ED 461 290   FL 027 120

AUTHOR   Hyon, Sunny; Chen, Ron
TITLE   University Faculty Writing and EAP Education: Beyond the
                Research Article.
PUB DATE   2001-02-25
NOTE   18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American
                Association of Applied Linguistics (St. Louis, MO, February
                24-27, 2001).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *College Faculty; *English for Academic Purposes; Graduate
                Study; Higher Education; *Teacher Attitudes; *Writing
                (Composition); Writing Instruction

ABSTRACT
                This study examined full-time college faculty members'
beliefs about various aspects of faculty work-related writing. Surveys asked
about the amount of time faculty spent writing texts related to teaching,
research, and services; rhetorical elements faculty believed they attended to
when writing the text; the degree of difficulty they experienced writing
various genres; and their attitudes about how well graduate school prepared
them to write certain texts, noting implications of those findings for
English for Academic Purposes (EAP) graduate writing courses. Results
indicate that faculty writing extends well beyond traditional research genres
and includes a number of rhetorically complex teaching and service texts that
require close attention both to accuracy and clarity of the message and to
appropriate levels of formality and the feelings of the audience. The
findings suggest that EAP courses preparing doctoral students for academic
careers at U.S. or other universities could usefully incorporate some
preparation from less frequently discussed texts in the literature, such as
peer evaluation reports that are perceived by faculty as particularly
difficult or that require attention to the often tricky interactional
features of writing. (SM)

University Faculty Writing and EAP Education: Beyond the Research Article

Sunny Hyon and Ron Chen
California State University, San Bernardino
(shyon@csusb.edu; rchen@csusb.edu)

ED 461 290

2

University Faculty Writing and EAP Education: Beyond the Research Article

Sunny Hyon and Ron Chen
California State University, San Bernardino
(shyon@csusb.edu; rchen@csusb.edu)

For the last several years, Ron and I have enjoyed working in faculty positions that regularly exercise and stretch our writing abilities. Recently, we have been reflecting on the very diverse writing acts that we participate in at our workplace. Our job profiles may parallel those of a number of you in this room. We are linguistics faculty in an English department at a mid-size state university, where we teach a range of undergraduate linguistics courses and graduate classes in a MA Composition/TESL program.

In our years as junior and fairly recently tenured faculty, we have engaged in the usual writing of conference papers and articles. We've realized, however, that our work-related writing extends way beyond these research genres. Certainly in the area of teaching, for example, we write class syllabi, handouts, writing assignments, exams, and of course comments on students' papers and masters' theses. In addition, we have found ourselves quite significantly engaged in writing what we might call "service genres," those texts required of our administrative service tasks to the department, college of arts and letters, and larger university. In a given year, these genres might include committee memos, peer evaluation reports, letters of recommendation, and curriculum proposals. Recently, our writing in this service area has been particularly heavy as we have both taken on key coordinator positions in our department--Ron as graduate coordinator and myself as composition coordinator. Our numerous letters and emailed memos written in these positions particularly interest us because we have found them to be rhetorically complex and challenging, requiring close attention not only to accuracy and clarity but also to appropriateness of tone and formality, as well as to the feelings of our audience. Contrary to being peripheral to our "real" jobs, we have found these texts to be critical for building rapport and successful communication between ourselves and students and colleagues.

In thinking about our processes for learning how to compose these texts, we've speculated that while our graduate school experiences prepared us well for writing research genres such as

1

conference abstracts and journal articles, as well as--to some extent--teaching-related genres, some of the rhetorical skills required of service texts have been learned largely on the job.

A parallel lack of attention to these genres seems to exist in English for Academic Purposes scholarship as well. That is, while a number of scholars in this area have analyzed and/or developed teaching materials for texts such as the experimental report, conference posters, and grant applications, relatively little work has focused on other texts relevant to faculty writing. However, there have been a few such as Precht (1998) and Swales and Feak (2000) who have considered the discourse features of texts for academic communications more broadly defined, genres that include letters of request and apology, correspondence with editors, job application letters, and letters of recommendation. Swales and Feak (2000) note that some such texts are "out of sight," that is, kept in files rather than on public record, and may also be difficult for newcomers to pitch to their specific audiences. Drawing on Swales (1996), Precht (1998) remarks that "since these occluded genres are private documents, they are much more likely to retain their authors' cultural influences than are the more public, highly stylized texts such as research articles" (p. 241). Precht focuses on one such occluded genre--the letter of recommendation--and reveals a number of differences in the ways this genre is handled across cultures. She also notes that "unlike other academic writing tasks, there is no specific training in how to write a [letter of recommendation]." This may in fact be the case with a number of other faculty genres, making them potentially challenging to those who are not yet familiar with the ways these texts are realized discoursally and linguistically in local academic cultures.

As research into these other genres of the academy is just beginning, investigations are needed of the range of writing integral to faculty life in the U.S. and elsewhere. Findings from studies of this kind may thus help guide curricula preparing advanced EAP graduate students to meet the varied writing demands of academic careers, should they choose this path.

The study we report on today offers a starting point for such an investigation. Spurred on by our reflections of our own writing practices, we conducted a survey of full-time faculty at our mid-size comprehensive state university--California State University, San Bernardino --to elicit

responses about various aspects of faculty work-related writing. Surveys were sent to approximately 455 tenure-line faculty and full-time lecturers, and a copy of this survey is included in your handout, beginning on page 2.

To help determine how significant various genres are in the daily lives of faculty, we inquired (in question 1) about the amount of time faculty spend writing texts related to three broad areas of their work--teaching, research, and service. The genres under teaching and research are probably quite common across universities. However, here are a few explanatory notes for the genres under service: class visitation reports refer to reports written by faculty evaluating one of their colleague's classes. A few down from that--The FAR and AAR, or Faculty Activity Report, and Annual Activity Report, are sort of curriculum-vita-like texts regularly submitted by all faculty to committees who evaluate them for retention, tenure, and promotion or merit pay decisions. RPT/FMI reports are the evaluation reports that are written by the committees making these decisions.

We also wished to explore the rhetorical elements faculty believe they attend to when writing these varied texts. Thus, on page 3 of your handout, we asked them to rank how conscious they are of the elements on the top row when writing the texts in the left-hand column. These features on the top might be divided roughly in terms of Brown and Yule's (1983) transactional and interactional discourse functions. That is, these first three categories--accuracy of information, clarity of expression, and organization seem critical to conveying the informational content of the message (or transactional function), whereas degree of formality, attention to others' feelings, flair and humor, and one's image may hinge more on the nature of the relationships between the faculty writer and the audience (or interactional function).

Turning to questions 3 and 4, we were also curious as to the degrees of difficulty faculty experienced writing various genres and the genre they found most difficult to write and why.

Finally, with respect to question 5, we were interested in faculty perceptions as to how well graduate school had prepared them to write certain texts and what implications these findings might have for EAP graduate writing courses.

In terms of our data collection, we had, in fact, a fairly good response rate--of the 455 surveys we sent out, we received 106 (or roughly 23%) back, suggesting that these issues may have struck a chord with a number of faculty.

I will now turn the floor over to Ron who will discuss the results of our survey.

My job is to help you make sense of the numbers we have come up with. I'd like to remind you of the following before I start. First, what the numbers mean. As you may have discovered when you went through the questionnaire with Sunny, in those questions which require a numeric, we used the same scale throughout: 0=none or not at all, 1=a little, 2=some or somewhat, 3=very (question 2) or quite a bit (others), and 4=extremely (question 2) or a lot (others). Second, as Sunny said just now, we use the term "genre" to refer to the 13 text types we identified that the CSU faculty are engaged in. Please notice that the 13 genres are constant in all questions and presented in the same order in the tables, although some of them may have been abbreviated for reasons of space.

Now, let's go to the findings, which are presented in 8 tables on the next few pages of your handout. Tables 1 and 2 are about the time faculty spent in each area and on each genre, respectively. Notice that, in Table 1, teaching is between 45% and 46%, research 29%, and service between 24% and 25%. Table 2 is a report on time spent on each genre, and we don't quite know what to make of it at this stage. What is clear, though, is that, while the genres in the area of teaching seem to take up a lot of time, some genres in service, such as memos and letters to colleagues (abbreviated as "memos") letters of recommendation (abbreviated as "letters") and FAR/AAR reports, also average between 2 and 3, between "some" and "quite a bit," that is.

Table 3 presents the difficulty faculty have with the genres. Glancing down the "Mean" column, you will find that the most difficult is manuscripts for publication, followed by grant applications, then by evaluation of colleagues, and then by FAR/AAR reports.

This ranking of difficulty is somewhat mirrored in Table 4, a summary of numbers of faculty members picking each genre as the most difficult: yes, manuscripts for publication is still at the top, grant applications next, evaluation reports third, and comments on students' work fourth.

Please recall that in question 4 of our questionnaire, we also asked faculty to provide reasons for their picking a particular genre as the most difficult. The results are not provided on your handout, but here is a brief summary. For manuscripts for publication, by far the most difficult genre (with a frequency of 38), 8 respondents named "time" as the reason: they just don't have the time to do it. Another 8 identified high expectations and intense competition as the reason, and 6 mentioned transactional elements such as clarity, succintness, and organization. The rest of the reasons for manuscripts being the most difficult display no discernible pattern, ranging from "fear of rejection," and "fear of sounding silly," to "creativity" and "lack of experience." One respondent was particularly forthcoming: "It's boring," he or she said.

The second most difficult genre, grant applications, are difficult mostly because of the uncertainty of what the grant reviewers expect, particularly when the reviewers are not familiar with the respondent's own field. There is always someone who tells it like it is: "It," grant writing, that is, "is tedious, meaningless, and usually unsuccessful," one of them told us.

The next most difficult, RPT/FMI evaluation reports, which is abbreviated as "Evaluation reports" in Table 4 (with a frequency of 10), elicited very different kinds of reasons. "Finding the proper tone," said one; "sensitivity about the different audiences," said another; "You have to weigh all aspects of someone's professional life and be fair," said still another; "How to deal with negative information," said still another; and, as you may expect, the truth teller said simply, "Professors don't take criticism well." What is clear from these responses is that all reasons for difficulty given for evaluation reports have to do with the interactional function while the transactional features are completely absent.

This is also true with the fourth most-frequently-picked most-difficult genre: comments on students' work. Why is it difficult? Because "it's boring." Because you have to "sound

encouraging"; you have to "make students feel good about themselves"; and finally, you have to "say positive things about worthless work."

Well, let's move on to Table 5. Table 5 looks the same as the table for question 2 in the questionnaire. The numbers in the cells are means. If you want to find out, for example, the attention given to self-image when writing each of the genres, you could look at the rightmost column and have a pretty good idea about how much people care about their image when they write each of the genres. For instance, people care about image most--a lofty 3.07, meaning "very"--when they do FARs and AARs, documents that are very much self-evaluative and to some degree self-promoting.

This table also offers an overall pattern. The first three rhetorical elements--accuracy, clarity, and organization--which we have grouped together under "transactional," are given a lot of attention regardless of what the genre is. The means are all between 3 and 4, between "very" and "extremely," save one: organization with regard to comments on students' work, and there is less variation among them. The four elements on the right, those we call interactional, are given less attention averagely, and the means vary a great deal.

When we group both kinds of variables together, into areas and discourse functions, we have the results presented in Table 6: Transactional in all three areas is between 3 and 4, and interactional in all three areas is slightly above 2 ("some").

We should not, however, allow this overall pattern to overshadow the importance of interactional elements. Please turn back to Table 5 one more time. If you look at the means of "formality," you will find that the means are pretty high: there are more 3s than anything else. What is low is "flair." While we can save for another day the debate on why university faculty are a humorless bunch of individuals, we can see that the element of flair played its part in dragging the overall means of interactional elements down quite a bit. Besides, some interactional elements are quite high with regard to some genres. Attention to others' feelings, for instance, scored three above-3s: for comments on students' work, for class visitation reports, and for memos and letters to colleagues. There are also a few between-2-and-3s, as you can see.

How does the graduate school experience fare in its preparation for its students' future academic life, then? Well, as you can see in Table 7, in the area of teaching it's between "a little" and "some" (mean=1.6); in the area of research, it's a bit better, "some" (mean=2.07); and in the area of service, graduate school experience seems to have failed: the mean of 0.58 is between "not at all" and "a little."

What conclusions can we draw from all this? There are two ways, it seems, to look at the overall patterns of our findings. First, we can look at them in terms of the three areas. Among the three areas, teaching is what the faculty do most in their professional life; its genres were not perceived as very difficult; and these genres got some attention in graduate school. Research occupied 29% of the faculty's time; two of its genres--manuscripts and grant applications--were viewed as the most difficult to write; and it got the most attention in graduate school. Service, on the other hand, takes up about a quarter of the faculty's time; its genres were viewed as more difficult than teaching; and it received almost no attention from graduate schools.

Of course, the classification of faculty professional life into the three areas is an artificial one, and one can argue that the kinds of rhetorical elements we identified might provide a better angle from which to look at our findings. For these elements seem to be more basic, being able to cut across all genres we have identified. So, looking at the findings this way, we can conclude the following. First, the transactional elements were viewed as very important in all genres of writing. They probably were given a lot of attention in graduate school, as can be judged by the higher numbers in Table 8 for manuscripts, grant applications, and lecture notes (the kinds of genres that seem to be primarily informational in nature), and they continue to be what faculty struggle with in their life after graduate school. The interactional elements, on the other hand, received a much more variant range of attention across genres and across individual faculty members (see the higher standard deviation in Table 6), and they seem to be more genre-sensitive--more relevant to some genres than others, although the overall means these elements received were lower than those by the transactional elements. They seem to be the root of difficulty for some "difficult" genres, such as evaluation reports on colleagues (including RPT evaluation and class visitation reports), self-

7

9

evaluative documents like FAR and AAR, and comments on students' work. This we can see from the responses to our reasons for difficulty question as I reported earlier and in Table 5, where these genres score quite high on at least some rhetorical elements. Last, these elements may have received little attention in the faculty's graduate school experience, as can be judged by inference from Table 5 and Table 8.

Now, I give the floor back to Sunny. She will discuss some possible implications our findings may have for both EAP education and ESP research.

The findings of our study suggest that faculty writing extends well beyond traditional research genres and includes a number of rhetorically complex teaching and service texts that require close attention both to accuracy and clarity of the message and to appropriate levels of formality and the feelings of the audience. We do recognize that the experiences of our faculty may not represent those of all U.S. universities, particularly those with a heavier research focus. The Cal State system is known as a teaching-oriented institution. However, we suspect that these writing experiences are similar in at least some ways to many U.S. faculty. In light of these results, it seems that EAP courses preparing doctoral students for academic careers at U.S. or other universities could usefully incorporate some preparation for these less frequently discussed texts in the literature, perhaps especially those such as peer evaluation reports that are perceived by faculty as particularly difficult or that require attention to the often tricky interactional features of writing.

Prior to developing such EAP preparation materials, an important next step is to examine the discourse features of some of these genres in depth. One may find as Connor and Mauranen (1999) did in their study of grant proposals, that there are similarities in communicative purposes and rhetorical features across rather distinct genres. As they noted connections between grant proposals, sales letters and job applications, researchers may find interesting similarities and differences between faculty service genres and business memos and policy documents, for example, or between comments on student papers and classroom visitation reports. We look forward to pursuing this next step of our research.

References

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Connor, U., & Mauranen, A. (1999). Linguistic analysis of grant proposals: European Union research grants. *English for Specific Purposes*, *18*, 47-62.

Precht, K. (1998). A cross-cultural comparison of letters of recommendation. *English for Specific Purposes*, *17*, 241-265.

Swales, J. (1996). Occluded genres in the academy: The case of the submission letter. In E. Ventola & A. Mauranen (Eds.). *Academic writing: Intercultural and textual issues* (pp. 45-58). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2000). *English in today's research world: A writing guide*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

University Faculty Writing and EAP Education: Beyond the Research Article

Sunny Hyon and Ron Chen
California State University, San Bernardino
(shyon@csusb.edu; rchen@csusb.edu)
AAAL Conference, St. Louis, MO., February 25, 2001

Studies related to "non-research" faculty genres
Precht (1998)--Letters of recommendation
Swales & Feak (2000)--Letters/emails of request and apology, correspondence with editors, job applications, letters of recommendation

The present study
A survey on faculty work-related writing was distributed to ~455 tenure-line faculty and full-time lecturers at California State University, San Bernardino (see attached survey). We received back 106 surveys.

Research questions
1. How much time do faculty spend writing genres related to the teaching, research and service aspects of their jobs?

2a. What rhetorical elements do faculty attend to when writing these genres?

2b. What genres require more or less attention to transactional vs. interactional functions of discourse?

3. What genres do faculty find most difficult to write and why?

4. How well have faculty graduate school experiences prepared them to write different genres?

Implications for graduate EAP writing instruction

References
Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Connor, U., & Mauranen, A. (1999). Linguistic analysis of grant proposals: European Union research grants. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*, 47-62.
Precht, K. (1998). A cross-cultural comparison of letters of recommendation. *English for Specific Purposes, 17*, 241-265.
Swales, J. (1996). Occluded genres in the academy: The case of the submission letter. In E. Ventola & A. Mauranen (Eds.). *Academic writing: Intercultural and textual issues* (pp. 45-58). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2000). *English in today's research world: A writing guide*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

12

Dear colleague:

We are researching the work-related writing of CSUSB faculty. We would greatly appreciate it if you would complete this questionnaire and return it to us in the enclosed envelope via campus mail. We also welcome questions and comments on our study.

Ron Chen, English   Sunny Hyon, English
email: rchen; Ext.5887   email: shyon; Ext. 5465

---

1. Please indicate how much time you spent on each type of writing in the past year. (**Circle one**)

		None	Little	Some	Quite a bit	A lot
TEACHING	Class materials (syllabi, handouts)	0	1	2	3	4
	Lecture notes	0	1	2	3	4
	Quizzes and exams	0	1	2	3	4
	Comments on students' work	0	1	2	3	4
	Other (Specify: _____)	0	1	2	3	4
RESEARCH	Abstracts/papers for conferences	0	1	2	3	4
	Manuscripts for publication	0	1	2	3	4
	Grant applications	0	1	2	3	4
	Other (Specify: _____)	0	1	2	3	4
SERVICE	Class visitation reports	0	1	2	3	4
	Memos/letters to colleagues	0	1	2	3	4
	Letters of recommendation	0	1	2	3	4
	FAR/AAR	0	1	2	3	4
	RPT/FMI evaluation reports	0	1	2	3	4
	Policy/curriculum documents	0	1	2	3	4
	Other (Specify: _____)	0	1	2	3	4

Please estimate what percentage of your work-related writing is devoted to each of these three areas:
Teaching _____%
Research _____%
Service _____ %

Note on acronyms:

RPT: Retention, Promotion, and Tenure
FAR: Faculty Activity Report, a document that the CSU faculty submit for retention, promotion, or tenure review
FMI: Faculty Merit Increase: Increase of salary based on merit
AAR: Annua Activity Report: a document submitted for merit increase.

2

2. In each of the boxes below, please rank (0-4) how <u>conscious</u> you are of each aspect in the top row when writing the texts listed in the left column

Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Very	Extremely
0	1	2	3	4

	Accuracy of info.	Clarity of expression	Organization	Degree of formality	Attn. to others' feelings	Flair and humor	Your image
Class materials (syllabi & handouts)							
Lecture notes							
Quizzes and exams							
Comments on students' work							
Abstracts/papers for conferences							
Manuscripts for publication							
Grant applications							
Class visitation reports							
Memos/letters to colleagues							
Letters of recommen.							
FAR/AAR							
RPT/FMI evaluation reports							
Policy/ curriculum documents							
Other (specify _____)							

14

3. Please rank the amount of difficulty you experience with each type of writing:

	None	A little	Some	Quite a bit	A lot
Class materials (syllabi, handouts)	0	1	2	3	4
Lecture notes	0	1	2	3	4
Quizzes and exams	0	1	2	3	4
Comments on students' work	0	1	2	3	4
Abstracts/papers for conferences	0	1	2	3	4
Manuscripts for publication	0	1	2	3	4
Grant applications	0	1	2	3	4
Class visitation reports	0	1	2	3	4
Memos/letters to colleagues	0	1	2	3	4
Letters of recommendation	0	1	2	3	4
FAR/AAR	0	1	2	3	4
RPT/FMI evaluation reports	0	1	2	3	4
Policy/curriculum documents	0	1	2	3	4
Other (Specify: _____)	0	1	2	3	4

4. Pick one type of writing (from the categories listed in Question 3, above) that is the most difficult for you and explain why you think it is difficult.

The most difficult type of writing: _____

Reason for difficulty: _____

_____

5. Please indicate how well your graduate school experiences prepared you for each type of writing:

	Not at all	A little	Some	Quite a bit	A lot
Class materials (syllabi, handouts)	0	1	2	3	4
Lecture notes	0	1	2	3	4
Quizzes and exams	0	1	2	3	4
Comments on students' work	0	1	2	3	4
Abstracts/papers for conferences	0	1	2	3	4
Manuscripts for publication	0	1	2	3	4
Grant applications	0	1	2	3	4
Class visitation reports	0	1	2	3	4
Memos/letters to colleagues	0	1	2	3	4
Letters of recommendation	0	1	2	3	4
FAR/AAR	0	1	2	3	4
RPT/FMI evaluation reports	0	1	2	3	4
Policy/curriculum documents	0	1	2	3	4
Other (Specify: _____)	0	1	2	3	4

Your College (optional) _____   Department (Optional) _____

Rank   (optional) _____   Name (Optional)   _____

4

Results of Survey

Table 1: Time spent in each area

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
teaching	100	.00	90.00	45.6700	19.3673
research	100	.00	75.00	29.2100	16.5873
service	100	.00	80.00	24.6200	16.5662
Valid N (listwise)	100				

Table 2: Time spent on each genre

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
classmat	102	.00	4.00	2.9176	.9658
lecture	103	.00	4.00	2.5825	1.1072
quizzes	103	.00	4.00	2.4563	.9780
comments	101	.00	4.00	2.9703	.9844
abstracts	104	.00	4.00	2.1923	1.1581
manus	103	.00	4.00	2.5825	1.2088
grants	102	.00	4.00	1.5686	1.3535
visitation	103	.00	4.00	1.6602	1.0247
memos	105	.00	4.00	2.2381	1.0609
letters	103	.00	4.00	2.3689	.9801
FAR/AAR	100	.00	4.00	2.3600	1.0873
evaluation	101	.00	4.00	1.8812	1.4716
policy	98	.00	4.00	1.7551	1.2440
Valid N (listwise)	84				

Table 3: Difficulty with each genre

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
classmat	105	.00	4.00	1.0190	.9902
lecture	100	.00	4.00	.9900	1.0396
quizzes	101	.00	4.00	1.5050	1.1102
comments	104	.00	4.00	1.7019	1.2532
abstracts	103	.00	4.00	1.7961	1.2630
manus	102	.00	4.00	2.5294	1.3402
grants	88	.00	4.00	2.3409	1.3552
visitation	95	.00	4.00	1.6842	1.2227
memos	102	.00	4.00	1.0784	1.0117
letters	103	.00	4.00	1.4466	1.0731
FAR/AAR	98	.00	4.00	1.9184	1.1899
evaluation	83	.00	4.00	2.0602	1.2332
policy	81	.00	4.00	1.7654	1.2070
Valid N (listwise)	63				

Table 4: Most difficult genres

GENRE	FREQUENCY	
Class materials	2	
Lecture notes	1	
Quizzes and exams	4	Teaching=15
Comments on students' work	7	
Abstracts/papers for conf.	1	
Manuscripts for pub.	38	Research=58
Grant applications	19	
Class visitation reports	4	
Memos/letters to colleagues	1	
Letters of recommendation	0	Service=20
FAR/AAR	5	
Evaluation reports	10	
Policy/curriculum documents:	0	
Other	3	
Not responding:	10	
Total	106	

Table 5: Attention to rhetorical elements across genres (The number in each cell is the mean of the degrees to which respondents were conscious of the rhetorical element specified in the top row when writing the genre listed in the leftmost column)

	Accuracy	Clarity	Organization	Formality	Feelings	Flair	Image
Class mat.	3.84	3.73	3.67	2.56	2.48	1.51	2.02
Lecture notes	3.73	3.52	3.56	1.98	2.27	1.91	1.90
Quizzes	3.90	3.89	3.47	2.71	2.10	1.17	1.67
Comments	3.74	3.69	2.69	2.30	3.30	1.39	1.85
Abstracts	3.85	3.86	3.81	3.40	1.76	1.19	2.29
Manuscripts	3.95	3.93	3.93	3.57	1.98	1.31	2.48
Grant appl.	3.60	3.62	3.62	3.29	1.74	0.72	2.05
Class visitation	3.76	3.75	3.52	3.21	3.41	0.64	1.61
Memos	3.56	3.45	3.13	2.37	3.12	1.82	2.35
Letters of rec.	3.64	3.72	3.51	3.38	2.96	0.91	2.12
FAR/AAR	3.86	3.82	3.73	3.43	1.62	0.68	3.07
Evaluation	3.90	3.85	3.84	3.45	2.50	0.68	2.47
Policy	3.69	3.66	3.62	3.30	1.67	0.52	1.52

Table 6: Attention to discourse functions across areas

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teaching/Transactional	86	2.42	4.00	3.6182	.3876
Resch/Transactionl	74	.00	4.00	3.8063	.5453
Service/Transactional	56	2.50	4.00	3.6587	.3706
Teaching/Interactional	81	.88	4.00	2.0926	.7723
Research/Interactional	69	.00	4.00	2.1111	.8679
Service/Interactional	49	.83	4.00	2.2126	.7844
Valid N (listwise)	38				

Table 7: Graduate school preparation for each area

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teaching	100	.00	4.00	1.6025	1.0553
Research	98	.00	4.00	2.0714	1.1053
Service	87	.00	4.00	.5766	.7543
Valid N (listwise)	82				

Table 8: Graduate school preparation for each genre

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
classmat	104	.00	4.00	1.4423	1.2293
lecture	102	.00	4.00	1.6765	1.2361
quizzes	101	.00	4.00	1.5941	1.2098
comments	104	.00	4.00	1.6346	1.2776
abstracts	102	.00	4.00	2.4608	1.2560
manus	104	.00	4.00	2.5385	1.2765
grants	100	.00	4.00	1.2200	1.3602
visitation	101	.00	4.00	.4554	.9330
memos	102	.00	4.00	1.0490	1.1972
letters	103	.00	4.00	1.0388	1.2201
FAR/AAR	99	.00	4.00	.4141	.8807
evaluation	98	.00	4.00	.2857	.7180
policy	90	.00	4.00	.5111	.9627
Valid N (listwise)	82				

18

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: University Faculty writing and EAP Education: Beyond the Research Article

Author(s): Sunny Hyon & Ron Chen

Corporate Source: 2001 AAAL Conference   February 2001

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ Sample _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ Sample _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ Sample _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1	2A	2B
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
[X]	[ ]	[ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: Sunny Hyon

Organization/Address: Cal State University San Bernardino

Printed Name/Position/Title: Sunny Hyon Associate Professor of English

Telephone: 909-880-5465   FAX: 909-880-7086

E-Mail Address: shyon@csusb.edu   Date: 1-7-01

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Languages & Linguistics
4646 40TH St. NW
Washington. D.C. 20016-1859

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)