal studied was the Journal of Business and Technical Communication (JBTC) between 2015 and 2020, and yielded a sample of 89 articles. The most common types of culture covered included social culture, organizational culture, and national culture. The most common roles of culture were a) comparing study results among groups; b) providing explanations for study results; and c) limiting the generalizability and accuracy of studies. The most common means of studying cultural issues were qualitative, including case studies, literature reviews, and interviews.

Conclusions

As a source of guidance in helping professional technical communicators develop cultural competence, the peer-reviewed literature studied seems to have the most coverage of awareness and understanding of cultural differences, similarities, and influences. It also emphasizes the ability to work effectively with diverse cultural groups. However, it provides the least guidance on understanding how certain types of cultures can be shaped by technical communication practices. This study is admittedly limited by its exploratory nature but the results suggest expanding it to cover more years and more publications.

Prompting and Transforming AI-Generated Text: Towards an Ecological Framework for Mapping Intrapersonal and Contextual Constraints during the Research Writing Process

Stuart MacMillan, he/him

With use of generative-AI tools such as ChatGPT/GPT-4, Bard, and Webpilot becoming increasingly prevalent in research writing, there is a new urgency to understand factors that enable or constrain effective use of machine-generated text during the writing process. This issue is particularly pertinent in the context of academic and research writing courses because course designers need to ensure that such interactions lead to better writing products without undermining learning. From an ecological perspective, successful prompting and transformation of machine-generated text requires writers to perceive and act on the affordances of these tools and their outputs in a series of time-bound perception/action couplings—a process constrained by both contextual and intrapersonal factors. Ecological inquiry into research writing process, aligned closely with situativity research spurred from decades-old work by Lave and Wenger (1991), Hutchins (1996), and others, can delve more deeply into these factors. It views research writing—including instances of supportive human-AI interaction—as part of a dynamic and situated process that unfolds through ongoing interaction between agents and their material, technical, and social environments. Although a rich literature on “writing ecologies” has emerged over recent decades (for salient works, see Cooper, 1986; Syverson, 1999; Wardle & Roozen, 2012; Spinuzzi & Zachry, 2000), much remains to be learned about the ecological factors that constrain and enable productive interactions with AI tools. With the goal of laying the groundwork for more in-depth research, I present findings from the most recent ecological systems literature focused specifically on human-AI interactions in the service of writing. I also provide insights based on personal experience as a course lecturer incorporating generative-AI support in a graduate-level course on technical and research writing for engineers and computer scientists.

The Rhetoric of Rhetorical Genre Studies Research in Indigenous Contexts

Shurli Makmillen, she/her, in person

This research is part of the panel that discusses the relevance of Rhetorical Genre Studies to Sustainable Development Goals, in this case those aimed at reducing inequality (SDG 10) and “build[ing] effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels” (SDG 17).

RGS scholarship has now long demonstrated how genre understood as “social action” (Miller) and as only “stabilized for now” (Schryer) can illuminate genre shifts over time in response to subtle and not so subtle changes in situation, exigence and motive. The scholarly research article is a case in point. Malone, for example, uses RGT to demonstrate a departure from the Swalesian CARS structure that comes when researchers in community - university partnerships work to deconstruct the authority of the genre. Elsewhere, Makmillen and Riedlinger note genre shifts resulting from the participation in the genre by Indigenous scholars and the inclusion of Indigenous subject positioning. Both examples can be seen in light of the 2022 UNESCO Report that calls for more research of the kind that affirms knowledge as a coproduction with communities, and that draws heavily on Santos’s concept of “knowledge ecologies” and their call for “cognitive justice” in university research agendas. I will further explore this connection with a systematic analysis of the uptake of rhetorical genre theory in research on/in Indigenous contexts, including the extent to which it is embraced by Indigenous scholars themselves. Preliminary results show emerging patterns—using RGT, for example, to reinterpret archival genres to point out Indigenous agency (Giltrow; Makmillen; Taylor); and to recognize genres as sites of resistance to dominant European norms (Makmillen and Riedlinger; Pare). This presentation will explore how these rhetorics of research align (or not) with calls for equality, inclusivity, and accountability in research institutions.

Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy for Teaching Writing in a Multidisciplinary Sample of Canadian Faculty

Kim Mitchell, she/her

Background: Teacher self-efficacy can be defined as the confidence teachers hold about their individual and collective capacity to influence student learning. While many faculty assign and assess student writing as part of their course activities, they often perceive the act of writing as separate from rather than complementary to their teaching of subject matter content. This paper will report on the combined findings of two large survey studies of 385 faculty at Canadian universities, polytechnics and colleges. The purpose of the study was to assess faculty individual and collective self-efficacy for teaching writing.

Methods: Data was collected from faculty via an electronic survey distributed by email or social media (Twitter). Faculty responded to the Individual and Collective Self-Efficacy for Teaching Writing Scales. They also responded to open-ended questions asking them to relate how they felt about their abilities to guide student writing.

Results: Participants’ average age was 49.9 years with 14.5 years of teaching experience. Participants reported their individual self-efficacy for teaching writing at 77.2% while feeling that their departments as a whole were only 60% confident at teaching writing. Higher individual self-efficacy for teaching writing were found in faculty who were in combined research and teaching positions, PhD prepared, with prior formal education in teaching writing, and with 20 or more years of teaching experience. No statistically significant findings were observed with the Collective Self-Efficacy scale. From the qualitative survey data three themes were identified: 1) Blaming and lamenting; 2) Is teaching writing our responsibility? 3) Hopeful efforts and recognitions.

Conclusion: Overall, the data is rife with narratives of blaming students and institutions for student inability to write and faculty questioning their role as writing instructor. These narratives drown out the narratives of faculty who have a passion for teaching writing. Future research should focus on the development of formalized workshops to support

faculty teaching writing and changing their attitudes toward the developmental and disciplinary shared responsibility of writing instruction in higher education.

Sustainability Through Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Writing Courses and Undergraduate TA Education

(Presentation of innovative approach to teaching or assessment)

Srividya Natarajan, she/her

Writing programs in smaller institutions can extend their institutional reach and consolidate their academic relevance through innovative interdisciplinary collaboration. This presentation reports on a teaching innovation that involved the folding of Undergraduate Teaching Assistant (UTA) education into two senior Writing courses. Students in these courses engaged critically with readings on the teaching of writing, and were involved in practicum experiences as UTAs—in one case in a Year 1 Writing course, and in the other, in a Year 1 Disability Studies course. Given that undergraduate writing centre staff are trained through senior Writing courses in some institutions, a Writing course that prepares students to be UTAs is by no means a stretch, though the combination of pedagogic theory, content instruction, critical praxis, and cross-disciplinary relationship-building makes for complex course design and places high demands on both students and collaborating instructors. Such a course would harness for Writing some of the benefits to students, faculty, UTAs, and institutions that have been documented in the teaching and learning scholarship on UTA education in other disciplines (see, for instance, Karpenko & Schauz, 2017; Murray, 2015; Murray, 2022). Alongside initiatives that draw on an ethic of collaborativeness and on Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) and Writing in the Disciplines (WID) frameworks, the opportunities created for UTAs to engage in holistic, career-enhancing, experiential learning and to develop professional identity can raise the profile of Writing and contribute to its sustainability as a discipline.

Racialized graduate student experiences of unintentional plagiarism: Exploring de/colonization

Kelvin Quintyne, he/him, Arif Abu, he/him, Priscilla Tsuasam, she/her, Seitebaleng Dintoe, she/her, Constance Owusu, she/her, and Cecile Badenhorst, she/her

Unquestioned and institutionalized practices in academic contexts can work to support inequalities for students of colour. Ahmed (2012) shows how social inequities perpetuate if we are engaged in performance at the cost of real institutional change. At our institution, diversity work is well under way in the form of committees, policies and directives; but what practices of deeply embedded exclusion and inequities continue under the radar where historical colonialism continues to be practiced? In this paper, we explore plagiarism, particularly unintentional plagiarism, in relation to racialized graduate student experiences. Many cases of student plagiarism are not intentional, as Eaton (2021) recently and many other researchers have convincingly shown (Eaton & Christensen Hughes, 2022). Yet, when it comes to plagiarism, there is still an “overrepresentation of reporting among particular student groups including international students, students of colour, and those for whom English is an additional language” (Eaton, 2022, p. 6). Students may plagiarize unintentionally for a variety of reasons without intending to cheat (Chandrasoma, Thompson, & Pennycook, 2004). Also, what is meant by “plagiarism” is far from universal and depends on prior education experiences (Mott-Smith, et al., 2017).

We situate academic integrity and plagiarism within broader systems of “inequality regimes” (Acker, 2006, p. 443). Using critical autoethnography as a decolonizing methodology we, university educators and graduate students, explore our racialized experiences of plagiarism with our own voices and positionality. Experiences of plagiarism show how notions of deficit, particularly lack of language competence, and lack of knowledge about local academic cultural conventions create a racial gaze. This gaze categorizes and labels behaviours collectively, and individuals are sorted and judged through these filters. Although the issue at the forefront is plagiarism, the broader issue is one of

diversity, equity, inclusion and decolonization. We argue that these notions of deficit must be continually confronted to ensure that change happens.

“Small” Strategies for Introducing and Sustaining Linguistic Justice in Classroom Conversations (Presentation of innovative approach to teaching or assessment)

Craig Stensrud, he/him, and Moberley Luger, she/her

As Schreiber et al. recently observed, despite increased scholarship that attends to linguistic justice and plurilingualism, “writing classrooms and other campus spaces are still dominated by a deficit and racist perspective toward language-minoritized students.” Our previous work has promoted linguistic justice by aligning scholarly speaking with equity-focused writing pedagogies (ANONYMIZED, 2022), and our newest research expands our scope to address not only formal oral presentations but also classroom speaking practices more generally. The way students speak to one another in class—socially, in class discussions, in small group work—is an essential factor of the classroom climate, and research tells us that establishing the right classroom climate is crucial to student wellbeing and academic success (Pratt, 1991; Ewert-Bauer, 2022). Our presentation will explore how we can promote an equitable climate in our classes by foregrounding linguistic justice—that is, by attending to the diverse ways that students express themselves linguistically and to the barriers they face in doing so. Schreiber et al. remind us that while scholarly theorizations around linguistic justice are “robust,” we have work to do in implementing those theories in our writing classrooms—and we hope to show that a linguistic justice approach to classroom speaking can also help instructors implement anti-racist and accessible writing pedagogies. In our presentation, we propose some pragmatic ways to bring a linguistic justice approach to the live conversations taking place in our classrooms through what James Lang calls “Small Teaching”: “small but powerful modifications” that can be made immediately, flexibly, and on a practical scale. What small changes to the classroom environment will enable students with accents to feel confident in their voices, or allow students to feel that their multilingualism is valued rather than stigmatized? We will highlight reflection exercises and a short “Linguistic Positionality” assignment we have designed that attempt to bring student awareness to linguistic difference, the advantages of multilingualism, and the challenges of code-switching.

What ChatGPT Threatens and Enables

Tosh Tachino, he/him

As a part of the panel that discusses the relevance of RSG on SDGs, this presentation discusses the impact of ChatGPT as it relates to SDGs 8, 9, and 17. ChatGPT and other generative AI is probably the most significant technology in recent years to affect writing studies, and its impact has been widely discussed in public (Rudolph, Tan, & Tan, 2023). The technology is still too new and still too fast evolving to have any consensus on how to use it, how to manage it, how to regulate it, or how to guide its future development, but the proponents tout AI's potential to ease the tedium of writing, enhance the student's learning experience, and ease the teacher workload, while the critics fear its effect on plagiarism, human relationships, and unemployment, among others. These hopes and fears are both legitimate, and we need to continue public conversations about what to do with this technology because it will affect all of us, and each of us should have a say in forming a public consensus. This presentation seeks to clarify some of the issues in this debate by conducting a theoretical analysis of AI-generated text from a rhetorical genre perspective. “Writing” is not just about generating texts, and “writer” is not always the person who generated the text. Conceptual tools related to rhetorical genre studies (RGS) can show us what specific aspects of writing are affected by AI, how AI tools change the nature of social action that results from it, how our understanding of “writing” must change as a result, and what it may mean to study and teach writing in the near future.

What is, or might be, trans writing studies? Sustaining community through writing studies (Roundtable discussion)

Katja Thieme, she/her, Mary Ann Saunders, she/her, Andrew Legge, he/him, Jamie Takaoka, they/she/he, and Hillary Pimlott, she/her

Harriet Malinowitz's 1995 book, *Textual Orientations: Lesbian and Gay Communities and the Making of Discourse Communities*, sparked what Jonathan Alexander and David Wallace call "the queer turn in composition studies" (2009). Questions about queer writing pedagogies, queering writing classrooms, the nature of queer writing, and what might constitute queer writing studies continue to be explored. In these explorations, "trans" is often absent or receives passing mention. There is an assumption that "trans" is subsumed under the queer writing studies umbrella.

More broadly, the academy has witnessed the emergence of transgender studies, which both acknowledges its links to and distinguishes itself from queer studies. Heather Love writes, "Despite historical, methodological, and political overlaps, queer and transgender studies have not always traveled in tandem, and it is not clear, as these fields age, to what extent they should" (2014, p. 173). This emergence of a transgender studies distinct from queer studies suggests there might also be a need to sustain trans writing studies as distinct from queer writing studies. Assuming this to be the case, what might trans writing studies look like?

Certainly, there are hints of trans writing studies emerging and developing. It is visible, for example, in work by Jacques (2017), Patterson (2019), Thieme & Saunders (2019), Peitho's 2020 special issue on transgender rhetorics, Webster (2022), and Thieme, Saunders, & Ferreira (forthcoming). Our field is in the early stages of thinking about the possibilities of trans writing studies and we propose this roundtable presentation and discussion as a venue to explore these possibilities through the diversity of our work. Here, trans writing studies take the form of analyses of trans expression, studies of genres employed in trans politics, conceptualization of trans identities within professional and public discourses, and attention to language features that mark trans scholarship.

CONTRIBUTORS

< Co-presenters 1 and 2 >

In a set of co-authored projects, we pursue possibilities for trans writing studies through analysis of professional and disciplinary discourses. We attend to language features which serve to develop trans studies and help express trans positions. None are specifically or exclusively "trans," rather they invite—in a polysemous way—integration of trans perspectives and expression of trans experience. Among these are positionality, patterns of citation, and use of first-person authority and autoethnography. We are interested in how these features of language and aspects of research show up in the work of trans writers as well as how these writers talk about them, strategize with them, and reflect on their effects. Our work explores implications of this research for pedagogy when analyzing trans writing and presenting trans scholarship in classrooms of predominantly cisgender students.

< Presenter 3 >

The project highlighted here focuses on how the process of writing 'auto-biographies' can heal and grow the author and also create representation of the 'actualities' of the very personal, individual struggles experienced across transgender communities. It attempts to work through the idea of surviving suicidal ideation and attempts as processes that communicate potential social and political resistance to those who seek the eradication of trans people from public existence. This project thinks about this communicative process as a form of 'weak resistance' (Scott, 1990). The situation in which we find ourselves today, despite the constant attacks on our very existence, is one in which the communication of first-person narratives or 'auto-biographies' become key to establishing the content and connection across our ever-growing community of queer and trans siblings.

< Presenter 4 >

It has been well-established that trans and non-binary (TNB) people experience higher rates of mental distress when seeking healthcare due to negative interactions with healthcare providers (e.g., Blodgett et al., 2017; Rastogi, 2021). When the responsibility falls on healthcare providers (HCPs) to seek out resources on their own (e.g., Diamond, 2020), they often have neither access to nor knowledge of these resources. Through semi-structured interviews, this study explores how these excluded HCPs discursively construct and represent TNB patients in order to better understand the language HCPs use and what factors may influence these choices. Via a combined narrative and critical discourse analysis (Menard-Warwick, 2011; Reisigl & Wodak, 2001; Blackledge, 2005), this research found that cis-normative assumptions are quite present in language choices, especially around pronoun use and gender presentation.

< Presenter 5 >

This paper will examine the anti-trans discourses in the public sphere that reproduce negative connotations, which have worked to undermine the support for trans people generally (see UK media coverage via the database provided by Dysphoreum Project [UK]). The more high-profile cases, such as Bud Light's abandonment of Dylan Mulvaney after the vitriolic backlash against the corporation and Target's buckling to extremists' pressure, has put more pressure on those high profile trans people and their cis allies to respond to the constant barrage of transphobic rhetoric. The question that this paper is concerned with is to what extent are these kinds of pressure creating a backlash in which trans people are being represented in ways against which they Andhave to re-represent themselves to shift from being a target for the right? And, a few trans people, in trying to bridge the gap with the anti-trans forces by engaging with them or even siding with them, to what extent are they only serving to reinforce misrepresentation and negative connotations of trans people throughout society?

“Because of ChatGPT...”: The Socio-Material Impact of Generative Artificial Intelligence on L2 Instruction and Assessment

Eugenia (Gene) Vasilopoulos, she/her

One year has passed since the launch of ChatGPT, and educators, administrators, and researchers remain uncertain of the impact that powerful generative artificial intelligence (GAI) writing tools, such as ChatGPT, will have on teaching and learning in university classrooms (Lo, 2023). The proliferation of GAI writing tools is especially relevant for teachers of L2 writing because the skill that GAI can replicate, the development of written text, lies at the heart of the L2 writing curriculum. Thus, it is imperative for L2 researchers to better understand how the availability of powerful GAI writing tools impacts the instruction and assessment of L2 writing in higher education (Perkins, 2023). Beginning with the premise that teaching, learning, and assessment “cannot be identified separately from the networks through which they are themselves enacted” (Fenwick et al., 2011, p. 6), this study draws on the concept of socio-material assemblage (Delanda, 2006) to explore the entanglements and linkages between human actors, established structures, and material objects across space/place and time. Methodologically, this study adopts an analytic auto-ethnographic approach (Anderson, 2006) to offer a rendering of the socio-material relations that drive L2 writing instruction and assessment. In keeping with the auto-ethnographic tradition, this study focuses on the experience of one L2 writing instructor/program co-ordinator at a large Canadian university. Data sources include a researcher's journal that documents interactions, discussions, and informal observations with colleagues, administrators, and students regarding GAI in L2 writing instruction and assessment, as well as the collection of corresponding documents. Data analysis follows the principles of constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz 2000) to reflect the researcher's ongoing relationality to the data as it is being produced, compiled, and analyzed. Findings will be presented as narratives to illustrate collectively how these socio-material linkages shape L2 writing instruction and assessment in a rapidly changing technological world.

Rhetorical Genre Analysis and Social Justice: The Public Inquiry Genre as a Record of Accountability

Diana Wegner, she/her, in person

As part of the panel that discusses the relevance of Rhetorical Genre Studies on SDGs, this proposed presentation examines the efficacy of rhetorical genre theory as a tool for gauging SDGs.

Rhetorical genre analyses (RGAs) of public genres constitute a record of discursive uptake by both government and non-government agencies towards the accomplishment of their intended social action. RGAs are also a record of public confidence in a genre and its functionality in addressing a perceived, dominant exigence, and, where found wanting, genres risk becoming dysfunctional and may undergo change, formally and/or situationally.

Anchored by the concepts of uptake (Freadman, 2002; Tachino, 2012; Wegner, 2020) and metagenre (Giltrow, 2012), RGS (Miller, 1984/94) offers a rigorous framework for analyzing the situational dimension of genre; that is, the motivation, strategy, and tactics involved in the deployment of genre—what genre participants do and don't do, before, during, and after an inquiry towards the likelihood of uptake—how resistance, power, accountability, and change are negotiated over time. Because genre posits contextual boundaries, RGA provides a useful framework for constraining analysis and for gauging genre functionality as social action toward SDG goals.

Two specific Public Inquiries (PIs) are analyzed for uptake towards SDGs: The Mass Casualty Commission, 2023, relevant to SDG 16 (justice), and The Missing and Murdered Women and Girls Inquiry, 2019, relevant to SDGs 16 and 5 (justice and gender equality). What tactics and strategies do genre participants adopt toward uptake? How responsive/functional is the PI genre in terms of its intended social action?

Evidence of uptake in meta-generic commentary (2022-2024) is drawn from X, news feeds, advocacy and government sources.

Reading for research: Uncovering expert writers' read-to-cite practices

Jonathan Vroom he/him, Aisha Mir, she/her, and Angelina Siew, she/her

Research on undergraduate students' source-use practices has found that they tend to paraphrase or quote one or two isolated sentences from the first two pages of their research sources—a problem known as “sentence-mining” (Jamieson & Howard, 2013). This sentence-mining practice has been confirmed in a recent study that analyzed screen recordings of students as they wrote research essays (Kocatepe, 2021). It was found that students tended to use Google to find sources, and they would use the Ctrl-F function to search for words from a source that connected with a point they were making, and they simply quoted or paraphrased that particular sentence to support that point. This suggests students struggle to read and engage with the research sources they cite.

Despite this problem, no studies have examined expert writers' read-to-cite practices. Research on experts' reading practices shows that scholars read academic texts non-linearly and selectively (Nowacek & James, 2018), which sounds a lot like sentence-mining. But what is the difference between experts' sentence-mining practices and students' practices? Although there is a plethora of research on the forms and functions of scholarly citation practices (e.g., see the overview of research in Lin, 2019, pp. 57-90), no studies have investigated the read-to-cite practices that underly expert writers' use of sources, and this is necessary for informing reading and source-use pedagogies that can address this sentence-mining problem.

This presentation will describe our project that seeks to fill this gap. Using a selection of research articles from criminology and social psychology, we looked up each citation of sources that follow the IMRD pattern, to determine which rhetorical moves expert writers tend to paraphrase/summarize when citing. Our analysis suggests that expert writers tend to summarize an IMRD source's main finding, additional findings, implication of findings, main method,

details of method, and purpose statement. These findings can help inform reading and citation pedagogies, which in turn can help students to navigate their research sources more effectively and engage with them more productively in their writing.