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Overview

• Institution: Vantage College (VC) Academic English Program (AEP)
• Pedagogy: Task-based curriculum based on the functions of language in context: content, positioning, organization
  Key paper: Ferreira & Zappa-Hollman, 2019
• Instructional practice workshop to explore pedagogical framework: role-playing dialogue with student about academic writing.
• Samples of pedagogical tasks across the VC AEP
• Questions and discussion
Applied Science student reflection: exit survey

In the VANT140 classes that I took this term, I have properly learned the scientific concepts in a better way, as I am able now to approach the problems from an aspect of language, which makes me comprehend the scientific wordings that are present. I used to approach the mathematical, physical, and chemical problems in a very narrow aspect, where I did not really understand the main purpose of the problems; all that I understood was how to calculate and find values of certain things. However, now I enjoy solving problems more than I used to, as I am able to understand the idea of the problem and relate it to real life examples.
I have practiced the analyses of language features in the written works and learned how to construct the academic writing well. These skills had been developed throughout the Vant 140 course. I started understanding the different structure of the text and the different meanings of words due to their locations in the sentences when I was in the class in term 1. In fact, we continued practicing these skills in term 2 and gaining extra knowledge and techniques of analyzing languages features. I had achieve great progress in academic writing with the helps from all my professors in Vant 140 course. These skills contributed a lot in all my assignments in varied disciplines.
Program Goals and Student Positioning

• Readiness for high-quality academic engagement
• Students positioned as apprentice researchers, as engaged in and reflective about processes of knowledge creation
• Students socialized into and explicitly taught the valued cultural and linguistic practices of the discipline
The Setting

New, custom designed, first year undergraduate program for international students at large research-intensive Canadian university

Student profile:

- International (24+ countries of origin)
- Recent high school graduate (18~19 years old)
- High academic achiever
- Slightly below university language admission requirements
- First time living abroad, independently
Program overview

Applied Sciences (Engineering)

Arts (Social Sciences)

Management

Sciences

Four degree options
BEGIN A UBC DEGREE IN VANTAGE ONE

Vantage One | BA, BASc, BMgt or BSc Program | Graduation
---|---|---
Year 1 | Year 2 to graduation

Vantage One, an innovative first year undergraduate program for international students, is the only content and language integrated program of its kind at a top-tier university in Canada. After successfully completing one year of academic courses combined with intensive academic English preparation, students are able to transition into the second year of their chosen degree program.

Vantage One presently offers four streams of study including Arts, Management, Science and Applied Science-Engineering.

Bachelor of Applied Science in Engineering
Coursework includes Foundational Engineering Skills, Chemistry, Math, and Physics. Complete a BASc at the UBC Okanagan or Vancouver campus.

Bachelor of Arts
Global Citizenship: Coursework in Geography, Political Science, Psychology, Research and Writing. Complete a BA at the UBC Vancouver campus.

Bachelor of Science
Coursework in Math, Physics, and Chemistry, with the choice to select either a Computational or Physical Sciences elective. Complete a BSc at the UBC Vancouver campus.

Bachelor of Management
Coursework prepares students for studies in Marketing, Finance, and Business. Complete a BMgt at the UBC Okanagan campus.

t. 604.827.0337  |  e. info@vantagecollege.ubc.ca  |  www.vantagecollege.ubc.ca
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 1 (UBCV)</th>
<th>Term 2 (UBCV)</th>
<th>Summer Term (UBCV) (May 11-Jul 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary Research Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Studies in Writing</td>
<td>Arts Studies in Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational writing course (LLED 200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Language and Content Instruction (VANT 140)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vantage One Science Stream
(41-42 credits total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 1 (UBCV)</th>
<th>Term 2 (UBCV)</th>
<th>Summer Term (UBCV) (May 11-Jul 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Multidisciplinary Research Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Writing research (LLED 201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational writing course (LLED 200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Language and Content Instruction (VANT 140)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary Research Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vantage One Engineering Stream
(44 credits total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term 1 (UBCV)</th>
<th>Term 2 (UBCV)</th>
<th>Summer Term (UBCV) (May 11-Jul 22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Engineering Design Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus</td>
<td>Calculus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Writing research (LLED 201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational writing course (LLED 200)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Language and Content Instruction (VANT 140)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Linear Algebra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Conventional View of Content and Language

**Academic Content**
the representation of specialized knowledge with uncertain links to the social enactment of knowledge creation

**Language**
variably undertheorized as decontextualized grammar rules, communicative gambits, vocabulary lists, and/or skills.
Learning **language**, learning **through language**, and learning **about language**

Learning a language increasingly becomes a matter of learning through this language in a growing range of quotidian and professional contexts...

and learning a language can increasingly be helped by learning about this language - not only passively, but also actively by investigating it and by developing one’s own resources for learning [...] learning through language is intricately linked to the expansion of a learner’s registerial repertoire.

(Matthiessen, 2006, p. 33).
Pedagogical approach & language orientation

- Integrated language and content instruction (CBI/CLIL)
- English for General Academic Purposes (EGAP) & English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP)

Text-based literacy pedagogy

Systemic Functional Linguistics
- Explicit Instruction
- Register and Genre

Wide angle

Narrow angle

Basturkmen (2016)
General Structure of AEP: 2 key courses & tutoring

**LLED 200/201**
- Writing courses provide the theoretical foundation for understanding content and language integration, and contextualized language study more generally

**VANT 140**
- Content and language integrated adjunct courses
  - Eg VANT 140 Sociology
  - VANT 140 Science: Physics, Chemistry, Calculus
A conventional View of Content-Language

An SFL-informed View of Language in Academic Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Function</th>
<th>A. Text Level</th>
<th>B. Section Level</th>
<th>C. Clause and Word Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These questions focus on the functions of representing and logical relations; that is, on what’s going on, with whom or what, and under what circumstances, and the logical connections between ideas. Writers focus on the content function in order to build well-reasoned valued knowledge of a discipline.</td>
<td>• Do the beginning, middle, and end stages of the text build knowledge relevant to the topic and purpose?</td>
<td>• Does the information in the paragraphs progress from general to specific?</td>
<td>• Are concepts and other entities appropriately represented, using a sensible level of abstraction or generalization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do logical relations set up between stages express the appropriate kinds of reasoning for this text (e.g., explanation, description, procedure, etc.)?</td>
<td>• Is there an initial sentence to preview the ideas and orientations in this section for the reader?</td>
<td>• Are experiences (material, verbal, mental actions) and associated circumstances appropriately represented?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Function</th>
<th>A. Text Level</th>
<th>B. Section Level</th>
<th>C. Clause and Word Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These questions focus on how writers position themselves in relation to their claims and to the reader. Writers work through interpersonal choices to convincing readers of the writer’s claims by fair and reliable means.</td>
<td>• Does the text build the author’s points and positions across its stages (e.g., reinforce and amplify)?</td>
<td>• In each stage of the text, does the writer direct the argument and the reader in a preferred direction?</td>
<td>• Are claims appropriately weighed, with well-supported claims presented confidently, if possible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the writer demonstrate familiarity with disciplinary expectations?</td>
<td>• Are there range of perspectives introduced?</td>
<td>• Does the writer position themselves effectively in relation to the reader?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Function</th>
<th>A. Text Level</th>
<th>B. Section Level</th>
<th>C. Clause and Word Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These questions focus on how writers organize the written message to facilitate its interpretation by readers. Often after the content and interpersonal functions are set, writers revise the information order considering what is background, known and new information for the reader.</td>
<td>• Does the title preview key ideas and orientations presented in the text?</td>
<td>• Does the information flow well within paragraphs and text subsections?</td>
<td>• Does the subject of each clause contain information that is known or expected to be known to the reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are headings and subheadings used to signal the organization of larger texts?</td>
<td>• Is there an initial sentence to preview the ideas and orientations in this section for the reader?</td>
<td>• Is information that is new to the reader introduced at the end of sentences?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are all in-text citations properly referenced at the end of the text?</td>
<td>• Are specific ideas easy to track in the text through cohesive resources, such as pronouns, repetition, synonyms?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Original 3x3 framework available here: [http://www.academia.edu/816239/The_3x3_Setting_Up_a_Linguistic_Toolkit_for_Teaching_Academic_Writing](http://www.academia.edu/816239/The_3x3_Setting_Up_a_Linguistic_Toolkit_for_Teaching_Academic_Writing)
Feedback on Academic Workshop Task

• A ‘map’ of academic literacy support in writing
• A context of f2f tutorial with writing student

1. Listen to the student. How is the student mediating/understanding the issue in their writing? i.e., what entry point for the pedagogical dialogue does the student’s question suggest in terms of language function and scale of language use?

2. From this entry point, where could we productively direct the discussion to support a more fully contextualized, holistic understanding? How can we use the instance as a point of departure for directing the student to their meaning potential?
Student questions: We know the main function at stake in the question is CONTENT, but what scale of language use (A, B, or C) is the student’s entry point for mediating/understanding the issue?

When does it become necessary to use the term “human biology” instead of simply “biology”?

I have to explain the factors in elastic collisions. What sensible options are available for logically ordering these factors across the assignment?
2. Interpersonal Function

These questions focus on how writers position themselves in relation to their claims and to the reader. Writers work through interpersonal choices to convince readers of the writer’s claims by fair and reliable means.

- Does the text build the author’s points and positions across its stages (e.g., amplifying or reinforcing)?
- Does the writer demonstrate familiarity with disciplinary expectations?
- In each stage of the text, does the writer direct the argument and the reader in a preferred direction?
- Are a range of perspectives introduced?

- Are claims appropriately weighed, with well-supported claims presented confidently, and more speculative claims hedged?
- Does the writer position themselves effectively in relation to the reader?
- Are key claims appropriately supported with citations?
- Is the level of formality of the vocabulary appropriate?

**Student question:**

When I cite an author, is there a projecting process (aka reporting verb) that I can use to express my agreement with the author?... And I would like to agree implicitly.
3. Organizational Function

These questions focus on how writers organize the written message to facilitate its interpretation by readers. Often after the content and interpersonal functions are set, writers revise the information order considering what is background, known and new information for the reader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Text Level</th>
<th>B. Section Level</th>
<th>C. Clause and Word Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The whole text</td>
<td>Text stages, sections &amp; paragraphs</td>
<td>Sentences, clauses, groups, phrases and words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Does the title preview key ideas and orientations presented in the text?
- Are headings and subheadings used to signal the organization of longer texts?
- Are all in-text citations properly referenced at the end of the text?

- Does the information flow well within paragraphs and text subsections?
- Is there an initial sentence to preview the ideas and orientations in this section for the reader?
- Are specific ideas easy to track in the text through cohesive resources, such as pronouns, repetition, synonyms?
- Are changes in logic signalled using appropriate phrases?

- Does the subject of each clause contain information that is known or expected to be known to the reader?
- Is information that is new to the reader introduced at the end of sentences?

“What are the benefits of a two-part title?”

A study of student questions
Mapping Academic Literacy Support (in Writing): A Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A. Text Level</th>
<th>B. Section Level</th>
<th>C. Clause and Word Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The whole text</td>
<td>Text stages, sections &amp; paragraphs</td>
<td>Sentences, clauses, groups, phrases and words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Content Function</td>
<td>Do the beginning, middle, and end stages of the text build knowledge relevant to the topic and purpose?</td>
<td>Does the information in the paragraphs progress from general to specific?</td>
<td>Are concepts and other entities appropriately represented, using a sensible level of abstraction or generalization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do logical relations set up between stages express the appropriate kinds of reasoning for this text (e.g., explanation, description, procedure, etc.)?</td>
<td>Is there an initial sentence to preview the ideas and orientations in this section for the reader?</td>
<td>Are experiences (material, verbal, mental actions) and associated circumstances appropriately represented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are ideas within each paragraph or section logically ordered (e.g., by time, cause, consequence, comparison, or a sensible mix of logics)?</td>
<td>Are ideas within each paragraph or section logically ordered (e.g., by time, cause, consequence, comparison, or a sensible mix of logics)?</td>
<td>Are causal and other logical relations appropriately presented in verbs, nouns, and circumstances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpersonal Function</td>
<td>Does the text build the author’s points and positions across its stages (e.g., reinforce &amp; amplify)?</td>
<td>In each stage of the text, does the writer direct the argument and the reader in a preferred direction?</td>
<td>Are claims appropriately weighed, with well-supported claims presented confidently, and more speculative claims hedged?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the writer demonstrate familiarity with disciplinary expectations?</td>
<td>Are a range of perspectives introduced?</td>
<td>Does the writer position themselves effectively in relation to the reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are key claims appropriately supported with citations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is the level of formality of the vocabulary appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Function</td>
<td>Does the title preview key ideas and orientations presented in the text?</td>
<td>Does the information flow well within paragraphs and text subsections?</td>
<td>Does the subject of each clause contain information that is known or expected to be known to the reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are headings and subheadings used to signal the organization of longer texts?</td>
<td>Is there an initial sentence to preview the ideas and orientations in this section for the reader?</td>
<td>Is information that is new to the reader introduced at the end of sentences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are all in-text citations properly referenced at the end of the text?</td>
<td>Are specific ideas easy to track in the text through cohesive resources, such as pronouns, repetition, synonyms?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are changes in logic signalled using appropriate phrases?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identifying entry points and trajectories of literacy support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Text Level</th>
<th>B. Section Level</th>
<th>C. Clause and Word Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Content Function</strong></td>
<td>The whole text</td>
<td>Text stages, sections &amp; paragraphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These questions focus on the functions of representing and logical relations; that is, on what’s going on, with whom or what, and under what circumstances, and the logical connections between ideas. Writers focus on the content function in order to build well-reasoned valued knowledge of a discipline.</td>
<td>• Do the beginning, middle, and end stages of the text build knowledge relevant to the topic and purpose?</td>
<td>• Are concepts and other entities appropriately represented, using a sensible level of abstraction or generalization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do logical relations set up between stages express the appropriate kinds of reasoning for this text (e.g., explanation, description, procedure, etc.)?</td>
<td>• Is there an initial sentence to preview the ideas and orientations in this section for the reader?</td>
<td>• Are experiences (material, verbal, mental actions) and associated circumstances appropriately represented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpersonal Function</td>
<td>Does the text build the author’s points and positions across its stages (e.g., reinforce &amp; amplify)?</td>
<td>• Are claims appropriately weighed, with well-supported claims presented confidently, and more speculative claims hedged?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These questions focus on how writers position themselves in relation to their claims and to the reader. Writers work through interpersonal choices to convince readers of the writer’s claims by fair and reliable means.</td>
<td>• Does the writer direct the argument and the reader in a preferred direction?</td>
<td>• Does the writer position themselves effectively in relation to the reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the writer demonstrate familiarity with disciplinary expectations?</td>
<td>• Are a range of perspectives introduced?</td>
<td>• Are key claims appropriately supported with citations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organizational Function</td>
<td>Does the title preview key ideas and orientations presented in the text?</td>
<td>• Does the level of formality of the vocabulary appropriate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These questions focus on how writers organize the written message to facilitate its interpretation by readers. Often after the content and interpersonal functions are set, writers revise the information order considering what is background, known and new information for the reader.</td>
<td>• Are headings and subheadings used to signal the organization of longer texts?</td>
<td>• Does the subject of each clause contain information that is known or expected to be known to the reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are in-text citations properly referenced at the end of the text?</td>
<td>• Are specific ideas easy to track in the text through cohesive resources, such as pronouns, repetition, synonyms?</td>
<td>• Is information that is new to the reader introduced at the end of sentences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are changes in logic signalled using appropriate phrases?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trajectories of support: Two directions

1. **Content Function**
   - These questions focus on the functions of representing and logical relations; that is, on what's going on, with whom or what, and under what circumstances, and the logical connections between ideas.
   - Writers focus on the content function in order to build well-reasoned valued knowledge of a discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Text Level</th>
<th>B. Section Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do the beginning, middle, and end stages of the text build knowledge relevant to the topic and purpose?</td>
<td>Does the information in the paragraphs progress from general to specific?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do logical relations set up between stages express the appropriate kinds of reasoning for this text (e.g., explanation, description, procedure, etc.)?</td>
<td>Is there an initial sentence to preview the ideas and orientations in this section for the reader?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Interpersonal Function**
   - These questions focus on how writers position themselves in relation to their claims and to the reader. Writers work through interpersonal choices to convince readers of the writer’s claims by fair and reliable means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Text Level</th>
<th>B. Section Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the text build the author’s points and positions across its stages (e.g., reinfore &amp; amplify)?</td>
<td>In each stage of the text, does the writer direct the argument and the reader in a preferred direction?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the writer demonstrate familiarity with disciplinary expectations?</td>
<td>Are a range of perspectives introduced?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Organizational Function**
   - These questions focus on how writers organize the written message to facilitate its interpretation by readers. Often after the content and interpersonal functions are set, writers revise the information order considering what is background, known and new information for the reader.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Text Level</th>
<th>B. Section Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the title preview key ideas and orientations presented in the text?</td>
<td>Does the information flow well within paragraphs and text subsections?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are headings and subheadings used to signal the organization of longer texts?</td>
<td>Is there an initial sentence to preview the ideas and orientations in this section for the reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are all in-text citations properly referenced at the end of the text?</td>
<td>Are specific ideas easy to track in the text through cohesive resources, such as pronouns, repetition, synonyms?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Are concepts and other entities appropriately represented, using a sensible level of abstraction or generalization?
- Are experiences (material, verbal, mental actions) and associated circumstances appropriately represented?
- Are causal and other logical relations appropriately presented in verbs, nouns, and circumstances?
- Are claims appropriately weighed, with well-supported claims presented confidently, and more speculative claims hedged?
- Does the writer position themselves effectively in relation to the reader?
- Are key claims appropriately supported with citations?
- Is the level of formality of the vocabulary appropriate?
- Does the subject of each clause contain information that is known or expected to be known to the reader?
- Is information that is new to the reader introduced at the end of sentences?
### Trajectories of Support: Two Directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Text Level</th>
<th>Section Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Content Function</strong></td>
<td>Do the beginning, middle, and end stages of the text build knowledge relevant to the topic and purpose?</td>
<td>Does the information in the paragraphs progress from general to specific?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do logical relations set up between stages express the appropriate kinds of reasoning for this text (e.g., explanation, description, procedure, etc.)?</td>
<td>Is there an initial sentence to preview the ideas and orientations in this section for the reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connect this entry point in this function to other levels of language use</td>
<td>Are ideas within each paragraph or section logically ordered (e.g., by time, cause, consequence, comparison, or a sensible mix of logics)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Interpersonal Function</strong></td>
<td>Does the text build the author’s points and positions across its stages (e.g., reinforce &amp; amplify)?</td>
<td>Are claims appropriately weighed, with claims presented confidently and more speculative hedged?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the writer demonstrate familiarity with disciplinary expectations?</td>
<td>Does the writer position themselves effectively in relation to the reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connect this entry point to parallel functions</td>
<td>Are key claims appropriately supported with citations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Organizational Function</strong></td>
<td>Does the title preview key ideas and orientations presented in the text?</td>
<td>Does the subject of each clause contain information that is known or expected to be known to the reader?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are headings and subheadings used to signal the organization of longer texts?</td>
<td>Is information that is new to the reader introduced at the end of sentences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are all in-text citations properly referenced at the end of the text?</td>
<td>Are specific ideas easy to track in the text through cohesive resources, such as pronouns, repetition, synonyms?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TASK**

**Procedure:**

Complete the matrix by identifying the ‘entry point’ indicated by the 10 student questions (cases) with the location on the map/matrix. From this entry point, where would you direct the student in/around the Matrix to better contextualize their understanding/practice?

- Working alone, locate the entry point in the matrix (i.e., by function & level) for the tutorial talk with the student. From this entry point, where would you take the discussion?
- Present your case(s) to a partner; discuss options
- Note Case # entry point (EP) and trajectory (TR) on your matrix
UBC Vantage College Academic English Program

Selected Instructional Resources

for content-language integrated literacy
LLED 200 Introduction to Writing in Professional and Academic Registers: Language functions taught/assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sept 4 - 8</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td>Course Introduction and Diagnostic Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 1 - Description &amp; Paragraghing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sept 11 - 15</td>
<td>Unit 1 - Description &amp; Paragraghing</td>
<td>Unit 1 - Description &amp; Paragraghing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sept 18 - 22</td>
<td>Unit 1 - Description &amp; Paragraghing</td>
<td>Unit 1 - Description &amp; Paragraghing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sept 25 - 29</td>
<td>Unit 2 - Information Ordering in Academic Texts</td>
<td>Unit 2 - Information Ordering in Academic Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oct 2 - 6</td>
<td>Unit 2 - Information Ordering in Academic Texts</td>
<td>Unit 3 - Interpersonal Positioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment 1 DRAFT (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due date: Sun., Oct 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oct 9 - 13</td>
<td>Unit 3 - Interpersonal Positioning</td>
<td>Unit 4 - Representing Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Oct 16 - 20</td>
<td>Unit 3 - Interpersonal Positioning</td>
<td>Assignment 1 FINAL (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Due date: Sun., Oct 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oct 23 - 27</td>
<td>Unit 4 - Representing Content</td>
<td>Unit 5 - Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 30 – Nov 3</td>
<td>Assignment 2 DRAFT (10%)</td>
<td>Assignment 2 DRAFT (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 6 - 10</td>
<td>Assignment 2 FINAL (10%)</td>
<td>Assignment 3 (25%) Due date: Fri, Dec 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nov 13 - 17</td>
<td>Unit 6 - Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nov 20 - 24</td>
<td>Unit 6 - Cohesion</td>
<td>Writing Workshops / Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 27 – Dec 1</td>
<td>Writing Workshops / Review</td>
<td>Writing Workshops / Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERVIEW**

**Organization – paragraph**
- Definition, classifying

**Organization – clause**
- Interpersonal positioning, hedges, boosters, self-mention etc

**Content – processes**
- States, mental, verbal, material actions
- Participants (concepts, things, people)
- Circumstances (place, time etc)

**Content – managing abstraction**
- Cohesion
Feedback and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good effort with topic sentences but more clarity would help. Theme/new choices sometimes interrupted flow. Also, at times, you need to signpost for the reader the logical connections between ideas with 'Specifically... 'For example,...etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You show good insight and maturity in the focus (eg only focus on interesting results). However, sometimes the ideas are not very clear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Positioning</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine. Just the lack of clarity led me to become skeptical about some of your knowledge claims.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoyed reading your Discussion. Good effort. In the grade, I took into account the novelty for you of the approach, as well as what can be reasonably expected from your writing given the instruction you've received. Your writing has shown development: good effort!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

This study investigates the differences and similarities of use of interactional resources in organic chemistry in terms of contrastive rhetoric (Chinese & English), staging (Abstract & Discussion) and sub-fields of chemistry (PEG & UV). The results are two: higher hedges used in English writing compared to Chinese writing, use of “we” in English writing compared to “researchers” in Chinese as self-mention, no interesting variation between sub-fields and higher self-mention in Discussion compared to Abstract. The discussion section will
“Catalyzing Students’ Knowledge of Language”

Aims of LLED201: Science students develop and write a study of science discourse

“to further develop students’ knowledge and experience of the features that characterize research-based academic writing”

“to build critical research and writing skills”

and be “better prepared to communicate about a small-scale empirical research study”
Guidelines for Discourse Research

• Focus on written communication in science
• Comparative analysis of two or more texts or text-types
• Minimum # of words of all texts analyzed: 1,800

Suggestions for research on discourse variation
• Two (or more) text-types in one discipline*
• Levels of specialization in one discipline
• One text-type in two (or more) disciplines*
• Sub-sections within one text-type*
• Two modes in one discipline (e.g., writing and speech)
• Historical changes within a discipline*
• Inter-cultural/lingual comparison in a discipline*
Choices for meaning-language focus

(nb. scope vs depth)

• Experiential abstraction, discourse specialization, info density:
  lexical density, length of clause*, nominalization*,
  noun group formation

• Density of logical reasoning (explicit – implicit):
  grammatical intricacy*

• Topic preview, development:
  hyper-theme (topic sentences); theme-rheme/new;
  thematic patterns

• Interpersonal positioning*:
  hedging; boosting; self-mention; engagement markers;
  attitude markers
**Explicit Instruction for Discourse Research: IMRD Plan Staging**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Back-ground: Topic &amp; Rationale</td>
<td>Identify the general research domain and the research topic; provide a rationale for this focus (i.e., explain why knowing more about them will be of interest and of value); review and cite at least two relevant past studies in the general research domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify the Gap in Knowledge</td>
<td>Within the general research topic, identify the specific focus of the research; the focus is identified by moving from the general scope of the research presented in Stage 1 to a specific research focus; the specific focus is introduced by reviewing and citing at least two relevant past studies that show there is a gap in knowledge or an opportunity to extend knowledge in terms of language functions or variables (specific aspects of content e.g., processes, lexical density, nominalization; organization e.g., theme/new, topic sentences; and/or IP eg, hedging, attitude markers). The interest in how these variables indicate the different purposes, uses, and context of the texts. The focus of the research is stated in the form of a research question, which ends Stage 2 of the research plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plan to Fill the Gap</td>
<td>Explain how you plan to fill the gap – how the research question will be answered – in your research project; briefly explain the methods that are involved in the research: What kind of study is it? How will focal texts/ data be selected and collected for the study? What methods will be used to analyze the data e.g., analysis of nominalization, theme, hedging?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluate the Plan</td>
<td>Restate the purpose of the research; if you have a hypothesis about the variation (differences) between the focal texts, state it here; identify possible challenges or limitations in the study; restate the potential value of the research (e.g., for teaching and learning writing; understanding how academic knowledge is adapted to various situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• VIDEO of student presentation
Adjunct Course (VANT 140)
Learning Outcomes

• use strategies of self-directed learning to reflect on and revise work.
• identify the main organizational patterns of disciplinary-specific (written/oral) texts and be able to produce these for either a specialist or non-specialist audience.
• identify and employ strategies to pack and unpack information, concepts, and/or arguments from a variety of sources.
• utilize comprehension strategies (listening, reading, writing, oral) to engage with and respond to questions or comments about their discipline from either a specialist or non-specialist perspective.
• provide and receive peer feedback on student work in a variety of modes (oral, visual, written, mixed).
### ARTS
- 2-stage mid-course and final tests (nominalization, morphology, summarizing, IMRD journal articles, etc.) [ARTS] (2 x 15%)
- Reading annotation assignment [GEOG] (2.5%)
- Written reflection on oral presentation of assigned reading [GEOG] (2.5%)
- Written summary of 1-page journal article excerpt [GEOG] (15%)
- Written reflection on learning [POLI] (15%)
- Vocabulary/morphology test [POLI] (5%)
- Midterm quiz [PSYCH] (understanding academic articles) (5%)
- Creation and comparative analysis of two spoken psychology texts (academic and popular) [PSYCH] (15%)

### MANAGEMENT
- Midterm & final tests (language features of MGMT register/genres) [MGMT] (2 x 15%)
- Vocabulary wiki [ECON] (5%)
- Written discussion assignment [ECON] (15%)
- Vocabulary quiz [SOCI] (5%)
- Oral presentations applying sociology concepts to popular podcasts [SOCI] (15%)
- Midterm quiz (understanding academic articles) [PSYCH] (5%)
- Creation and comparative analysis of two spoken psychology texts (academic and popular) [PSYCH] (15%)

### SCIENCE
- Oral presentation of a solution to a physics problem (15%)
- Midterm (prob-sol’n staging, translating equations into prose, academic def’ns) (15%)
- Intonation/staging assessment (15%)
- Quiz on logical fallacies (15%)
- Debates on scientific issues (15%)
- Final quiz (logic & argumentation) (15%)

### ENGINEERING
- Assessments of language use in lab reports [CHEM] (28%)
- Lab report peer feedback assignment [CHEM] (2%)
- Contributions to vocabulary wiki [COMP+DESIGN] (2%)
- Quiz on vocabulary wiki items [COMP + DESIGN] (5%)
- Oral presentation of a sol’n to a coding prob. [COMP] (8%)
- Oral presentation of a sol’n to a physics problem [PHYS] (13%)
- Oral group presentation of mini-project [DESIGN] (8%)
- Written language use in poster presentations [DESIGN] (7%)
- Quiz on vocabulary of schematic design [DESIGN] (2%)
- ‘Talking Head’ video presentation [DESIGN] (7%)

What are we teaching and assessing?
Oral Presentations: Organization and Intonation

Alfredo A. Ferreira
UBC Vantage College
VANT140 Science
A. Setting up the story

  Interpersonal framework
  1a Greeting .
  and/or 1b Acknowledgement of support

  Discourse framework
  2a Announce topic
  and/or 2b Outline structure/Indicate Scope

B. The context of the topic

  1a Local conference context
  and/or 1b Research context/literature review

C. Research rationale

  Motivation
  1a Problems / Gaps / Counter-claims
  and/or 1b Relevance / Centrality / Need

  Response
  2a Hypothesis/Research Question
  and/or 2b Preview results or solutions
Quick Set up TASK: identify the moves

- **A1a:** Good afternoon and many thanks for attending this talk about our VANT149 research. My research partner is Janika Lee and I’m Ken Ishii.
- **A1b:** We’d like to acknowledge the help of our VANT149 instructor, Brett Gilley, in preparing this study.
- **A2a:** Our topic concerns levels of bacteria in drinking water.
- **B1a:** You may have noted several other presentations concerning water security at this conference and...
- **B1b:** The previous studies noted in the slide have focused on the effect of bacteria in drinking water in terms of human safety, ...
- **C1b:** we’re excited to help address this general global issue in a small way.
- **C1a:** ...but none have explored the interactions between bacteria and minerals.
- **C2a:** We sought to find out how these two interact and how this interaction affects drinkability or the safety of the water.
- **A2b:** Janika will continue by describing the specific scope of the research....
Data Commentary adapted from Swales & Feak, 2004

1. **Indicative summary of figure**  
   *optional move: Interpretive aid*

2. Highlighting statement(s)

3. **Extension/discussion/interpretation**
Data Commentary adapted from Swales & Feak, 2004

1. Indicative summary of figure
   *optional move: Interpretive aid

2. Highlighting statement

3. Extension/discussion/interpretation

Figure 2 presents the yield spread between Japanese short- and long-term interest rates. If the expectations hypothesis holds, the spread shown in Figure 2 should follow a stationary process. The spread shows a negative trend until around 1990, implying a lower risk premium due to higher expectation of future economic expansion. After 1991 it moves in an upward trend.
Data Commentary Embedded in Introduction
1. OK so good morning everyone
2. I'm delighted to have the opportunity to uh present my own research topic this morning
3. I'm going to talk about uh what I studied over the last two years
4. uh liquidity trap and monetary policy
5. uhm you may have noticed that this topic is similar to my previous presentation
6. that I jointly made with "name"
7. uhm there we talked about the lost decade in Japan, the zero-interest rate policy, and the recommendation for inflation-targeting scheme
8. today I want to talk about this issue more
9. uh by specifically focusing on liquidity trap
10. before I uh give you the outline
11. uh let me briefly mention
12. how this topic has raised the attention of macroeconomists
13. this figure is shows the number of journal articles written about liquidity trap
14. and as you can see there are clusters on the right hand side
15. and this is after 1999
16. as I have explained before uh
17. the zero interest rate policy started in 1998
18. and it just ended last week as some of you may know
19. so it coincides with the period when the Bank of Japan implemented this policy
20. so uh the Japanese experience has raised the attention of a lot of economists after 1999
21. so my presentation this is the outline
20. So uh the Japanese experience has raised the attention of a lot of economists after 1999.

21. So my presentation this is the outline.

22. And my presentation today is based upon two of my recent research papers.

23. The first one is a literature survey on liquidity trap.

24. But I will not tell you all the details about various technical papers.

25. But instead I will explain what the liquidity trap is.

26. And the second paper is uh analyzes the monetary optimal monetary policy under liquidity trap.

27. And it also considers investment behavior.

28. Which is normally abstracted for simplicity.

29. Uh we incorporated this investment behavior.

30. Because it is important when we think about the likelihood of getting caught in the liquidity trap.

31. And I will explain why it is so later on.
Primary tones of spoken English: simplified pedagogical model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone #</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Pitch movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td>falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td>rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td>level / low rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td>falling-rising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td>rising-falling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tone #</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Pitch movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,3</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Symbol" /></td>
<td>falling + level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

adapted from Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004
1. Good morning everyone.

2. I'm delighted to have the opportunity to present my own research topic this morning.

3. I'm going to talk about what I studied over the last two years.

4. Liquidity trap and monetary policy.

5. You may have noticed that this topic is similar to my previous presentation.

6. That I jointly made with "name".

7. There we talked about the lost decade in Japan, the zero-interest rate policy.

8. Today I want to talk about this issue more.

9. By specifically focusing on liquidity trap.

10. Before I give you the outline.

11. Let me briefly mention.

12. How this topic has raised the attention of macroeconomists.

13. This figure shows the number of journal articles written about liquidity trap.

14. And as you can see there are clusters on the right hand side.

15. And this is after 1999.

16. As I have explained before uh.

17. The zero interest rate policy started in 1998.

18. And it just ended last week as some of you may know.

19. So it coincides with the period when the Bank of Japan implemented this policy.

20. So the Japanese experience has raised the attention of a lot of economists after 1999.

21. So my presentation this is the outline.
1. So good morning everyone.

2. I'm delighted to have the opportunity to uh present my own research topic this morning.

3. I'm going to talk about uh what I studied over the last two years.

4. Uh liquidity trap and monetary policy.

5. Well you may have noticed that this topic is similar to my previous presentation.

6. That I jointly made with "name".

7. Uh there we talked about the lost decade in Japan, the zero-interest rate policy, and the recommendation for inflation-targeting.

8. May I want to talk about this issue more.

9. Uh by specifically focusing on liquidity trap.

10. Before I uh give you the outline.

11. Uh let me briefly mention.

12. How this topic has raised the attention of macroeconomics.

13. This figure is shows the number of journal articles written about liquidity trap.

14. And as you can see there are clusters on the right hand side.

15. And this is after.

16. I have explained before.

17. The zero interest rate policy started in 2010.

18. And it just ended last week as some of you may know.

19. So it coincides with the period when the Bank of Japan implemented this policy.

20. So uh the Japanese experience has raised the attention of a lot of economists after.

21. So my presentation this is the outline.
20. so uh the Japanese experience has raised the attention of a lot of economists after 1999
21. so my presentation this is the outline
22. and my presentation today is based upon two of my recent research papers
23. the first one is a literature survey on liquidity trap
24. uh but I will not tell you all the details about various technical papers
25. but instead I will explain what the liquidity trap is
26. and the second paper is uh analyzes the monetary optimal monetary policy under liquidity trap
27. and it also considers investment behavior
28. which is normally abstracted for simplicity
29. uh it incorporated this investment behavior
30. because it is important when we think about the likelihood of getting caught in the liquidity trap
31. and I will explain why it is so later on
Extension of intonation work to spoken calculus solutions


Alfredo Ferreira in Vantage College uses CLAS for linking language in math practice

"Videos of instructors solving mathematical problems on CLAS were annotated by students, allowing them to build the link between language use and mathematical practice."

—Alfredo Ferreira, Lecturer in UBC Vantage College

Back Story

VANT140 Math is one of several coordinated 'Content and Language Linked Tutorials' in the UBC Vantage College 'Vantage One' program, which is a full-credit first-year program with streams in Arts and Sciences in its inaugural year 2014-15. UBC Vantage College students are international UBC students who meet the university’s academic requirements but do not quite meet its language requirements. They take full credit loads in their respective programs as well as credit-bearing courses in the
Intonation in Calculus Solution; sample draft assignment

Transcription of Vant140/Math 100 Video: A Rate of Change Problem

Stage 1

Time | Annotation
--- | ---
0:30 | Ok, so here we have a nautical problem.
 | So at midnight, ship A is 10km north of ship B, some other ship.
 | Ship A goes west at 8km per hour.
 | Ship B goes south at 15km per hour.
 | And the problem is, one hour later, at 1am, what is the rate at which the distance between the ships is changing?
 | Ok so there's a lot to keep track of here.
 | so let me start be drawing a picture.

0:31 - 0:50 | Our initial situation is something like this, I guess.
 | So we have two ships, ship A and ship B, tens kilometres apart.
 | And ship A is going west.
 | And ship B is going south.
 | And what we wanna do is we wanna measure, we wanna find the rate at which the distance between the ships is changing one hour after they start moving.
 | So at that point, ship A will be somewhere over here.
 | And ship B will be somewhere down here.

1:01 - 1:30 | And if we call this distance d, let's say,
 | what do we wanna do?
 | This is ship A here.
 | This is ship B.
 | We wanna find the rate at which d is changing.
 | So let's say we wanna find
 | if this is a function of time, d of t,
 | we wanna find d prime of t.
 | In fact, we want to find d prime of t at t equals one hour past midnight.

1:31 | So we want to find d prime of one where d of t is the distance between the ships at time t.

Stage 2
Focal Register: Description in science/applied science

Fills a gap in instruction for reporting and categorizing in these streams
Distinguishing Description and Explanation

Match each assignment with a diagram

Assignment A:
*Describe the surficial (surface) geology of Vancouver.*

The surficial geology of the City of Vancouver comprises various lithostratigraphic features that are associated with the area’s glacial history and location beside a large river delta and ocean inlet. A dominant surficial geological feature is glacial drift. Glacial drift is late-Pleistocene deposits of till, stream gravel, sand, boulders, and shell. Another important but less common geological feature is the later, Holocene deposits of gravel, sand, clay and till from glacial retreat and melt-out. Also evident within the city’s limits are small areas of Pre-Quaternary sandstone and shale.

Assignment B:
*Explain a key factor in the geological formation of Vancouver.*

The geology of Vancouver is the result of many complex processes. However, in explaining Vancouver’s geological formation, geologists recognize glacial rebound as a key factor. At various times during the Pleistocene and Holocene Epochs, the low-lying area now occupied by Vancouver was covered by glaciers as much as two kilometres thick. During glaciation, the weight of the glaciers caused the underlying rock to sink. As the glaciers retreated and melted and their weight was removed, the sunken rock gradually rebounded upwards above the current sea level. This rebound exposed the large deposits of glacial sediment, which is evident in the much of the surficial geology of the city as gravel, sand, boulders, till and clay.
Focal Register: Description in science/applied science

-Helps to address key challenges in scientific English (Halliday, 1989):
  -Interlocking definitions
  -Technical taxonomies
  -Special expressions
  -Lexical density

These features “evolved to meet the needs of scientific method, argument, and theory. As learners master these features, they are also mastering scientific concepts and principles.” (p. 15)
Focal Register: Physical chemistry lab report in applied science

- Close cooperation between chemistry and two AEP instructors
- Co-written papers, conference attendance

-AEP instructor has SFL background, makes explicit links to foundational course e.g., VANT 140 slides including reminders to “link to LLED200”
For the lab report, students

“will be able to explain relevant physical chemistry concepts clearly; describe experimental procedures precisely; present and discuss results effectively; and use citations appropriately” (emphasis in the original).
However,

Vantage students are typically challenged not by technical calculations

but by reflecting on and recounting the experiment according to specific assignment guidelines and disciplinary norms. They tend to cluster around explanations of experimental errors and descriptions of the chemical processes themselves.
Other issues in the lab reports

In the procedure, students often enact an enabling procedural register with the Mood choice of commanding readers to act rather than choices that chronicle the procedures.

Consistent problems arise in theme choices, the use of thematic patterns, and associated choices and formation of active and passive voice, affecting information focus and flow.

Across the report, students tend to rely too much on processes in construing their lab observations; e.g., “the boiling water fluctuated on its surface”, which contrasts with a preferred, nominalized construal such as “the fluctuating surface of the water”.

Positive feedback

Exit survey of cohort about their experiences in the course

71% of students either agreed or strongly agreed that 'Getting written feedback from the professor and TA and revising my lab reports have helped me improve my English-language lab report writing skills'.
Podcasts in Sociology

• Sociology course learning outcomes: “to develop a sociological perspective on complex, everyday issues such as social inequality, social institutions, and social change”
  – Exploration of theories and concepts => application through the analyses of podcast episodes (two short writing assignments)

• Adjunct course: Oral presentation assignment
  • Summary of podcast
  • Explanation using theory/concept
  • Discussion of limitations
Podcasts in Sociology

Listening & analyzing for content

Comparing features of spoken and written texts -> turning spoken-like texts into written-like texts through increased abstraction

Composing two texts: spoken (peer audience) and written (sociologists)

Analyze podcast episode drawing on sociological theory/concept -> write paragraph

Sociology podcast analysis paper
Collaborations and SFL expertise

• Crucial role of collaborations between language and disciplinary specialists
  – EAP instructors as ethnographers of disciplinary registers

  “Increasingly, SFL specialists are working collaboratively with subject teachers and literacy tutors who, while expert users of academic language themselves, have not had specialist training in SFL and have not developed a metalanguage for making understandings explicit to students.” (Humphrey et al, 2010, p. 186)

• Professional development needs
  – Workshops; SFL help-desk; weekly curriculum meetings; readings; marking calibration sessions
References

- Williams, G. (2016). Social justice, social class, and literacy development: thinking beyond 'scaffolding'. Public lecture at the Department of Language and Literacy Education (LLED), October 24, UBC.
Thank you!

Alfredo A. Ferreira: alfredo.ferreira@ubc.ca