



COWL Project Pedagogic Approaches Report

Mary Deane, Senior Lecturer, CAW
Billy Brick, Languages Centre Manager, BES



Acknowledgments

The following scholars advised the authors on the content of this Report:
Mark Childs, Erik Borg, Peter Hartley, Lisa Ganobcsik-Williams, Penny Gilchrist, Emma Moreton, David Morris, Hilary Nesi, Tom Parkinson, Ray Summers, and John Tutchings



Contents

Introduction	3
Table 1. New Pedagogic Approaches for COWL Learning Activities	5
Table 2. Existing Scholarship informing COWL Learning Activities	7
Part 1. Putting responsibility for writing development into students' hands	
1.1 Online 'filtering' of students to identify type/s of learning activity required	9
1.2 Writing resources available online	9
Part 2. Teaching students to plan and revise assignments	
2.1 Asynchronous individualised feedback online	10
2.2 Synchronous individualised feedback online	10
2.3 The BAWE Corpus	11
2.4 Kibbitzers	11
2.5 Visualisation and Corpora	12
Part 3. Promoting students' independence and confidence as writers	
3.1 Protected Writing Time (PWT) for students	13
3.2 Workshops for undergraduate and postgraduate students	13
Table 3: A comparison of screen capture software products	13
3.3 Add+vantage modules in Academic writing	14
3.4 'Ask the Tutor' (reply within 24hrs)	15
3.5 FAQs	14
3.6 CU Harvard Reference Style website and <i>Guide</i>	15
Conclusions	16
List of References	17
Appendices	
i. Shopping list of e-learning technologies	22
ii. Using the BAWE Corpus to support students: concordancing list for 'academic'	26
iii. Using the BAWE Corpus to support students: visualisation of the methodology genre	27
iv. Using the BAWE Corpus to support students: visualisation of the reflection genre	27



Introduction

Aims

The 'Coventry Online Writing Lab' (COWL) Project is funded by the JISC 'Transforming Curriculum Delivery through Technology' programme, and this Report is the first deliverable of the Pedagogic Approaches Workpackage. The aim of this Report is to identify new pedagogic approaches which may inform the proposed learning activities within COWL. The proposed components of COWL are: a filtering system, writing resources, asynchronous and synchronous individualised writing tutorials, Protected Writing Time (PWT) sessions, workshops for undergraduates and postgraduates, Add+vantage modules, an 'Ask the Tutor' facility, Writing FAQs, and the CU Harvard Reference Style website and *Guide*. Together, these learning activities seek to:

- Extend CAW's writing development to distance learners
- Provide more flexible teaching interventions for all students
- Respond to increasing student demand for individualised writing development
- Improve the scalability of CAW's provision by collaborating with discipline-based colleagues to teach writing

CAW's mission is to enhance students' independence and self-confidence as scholars, and this goal informs both face-to-face and online writing development at CAW (Oates 2000; Beaufort 2007). As CAW's writing tutors recognise the authority and expertise of subject specialists (Hesse 2005), lecturers in the disciplines at CU are integrally involved in the COWL Project. The Project's main discipline-based project partners are: Peri Yavash, Jon Guest, and Mike Walsh (Economics) and Mark Garratt (Paramedics).

Objectives

This Report explores three main ways in which the COWL Project could transform curriculum delivery through technological interventions. These are:

1. Putting responsibility for writing development into students' hands
2. Teaching students to plan and revise assignments to maximise their academic performance
3. Promoting students' independence and confidence as writers

Part 1 of this Report concentrates on possible ways of putting responsibility for writing development into students' own hands through a 'filtering' system and writing resources. Part 2 focuses on teaching students to plan and revise assignments through asynchronous and synchronous



individualised tutorials, including the possible integration of the BAWE Corpus into the COWL site. Part 3 explores ways of promoting students' independence as writers through Protected Writing Time (PWT) sessions, workshops, Add+vantage modules, an 'Ask the Tutor' facility, Writing FAQs, and the CU Harvard Reference Style website and *Guide*.

More widely, the COWL Project seeks to enhance CAW's range of provision through technological interventions which support distance learners and enable students to use their personal technologies. The Project may help raise retention rates and support non-traditional students. The Project could also facilitate collaboration between staff at CAW and academics in the disciplines at Coventry University. Such collaboration would provide staff development in teaching writing within Faculties, and may improve the scalability of CAW's learning activities by capturing and disseminating the expertise of staff at CAW.





Table 1. New Pedagogic Approaches for COWL Learning Activities

COWL Learning Activities	Project-based Pedagogic Rationales	Possible Pedagogic Tools (full <i>Pedagogic Tools Report</i> due 1 st June 09)
1.1 Online 'filtering' of students to identify type/s of learning activity required	Capture CAW Admin Team's expertise and disseminate via online forum to make students more responsible for their own learning Extend CAW's provision to distance learners Provide more flexible teaching interventions for all students Respond to increasing student demand for individualised writing development	Google chat Email CU Student Portal/CAW website Accutrack Second Life
1.2 Writing resources available online	Capture CAW tutors' expertise and disseminate to students efficiently Enhance students' confidence and independence by enabling them to locate and use a range of writing development resources Respond to increasing student demand for writing development	Curve repository Enhance paper-based resources using Raptivity, etc. Adobe Links to existing OWLs Podcasts Kibbitzers
2.1 Asynchronous individualised feedback online (reply within 5 working days)	Improve the scalability of CAW's provision by increasing collaboration with colleagues across the Faculties at CU to offer writing development to students, especially via formative feedback on students' writing Encourage students to use peer review to revise assignments submitting them for assessment Extend CAW's provision to distance learners	Feedback tools: Riffly plus enhancements (Clive Teed/John Tutchings) Illuminate Podcasts Kibbitzers Links to online writing resources and existing OWLs
2.2 Synchronous individualised feedback online (50 mins and 20 mins)	Improve the scalability of CAW's provision by increasing collaboration with colleagues across the Faculties at CU Encourage students to revise assignments before submitting them for assessment Extend CAW's provision to distance learners	Conferencing tools: Mega Meeting Skype The BAWE Corpus Kibbitzers Visualisations Second Life Kibbitzers Links to online writing resources and existing OWLs
3.1 Protected Writing Time (PWT) for students	Capture CAW tutors' expertise and disseminate to students efficiently Promote students' independence and confidence as writers Extend CAW's provision to distance learners Provide more flexible teaching interventions for all students Respond to increasing student demand for writing development	Conferencing tools: Mega Meeting Skype The BAWE Corpus Visualisations Web 2.0 technologies (social networking) Second Life Links to online writing resources and existing OWLs



<p>3.2 Workshops for undergraduate and postgraduate students</p>	<p>Capture CAW tutors' expertise and disseminate to students efficiently</p> <p>Enhance students' confidence and independence by teaching them to improve their own writing</p> <p>Extend CAW's provision to distance learners Provide more flexible teaching interventions for all students</p> <p>Respond to increasing student demand for writing development</p>	<p>Wimba classroom Wiki Moodle Mind mapping tools The BAWE Corpus Visualisations Web 2.0 technologies (social networking) Adobe Echo 360 Camtasia Second Life Illuminate Podcasts Kibbitzers Links to online writing resources and existing OWLs</p>
<p>3.3 Add+vantage modules in Academic Writing</p>	<p>Capture CAW lecturers' expertise and disseminate to students efficiently</p> <p>Improve the scalability of CAW's provision</p> <p>Enhance students' employability</p> <p>Enhance students' confidence and independence by teaching them to improve their own writing</p> <p>Potentially, extend CAW's provision to distance learners and respond to increasing student demand for writing development</p>	<p>Moodle Wiki COWL writing resources available online COWL asynchronous individualised feedback online The BAWE Corpus Visualisations Adobe Echo 360 Camtasia Second Life Podcasts Kibbitzers</p>
<p>3.4 'Ask the Tutor' (reply within 24hrs)</p>	<p>Promote students' independence and confidence as writers</p> <p>Extend CAW's provision to distance learners</p> <p>Respond to increasing student demand for writing development</p>	<p>COWL Project online filtering system Web 2.0 technologies (Google chat) Email Moodle Second Life Podcasts Kibbitzers Links to online writing resources and existing OWLs</p>
<p>3.5 FAQs</p>	<p>Capture CAW tutors' expertise and disseminate to students efficiently</p> <p>Promote students' independence and confidence as writers</p> <p>Put responsibility for improving writing in students' hands as much as practical</p> <p>Extend CAW's provision to distance learners</p>	<p>Wiki Wimba create/course genie/soft chalk Moodle Echo 360 Podcasts Videos of Q&As Kibbitzers Links to online writing resources and existing OWLs</p>
<p>3.6 CU Harvard Reference Style website and Guide</p>	<p>Capture CAW tutors'/lecturers' expertise and disseminate to students</p> <p>Promote students' independence and confidence as researchers</p> <p>Enhance students' confidence and independence by teaching them to cite and reference sources</p>	<p>Link to existing website and downloads Wimba create/course genie (Turnitin)</p>



Table 2. Existing Scholarship informing COWL Learning Activities

COWL Learning Activities	Influential Scholarship	Topic of publication/s
1.1 Online 'filtering' of students to identify type/s of learning activity required	Coogan (1999) Gordon Smith, Ferguson, and Caris (2009) Moore (1993) Leung and Safford (2005); Scalone and Street (2006)	Online writing centres Teaching online vs. face-to-face Types of interaction Widening Participation
1.2 Writing resources available online	Peters (1993) Lea and Street (1998); (2006), Lea (2004)	Distance learning Academic Literacies
2.1 Asynchronous individualised feedback online (reply within 5 working days)	Ice, Curtis, Philips, Wells (2007) O'Donovan, Price, and Rust (2004, 2008) Cooper, Bui, and Riker (2000) Dayton, D. (1998) Williams and Peters (1997)	Asynchronous audio feedback Formative feedback and peer review Protocols for online tuition Formative feedback strategies Audio feedback pedagogy
2.2 Synchronous individualised feedback online (50 mins and 20 mins)	Doyle (2009) Nesi (2000); (2008) Harris and Pemberton (1995) Brooks (1995) Clark and Ivanič (1997) Coffin, Curry, Goodman, Hewings, Lillis, and Swann (2003) Haswell (2008) Lillis (2002) Lea and Street (1998) Pritchard and Honeycutt (2006)	Data driven learning The BAWE Corpus Writing Centre pedagogies Minimalist feedback strategies Politics of writing development A toolkit for teaching writing Teaching writing Wider contexts of writing instruction Academic literacies Process approach to writing tuition
3.1 Protected Writing Time (PWT) for students	Murray and Moore (2006) Petraglia (1995) Peters (1993) Wysocki (2008) Jones and Lea (2008)	Writing groups Rethinking writing instruction Distance learning Digital writing research Digital Literacies
3.2 Workshops for undergraduate and postgraduate students	Brick and Holmes (2008) Macarthur (2006)	Screen capture software New technologies



	Peters (1993) Pritchard and Honeycutt (2006)	Distance learning Process approach to writing tuition
3.3 Add+vantage modules in Academic Writing	Brick (2008b) Ivanič (1997) Hyland (2002) Pritchard and Honeycutt (2006)	Podcasting and screen capture software Writing and identity Teaching writing Process approach to writing tuition
3.4 'Ask the Tutor' (reply within 24hrs)	(Moore 1993)	Types of interaction
3.5 FAQs	(Moore 1993)	Types of interaction
3.6 CU Harvard Reference Style website and Guide	Brick (2008a)	Turnitin as a teaching tool



Part 1

Putting Responsibility for Writing Development into Students' Hands

1.1 Online 'filtering' of students to identify type/s of learning activity required

This part of the COWL Project consists of an online booking system and 'filtering' website, which may eventually merge with CAW's face-to-face activities. This is an innovative feature with no obvious existing comparatives (Blake Yancey 2009; Coogan 1999; Gordon Smith, Ferguson, and Caris 2009). The main purpose of this facility is to enhance students' ability to access and select appropriate writing development from the range of learning opportunities at CAW. The intended outcomes are to make students responsible for their own development as writers and enable them to apply writing strategies to future writing projects. This filtering system will capture and disseminate existing expertise within the CAW Admin Team, and may improve the scalability of existing Reception procedures.

1.2 Writing resources available online

This aspect of the COWL Project seeks to enhance students' independence in accessing a variety of resources on grammar, punctuation, the Writing Process, and discipline-based writing conventions (Peters 1993). The focus of this feature is to give students access to existing CAW materials, and in some cases to enhance these by making them audio/visual or interactive (Dailey 2004). It will also enable students to use other OWLs effectively. As students' academic writing is partly determined by their exposure to effective models of communication, this aspect of COWL could also link to existing guidance on **reading** strategies for university study. For models of online resources and examples of existing OWLs, see Ganobcsik-Williams (2009) and Parkinson (2009).



Part 2

Teaching students to plan and revise assignments to maximise their academic performance

2.1 Asynchronous individualised feedback online (reply within 5 working days)

This part of the COWL Project provides individualised formative feedback to student writers (Brooks 1995). Formative feedback helps students become familiar with scholarly conventions and enhances their understanding of how to fulfil assessment criteria (O'Donovan, Price and Rust 2004). Formative writing feedback also builds students' confidence by offering them a relatively safe environment in which to test out writing styles and ideas (Clark 1995). The COWL asynchronous individualised feedback facility could be used by subject specialists within the Faculties at Coventry University, which would improve the scalability of CAW's provision (Lunsford 1991). The asynchronous feedback opportunity could also be used for peer review within modular contexts to improve students' understanding of assignment briefs, marking criteria, and academic writing conventions (O'Donovan, Price and Rust 2008). For models of online writing tuition, see Ganobcsik-Williams (2009) and Parkinson (2009).

2.2 Synchronous individualised feedback online (50 mins and 20 mins)

This facility within the COWL Project is an innovative feature that will extend CAW's existing individualised tutorials to distance learners. The addition of 20 minute tutorials will also improve the scalability of CAW's provision (Cooper, Bui and Riker 2000). When teaching face-to-face, CAW tutors begin tutorials by asking students to suggest a focus for the feedback, which could also be done in an online forum (Dayton 1998). CAW tutors identify potential issues to discuss and record these, and students are expected to identify action points based on the tutorial (Coogan 1999). These processes could be captured online and recorded for the purpose of Applied Research. Recent research at CAW has identified four main areas which are often addressed in CAW tutorials (Borg and Deane 2009):

- The structure of a text (determined by the Assignment Brief and disciplinary conventions)
- The coherence of a text (in particular at sentence level)
- The vocabulary used in a text (including lexical density and verb-noun relationships)
- The grammar, punctuation, and referencing within a text

Importantly, by teaching writing strategies CAW tutors enhance students' study skills more widely (Monroe 1998) which could also be emphasised in an online forum. For models, see (Ganobcsik-Williams 2009) and Parkinson (2009).



2.3 The BAWE Corpus (<http://www.coventry.ac.uk/researchnet/d/505>)

Potentially, this facility could be an exciting departure from current practice. The BAWE Corpus contains examples of assignments produced by students at British universities (including Coventry University) which gained Class I and II:1. Corpora such as BAWE are useful for students and tutors because they contain authentic models of effective academic writing from a wide range of disciplinary contexts. With access to effective exempla tutors can show students how to produce the required writing structures, styles, and conventions. The advantages of the BAWE Corpus include:

- Useful for both home and international students
- A possible teaching tool for CAW tutors demonstrating disciplinary writing conventions
- Allows students to see common and typical patterns of language use
- More examples than students find in dictionaries
- Enables students to discover the different ways words/phrases are used in authentic academic assignments

The BAWE Corpus is beneficial because although we learn to speak English through imitation and examples, we tend to teach writing through more abstract information such as grammar rules and dictionary definitions. Corpora such as BAWE offer authentic examples in context to address this deficiency and offer a pedagogy for individualised writing tuition. The BAWE corpus is freely available, but multiple user licences can be purchased for enhanced functionality. The software antconc and Wordsmith tools 5.0 provide increased features for teaching and research. The BAWE Corpus is currently undergoing further development to integrate new ways of visualising the data contained within it. See, www.coventry.ac.uk/researchnet/d/904 and the Appendices of this Report.

2.4 Kibbitzers (<http://www.eisu.bham.ac.uk/support/online/kibbitzers.shtml>)

This facility represents a further departure from current practice. The development of teaching materials from corpora is a relatively new field pioneered by Birmingham University, where a bank of 80 'kibbitzers' has been developed based on individualised tutorials. These are freely available, and are categorised under vocabulary, grammar and discourse. 'Kibbitzer' is a term associated with the chess cafes of central Europe in the early C20th and this word refers to a person who observed chess games and made comments on their play. In the context of COWL, kibbitzers would be a bank of advice for student writers based on synchronous and asynchronous tutorials. They could be especially useful as part of the COWL Project FAQs.



2.5 Visualisation and Corpora

This feature could also represent a novel departure from current practice by enabling tutors to show students how ideas should develop logically within academic papers. Examples of how corpora can be visualised are available via the Scottish Corpus of Text and Speech site (<http://www.scottishcorpus.ac.uk/>). The BAWE corpus will also be available in this format by the end of 2009. See also the Appendix below. For further information about corpora, kibbitzers, and visualisation, please contact Billy Brick.



Part 3

Promoting students' independence and confidence as writers

3.1 Protected Writing Time (PWT) for students

This facility within the COWL Project is another innovative feature which will extend CAW's existing provision to distance learners and enable CAW tutors to explore the implications of teaching writing in an online forum (Takayoshi 1996; Petraglia 1995). PWT sessions would improve the scalability of CAW's writing development and help to make students more responsible for improving their own texts. Conferencing tools could be used to create an online space within which tutors and students could interact. Peer review could also be integrated after initial trails of this online forum for group writing sessions.

3.2 Workshops for undergraduate and postgraduate students

This facility within the COWL Project would be influenced by recent developments in the applications of screen capture software for learning and teaching online. Screen capture software enables tutors to record their on-screen actions and their spoken comments while creating feedback. The resulting files can be distributed to individual learners, for example through a VLE such as Moodle, and can be played back by students as video with a running commentary, with various sections of their writing highlighted, annotated, and discussed (Brick and Holmes 2008). Until recently two of the major practical problems with providing this kind of feedback were the cost of the software (Camtasia Studio costs about £200) and the size of the files generated, as well as the associated problems of returning the finished product to students. The recent availability of free software and web-hosting services have largely addressed these issues.

Table 3: A comparison of screen capture software products

Product and address	Cost	File quality	Formats	Web hosting	Strengths	Weaknesses
Camtasia http://www.techsmith.com/camtasia.asp File hosting at: www.screencast.com	\$299	Depends on compression and file format selected.	Multiple possibilities. Camtasia also includes a sophisticated editing suite	Free up to 2GB per month storage and bandwidth Pro account available from \$9.95	Professional screen capture and editing suite with multiple file format possibilities. Sophisticated editing suite. Comprehensive support site.	Automatic upgrades not provided. Downloaded onto a specific PC - not web based. Expensive.
Jing Project	Free	Excellent	Just a url.	Yes – pro version available at \$14.95	Downloadable (not web)	Firewall problems at Coventry



http://www.jingproject.com/ File hosting at: www.screencast.com			Pro version allows MPEG- 4, direct upload to YouTube	per year	based) Stripped down version of Camtasia without the editing suite.	University
Screen Toaster http://www.screentaster.com/	Free	Excellent	url .mov .swf	Yes	Web based. Intuitive.	.swf format still in beta and does not include sound.
Screencastle http://screencastle.com/	Free	Excellent	url html embed code	Yes	Web based. Good quality full screen option.	Slow. No audio test facility. Difficult to use and unreliable

3.3 Add+vantage modules in Academic Writing

Currently, level 1 Add+vantage modules use wikis developed by Paul Gove to teach students feedback strategies and provide formative feedback opportunities. CUOnline is a key feature of Add+vantage modules at present, which take place in the CAW Writing Lab. Moodle could be used for a distance learning offering of these modules (Moore 1993, Gordon Smith, Ferguson, and Caris 2009). Online workshops could also draw upon screen capture software (Brick 2008b).

3.4 'Ask the Tutor' (reply within 24hrs)

At present CAW offers a limited version of this feature via the Centre's email address: writing.caw@coventry.ac.uk. This could be extended using a rota system or other means of distributing queries to individual tutors, such as the COWL Project filtering system. This facility could be used to promote students' independence by encouraging them to address questions to writing tutors in place of attending individualised tutorials. The feature could draw on a range of tools including email, web 2.0 technologies, and Moodle. An advantage would be the opportunity to capture the expertise of CAW tutors and make this available for students in conjunction with online writing resources and links to existing OWLs.

3.5 FAQs

This would be a new type of provision that would help to make students more independent learners. It could draw on kibbitzers, podcasts, and other tools. The COWL Project FAQs would be determined by the questions addressed to writing tutors, which could be enhanced by short videos of writing tutorials. This facility could be linked to online writing resources and existing OWLs.



3.6 CU Harvard Reference Style website and *Guide* (www.coventry.ac.uk/caw)

This facility could be based on the existing referencing resources developed at CAW (Deane 2006) which is designed to make students more confident and independent scholars. The existing website and downloads could be extended by adding referencing FAQs and links to other useful websites and OWLs. Links could also be introduced to Turnitin, RefWorks and the University Library.



Conclusions

By implementing a selection of the pedagogic approaches outlined in tables 1 and 1, the COWL Project could seek to transform curricula through demonstrable impacts in the following four areas:

- **Student behaviour** (for instance, by evidencing an increase in students who revise assignments effectively before submission)
- **Staff behaviour at CAW** (for instance, by making explicit and recoding tutor's knowledge about giving feedback and producing staff development resources)
- **Institutional behaviour** (for instance, by encouraging academics to teach peer review strategies via COWL's asynchronous/synchronous feedback tools)
- **Influence on the sector** (for instance, by providing a pedagogy for individualised and group synchronous online writing tuition)

Based on responses to this document from members of the COWL team, the forthcoming *Report on Pedagogic Tools* will identify which tools are most appropriate for each learning activity within the COWL Project. As the second outcome of the Pedagogic Approaches Workpackage, the *Report on Pedagogic Tools* is due to be delivered on June 1st 2009.



List of References

- Beaufort, A. (2007) *College Writing and Beyond*. Logan, UT: Logan State University Press
- Black, P. and William, D. (1998) 'Assessment and Classroom Learning.' *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice* 5, (1): 7-74
- Blake, Yancey. K. (2009) 'Writing in the 21st Century.' *National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) Report 2009*. Urbana, IL: NCTE: 1-9
- Borg, E. and Deane, M. (2009) *Interim Report on Individualised Writing Tutorials at Coventry University's Centre for Academic Writing (CAW)*. Unpublished Report. Coventry University
- Brick, B. (2008a) 'From carrot to stick – using Turnitin to help improve students' writing' [online] available from
<<http://www.english.heacademy.ac.uk/explore/publications/casestudies/assess/turnitin.php>> [29th April 2009]
- Brick, B. (2008b) 'How to provide student feedback using screen capture software' [online] available from <<http://www.illas.ac.uk/events/archive/3170>> [29th April 2009]
- Brick, B and Holmes, J. (2008) 'Using Screen Capture Software for Student Feedback.' In: Klinshuk, D. Sampson, G., Spector, J.M., Isaias, P., and Ifenthaler, D. (eds.) *Cognition and Exploratory Learning in Digital Age: Proceedings of the IADIS CELDA 2008 Conference*, Freiburg, Germany: 339-342
- Brooks, J. (1995) 'Minimalist Marking.' In Murphy, C. and Sherwood, S. (eds.) (1995) *The St. Martin's Sourcebook for Writing Tutors*. New York: St. Martin's Press: 88-95
- Chickering, Z. F. and Gamson, A. W. (1991) *Applying the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Clark, I. L. (1995) 'Collaboration and Ethics in Writing Center Pedagogy.' In Murphy, C. and Sherwood, S. (eds.) (1995) *The St. Martin's Sourcebook for Writing Tutors*. New York: St. Martin's Press: 83-7
- Clark, R. and Ivanič, R. (1997) *The Politics of Writing*. London: Routledge



- Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T. M. and Swann, J. (2003) *Teaching Academic Writing: A Toolkit for Higher Education*. London & New York: Routledge
- Cooper, G., Bui, K., and Riker, L. (2000) 'Protocols and Process in Online Tutoring.' In Raforth, B. (ed.) (2000) *A Tutor's Guide: Helping Writers One to One*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook
- Coogan, C. (ed.) (1999) *Electronic Writing Centres*. Stamford: CT: Ablex
- Dailey, S. R. (2004) 'Linking Technology to Pedagogy in an Online Writing Center.' *The Journal of the Legal Writing Institute* 10: 181-206
- Dayton, D. (1998) 'Technical Editing Online: The Quest for Transparent Technology.' *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 28, (1): 4-37
- Deane, M. (2009) 'Seeking Students' Perceptions of Individualised Writing Consultations.' *Academic Futures: Inquiries into Higher Education and Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars
- Deane, M. (2006) *CU Harvard Reference Style Guide* [online] available from www.coventry.ac.uk/caw [30th April 2009]
- Doyle, P. (forthcoming, 2009) 'Viewing Language Patterns: Data Visualisation for Data Driven Language Learning.' In Ho, C. M. L., Anderson, K. T., and Leung, A. P. (eds.) (forthcoming) *Transforming Literacies and Language: Innovative Technologies, Integrated Experiences*. London: Routledge
- Forbes, D. and Spence, J. (1991) 'An Experiment in Assessment for Large Classes.' In Smith, R. (ed.) (1991) *Innovations in Engineering Education*. London: Ellis Horwood
- Ganobcsik-Williams, L. (2009) *COWL Project Review of the Origins and Current Practices of Online Writing Labs (OWLs) and Online Writing Support*. Unpublished Report. Coventry University
- Gibbs, G. (2006) 'How Assessment Frames Student Learning.' In Bryan, C. and Klegg, K. (2006) *Assessment in Higher Education*. Routledge: Abingdon: 23-36
- Gordon Smith, G., Ferguson, D. and Caris, M. (2009) 'Teaching College Courses Online vs Face-to-Face.' *Transforming Education through Technology* [online] available from <http://www.thejournal.com/articles/15358> [29th April 2009]



- Harris, M. and Pemberton, M. (1995) 'Online Writing Labs (OWLs): A Taxonomy of Options and Issues.' *Computers and Composition* 12, (2): 145-59
- Haswell, R. H. (2008) 'Teaching of Writing in Higher Education.' In *Handbook of Research on Writing: History, Society, School, Individual, Text.* ed. by Bazerman, C. New York & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 331-346
- Hesse, D. (2005) 'Who Owns Writing?' *College Composition and Communication* 57: 335-57
- Hyland, K. (2002) *Teaching and Researching Writing.* London: Longman
- Ice, P. Curtis, R., Philips, P., and Wells, J. (2007) 'Using Asynchronous Audio Feedback to Enhance Teaching Presence and Students' Sense of Community.' *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks* 11: 2
- Ivanič, R. (1997) *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Jones, S. and Lea, M. R. (2008) 'digital Literacies in the Lives of Undergraduate Students: Exploring Personal and Curricular Spheres of Practice.' *Electronic Journal or E-Learning* 6 (3): 207-16
- Lea, M. (2004) 'Academic Literacies: A Pedagogy for course Design.' *Studies in Higher Education* 29, (6): 739-56
- Lea, M. R. and Street, B. V. (1998) 'Student Writing in Higher Education: An Academic Literacies Approach.' *Studies in Higher Education* 23, (2) 157-172
- Lea, R. L. and Street, B. V. (2006) 'The Academic Literacies Model: Theory and Applications.' *Theory into Practice* 45, (4): 368-377
- Leung, c. and Safford, K. (2005) 'Nontraditional Students in Higher Education in the United Kingdom: English as an Additional Language and Literacies.' In Street, B. V. (ed.) (2005) *Across Educational Contexts: Mediating Learning and Teachings.* Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing
- Lillis, T. M. (2001) *Student Writing: Access, Regulation, Desire.* London & New York: Routledge
- Lunsford, A. (1991) 'Collaboration, Control, and the Idea of a Writing Center.' *The Writing Centre Journal* 12, (1): 3-10



- MacArthur, C. A. (2006) 'The Effects of New Technologies on Writing and Writing Process.' In *Handbook of Writing Research*. ed. by MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S. and Fitzgerald, J. New York: Guilford: 248-262
- Monroe, B. (1998) 'The Look and Feel of the OWL Conference.' In Hobson, E. (ed.) (1998) *Wiring the Writing Center*. Logan UT: Utah State University Press: 3-24
- Moore, M. (1993) 'Three Types of Interaction.' In Harry, K., Hohn, M. And Keegan, D. (eds.) *Distance Education: New Perspectives*. London: Routledge
- Murray, R. and Moore, S. (2006) *The Handbook of Academic Writing: A Fresh Approach*. Houndmills: Open University Press
- Nesi, H. (2001) 'A Corpus-based Analysis of Academic Lectures Across Disciplines.' In Cotterill, J. and Ife, A. (eds) (2001) *Language Across Boundaries*. London: BAAL in association with Continuum Press: 201-218
- Nesi, H. (2008) 'Introducing BAWE: A New Lexicographical Resource.' In Bernal, E. And DeCesaris, J. (eds) *Proceedings of the XII EURALEX International Congress, Barcelona, 15-19 July 2008*. Barcelona: Institut Universari de Linguística Aplicada, Universitat Pompeu Fabra: 737-752
- Oates, L. C. (2000) 'Beyond Communication: Writing as a Means of Learning.' *The Journal of the Legal Writing Institute* 6: 2-27
- O'Donovan, B., Price, M. and Rust, C. (2004) 'Know what I mean? Enhancing student understanding of assessment standards and criteria.' *Teaching in Higher Education*, 9, (3): 145-158
- O'Donovan, B., Price, M. and Rust, (2008) 'Developing student understanding of assessment standards: a nested hierarchy of approaches.' *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13, (2): 205-217
- Parkinson, T. (2009) *Online Writing Labs Report*. Unpublished Report. Coventry University
- Peters, O. (1993) 'Understanding Distance Education.' In Harry, K., Hohn, M. And Keegan, D. (eds.) *Distance Education: New Perspectives*. London: Routledge
- Petraglia, J. (ed.) (1995) *Reconceiving Writing, Rethinking Writing Instruction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum



Pritchard, R. J. and Honeycutt, R. L. (2006) 'The Process Approach to Writing Instruction.' In *Handbook of Writing Research*. ed. by MacArthur, C. A., Graham, S. and Fitzgerald, J. New York: Guilford: 275-290

Rogers, C. (1969) *Freedom to Learn*. Columbus: Merrill

Scalone, P. and Street, B. (2006) 'Academic Language Development Programme' (Widening Participation). In BAAL London: Equinox Publishing: 121-35

Sinclair, J. (1995) 'Introduction.' In *Collins Cobuild English Dictionary*. London: HarperCollins

Takayoshi, P. (1996) 'The Shape of Electronic Writing.' *Computers and Composition* 13: 235-41

Williams, V. and Peters, K. (1997) 'Faculty Incentives for the Preparations of Web-Based Instruction.' In Khan, B. H. *Web-based Instruction* Educational Technology Publications. Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey

Wysocki, A. F. (2008) 'Seeing the Screen: Research into Visual and Digital Writing Processes.' In *Handbook of Research on Writing: History, Society, School, Individual, Text*. ed. by Bazerman, C. New York & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: 599-611



Appendices

i. Shopping list of e-learning technologies by Mark Childs

What they are	How they work	What they're used for	Some things that need to be looked out for
Email mailing lists		Information can be disseminated effectively, by placing all learners within a mailing list so all can communicate with everyone else, group communication should be possible.	Few students use email as their main mode of communication. Email responses, and responses to responses are difficult to organise into sensible dialogues and get mixed in with all other communications.
Websites		Transmitting information from central source to recipients. Really good for helping organise and administrate courses.	Borderline elearning. Only really achieves assimilative learning, and administration (the value of either shouldn't be underestimated however)
Blogs	Learners create content by uploading posts to their own website. Posts can be tagged and the tags searched on to bring together all posts on a subject into one stream. Some blogs environments generate an RSS feed (discussed below)	Blogs are effective for reflection and are effectively an online diary. The advantages of writing online is that content can be shared and others can reflect on learners' posts. Groups of learners can link to each others blogs to share experiences. Blogs can be appended with photos, audio and video.	Although blogging has been around for a long time, it's probably still the best environment for encouraging reflection. Structuring reflection, for example by setting questions to be answered in the blog makes it more effective.



What they are	How they work	What they're used for	Some things that need to be looked out for
<p>RSS Feeds / podcasting / vodcasting /twitter</p> <p>RSS uses long text posts, podcasting audio files, vodcasting video files, twitter very short text files.</p>	<p>They all work by creating a feed from a series of posts /audio file, etc.</p> <p>The reader sets up an aggregator that pulls all these different feeds together.</p> <p>Twitter particularly can be used as a backchannel in sessions – participants create a tweet with a tag; the tag enables all other tweets with that tag to be pulled into a single stream.</p>	<p>These are all ways to transfer information from a central place to a set of recipients. The learner can choose which feeds to include, so can personalise and create their own synthesis of the feeds. These systems also make it very easy for learners to create their material, you then can create a community of learners sharing content and reflecting on each others content.</p> <p>A backchannel can be useful in lectures and presentations for the audience to comment and raise questions during the presentation, making them far more participative.</p>	<p>Just setting up a system for reflecting doesn't mean you'll get reflection. The process needs to be structured effectively for it to work.</p>
<p>Social bookmarking</p>	<p>Websites can be tagged with keywords and the links shared on sites such as del.icio.us, digg, reddit and stumbleupon – browsers can have buttons on the toolbar to simplify this process</p>	<p>These are useful for sharing information within a group on a project. Links can be annotated with additional information.</p>	<p>The number of bookmarks need to reach a critical mass and be regularly updated for participants to find them useful.</p>



What they are	How they work	What they're used for	Some things that need to be looked out for
Social networking sites (Facebook, MySpace Bebo) content sharing sites (Flickr, Youtube, slideshare)	<p>Social networking sites enable users to upload their own content and link their sites with other contacts. Flickr does this with photos; youtube videos and slideshare powerpoint.</p> <p>Many social networking sites also include discussion boards, and can send out emails or feed updates when a contact updates their information. Facebook includes a chat facility. Facebook also can incorporate a feed from Twitter and content from Flickr pages.</p>	These platforms enable users to upload and share content, work can be swapped between them to make working collaboratively simple. The integration of other web 2.0 technologies means that most of the tools that could be used to communicate are incorporated into one location.	<p>The multiplicity of tools can be confusing, information can be posted onto walls, shared in a discussion group and instant messaged.</p> <p>It's very rare to find a student who does not use FaceBook. However, this does not automatically mean that they would be competent at using it for educational activities. Also there is likely to be some resistance to an institution invading their personal space. Usually the balance is to provide the option to use it to support teaching but not make it compulsory.</p>
Discussion boards	Discussion boards are websites in which members of the group can post messages or reply to messages already posted. The replies are displayed next to each other to form threads, enabling the different dialogues to be followed. Most discussion boards can be communicated with via email, i.e. posts to the board will also be emailed to members, and emails to the board will be posted as part of the discussion. Some systems incorporate the possibility to upload documents	These are useful for sharing and collaborating on ideas. Dialogue can be collected and reviewed.	These can struggle if a critical mass of postings isn't reached. The discussions need to be facilitated and moderated usually so require some input from the teacher. Setting up forwarding to emails helps make people aware of postings and encourages participation.
wikis	Wikis are webpages that permit subscribers to alter content on the page. Previous versions of the page are stored for retrieval. Many wikis enable users to annotate the changes with a parallel discussion page.	These are excellent for creating collaborative documents, since only one version ever exists and all participants can access it at any time.	There's a cultural reticence (maybe it's particularly a UK one) to being forward enough to alter a colleague's work. People need to be encouraged to feel eligible to make the changes.



What they are	How they work	What they're used for	Some things that need to be looked out for
IM chat	Instant messaging enables people to send text messages directly to another person, chat opens up a window on the desktop in which a dialogue can take place. Yahoo, Google, MSN, Facebook all have chat facilities. A chat widget can be added to webpages to enable greater integration	IM and chat both can connect people quickly and easily. Mobile devices can connect to Messenger and so on. Chat can be constantly running to provide a degree of "absent presence" for a group of learners.	This works well in one-to-one communication. Running a group in chat requires a level of specialised techniques in order to manage the interactions.
Mobile devices	Mobile phones and PDAs both enable people to receive a wide range of content which can be accessed at any time and any place.	These are ubiquitous devices that are now capable of a fairly high level of sophisticated content. Placing the learning literally within the hands of learners personalises and individualises the learning.	Content needs to be specifically designed for the smaller displays. This is still only assimilative learning. Little opportunity for social construction etc.
eportfolio	Real eportfolio systems (e.g. PebblePad) specifically for bringing in a range of different sources of content, organising them, and pushing them out to all subscribers, peers, etc. Other eportfolios can tend to be just websites with CVs etc uploaded to them.	Eportfolios can be very effective means for managing content and sharing it within a group.	
videoconferencing	Systems range from highly sophisticated bespoke rooms with high bandwidth connections and mounted cameras (access grid, Cisco Telepresence) through to multiple webcams connected via Adobe Connect, to just a single point-to-point system such as Skype	This is a very effective way to connect to learners and learner providers in other locations. Some systems such as Connect also have chat and shared whiteboard spaces. Presentation and applications can be shared between sites.	This works well for discussions, and seminars, poorly for lectures (unless they're very interactive).
video	Video systems can just be a standalone camera, or a camera controlled from a PC, to systems such as Echo 360 which can capture and upload the video to a streaming server in one go	Video works mainly as 1) a resource for learning 2) a method for generating reflective responses to student presentation skills 3) motivation for students to conduct their own learning	To expand upon 3) setting students the task of producing a video that can act as a learning resource for other students can be an effective means to motivate them to learn



What they are	How they work	What they're used for	Some things that need to be looked out for
Virtual worlds, multi-user virtual environments	These are computer-generated environments that participants enter from different locations and interact with each other via a digital representation of themselves known as an avatar. Second Life, Active Worlds, Metaplace, etc. (there are 60 to 70 different virtual world platforms)	Can be effective for roleplay, for interacting with 3D resources, for discussions, and for experimenting with design (even identity design).	Possibly the system with the most inherent barriers to participation. Quite demanding of resources, and takes a while to learn to operate the interface. Also the benefits of VWs come from the ability to experience embodiment within the space, which takes time to develop (and not all participants do). Also because they superficially resemble games (and poor resolution games at that), and have a playful element, this encourages some learners to feel entitled not to engage.

ii. Using the Scottish Corpus to support students: concordancing list for 'academic'. By Billy Brick



