WRDS 350: ACADEMIC WRITING AND DISCIPLINARY KNOWLEDGE
(RESEARCH AND WRITING IN THE
HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES)

Diana Wegner, BuTo. 415
wegnerd@telus.net
Term 1/Fall 2016, Section 001
Mon/Wed/Fri: 1 – 2 pm

WRDS 350 is an advanced scholarly writing course focusing on stylistic analyses of academic writing in different disciplinary contexts. An important theme of the course is the development of students' awareness of their own identity as knowledge-makers in the university community through the methodology of discourse analysis. Students will apply concepts from discourse analysis and language studies to the writing and practices of academic disciplines, ultimately focusing on their own discipline, as opposed to writing papers on the subject matter of their discipline. For example, if your discipline is Sociology, instead of writing Sociology papers, you will be analyzing how scholars in various disciplines write for publication as a basis for producing a research paper that analyzes the language features of Sociological publications. This approach is intended to equip students to negotiate writing tasks effectively in both their disciplinary courses and in other professional contexts.

In the course, students will build on their knowledge of scholarly writing, language, and genre analysis to explore the styles of expression which characterize knowledge-making activities—the key practices of research and scholarly discourse--in particular fields of discursive practice, or disciplines. Students will read about social theories of written texts, corpus-supported and other analytical methods, and the range of genres typical of a research culture's activities. As discourse analysts, students will design and carry out a study of the stylistic features and social context of scholarly writing in their own discipline.

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

1. identify the role of disciplinary epistemologies (knowledge practices) in generating research genres;
2. make distinctions among disciplinary epistemologies and between scholarly and non-scholarly discourses;
3. apply discourse and rhetorical analytic methods of analysis to various research genres;
4. analyze the key features of organizational culture to map the social context and networks of genres in a discipline;
5. design and execute a theoretically-informed research project on the disciplinary language of their major;
6. write in a variety of academic genres, including the literature review, oral presentation, analytical report, proposal, and research paper.

There is no text book for this class.

CORE READINGS

The following articles and book chapters (all of which are available electronically through the UBC Library) are required readings.

*NOTE: Students are required to bring a print copy of each reading to class on the date when the reading is due for in-class discussion: see the course syllabus below for these dates.

Bauer, M. W., & Aarts, B. (2000). Corpus Construction: a Principle for Qualitative Data Collection. In M. W. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook* (pp. 19-37). London: Sage.

Bawarshi, A. (2003). The genre function. *Genre and the Invention of the Writer*. Logan, UT: Utah State UP.

Becher, T. (1994). The significance of disciplinary differences. *Studies in Higher Education, 19.2:* pp. 151-161.

Charles, M. (2009). Stance, Interaction and the Rhetorical Patterns of Restrictive Adverbs: Discourse Roles of *Only*, *Just*, *Simply* and *Merely.* In M. Charles, D. Pecorari & S. Hunston (Eds.), *Academic Writing: At the interface of Corpus and Discourse* (pp. 152-169). London: Continuum International Publishing.

Cotos, E., Link, S., & Huffman, S. (2016). Studying disciplinary corpora to teach the craft of discussion. *Writing & Pedagogy, 8* (1), 33-64.

Flowerdew, J., & Forest, R. (2009). Schematic structure and lexico-grammatical realization in corpus-based genre analysis: The case of research in the PHD Literature Review. *Academic writing: At the interface of corpus and discourse.* Eds. Charles, et al. London, GBR: Continuum International Publishing, pp. 15-32. UBC Library E-Books.

Gill, R. (2000). Discourse Analysis. In M. W. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook* (pp. 172-190). London: Sage.

Giltrow, J. (2005). Modern conscience: modalities of obligation in research genres. *Text, 25*(2), 171-199.

Hallek, G. B., & Connor, U.M. (2006). Rhetorical moves in TESOL conference proposals. *Journal of English for Special Purposes, 5,* pp. 70-86.

Hyland, K. (1999). Academic Attribution: Citation and the Construction of Disciplinary Knowledge. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(3), 341-367.

Hyland, K. (2009). Writing in the disciplines: Research evidence for specificity. *Taiwan International ESP Journal, 1*(1), 5-22.

Myers, G. (2003). Discourse studies of scientific popularization: questioning the boundaries *Discourse and Society 5*(2), 265-279.

Pho, P.D. (2008). Research article abstracts in applied linguistics and educational technology: a study of linguistic realizations of rhetorical structure and authorial stance. *Discourse Studies,* Vol. 10, pp. 231-250.

Tardy, C. (2003). A Genre System View of the Funding of Academic Research. *Written Communication, 20*(1), 7-36.

WRDS 350
Term 1, Fall 2016
Mon/Wed/Fri: 1-2 pm
D. Wegner, BuT.415

SYLLABUS

The following course activities and tasks are required on the dates indicated. These include readings, exercises, class presentations, drafts, and assignments.

*Assignment requirements will be emailed to the class before we discuss them. Students are required to bring a print copy of these instructions to class.

WEEK 1

Sept. 7   Course Introduction: Research, language, and the university
                 Reading 1: R. Gill: "Discourse Analysis"

Sept. 9   Assign summary and background description: due next class for completion
                 checks

WEEK 2

Sept. 12   Reading 2: T. Becher: "The Significance of Disciplinary Differences"
                 Submit: a one-page summary (250 words) of the Becher reading, and,
                              a one-page description of your academic background,
                              discipline, research and goals (for completion checks)

Sept. 14   Discourse Analysis Practice: tagging
                 Review Becher summaries

Sept. 16   Reading 3: A. Bawarshi: "The Genre Function"
                 Discuss Literature Review Assignment

WEEK 3

Sept. 19   Reading 4: C. Tardy: "A Genre System View" (Tutorials Begin)

Sept. 21   Tagging Practice
                 Discuss Field Report

Sept. 23	Reading 5: Cotos, Link, & Huffman: "Studying Disciplinary Corpora" Tagging Practice

WEEK 4

Sept. 26	Reading 6: G. Hallek & U. Connor: "Rhetorical Moves in TESOL"

Sept. 28	Exit Slip 1 Readings 7: K. Hyland: "Writing in the Disciplines"

Sept. 30	Draft of Literature Review Due (for peer review and completion check) Exit Slip 1 Feedback

WEEK 5

Oct. 3	Overview of Modality with Tagging Practice

Oct. 5	Reading 8: K. Hyland: "Academic Attribution" Tagging Practice

Oct. 7	Discuss Corpus Development Assignment Reading 9: "M. Bauer & B. Aarts: "Corpus Construction"

WEEK 6

Oct. 10	Thanksgiving (no class)

Oct. 12	Literature Review Due (for submission) Reading 10: J. Flowerdew and R. Forest: "Schematic Structure and Lexico-Grammatical Realization in Corpus-based Genre Analysis"

Oct. 14	Draft of Field Report Due (for peer feedback and completion check)

WEEK 7

Oct. 17	Feedback on Lit Review Assignments Overview of "schematic structure" and analysis practice

Oct. 19   Discuss Research Proposal Assignment
Field Report Due (for submission)

Oct. 21   Corpus Development Assignment Due
Exit Slip 2

WEEK 8

Oct. 24   Feedback on Marked Assignments and Exit Slip 2
Reading 11: M. Charles: "Stance, Interaction and the Rhetorical Patterns of Restrictive Adverbs"

Oct. 26   Workshop on Research Proposals
Reading 12: G. Myers: "Discourse studies of scientific popularization"

Oct. 28   Study Break/Catch-Up
No class/Office Hours: 12-2

WEEK 9

Oct. 31   Research Proposal Drafts Due for peer feedback workshop (completion check)

Nov. 2   Mini-Presentations
Discuss Research Paper Assignment and Oral Presentation

Nov. 4   Mini-Presentations
Research Proposals Due

WEEK 10

Nov. 7   Research Proposal Feedback
Reading 13: P.D. Pho: "Research Article Abstracts"

Nov. 9   Research Paper drafting/data analysis Workshop
Exit Slip 3

Nov. 11   Remembrance Day (no class)

WEEK 11

Nov. 14   Reading 14: J. Giltrow: "Modern Conscience: modalities of obligation"
           Exit Slip 3 Feedback

Nov. 16   Research Project Workshop

Nov. 18   Oral Presentations

WEEK 12

Nov. 21   Oral Presentations

Nov. 23   Oral Presentations

Nov. 25   Oral Presentations
           Research Paper Sample Analysis

WEEK 13

Nov. 28   Research Paper Drafts due for peer review workshop (completion check)

Nov. 30   Course Review/Exam Prep
           Workshop Time
           Final Exit Slip

Dec. 2   Research Papers Due (for final edit and submission)
           (No Class)

ASSIGNMENTS

Tutorial Presentation and Notes	5%
Literature Review	10%
Field Report	10%
Corpus Development	5%
Research Proposal	10%
Oral Presentation	10%
Research Paper	30%
Final Exam	20%

COURSE POLICIES

OFFICE HOURS AND APPOINTMENTS

You can make appointments to see your instructor on an individual basis at a mutually agreed time. If you simply require information because you missed a class, you are expected to contact another student in the class instead of your instructor.

Regular office hours: Mon/Wed 12-12:45, BuTo 415. (Or by appointment)

ASSIGNMENT PROTOCOL

Late Assignments: Penalties for late assignments will be applied at the instructor's discretion. Grades for late assignments will then be reduced by 10% for each day the assignment is late. If you foresee that a late submission is unavoidable, you must request an extension before the assignment is due. You can request, with rationale, a short extension by seeing your instructor personally or by emailing your instructor at least the day before the assignment is due.

Submitting Assignments: Assignments should be submitted in-person at the class when it is due unless otherwise stipulated in the course syllabus. Should you need to submit an assignment outside of class time and cannot find your instructor, you must have the assignment signed with the time and date by the English Department Receptionist. You are advised to ensure you have saved copies of assignments. If you know ahead of time that you will be absent from class when an assignment is due, please arrange to submit your assignment to your instructor early.

Repeating Assignments: Normally, since revision and editing activities are incorporated in the production of a document, once a final version has been submitted, an assignment cannot be rewritten.

ATTENDANCE

University Policy (calendar): "Regular attendance is expected of students in all their classes (including lectures, laboratories, tutorials, seminars, etc.). Students who neglect their academic work and assignments may be excluded from the final examinations. Students who are unavoidably absent because of illness or disability should report to their instructors on return to classes."

English Department Policy: "Students missing 40% or more of the classes, regardless of whether their absences are avoidable or unavoidable, may be considered unable to meet the 'learning outcomes' of the course and may be excluded from the final examination."

If missing a class is absolutely unavoidable, you will be responsible for any information regarding changes in the course or assignments, or in course material which is given in the class you missed, and you will be expected to submit any assigned work on time (this includes assignment drafts). You should contact classmates not your instructor for this information.

TUTORING

Some students hire tutors or use a tutoring service on an occasional basis to assist them with specific assignments; others work with a tutor on a regular basis. While we recognize that tutors can be helpful, we have also observed that tutors may misdirect WRDS 350 students and impede their learning as well as their success in the course. Using tutors may even inadvertently result in questionable academic conduct. We therefore discourage the use of tutors in this course.

If you use the help of a tutor on WRDS 350 assignments, you are required to hand in the drafts of your written work with your tutor's feedback along with the revised text and any other required materials.

ACADEMIC HONESTY

The university considers cheating, especially plagiarism, to be the most serious academic offence that a student can commit. Whether intentional or not, it can be result in expulsion from the university. Such dishonest behaviour involves deceptive conduct or attempted conduct by which an individual or group uses unauthorized methods to represent their academic work to be other than which it is.

CRITERIA FOR A SATISFACTORY DRAFT

Drafts will be recorded by your instructor as completion checks when they satisfy the following criteria:

Readability: The draft is reader-ready–it is coherent and accessible for its intended readers, and expressed in competent Standard English.

Purpose: The purpose or function of the assignment has been fulfilled.

Content: The facts, concepts, and analysis show a serious effort has been made to present and explain points. The thinking revealed in the assignment is not superficial or half-hearted.

Strategies: The assignment shows clear evidence of appropriate use of writing and rhetorical strategies (e.g. persuasive, informative, graphic, etc.).

Completeness: The assignment includes all required parts or elements typical of its genre or type (e.g. forecasts in essay introductions, research question in proposals, etc.). Completeness also entails fully developed components, for example well developed introductions, bodies and conclusions in essays.

Minor Weaknesses: The draft may have some relatively minor problems that a final revision and editing should focus on later: headings/titles, punctuation, spelling, arrangement of points or sections, format niceties, etc. Some deletion and/or expansion may still be necessary. A satisfactory draft may not "look" neat (as the final copy should), but should be legible. During the draft workshop, changes can be made right on the draft, so that parts may be crossed out, erased, added, or attached.

Punctuality: To receive a completion check for your draft, it must be available at the class stipulated in your course syllabus, both for peer feedback and for your instructor.

Classmate Assistance: Each draft must be read by and discussed with at least one classmate, two when workshop time permits.

SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS

Please contact the Centre for Access & Diversity (Tel: 604.822.5844; Email: access.diversity@ubc.ca), if you require special accommodations owing to a disability.

RECOMMENDED ADDITIONAL READING

If you would like to do additional reading, the following texts provide useful information on scholarly discourse, genre and discourse analysis.

Adami, E. (2009). "To each reader his, their or her pronoun": Prescribed, pro-scribed and disregarded uses of generic pronouns in English. *Language & Computers, 69*(1), 281-308.

Biber, D., & Barbieri, F. (2007). Lexical bundles in university spoken and written registers. *English for Specific Purposes, 26*, 263-286.

Bruce, I. (2009). Results Sections in Sociology and Organic Chemistry Articles: A Genre Analysis. *English for Specific Purposes, 28*(2), 105-124.

Charles, M. (2003). 'This mystery. . .': a corpus-based study of the use of nouns to construct stance in theses from two contrasting disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*(4), 313-326.

Charles, M. (2006). The Construction of Stance in Reporting Clauses: A Cross-disciplinary Study of Theses. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(3), 492-518.

Charles, M. (2007). Argument or evidence? Disciplinary variation in the use of the Noun that pattern in stance construction. *English for Specific Purposes, 26*(2), 203-218.

Cortes, V. (2004). Lexical bundles in published and student disciplinary writing: Examples from history and biology. *English for Specific Purposes, 23*, 397-423.

Dahl, T. (2009). The Linguistic Representation of Rhetorical Function: A Study of How Economists Present Their Knowledge Claims. *Written Communication, 26*(4), 370-391.

Diani, G. (2008). Emphasizers in spoken and written academic discourse: The case of *really*. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 13*(3), 296-321.

Gabrielatos, C., & Baker, P. (2008). Fleeing, Sneaking, Flooding: A Corpus Analysis of Discursive Constructions of Refugees and Asylum Seekers in the UK Press, 1996-2005. *Journal of English Linguistics, 36*, 5-38.

Giannoni, D. S. (2012). Value marking in an academic genre: When authors signal 'goodness'. In V. K. Bhatia & M. Gotti (Eds.), *Insights into academic genres*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Groom, N. (2005). Pattern and Meaning across Genres and Disciplines: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 4*(3), 257-277.

Harwood, N. (2007). Political Scientists on the Functions of Personal Pronouns in Their Writing: An Interview-Based Study of 'I' and 'we'. *Text and Talk, 27*(1), 27-54.

Holmes, R. (1997). Genre Analysis and the Social Sciences: An Investigation of the Structure of the Research Article Discussion Sections in Three Disciplines. *English for Specific Purposes, 16*(4), 321-337.

Hyland, K. (1996). Talking to the academy: forms of hedging in scientific research articles. *Written Communication, 13*, 251-281.

Hyland, K. (1998). Boosters, hedges and the negotiation of academic knowledge. *Text, 18*(3), 349-382.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. London: Longman.

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies, 7*(2), 173-192.

Hyland, K. (2008). Academic clusters: text patterning in published and postgraduate writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 18*(1), 41-62.

Hyland, K. (2008). Persuasion, Interaction and the Construction of Knowledge: Representing Self and others in Research Writing. *International Journal of English Studies, 8*(2), 1-23.

Hyland, K. (2010). Community and Individuality: Performing Identity in Applied Linguistics. *Written Communication, 27*(2), 159-188.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in Academic Writing: A Reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics, 25*(2), 156-177.

Julián, M. Q. (2011). More than Personal Narratives in English Academic Lectures. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada, 24*, 131-151.

Kedhri, M., Heng, C. S., & Ebrahimi, S. F. (2013). An exploration of interactive metadiscourse markers in academic research article abstracts in two disciplines. *Discourse Studies, 15*(3), 319-331.

MacDonald, S. P. (1989). Data-Driven and Conceptually Driven Academic Discourse. *Written Communication, 6*(4), 411-435.

MacDonald, S. P. (1992). A Method for Analyzing Sentence Level Differences in Disciplinary Knowledge Making. *Written Communication, 9*, 533-569.

Madigan, R., Johnson, S., & Linton, P. (1995). The Language of Psychology: APA Style as Epistemology. *American Psychologist, 50*(6), 428-436.

North, S. (2005). Different Values, Different Skills? A Comparison of Essay-Writing by Students from Arts and Science Backgrounds. *Studies in Higher Education, 30*(5), 517-533.

Peacock, M. (2011). A comparative study of introductory *it* in research articles across eight disciplines. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 16*(1), 72-100.

Reeshemius, G. (2012). Research cultures and the pragmatic functions of humor in academic research presentations: A corpus-assisted analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44*(6/7), 863-875.

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

Swales, J., Ahmad, U. K., Chang, Y.-Y., Chavez, D., Dressen, D. F., & Seymour, R. (1998). Consider This: The Role of Imperatives in Scholarly Writing. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(1), 97-121.

Teich, E., & Holtz, M. (2009). Scientific registers in contact: An exploration of the lexico-grammatical properties of interdisciplinary discourses. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 14*(4), 524-548.

Thompson, G., & Ye, Y. Y. (1991). Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers. *Applied Linguistics, 12*(4), 365-382.

Thompson, P., & Tribble, C. (2001). Looking at Citations: Using Corpora in English for Academic Purposes. *Language Learning & Technology, 5*(3), 91-105.

Wynne, M. (2010). Interdisciplinary relationships. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 15*(3), 425-427.