International Symposium

Talk about Writing

Thu 23/05/2024 - Sat 25/05/2024

Paderborn University, Germany

Abstract Booklet

Table of Contents

How PhD students live and develop in metaphors

Accessing processes of 'discovery' with microphenomenological interviewing techniques

Creating an international journal for early career researchers – the En-Gender Project

Jessica Albrecht

University of Bonn, Germany

Format: Extended presentation

En-Gender is a collaborative network and a peer reviewed journal in the broad field of gender studies. It was born out of the idea of a handful of master's students at the University of Glasgow in 2018 who did not want their writing to be forgotten and only to be read by their markers as these writings consisted of valuable research which these students wanted to share. As one of these students, I have subsequently created the En-Gender project which is now a working paper series with approximately 5-10 publications per year from scholars across the globe and the disciplines. As much as this is a scholarly important approach, it is also a very challenging one. The current editorial team consist of seven people from as many different countries in the Global North as well as the Global South and already bring in their expertise that stems from a variety of disciplines and approaches to scholarly writing. In addition to the challenges of interdisciplinarity in evaluating the contributions by early career scholars, often graduate students, differing national and regional forms of writing and style influence the work at En-Gender and internal discussions on language, style, or form in the editorial team. Further, as we want the reviewers to find a form of critique that is encouraging for people from diverse backgrounds, the editorial team also has to find ways to steer the reviewing process while trying not to interfere with disciplinary expectations of scholarly writing. In this presentation, I want to expand on this dilemma and share our experience with the participants of the symposium. This, to reflect on the challenges of cultural diversities and the coloniality of academic writing while, at the same time, aiming at creating an international credited journal for early-career research.

Talking about roles in academic writing: "That it is so much more than just writing!"

Irina Barczaitis

Georg-August-University of Goettingen, Germany

Format: Extended presentation

Conversations about academic writing can include holistic perspectives. In the workshops of the International Writing Lab/Universität Göttingen we try to open spaces for these perspectives. Our workshop participants are diverse e.g. in academic disciplines, educational experiences, background concerning culture, ethnicity, class or writing experience. We focus on encouraging students to explore their multilingual resources, their academic voice and style between own demands towards their text and expectations of their discipline and their identification with their writing projects. This opens a multi-perspective view and supports students to take a resource-oriented and active stance towards their writing. This contributes to making academic writing the very own "agenda" and not taking it just as a necessity and fulfilling (assumed?!) patterns and guidelines from the outside.

In this presentation I would like to share a task, based on the poem "Was ich Alles bin" in which the narrator lists several social roles s*he takes. By writing a similar poem at the beginning and towards the end of a workshop, students list the roles they take towards their writing project and present them in class. On a technical level this task can be used to clarify the small steps that are involved in writing a text. As a creative – but simple – task it can also foster awareness to what is linked to the own writing process beyond "just" writing, e.g. emotional or psychological aspects. It helps students to discover and appreciate these and to integrate them consciously into organising the own writing and communication about it, e.g. with supervisors, tutors or other students.

I will share example poems from students, student's commentaries and reflections from portfolios which show differences between the two versions of their poem and how the listed roles often become more explicit, differentiated and active in the second version.

Franz Hohler: „Was ich Alles bin". Published on the live-album: „Traraa!" (1971) and the live-album: "Vom Mann, der durch die Wüste ging" (1979). Text found online on: https://genius.com/Franz-hohler-was-ich-alles-bin-lyrics (online: 25.10.2023)

Spasmodic writing: Disability and the myth of the well-composed man

Crystal Benedicks

Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Indiana, USA

Format: Extended presentation

For a brief moment in the 1850s, three discourses about bodies and writing collided, with repercussions for the ways we talk about writing today. One strain of discourse took place in literary circles in England, where an intense but chaotic new genre of poetry—dubbed "Spasmodic"—was growing in popularity. Another took place in laboratories, where scientists and doctors were researching the body's electrical currents and nervous centers, leading to a classification of diseases known as "spasmodic disorders"—and the haunting realization that sometimes bodies pulse with their own chaotic power, beyond the realm of the heart, soul, or brain. A final strain of discourse was the growing calcification of instruction manuals for would-be writers. Drawing on disability theory, masculinity studies, and writing studies, I argue that the intersection of these discourses produced a kind of panic about bodies—of writing and of persons—that were ruptured and uncontrollable, spasmodic rather than composed. The codification of writing rules and classifications helped paper over this panic, but the trepidation remains. This presentation suggests that we may do a great deal to ease student anxiety about writing, especially in beginning composition classes, if we re-interpreted that threat as an invitation.

Despite its popularity, contemporary critics dismissed Spasmodic poetry as unmanly and quite literally diseased. For them, the main problem was that Spasmodic poems were full of arresting images but lacked structure or direction. Spasmodic poets are out of print today. However, a closer examination of Spasmodic practices suggests that instead of failing to write well, they were approaching the question of composition in an entirely different way, one that was at odds with ideals of the well-composed gentlemen and writing manuals' insistence on structure and clarity. The disability aesthetic they embrace speaks to the ways disability studies and composition programs are seen as complementary today, as both fields are ideally invested in expanding access and resisting monolithic interpretations of normative bodies and writing styles.

Getting close to writing through reading – listening to written speech and moving voices

Marie-Cécile Bertau

University of West Georgia, USA

Format: Workshop

The workshop offers a possibility in deconstructing some of the entrenched pictures we have about writing as individuals and professionals in current academia. The path chosen leads through reading, as if the other side of writing, or the background to the figure we create while writing. In the first part of the workshop, participants will be introduced to the term "written speech" ("schriftliche Rede") used by the dialogical linguist Lev Jakubinskij (1979; 2004) and taken up by Vygotsky when theorizing inner speech (1987; 2002, "schriftliches Sprechen"). The landscape emerging from this term illuminates a dialogical continuity between different forms of speech with specific language forms, materiality, embodiment, and addressivity. Language as activity encompasses the social and the psychological, shifting through types of spacetimes, others, and forms: Writing, or written speech, is seen as a moment within these complex, dynamic shifts. The grounding model of language is briefly addressed to note the implications for the writing subject specifically. The second part works with the theory elements introduced and looks firstly at reading through the analysis of published texts from two different disciplines, asking: Who is doing the writing? What can be observed and heard? Whose voices are (more or less, and how) present? Secondly, a small reading exercise opens to an experience translating into another analysis, this time of texts talking about reading. In closing, the group will discuss the possible benefits of getting close to writing through reading.

Jakubinskij, L. P. (1979). On verbal dialogue (J. E. Knox & L. Barner Trans.). *dispositio. Revista Hispánica de Semiótica Literaria IV, 11-12*, 321-335. (Original work published in 1923)

Jakubinskij, L. S. (2004). Über die dialogische Rede. In K. Ehlich & K. Meng (Eds), *Die Aktualität des Verdrängten. Studien zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft im 20. Jahrhundert* (K. Hommel & K. Meng, Trans.) (pp. 383-433). Synchron. (Original work published in 1923)

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (Eds., N. Minick Trans.), *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky, Vol 1*. Plenum Press. (Original work published in 1934

Vygotskij, L. S. (2002). *Denken und Sprechen. Psychologische Untersuchungen*. J. Lompscher & G. Rückriem (Eds, Trans.) Beltz

Dialogic peer-feedback: How a 20-minute intervention encourages students to engage in a dialogue on higher order concerns of a text

Joy C. de Jong, Jochem Aben, Renske Bouwer, Griet Coupé

Utrecht University & Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Format: Extended presentation

Talking about texts is often interpreted as one-directional feedback: a reader gives something which is received by the writer. Supervisors in thesis conversations talk significantly more, when they discuss a student's draft (76% of the amount of words), compared to other 'scenes' (61%) (De Jong, 2006). Students demonstrate similar behaviour. Students in Communication and Information Science were asked to discuss a text with a peer, without any instructions beforehand. The audio taped conversations confirmed that students interpreted 'discussing a text' as giving oral feedback in a rather monological way.

This monological talk, similar to written feedback, tends to neglect the writer as an actor in the process. Moreover, it is, with peer feedback specifically, often more focussed on lower order concerns than on higher order concerns. Recent theories and non-directive tutoring in writing centres, suggest the potential importance of dialogue, where writers actively engage in reflecting on the product and process. A more dialogical approach of feedback might enhance talking about higher order concerns. We performed a study to find out whether this could be applicable to peer feedback situations.

Students were divided into two conditions: in the dialogic peer-feedback condition (n=14), we instructed students **how** to engage in conversations about texts. In the non-dialogic peer-feedback condition (n=11), the instruction focused on the content (**what**) of conversations. After the 20-minute instruction, student dyads had peer-feedback conversations about their theses.

The instruction was effective: in the dialogue-driven condition, the text writer spoke for 57% of the time, compared to 25% in the text-quality-driven condition. Additionally, students in the dialogue-driven condition discussed higher order concerns more frequently (76% of segments) than in the text-quality-driven condition (64% of segments). In this presentation we will compare the results of this study with talking about writing in thesis supervision and in writing centre talk.

Aben, J. (2022). *Rectifying errors: A reconceptualization of the role of errors in peer feedback provision and processing* [doctoral dissertation]. University of Groningen. https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.208729687

Bouwer, R., Van Braak, M. & Van der Veen, C. (2023). *Dialogic writing in the upper grades of primary school: How to support peer feedback conversations that promote meaningful revisions.* Submitted for publication.

De Jong, J. (2006). *Uitgesproken complex. Interactie tussen scriptieschrijvers en begeleiders (Outspoken Complexity. Interaction between thesis writers and supervisors)* [doctoral dissertation]. Utrecht University.

Filius, R.M., De Kleijn, R.A.M., Uijl, S.G., Pirns, F,.J., Van Rijen, H.V.M. & Grobbee, D.E, (2018). Strengthening dialogic peer feedback aiming for deep learning in SPOCs. *Computers & Education 125,* 86-100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.06.004

Talk about writing, over time and (not) in context

Tiane Donahue

Dartmouth College, USA and Université de Lille, France

Format: Extended presentation

I propose a data session on longitudinal study work, highlighting how talk about writing must be informed by attention to writing over time. The session will present a longitudinal study of first-year students' writing in a US context; share parts of the data analyzed; focus on the ways these data were treated; and talk about some traditional critiques of text analysis and how a Bakhtinian framework might cast those critiques in a different light.

Framed by research on liminality, transition, and knowledge adaptation across writing contexts, this longitudinal study initially examined defined text features of postsecondary student writers as they moved between a first-year writing course (focused on developing the rhetorical flexibility students need for academic success) and a first-year seminar (intended to gesture toward disciplinary writing perspectives while still focusing on first-year needs). The sampling plan includes 156 students and 636 text samples produced across a year of writing. Texts were reliably hand-coded for 7 text features and 38 accompanying facets. Statistically significant differences in text features were present in each phase, as students moved between the two courses and met different writing expectations; these shifts were underscored by documented reoccurrence, or not, of the features and their facets between courses.

The study suggests the need for extensive ongoing empirical research on textual features to deepen our understanding of student writing in terms of noticeable rhetorical differences in defined writing features and the reuse or adaptation of learning that occurs across disciplinary settings. But critiques of the analysis for its focus on isolated texts and their features led us to reframe our approach. We now evoke the discursive always-already social nature of any utterance as a way to rethink talk about written words in student texts and what they do.

Radicalizing the motherscholar through collective writing – theorizing the activist-academic writing of a manifesto

Lena Eckert

Europe-University Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder), Germany

Format: Extended presentation

One's always writing to bring something to life,
to free life from where it's trapped, to trace lines of flight.
(Deleuze 1995: 141)

Becoming a mother as a scholar – at least in Germany – is a challenge. We don't know how many mothering people do institutionalized knowledge production; there are no figures. In order to politicize the exclusion of mothers from academia, an author collective wrote a manifesto that problematizes a variety of aspects in current academic life (Adhoc-Kollektiv von Mutter*Wissenschaftler*innen 2022). If we see and teach writing not as a containment of thought but as liberation, we might be able to enable a new understanding and experience of writing. By drawing on Deleuzian conceptualizations of writing, thinking and becoming, I want to propose a new understanding of writing as a motherscholar that can empower beyond regular gender equality plans. Moreover, I consider it to be a queer-feminist, decolonial way of producing knowledge. I argue that if we "treat writing as a flow, not a code" (Deleuze 1995: 7) we might be able to empower ourselves to find our own voice in writing and realize that our own experiences matter. Through the motherscholar-collective, we realized that we „hide behind the modernist conceit that writing is universal, authoritative, and finalizable" (Pensoneau-Conway et al. 2014: 322) yet we also came to realize that writing can be quite the opposite: It is always specific and personal, vulnerable, necessarily neglecting, processural and: it can be democratic, powerful and a valuable contribution to the community (in academia but also beyond). By actually letting ourselves experience the necessary incompleteness of one's own and each others' writing by writing together and in the vein of becoming, one might enable the embodied and performative dimensions of "the tender together/apartness of writing" (see Wyatt et al. 2010: 730). My paper addresses the theoretical underpinnings of such a possibility in collaborative creative academic activism by reflecting on the process of collectively writing a manifesto that helped to radicalize mothering persons in academia.

Adhoc-Kollektiv von Mutter*Wissenschaftler*innen (2022). Mutterschaftsfeministische Postulate an die Wissenschaft. Ein Manifest. In: Czerney, S.; Eckert, L. und Martin, S. (eds.) *Mutterschaft und Wissenschaft in der Pandemie. (un-)Vereinbarkeit zwischen Kindern, Care und Krise.* Opladen: Budrich.

Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations 1972-1990* (M. Joughin, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Pensoneau-Conway, Sandra L., Derek M. Bolen, Satoshi Toyosaki, C. Kyle Rudick, and Erin K. Bolen (2014) Self, Relationship, Positionality, and Politics: A Community Autoethnographic Inquiry Into Collaborative Writing. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies.* 14(4) 312–323.

Wyatt, Jonathan, Ken Gale, Susanne Gannon, and Bronwyn Davies (2010). Deleuzian Thought and Collaborative Writing: A Play in Four Acts. *Qualitative Inquiry 16(*9) 730–741.

Re-writing the word, re-writing the world. *In Other Words* dictionary as a free online resource for participatory writing

Paola Giorgis, Bilyana Todorova, Andrea C. Valente

IOW Editorial Board

Format: Extended presentation

In Other Words (IOW)- A Contextualized Dictionary to problematize Otherness is a free online resource that analyses the words that, in different contexts and countries, (re)produce different forms of Otherness and proposes alternative readings through the use of creative materials.

The IOW Dictionary is an alternative writing space and platform that attempts to negotiate the rigour of academic writing, standard English and unconventional compositions, such as the use of multimodalities and collaborators beyond higher education. Hence, it can be considered an experimental space for composition in which creativity, reflexivity, and intertextualities are strongly encouraged. Such an experimental attempt can result in a *métissage* writing that merges and blurs "genres, texts, identities'' (Hasebe-Ludt *et al*. 2009, p.9), unsettling rhetorical, discursive, and compositional elements in order to provide entries that deal with various forms of Otherness.

The process of writing in the dictionary is collaborative and therefore it becomes a reflexive experience. Since some of the keywords are co-written with a peer – as, for example, the entry 'nostalgia' – the main strategy of the authors was to write together collaboratively without dividing the text into different parts. It seems a difficult and time-consuming procedure but at the same time it brings different perspectives together and the dialogue helps the authors to share ideas and look for a common ground (Lingard 2021). Thus, the existence of the 'Other' co-writer presupposes the availability of diverse viewpoints.

The ethos of IOW dictionary is grounded in its *praxis*, which is shaped by the critical approach as applied in several field such as pedagogies (Freire & Macedo 1987; hooks 1994), language studies (Wodak 2015), cultural studies, and intercultural studies (Nakayama & Halualani 2012). Since 'the vocabulary of the *world*' is determined by socio-economic, historical, and geographical factors and conditions which construe representations and attributions, we then advocate that IOW dictionary, as a collective, dialogic, and participatory re-writing of the *word*, can foster transformative process able to tackle issues of inequalities and discrimination.

Drawing from our experiences with the dictionary's collaborative writing and as Editors of the new entries, we will present some examples of activities we have conducted, such as webinars, teacher training courses, and participatory writing with students and colleagues.

Freire, P. & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy. Reading the world and the word*. New York; London: Routledge.

Hasebe-Ludt, E., Chambers, C., & Leggo, C. D. (2009). *Life writing and literary métissage as an ethos for our times* (Vol. 27). Peter Lang.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress. Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York; London: Routledge.

Lingard, L. (2021) Collaborative writing: Strategies and activities for writing productively together. *Perspect Med Educ* 10, 163–166 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-021-00668-7

Nakayama, T.K. & Halualani, R.T. (2012) (eds.). *The Handbook of Critical Intercultural Communication*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell.

Wodak, R. 2015. *The Politics of Fear. What Right-Wing Discourses Mean*. London: SAGE.

Writing consultation talk: An exemplary analysis of perspectives and metaphors

Ella Grieshammer

Georg-August-University of Goettingen, Germany

Format: Extended Presentation

One of the challenges of writing instruction and writing consultation is to ensure students' understanding about requirements of different academic genre and their consequences for students' writing processes. The contribution aims to shed light on how participants in writing consultations handle this challenge by talking about writing. To do this, a transcript of a video-recorded online writing consultation will be analysed, using a combination of sequential conversation analysis (Bergmann 2012, Deppermann 2008) and metaphor analysis (Schmitt, Schröder, Pfaller 2018).

The transcript depicts an online writing consultation in which the student, a master candidate of English Philology, is struggling with finding a research question for his master's thesis and with the differences between the academic genre synopsis, abstract and introduction. The analysis of the transcript shows that the writing consultant's talk contains various perspectives on the text (Grieshammer 2018) as well as metaphorical language (Lakoff und Johnson 2011) when referring to genre, writing and text. In a detailed analysis of those perspectives and metaphors, it will be demonstrated how these two resources applied by the consultant are used as scaffolding strategies: Both serve the purpose of making abstract concepts such as genre expectations more explicit, vivid and, therefore, more accessible to the student.

At the same time, the analysis offers insights into how writing is conceptualized by the integration of different perspectives on the text, such as the reader's perspective, as well as by using different metaphorical fields to describe text and writing. By elaborating these aspects of talk about writing, the presentation also aims to contribute to the question of how a pedagogical language about writing could look like, a language that makes the complex demands of academic writing more accessible to students.

Bergmann, Jörg R. (2012). Konversationsanalyse. In: Uwe Flick, Ernst von Kardorff, Ines Steinke (Eds.), Qualitative Forschung. Ein Handbuch (9th edition, 524–537). Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Deppermann, Arnulf (2008). Gespräche analysieren. Eine Einführung. Wiesbaden: VS.

Grieshammer, Ella (2018): Textentwürfe besprechen. Analysen aus der akademischen Schreibberatung. Bielefeld: wbv media.

Lakoff, George; Johnson, Mark (2011): Leben in Metaphern. [Metaphors we live by] (7th edition). Tübingen: Carl-Auer.

"Writing isn't just something we do; it's something we study": Talking and teaching writing at Fairfield University

Kim Gunter

Fairfield University, USA

Format: Panel Discussion

This panel takes a reflective practice approach to discuss the development, launch, and current success of Fairfield University's Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program. In Fall 2019, Fairfield had zero WAC-designated courses. However, by Fall 2023, we have well over 200 courses, taught by 105 faculty in 36 departments, and we will offer 336 individual WAC classes this year. To reach this level of success quickly, we have paid careful attention to how we talk about writing–to our interdisciplinary colleagues, students, and administrators. A foundational point has been that language and literature departments do not "own" writing but instead that every discipline is bound by genre expectations and rhetorical conventions that both empower and also constrain writers, perhaps especially student writers. In this panel discussion, we will discuss the founding principles of Fairfield's program, focusing on the decision to require all students to complete an Introduction to Writing Studies course. Designed as an entryway to the discipline of writing and inspired by both the Writing about Writing pedagogical movement (Wardle and Downs) and the recent move to name the field's "threshold concepts" (Adler-Kassner and Wardle), this course identifies and pedagogically addresses key terms and concepts (Yancey, Robertson, Taczak) that transfer into WAC-designated courses, focusing on the maxim of the program: "At Fairfield, writing isn't just something we do; it's something we study." We then discuss the culture of writing (Cox, Galin, & Melzer) that has manifested on Fairfield's campus in the last four years. While writing is better resourced than ever and a frequent subject of cross-disciplinary faculty's talk and professional development, challenges in communication remain, challenges exacerbated by questions surrounding labor categories on our campus and social justice questions that manifest in the teaching of writing (e.g., just whose writing meets the expectations of disciplinary conventions).

Adler-Kassner, Linda, and Elizabeth Wardle. Naming What We Know: Threshold Concepts of Writing Studies. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 2015.

Cox, Michelle, Jeffrey R. Galin, and Dan Melzer (Eds.). Sustainable WAC: A Whole Systems Approach to Launching and Developing Writing Across the Curriculum Programs. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2018.

Wardle, Elizabeth and Douglas P. Downs. Writing about Writing: A College Reader. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011.

Yancey, Kathleen Blake, Liane Robertson, and Kara Taczak. Writing Across Contexts: Transfer, Composition, and Sites of Writing. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 2014.

Focus group discussion as a research tool in tutor training for the writing centre: #reflecting on reflections, #voice matters

Carmen Heine

Aarhus University, Denmark

Format: Extended presentation

Based on the notion that reflecting one's processes, actions and products is crucial for writing tutors, a focus group discussion study is carried out with four freshly trained writing tutors at the English Writing Centre, School of Communication and Culture, Aarhus University. The focus group discussion is about an instructor course just completed and teaching activity material development, both described and argued for in compulsory tutor portfolios. Besides the two aims of the study described below, the method itself is under scrutiny. It's feasibility to serve the following purposes will be examined: If it enables the new team to present portfolio content, to re-discuss central elements of the course, to bounce ideas off each other, and to discuss each other's reflections, to close the reflection loop and to wrap the training course before the regular centre work begins. And, it is investigated, if a coordinator-lead focus group discussion provides the expected rich data set (recordings, observation protocol, transcripts) to investigate how instructors talk about writing. The aims of the study are A: to tease out perspectives for the writing centre going forward and to evaluate the reflection loop: **#reflecting on reflections**; and, B: to investigate the utterances of the tutors regarding differences of voice and tone in self-reflective statements versus general statements about writing: **#voice matters**. The voice analysis* will shed light on the "voicing" of thoughts and opinions in early conversations about writing among writing centre employees, and - hopefully - help communicate why voice matters in talking about writing.

*The study is carried out in collaboration with the Centre for Voice Studies at Aarhus University.

Reading against the grain: Four provocations on writing

Silvia Introna, Eva Seidl, Andrea Scott, Margret Mundorf

Bielefeld University, Graz University, Europe-University Viadrina Frankfurt (Oder),

Virtuelles Kompetenzzentrum & memoscript text + trAIning, Germany & Austria

Format: Panel discussion

How do we talk about reading in writing research? There is widespread consensus that reading is central to writing practices (e.g., Carillo, 2017; n.a., 2021), yet it remains a relatively neglected domain. Through four multidisciplinary provocations, we illuminate the complexity of reading as a dialogic and contextual activity. Together we assert that how we read, who we read, and how we represent reading has ethical, sociopolitical, and epistemic consequences—for the field and for writers.

Silvia Introna: If one compares reading and writing processes and outcomes, it is clear that reading is even more difficult to facilitate and evaluate than writing. Nevertheless, a systematic examination of reading is still missing at German universities. What consequences does this have? While students are left alone with their course readings, university teachers are convinced about students' lack of reading skills (Hoffmann & Seipp, 2015). This provocation focuses on the question of how university students are supposed to develop advanced reading skills without the possibility to talk about reading.

Eva Seidl: Are we as educators appreciative of and interested in undergraduate students and their writings or do we place too much focus on working with graduate students? This provocation challenges the prevailing notion that undergraduates' writings deserve less attention by arguing that quite the opposite holds true. In line with Brabazon (2013), writing instructors are challenged to emphatically engage with first and second-year students and their texts, "helping them with reading, writing and thinking".

Andrea Scott: What are scholars reading, and, perhaps more importantly, *not* reading in our field? This provocation employs Sara Ahmed's (2017) theory of citational chains to ask whether German-language research on writing functions as an "effective reproductive technology, reproducing the world around certain bodies" to the exclusion of others (Ahmed, 2013), affecting not only the diversity of voices in the field but also the richness of the discourse on writing.

Margret Mundorf: In the age of generative AI, will we need reading primarily to summarise and grasp the essence of a text, assisted by AI tools? Isn't writing more like this new form of reading—distancing oneself as a reader from the generated text? One thing is likewise clear: readers will evaluate texts differently (Limburg et al., 2023). In this context, data-driven style analysis can expand the recognition of linguistic patterns, interpretative readings and sensitise people to "writing differently" (Scharloth et al., 2012). By "Talking about writing" this provocation focuses on talking to, with and about the machine as a reader and writer, using the example of technical language use in law.

Following the four brief provocations, each panelist will respond informally to a set of questions, before opening the floor to discussion. How are our subfields talking about reading? What are the

consequences of this image of reading for writing? How might we talk about reading with more nuance in the future?

Ahmed, S. (2013). Making Feminist Points. Blog feministkilljoys. Retrieved from https://feministkill-joys.com/2013/09/11/making-feminist-points/

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a Feminist Life*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Brabazon, T. (2013): Digital Dieting. From Information Obesity to Intellectual Fitness. London/New York.

Carillo, E. C. (2017). Reading and Writing Centers: A Primer for Writing Center Professionals. *The Writing Center Journal, 36*(2), 117-145.

Hoffmann, N. & Seipp, T. (2015). Förderung studentischer Schreibkompetenz. Ergebnisse einer Umfrage bei Lehrenden und Studierenden der JGU Mainz. Zeitschrift Schreiben. https://zeitschrift-schreiben.ch/globalassets/zeitschrift-schreiben.eu/2015/hoffmann_seipp_foerderung_schreibkompetenz.pdf (31.10.2023).

«Lesen und Schreiben: Texte rezipieren, integrieren, produzieren» (11 - 12 June, 2021). Trinationale Tagung der Gesellschaften für wissenschaftliches Schreiben in Deutschland (Gesellschaft für Schreibdidaktik und Schreibforschung – gefsus), in Österreich (Gesellschaft für wissenschaftliches Schreiben – GeWissS) und in der Schweiz (FwS), Windisch (online).

Limburg, A., Bohle-Jurok, U., Buck, I., Grieshammer, E., Gröpler, J., Knorr, D., Lira Lorca, A., Mundorf, M., Schindler, K. & Wilder, N. Zehn Thesen zur Zukunft des Schreibens in der Wissenschaft. Diskussionspapier Nr. 23/Juni 2023. https://hochschulforumdigitalisierung.de/sites/default/files/dateien/HFD_DP_23_Zukunft_Schreiben_Wissenschaft.pdf

Scharloth, J., Bubenhofer, N. & Rothenhäusler, K. (2012). Andersschreiben aus korpuslinguistischer Perspektive: Datengeleitete Zugänge zum Stil. In B.-M. Schuster & D. Tophinke (Hrsg.), Philologische Studien und Quellen (PhSt): Bd. 236. Andersschreiben: Formen, Funktionen, Traditionen (S. 157–178). Erich Schmidt Verlag.

Master's students talking about the challenges of master's thesis writing

Alma Jahić Jašić & Tanja Pavlović

University of Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina 14

Format: Extended presentation

The number of master's students seems to be increasing as universities offer a wide range of master's level study programs and as master's degrees potentially offer better hiring prospects in the contemporary labor market. Research, on the other hand, has not followed the pace as it seems that not much research has been done on master's level studies. More precisely, research on challenges of writing a master's thesis, which is a common requirement for obtaining a master's degree, appears to be scant. Therefore, this study provided a space for nine students studying in different European countries to voice their opinions about the issues and challenges they encountered during their master's thesis writing journeys. Through the in-depth, semi-structured interviews, the students shared different issues they faced with topic selection, their relationship with the supervisor, and text production. They also talked about how certain personal issues negatively affected their thesis writing process. Finally, several students also identified insufficient resources at their institution as challenges they had to overcome. Apart from discussing challenges, the participating students also shared some of the coping strategies they utilized to deal with the challenges. The aim of the study was to identify some of the potential issues and challenges in master's thesis writing as well as potential coping strategies for dealing with them in order to be able to provide students with better support during their master's thesis writing journeys.

Conversation starters: A reflective toolkit approach to individual professionalization and institutional development at Leuphana's Schreibzentrum / writing center

Dagmar Knorr & Micha Edlich

Leuphana University Lueneburg, Germany

Format: Extended presentation

Reflection is widely assumed to be a key prerequisite for the development of writing competencies (cf. Sennewald 2020) and professional consultation skills (cf. Engel 2007). It is not clear to what extent this is also true for tutoring skills, especially in a writing center context, but reflective practices could well be a means for peer writing tutors to acquire the wide range of skills they need. As Hall (2011) argues, it is, however, not enough for tutors to engage in these practices on their own (even if doing so may also involve feedback from directors or staff members). Peer writing tutors also need practice "dialogic reflection" (Hall's term), that is, they have to reflect and join conversations—with their clients but also and perhaps more importantly with their peers and staff members—about writing practices, pedagogies, and theories if they are to evolve as writers and writing tutors. To create this kind of "writing center community of practice" (Hall's term) at the institutional level and to support tutors in their development, Leuphana University's bilingual Schreibzentrum / Writing Center has adopted a systematic approach that introduces writing center theory and pedagogy with a set of reflective practices and tools (cf. Knorr 2023). We describe this approach by introducing the reflective toolkit alongside related writing theories and pedagogies. We discuss the potential and limits of this approach based on accounts shared by experienced peer writing tutors and those currently completing the peer writing tutor training. The approach described here might be of interest to other writing center professionals eager to implement (or improve upon) a systematic reflective approach to individual and institutional development with an emphasis on conversations about writing and tutoring practices.

Engel, Frank (2007): Allgemeine Pädagogik, Erziehungswissenschaft und Beratung. In: Nestmann, Frank / Engel, Frank / Sickendiek, Ursel (Hrsg.): Das Handbuch der Beratung. Band 1: Disziplinen und Zugänge. Tübingen: dgvt, 103–114.

Hall, R. Mark (2011): Theory In/To Practice. Using Dialogic Reflection to Develop a Writing Center Community of Practice. In: Writing Center Journal 31, Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.7771/2832-9414.1724>.

Knorr, Dagmar (2023): Eine Theorie der Schreibberatung. Schreibberatende im Spannungsfeld kontextueller, persönlicher und situativer Anforderungen. (Habilitationsschrift Universität Hildesheim).

Sennewald, Nadja (2020): Schreiben, Reflektieren, Kommunizieren. Studie zur subjektiven Wahrnehmung von Schreibprozessen bei Studierenden [Theorie und Praxis der Schreibwissenschaft; 8]. Bielefeld: wbv.

What literary scholars can learn from writing studies: The case of genre studies

Jennifer Lewin

University of Haifa, Israel

Format: Extended presentation

My paper argues that genre studies, a research area the field of writing studies, can significantly strengthen this academic subject's relevance to literary scholarship, establishing a closer relationship between the two. For decades, they existed symbiotically within English departments but now they function as separate units in academic institutions worldwide. Consequently, the vital role of writing in knowledge production among literary researchers thus has remained undertheorized since the advent of writing studies fifty years ago, and writing studies itself has developed its own agendas in relation to other fields by developing theories of transfer that justify its having moved away from its origins in literary analysis. The divergence has left the relevance of its methodologies to English studies largely unexamined. My longer study, the first of its kind, presents the manifold benefits to our English curricula of closer attention to four specific writing studies topics, as a means of coordinating our pedagogy with our research goals (genre studies, literacy, rhetorical listening, and the campus writing center). The current paper focuses on the first section of the project.

Major histories of broad trends in the field of literary scholarship over the past few decades (Felski 2008 and 2015 and Guillory 2023) brilliantly assess the language researchers use to describe their reading practices and intentions as well as what we stand to gain from reevaluating that language. The various directions they provide in shaping how we understand the field's approaches and teach them are unquestionably significant and long-ranging. But they and others are missing a comprehensive articulation of how our research translates into pedagogical expectations and practices, and into opportunities for students to engage these developments in their writing (Aull 2015). Genre studies, I will show, with its focus on communication (Swales 1990) and context (Devitt 2004) advances the shared goal of aligning how we think about research with the written production of knowledge in the classroom, improving students' textual engagement with literature.

Graduate students' talk about writing: Insights from graduate writing consultants

Weijia Li

Bucknell University, USA

Format: Extended presentation

Academic writing at the graduate level has been unanimously considered difficult, regardless of writers' linguistic, cultural, and disciplinary backgrounds (Aitchison et al., 2012; Gillespie, 2007; Ma, 2019; Rogers et al., 2016). Unlike undergraduate students, graduate students are required to produce texts in new genres (e.g., thesis and dissertation) for academic and professional audiences in respective discipline communities (Hyland, 2008). In the context of Anglophone countries such as the United States, even students who grew up speaking and writing in English can experience difficulties in adjusting to meet writing expectations, because academic language, or discourse, is more than language use in academic contexts (Casanave & Swales, 2014). Oftentimes, graduate students need to acquire new knowledge about writing and sometimes to unlearn what they have known since their undergraduate years. My qualitative study explored graduate students' writing experiences from a peer perspective. That is, my participants were graduate students who worked as writing consultants to conduct one-on-one consulting sessions at a research-intensive university. Data from interviews and session observations showed overlap between both what my participants shared with me and what they discussed with graduate student writers about writing. Findings showed that when focusing on a piece of writing, my participants and the writers discussed the need to understand the genre, attend to audience expectations, and work on clarity, in addition to dealing with feedback and adopting tools. Meanwhile, when it came to navigating writing processes, my participants and their writers discussed the importance of assurance and accountability and relevant practices. In terms of implications, my study can help faculty and supervisors understand graduate writing from students' perspectives and think of ways to better support their students. Furthermore, my study can offer insights for graduate writing support, such as session format and consultant training.

A dialogue on the challenges of linguistically- and culturally-centered coursework in the age of AI and multilingualism

Joyce Meier, Xiqiao Wang, Julia Kiernan

Michigan State University, University of Pittsburgh, Lawrence Technological University, USA

Format: Panel discussion

Drawing on North American informed theories of linguistic racism (Lippi-Green, 2012; de Costa, 2020), anti-racist pedagogy (Peréz, 2021), and intersectionality (Collins & Bilge, 2020), this panel incorporates action research and dialogic reflection to advocate for a *critical listening* that interrogates and dismantles the white linguistic hegemony (Baker-Bell, p. 34) visible in AI-generation, writing pedagogy, and research methodology. Examining the challenges faced by teachers and students when communicating across lines of differences, this panel addresses how pedagogical and methodological choices made to elevate the rich linguistic and cultural gifts of multilingual learners might also create productive friction *and* racialized microaggressions, exclusion, and injustice. Each speaker addresses how they integrated dialogue and reflection in order to engage in what we call "critical listening" —an extension of Ratcliffe's notion of "rhetorical listening" (1999; 2005; 2022) that invites writing students, teachers, and researchers to talk about and hear themselves from another's vantage point, thus acknowledging the implications of their own assumptions and biases. We examine how pedagogical and methodological choices that center students' identities and experiences must also be grounded in ongoing and layered critical listening via dialogic reflection.

This panel is designed to engage audience members in a dialogue; each speaker will speak for ten minutes with the remainder of the time used for open discussion.

Speaker 1 highlights how a video created by multilingual students on their ongoing negotiations with Standard (white) Written English complicates teachers' (and AI-generated) interpretations / discussions of 'academic' writing.

Speaker 2 illustrates how the transdisciplinary approaches of students-cum-professionals are central to successful STEM communication because they position science communication as collaborative, dialogic, and interactive.

Speaker 3 offers ecological entanglement as a metaphor to shift human-centered view of writing towards a view of multilingual writing as unfolding through the writer's relationship with other natural, cultural, and literary beings.

Focusing on decision making: The practice of creative writing

Sigrun Meinig

Bielefeld University, Germany

Format: Extended presentation

In many contexts, creative writing has traditionally been framed as finally ungraspable, with concepts such as the subconscious or the imagination or with an emphasis on the idiosyncratic, not least by literary writers such as Annie Dillard or, recently, Ralf Rothmann. The enduring debate whether and how creative writing can be taught is linked to such perspectives. Other presentations focus on text types and elements or on the reflexivity of the creative writing process (e.g. Girgensohn and Sennewald, 2021). This paper concentrates on the role of decision making in creative writing and will discuss the insights and practical angles this might bring for classes and consultations. It will also consider the uses this focus might offer for creative writing segments in an academic context in different disciplines.

This paper argues that creative writing can draw our attention to the role of decision making in the writing process. Creative writers often make more decisions resp. have more options for individual decisions than non-creative writers who work with more standardised text types. Frequently, creative writers also make different decisions because of the norm of creativity that requires openness as well as new, unexpected results, at least to some extent. Arguably, creative writers also make more decisions in other areas because of the openness that creativity brings; creative writers make decisions, for example, where their roles as writers are concerned. This consideration of the decision-making dimension of creative writing will draw on my experience of teaching workshops and classes and also include, for example, interdisciplinary decision theory such as discussions of embodied decision making. This focus's ramifications will be explored in questions such as a strengthened sense of agency in the creative writing process or the possibility that through this lens creative writing segments in the seminar room might help model the decision processes in academic writing.

Talking about working with students' writing: Teacher educators' metalanguage

Ingunn Ofte

Norwegian University of Technology and Science Trondheim, Norway

Format: Extended presentation

Considering the centrality of writing to student teachers' disciplinary and professional development, it is crucial for teacher educators to proficiently master a metalanguage for explicating writing in the disciplines and the profession with their students. In this context, such a 'language for talking about language' comprises a tool for acquiring conscious control over language, enabling the writer to make more effective choices related to language use in different contexts.

Building on a sociocultural perspective on language and learning as a social endeavor, the on-going study presented here explores a group of teacher educators' talk in collegial conversations about working with student teachers' writing. Focusing in particular on the use and nature of such talk, it seeks to answer the following research question: *What characterizes the teacher educators' metalanguage about students' writing in collegial conversations?*

First, collegial conversations were recorded and transcribed. Then, topical episodes from the collegial conversations were analyzed to identify characteristics of the teacher educators' metalanguage. Preliminary findings suggests that the teacher educators' talk about students' writing is characterized informal, everyday language, while the use of a more formal metalanguage is less common. For instance, we see that when using formal language related to writing, the teacher educators seldom elaborate upon or explain the concepts they use. This suggests that their metalanguage lacks a vocabulary for such elaboration and explanation. Moreover, this indicates that the teacher educators have not internalized a more formal metalanguage about writing. The preliminary findings points to a need for establishing venues where teacher educators can meet on a regular basis and actively explore and engage in activities which can promote the development of a shared metalanguage about working with student writing, and the role of writing in teacher education, both within and across disciplines.

Writing as a gesture. A workshop on writing through/as gestural movement

Arno Plass

University of Arts Linz, Austria

Format: Workshop

Writing in academia tries to fulfil the intellectual demand to put an argument into order, to follow a certain logic, to express properly, to be immediately comprehensible regardless of the complexity of the content - often we forget that body perception might be useful. Feminist dancer and philosopher Marie Bardet (FR/ARG) proposes the term gestures to point at movement as the human condition. Her focus on gestures is a strategy of escaping the reproductive dynamics of hegemonic, dualistic thought and, instead, thinking together feminist thought, cultural/philosophical critique, and ecological questions. Lesbian feminist writer val flores (ARG) deploys language to destroy hegemonic thought using explicitly body awareness, a sex-positive posture and practice, performance and sensations.

In collaboration, they search ways of hollowing out our concepts of thinking and writing. They also question academic writing as evaluating it as a standardized, disciplined form. The authors insist on the fact that language is already conceptually preformed and thereby delimits expression and thought. Their approach is to displace or twist language. While val flores concentrates on poetry and poetic narration, also in her political essays, Marie Bardet deforms grammar to come up with the process of moving.

I propose a 90-minutes-workshop consisting of (not necessarily in this order, but rather intermingled)

*   presenting concepts - theoretical aspects of Marie Bardet and val flores; practical concepts for the workshop
*   moving - guided simple exercises (alone, in couples, in a smaller group) that aim on body perception
*   gesturing - what do we already 'write', while we move?
*   writing - finding ways into expression
*   sharing experiences and perceptions

No specific movement experience needed! Suitable for all abilities, for individual needs exercises will be adapted on site. An openness to share experience is very welcome.

Marie Bardet, Pensar con mover, Editorial Cactus, Buenos Aires, 2012.

Marie Bardet, acer mundos con gestos, in: André Haudricourt/Marie Bardet, El cultivo de los gestos. Entre plantas, animales y humanos/Hacer mundos con gestos, Editorial, Buenos Aires, 2019.

Marie Bardet, Perder la cara, Editorial Cactus, Buenos Aires, 2021.

val flores, Una lengua cosida de relámpagos, hekht - Colección Incandescencias, Buenos Aires, 2019.

val flores, Romper el corazón del mundo. Modos fugitivos de hacer teoría, Continta me tienes, Madrid, 2021.

val flores, labiar el desierto, La Libre Editora, Buenos Aires, 2022.

AI as academic writing assistant: The student perspective

Marilize Pretorius

University of Antwerp, Belgium

Format: Extended presentation

Becoming a proficient academic writer can be conceptualised in terms of accommodative competence – the ability to adapt your language use to conform to the norms and conventions of a discourse community. An essential aspect of becoming a competent accommodator is feedback. Without feedback, students are unaware and/or uncertain of the extent to which the discourse they produce (do not) meet the expectations of the intended audience. However, providing feedback is often problematic due to high student to lecturer ratios. The recent rise of artificial intelligence (AI) opens new avenues for reducing lecturers' workload while still ensuring that students receive feedback. Students' perspectives on the use of AI as writing assistant can offer valuable insights into the potential for using AI to complement feedback provided by human experts.

A qualitative approach, namely thematic analysis, is used to investigate student reflections in an English academic writing course where ChatGPT 3.5 is used as a writing assistant. The students are guided in using ChatGPT to create and revise writing assignments and subsequently reflecting on its usefulness, strengths, weaknesses, and their intention to use it again in future. The assignments have different foci, e.g. brainstorming, outlining, paragraph structure, using sources, and mechanics (i.e. spelling, grammar, punctuation, etc.). The participants (N=140) are students in the first year of their Bachelor in literature and linguistics, with English as a major, at the University of Antwerp, Belgium. The data is being collected between October and December 2023.

The results will be discussed in terms of whether and/or how we should teach students to use AI as a writing assistant in academic writing courses in higher education.

Participatory sense-making in writing consultations: The what, the why, and the how of developing ideas together

Frano P. Rismondo & Erika Unterpertinger

University of Vienna, Austria

Format: Workshop

In writing consultations, writing professionals typically offer their expertise and guidance on writing, but not on the topic and content at hand. They do, however, facilitate the development of topics within the setting, for example, by asking specific questions, discussing possible approaches, or providing feedback. This content component orientation of non-directive writing consultations, which is usually implicit, has received little attention within writing studies. In our workshop, we introduce two concepts, *felt sense* (Gendlin, 1984; 1996) and *participatory sense-making* (*PSM*; Di Paolo, 2005; Di Paolo, Rohde & De Jaegher, 2010), to provide a theoretical framework for this implicit component of writing consultation. Based on this framework and the participants' personal experiences in writing consultation settings, we will explore possible meanings of these concepts for the practice of writing consultation. The goal of this workshop is to reflect on the participants own practices, explicate moments of relevance and in conclusion consider the practical implications of *felt sense* and *PSM* for writing consultations.

How metaphors shape agentivity in talking about writing and what we can do about that

Ingrid Scharlau

Paderborn University, Germany

Format: Workshop

Talking about writing is peppered with metaphors. Writing doesn't flow (or it flows – but less often), things have to be put together or digested, suddenly something is revealed through writing, and so forth.

The workshop is based on the idea that metaphors, which we use casually (but of course also specifically) for writing, can promote writing processes, but can also hinder them. One way in which they do this is through implied agentivity, that is, the agency of the person writing. When flowing, for example, agency is considerably lower than when assembling with revealing in between the two more extreme points. This is not to say that there is an optimally agentive writing metaphor. Whether this is the case is simply unknown at present; perhaps different situations and tasks require different metaphors?

The workshop introduces a method with which the participants can analyze writing metaphors – their own, metaphors taken from scientific texts or produced by students – in a structured way with regard to their agentivity, so-called transitivity analysis. We will then use the method of metaphor expansion to try out how metaphors can be changed so that they are more beneficial to the writing process. The emphasis of the workshop will be on working, that is, besides short, focused inputs, participants will work on their own metaphorical ideas about writing or material provided by the workshop coordinator.

(How many metaphors did you find?)

Tea and biscuits: Questions of clarity & entitlement in writing instruction

Liesl Schwabe

Berkshire Community College, USA

Format: Extended presentation

As instructors of writing, we strive to empower students with strategies for clarification. But can expectations for "clarity" function, at times, as an extension of entitlement or consumerism, particularly across different cultural contexts? As the writer Arundhati Roy once speculated, "I have often wondered whether the attempt to always be precise... somehow reduces the epic scale of what is really going on." In this reflective presentation, I will explore the tension between precision and reduction in student writing and writing instruction, ultimately arguing that while there's no singular answer, it's a question worth asking.

Both for the relative ease of descriptive writing and because broader concepts are often more effectively conveyed when anchored in the tangible, I often emphasize concrete nouns in my undergraduate writing courses. The more specific the noun, in other words, the more intimate, vivid, and even universal its significance can become.

However, while serving as a Fulbright-Nehru Scholar in Kolkata, India and teaching an essay writing course, I was challenged by a student who argued that concretizing lived experience, across time, disparate cultural viewpoints, and possibly language, might, at best, flatten or misrepresent that experience. At worst, she later elaborated, it could give a reader the false impression of having comprehended something far too violent, traumatic, or intergenerational to ever be crystallized. Something like the horrors of Partition. As a fourth-generation Partition survivor, she resisted my emphasis on the concrete because she rejected the implication that the plight of refugees over newly wrought borders could ever be understood "as seamless(ly) as tea and biscuits." The possibilities and impossibilities of the concrete became a years-long dialogue between this student and me, a dialogue I am now looking to share and with which to publicly grapple.

Formal structures in student talk about academic essays

Paul Vincent Smith

Manchester Institute of Education, The University of Manchester, UK

Format: Extended presentation

Ethnomethodology is an approach to sociology that focuses on the methods that members of society use to achieve social order. It assumes "order at all points", and is therefore warranted to study technical, scientific, and academic settings, as well as everyday, lay contexts.

One category of "talk about text" that I have studied with an ethnomethodological lens is that of how university students in the social sciences talk about assessment texts they have produced, with the aim of finding out how they come to learn the requirements of tertiary level academic writing. One under-elaborated set of practices from my doctoral data concerns the discussion of physical texts by students. The presence of their own texts in hard copy form, and in the light of feedback on their work, occasioned a series of practices that arose from the embodied experience of dealing with both document (the physical and generic instantiation) and text (the meaning of what the text says and does) (Heap 1991, Lynch 1993).

Several analytically separable ethnomethods were identifiable in such examples, including formulations, gestalts, glosses, tying, and retrospective seeing practices. These recurring practices – hence the formal structures (Garfinkel & Sacks 1970, Carlin 2009) of the title – can be seen in the context of wider behaviours such as finding actions and motives; and justifying, explaining, and accounting for the same. In my extended presentation, I would like to present extracts of my transcript data for the examination of these spoken practices, and to invite discussion on the general significance of how they emerge.

Ambiguities in writing assignment design – tensions between different contextual frames

Ingrid Stock

Norwegian University of Science and Technology Trondheim, Norway

Format: Extended presentation

Traditionally, the goal of assigning writing in higher education has been to assess students' acquisition of disciplinary knowledge and their familiarity with disciplinary conventions of academic writing. Researchers and educators have been questioning the usefulness of assignments in higher education, asking for more contextual writing that facilitates the transfer from higher education to the professional world and helps students become aware of the relevance of disciplinary knowledge. However, bridging the gap between academic writing in higher education and workplace writing is not an easy task and makes assignment design a complex activity.

This presentation demonstrates teachers' attempts to provide a contextual frame for students' assignments. The study took place in a Norwegian university where teachers from various disciplines participated in a module about writing and learning, focusing on approaches that support students in their writing development. The data for the study are assignments the participants designed for their students. The teachers were encouraged to design a meaningful assignment for the students in their discipline, based on Bean's (2011) alternative approaches to assigning writing, where students are offered a rhetorical context for their writing, for example a situation they may face in their future professional work. The analysis was guided by the questions: What are the contextual frames of the assignments in terms of communicative situation, genre, purpose or audience? Do the assignments reveal tensions between the rhetorical context intended in the assignment design and the learning context in higher education? Preliminary results reveal ambiguous contextual frames that can be confusing for students. These ambiguities might be difficult to avoid completely. However, raising teachers' awareness about the complexity of assignment design may help to narrow the gap between writing in the context of higher education and writing at the workplace.

Bean, J. C. (2011). *Engaging ideas. The professor's guide to integrating writing, critical thinking, and active learning in the classroom.* John Wiley & Sons.

How PhD students live and develop in metaphors

Juliane Strohschein

Karlsruher Institute for Technology, Germany

Format: Data session

Metaphors can be understood as language activities (Bertau) that can be deliberately chosen to promote self-explanation and communicative understanding. Also, metaphors as part of our (not conscious) everyday conceptual system shape how we speak, think and interact (Lakoff). How can writing and talking about metaphors support the personal development and (writing) process of PhD students? In the conducted writing experiments – choosing metaphors and freewriting – there is a relative freedom from conventions of genre, audience expectations etc. which allows access to the challenges faced by PhD students as a person: like enculturation, taking a stance, questions of belonging and livelihood – and not least attaining self-confidence and sovereignty in an academic world that not so long was only welcoming to a small elite. While being in the process of doing a PhD as a stage of life metaphors and written speech can help to grasp and come to terms with what is relevant but not yet comprehensible and communicable.

The data session is an invitation to examine the collected metaphors, how they transform over time and what they might show about the person and the challenges they are struggling with. How can dialogue on metaphors strengthen self-access, which is an important factor for emotion regulation and to help aligning one's actions, needs and values (Quirin/Kuhl, 2018).

The first layer of data – written personal metaphors for doing a PhD – originates from the warm-up task of the two-day writing workshop "en-writing sovereignty for doctoral candidates" in July 2022. They contrast with the not so conscious metaphors in the freewriting. In follow-up sessions in spring 2023, participants were once again asked for metaphors expressing their current states, and then reflected looking back at their prior metaphor. Here, talking about metaphors as a tool for becoming aware of personal development was experienced as powerful and empowering by participants. Thus, the decision to continue and collect metaphors and freewriting again in April 2024.

Bertau, M.-C. (1996). Sprachspiel Metapher. Denkweisen und kommunikative Funktion einer rhetorischen Figur. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-663-12379-8

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2011). Metaphors we live by: With a new afterword (6. print). Univ. of Chicago Press.

Quirin, M., & Kuhl, J. (2018). The Self-Access Form: Development and Validation in the Context of Personality Functioning and Health. Journal of Individual Differences, 39(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-0001/a000244

Accessing processes of 'discovery' with microphenomenological interviewing techniques

Erika Unterpertinger

University of Vienna

Format: Data session

Many academic writing processes involve a process of 'discovery': writers make discoveries about themselves and their writing processes, and develop ideas as they write (Eigler, 2005, p. 245). These processes of 'discovery' take place in "the mind and [are] consequently hidden" (Rohman, 1965, p. 107), but there are no clear markers to identify them (Danek et al., 2013). Thus, many attempts have been made to explore what happens when a thought is committed to paper, such as think-aloud protocols (Witte & Cherry, 1994), interviews (Chin, 1994), or ethnographic observations (Engert & Krey, 2013).

This data session opens up the problem space of exploring the invisible parts of the writing process that often lack terms in everyday language (Keseling, 2010), focusing on processes of 'discovery'. We begin by looking at how different perspectives in writing studies have conceptualized epistemic writing and how ideas are developed during writing (Karsten & Bertau, 2019; Hoffmann, 2013; Ortner, 2003, 2000; Molitor, 1984). Using examples from case studies collected in an active Ph.D. project, we then discuss a combination of drawing exercises inspired by Prior & Shipka's (2003) and Busch's (2013) work, and the use of microphenomenological interviewing techniques (Petitmengin, 2016; Maurel, 2009; Petitmengin, 2006) as an approach to accessing writers' processes of 'discovery', and how this multimodal form of data collection can be analyzed using constructive grounded theory.