References

Angelil-Carter, S. 1998. *Access to success: Literacy in academic contexts.* Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

Angelil-Carter, S. 2000. Understanding plagiarism differently. In: Leibowitz, B. & Mohamed, Y. (Eds.) 2000: 154-177.

Babbie, E. & Mouton, J. 2001. *The practice of social research.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L.F. & Palmer, A.S. 1996. *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Badger, R. & White, G. 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2):153-160.

Barnet, S. & Bedau, H. 1993. *Critical thinking, reading, and writing.* Boston: Bedford Books.

Belcher, D. 1990. How professors initiate nonnative speakers into their disciplinary discourse communities. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, 1(3):207-225.

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S. & Finegan, E. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Bizzell, P. 1987. Language and literacy. In: Enos, T. (Ed.) *A sourcebook for basic writing teachers.* New York: Random House. P. 125-137.

Bizzell, P. 1992. *Academic discourse and critical consciousness.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Blanton, L.L. 1998. Discourse, artefacts, and the Ozarks: Understanding academic literacy. In: Zamel, V.Z. & Spack, R. (Eds.) 1998: 219-236.

Blacquiere, A. 1989. Reading for survival: Text and the second language student. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 3(1):82.

Boeschoten, A.V. 2005. *Promotievoorstel.* Academisch Scrijfcentrum Nijmegen, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.

Bureau for Institutional Research and Planning (BIREP). 2006. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.

Butler, H.G. 1999. *Collaborative language teaching in English and Engineering studies at a technikon.* Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University. Unpublished MA thesis.

Cantor, J.A. 1993. *Academic writing.* Westport: Praeger.

Coetzee-Van Rooy, A.S. 2000. *Cultural identity and acquisition planning for English as a second language in South Africa.* Unpublished PhD thesis, Potchefstroomse Universiteit vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys.

Coetzee-Van Rooy, A.S. 2002. *Designing a questionnaire.* Vanderbijlpark: Vaal Triangle Technikon.

Coffin, C., Curry, M.J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T.M. & Swann, J. 2003. *Teaching academic writing.* New York: Routledge.

Conrad, S.M. 1996. Investigating academic texts with corpus-based techniques: An example from Biology. *Linguistics and Education*, 8:299-326.

Coxhead, A. 2000. A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2):213-238.

Cummins, J. 1984. *Bilingualism and special education: issues in assessment and pedagogy.* Clevedon: Multilingual matters.

Dalvit, L. & De Klerk, V. 2005. Attitudes of Xhosa-speaking students at the University of Fort Hare towards the use of Xhosa as a language of learning and teaching (LOLT). *South African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 23(1):1-18.

De Kadt, E. 2005. English, language Shift and identities: a comparison between 'Zulu-dominant' and 'multicultural' students on a South African University campus. *South African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 23(1):19-37.

De Klerk, V. 2002. Language issues in our schools: whose voice counts? Part 1 – the parents speak. *Perspectives in Education*, 20(1):1-13.

Delpit, L. 1995. *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York: The New Press.

Dillon, S. 2005. *Literacy falls for graduates from college, testing finds.* [Online]. Available: http://www.nytimes.com . Accessed: 19 December 2005.

Fathman, A.K. & Whalley, E. 1990. Teacher response to student writing: focus on form versus content. In: Kroll, B. (Ed.) *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom.* New York: Cambridge University Press. P. 178-190.

Ferris, D. & Hedgcock, J.S. 1998. *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process and practice.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gee, J.P. 1990. *Social linguistics and literacies.* London: Falmer Press.

Gee, J.P. 1998. What is literacy? In: Zamel, V.Z. & Spack, R. (Eds.) 1998. *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum. P. 51-59.

Givon, T. 1989. *Mind, code and context – essays in pragmatics*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gough, D. 2000. Discourse and students' experience of higher education. In: Leibowitz, B. & Mohamed, Y. (Eds.) *Routes to writing in Southern Africa.* Cape Town: Silk Road International. P. 43-58.

Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R.B. 1996. *Theory and practice of writing.* New York: Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. 2004. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

Harwood, N. & Hadley, G. 2004. Demystifying institutional practices: Critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes,* 23(4):355-377.

Habte, A. 2001. The development of supplementary materials for English language teaching in a scarce resource environment: an action research study. Pretoria: University of Pretoria. Unpublished MA mini-thesis.

Horne, F. & Heinemann, G. 2003. *English in perspective.* Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Huddleston, R. 1988. *English grammar: an outline.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G.K. 2005. *A student's introduction to English grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. 2000. *Disciplinary discourse*. London: Longman.

Ivanič, R. 2004. Discourses of writing and learning to write. *Language and Education*, 18(3):220-245.

Jackson, F. 1995. Acquiring applied linguistic discourse: The role of diverse writing tasks for academic development in a postgraduate degree. *Academic Development,* 1(2):153-167.

Jiya, Z. 1993. Language difficulties of black BSc students. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 7(1):80-84.

Johns, A.M. 1990. L1 composition theories: implications for developing theories of L2 composition. In: Kroll, B. (Ed.) *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom.* New York: Cambridge University Press. P. 24-36.

Johns, A.M. 1997. *Text, role and context: Developing academic literacies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johns, A.M. 2005. *Research and theory in the teaching of second/foreign language writing.* Paper presented at the SAALA/LSSD Conference held from 6-8 July at Dikhololo, South Africa.

Kotecha, P. 1994. *Communication for engineers: An integrated approach to academic and language skills.* Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.

Krashen, S. 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. 1985. *The input hypothesis: issues and implications*. London: Longman.

Kroes, H. 1996. Academic support programmes within the RDP. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 30(4):281-291.

Kroll, B. 1990. *Second language writing: Insights for the classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kuhn, T.S. 1962. *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. 2003. *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. London: Yale University Press.

Kutz, E. 1998. Between students' language and academic discourse: Interlanguage as middle ground. In: Zamel, V.Z. & Spack, R. (Eds.) 1998: 37-50.

Lee, I. 2003. L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing,* 8(1):216-237.

Leibowitz, B. 2000. Policy in practice about teaching writing. In: Leibowitz, B. & Mohamed, Y. (Eds.) 2000: 15-42.

Leibowitz, B. 2005. Learning in an additional language in a multilingual society: a South African case study on university-level writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(4):661-681.

Leibowitz, B. & Mohamed, Y. 2000. *Routes to writing in Southern Africa*. Cape Town: Silk Road International.

Lillis, T. 2003. Student writing as 'academic literacies': drawing on Bakhtin to move from critique to design. *Language and Education*, 17(3):192-207.

Limerick, N.P. 1998. Dancing with professors: The trouble with academic prose. In: Zamel, V.Z. & Spack, R. (Eds.) 1998: 199-206

Long, M.H. & Crookes, G. 1992. Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly,* 26(1):27-56.

Makhubela, L. 2000. Information literacy: a survival tool for lecturers. In: Leibowitz, B. & Mohamed, Y. (Eds.) 2000: 133-153.

Martin, J.R. & Rose, D. 2001. *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause.* Sydney.

Menck, C. 2000. Word processing as an aid in written language work: Reflections on an early experience at UWC. In: Leibowitz, B. & Mohamed, Y. (Eds.) 2000: 224-239.

Moore, R., Paxton, M., Scott, I. & Thesen, L. 1998. Retrospective: Language development initiatives and their policy contexts. In: Angelil-Carter, S. (Ed.) 1998: 8-20.

Moyo, T. 1995. Student academic writing in an ESL situation. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 9(1):168-172.

Nunan, D. 1991. Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2):279-298.

Nunan, D. 1992. *Research methods in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nyamapfene, K. & Letseka, M. 1995. Problems of learning among first year students in South African universities. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 9(1):159-167.

Ong, W.J. 1982. *Orality and literacy: the technologizing of the word.* New York: Methuen.

Orr, M.H. 1995. Teaching writing at university: An academic literacy programme. *South African Journal of Higher Education,* 9(2):189-197.

Pallazo, L. 1989. A support course for disadvantaged first-year English students. *Crux*, February:45-52.

Parkerson, A. 2000. Providing effective oral and written feedback on student writing. In: Leibowitz, B. & Mohamed, Y. (Eds.) 2000: 118-132.

Phillips, B. 1997. *Getting to grips with unit standards in the NQF*. Johannesburg: NQF Network.

Prosser, M. & Webb, C. 1993. Relating the process of undergraduate essay writing to the finished product. *Studies in Higher Education,* March:1-30.

Puhl, C.H. & Swartz, J.J. 1989. Designing a second-language bridging course for university students. *Per Linguam*, 5(1):17-32.

Radloff, A. 1994. *Writing to learn, learning to write: helping academic staff to support student writing in their discipline.* Workshop presented at the Thirteenth International Seminar on Staff and Educational Development, Cape Town (15-18 June 1994).

Rose, M. 1998. The language of exclusion: Writing instruction at the university. In: Zamel, V.Z. & Spack, R. (Eds.) 1998: 9-30.

Sheeran, Y. & Barnes, D. 1991. *School writing: Discovering the ground rules.* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Starfield, S. 2000. Assessing students' writing. In: Leibowitz, B. & Mohamed, Y. (Eds.) 2000: 102-117.

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

Thesen, L. 1998. Creating coherence: Design and critique of academic literacy materials. In: Angelil-Carter, S. (Ed.) 1998: 36-52.

Townsend, R. 2000. Referencing in the arts. In: Leibowitz, B. & Mohamed, Y. (Eds.) 2000: 178-188.

Truscott, J. 1996. Review article: The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2):327-369.

Truscott, J. 2004. Evidence and conjecture on the effects of correction: A response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13:337-343.

Van der Riet, M., Dyson, A. & Quinn. L. 1998. Conceptual development through process-writing in a psychology II course. *South African Journal of Higher Education,* 12(1):220-226.

Van der Slik, F. & Weideman, A.J. 2006. Measures of improvement in academic literacy. Forthcoming in *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*.

Van der Wal, R.J. 2004. Developing proficiency in Afrikaans as an additional language: criteria for materials development. Pretoria: University of Pretoria. Unpublished doctoral thesis.

Van der Walt, C. 2004. Motivating attitudes and educational language planning in the context of English as an international language. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 38(2):302-315.

Van Dyk T.J. & Weideman, A.J. 2004a. Switching constructs: On the selection of an appropriate blueprint for academic literacy assessment. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 38(1):1-13.

Van Dyk, T.J. & Weideman, A.J. 2004b. Finding the right measure: From blueprint to specification to item type. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 38(1):15-24.

Van Rensburg, C. & Weideman, A.J. 2002. Language proficiency: current strategies, future remedies. *SAALT Journal for Language Teaching*, 38(1&2):152-164.

Ventola, E. 1998. Textlinguistics and academic writing. In: Allori, P.E. (Ed.) *Academic discourse in Europe: Thought processes and linguistic realization.* Rome: Bulzoni.

Weideman, A.J. 1981. *Systematic concepts in linguistics*. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State. Unpublished MA thesis.

Weideman, A.J. 1987. *Applied linguistics as a discipline of design: A foundational study*. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State. Unpublished doctoral thesis.

Weideman, A.J. 2003a. Justifying course and task design in language teaching. *Acta Academica,* 35(3):26-48.

Weideman, A.J. 2003b. *Academic literacy: Prepare to learn.* Pretoria: Van Schaik.

Weideman, A.J. 2003c. Assessing and developing academic literacy. *Per Linguam*, 19(1&2):55-65.

Weideman, A.J. 2006a. Assessing academic literacy in a task-based approach. Forthcoming in *Language Matters*, 37(1).

Weideman, A.J. 2006b. Redefining applied linguistics. Submitted to *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* (in the process of review).

Weideman, A.J. 2007. Overlapping and divergent agendas: Writing and applied linguistics research. Forthcoming, In: Van der Walt, C. (Ed.) *Living through languages: An African tribute to Rene Dirven.*

Zamel, V. 1998. Questioning academic discourse. In: Zamel, V.Z. & Spack, R. (Eds.) 1998: 187-198.

Zamel, V.Z. & Spack, R. 1998. *Negotiating academic literacies: Teaching and learning across languages and cultures.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zulu, C. 2005. Academic reading ability of first-year students: what's high school performance or prior exposure to academic reading got to do with it? *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 23(1):111-123.

Addendum A   Questionnaire – Supervisor perceptions of the academic literacy requirements of postgraduate students regarding the production of written academic texts

Unit for Language Skills Development
University of Pretoria
Researcher: H.G. Butler
Tel: (012) 420 2269
Cell :   082 872 5631
E-mail: gustav.butler@up.ac.za

**University of Pretoria
Universiteit van Pretoria**

INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of research: A framework for course design in academic writing for tertiary education

Dear colleague

The questionnaire **'Supervisor perceptions of the academic literacy requirements of postgraduate students regarding the production of written academic texts'** forms part of a larger DPhil study in Linguistics that investigates academic writing in a tertiary academic environment. The study aims to develop a comprehensive, generative framework that could be applied to the design of writing courses aimed at the improvement of academic writing ability at the University of Pretoria (UP). In this study, the application of the designed framework will focus in particular on the academic writing needs of postgraduate students. A crucial component of the research is, therefore, to determine the specific academic writing requirements of postgraduate studies offered at the different faculties and departments/centres/units at the University.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your personal contribution to the research is, however, extremely important in the sense that the researcher wishes to involve as many supervisors as is practically possible. Information obtained from the questionnaire will be used to make informed decisions about the content and structure of academic writing support offered to postgraduate students at the University. The data would be treated confidentially, in other words, you would not be personally implicated in the research. You might, however, lose anonymity if you declare yourself willing to participate in a short follow-up interview. At the completion of the study, the data will be incorporated into the ULSD database which consists of ongoing research data on academic literacy and language-related matters.

Ethical clearance for the study has been obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Pretoria. Permission has also been received from the deans of faculties to distribute the questionnaire in their faculties.

Would you be so kind as to complete the consent form as well as the attached questionnaire and return it to Gustav Butler (office no. 22-4, ext. 2269, Human Sciences Building, Unit for Language Skills Development) prior to 6 June 2005.

Participant signature: _____ Date and place: _____

Researcher signature: _____ Date and place: _____

QUESTIONNAIRE - SUPERVISOR PERCEPTIONS OF THE ACADEMIC LITERACY REQUIREMENTS OF POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS REGARDING THE PRODUCTION OF WRITTEN ACADEMIC TEXTS

Instructions and additional information:

- *For the purposes of this questionnaire only master's and doctoral students are regarded as 'postgraduate students'. All questions that focus on students are aimed at postgraduate students.*
- *The term 'academic literacy' in the context of the questionnaire refers to the integrated academic language ability of students that enables them to cope with the demands of studying in a tertiary academic environment. Such ability incorporates, amongst others, aspects of how students deal purposefully with written texts in their interpretation and production of such texts. This mainly includes: an understanding of how different academic texts work (their structure, type of content and how language is employed to create this structure and content), strategies for selecting, arranging and generating information appropriately in their academic argumentation and how students generally integrate their familiarity with academic language conventions (e.g. register, style and appropriateness and correctness of language) in their production of academic texts. In part, the purpose of this questionnaire is, therefore, to gather data on how postgraduate students are guided in their use of different aspects of this integrated ability in order to arrive at an acceptable written product that could be presented for final assessment.*
- *'Primary language' refers to the student's mother tongue. In other words, this is the language a student acquired first. 'Additional language' pertains to any other language a student has acquired apart from his/her primary language. In the UP context, 'additional language' students are those for whom English or Afrikaans is not their primary language.*
- *Please complete all sections of the questionnaire.*
- *Where necessary, indicate your choice with an 'X' in the appropriate space.*
- *Where requested, please provide a short motivation for your answer.*

SECTION A: INSTITUTIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

1   To which faculty and department/centre/unit do you belong?

Faculty	
Department/centre/unit	

2a   Did you complete any formal tertiary language course (English on second year level, isiZulu on first year level, for example) in your own studies?

Yes	
No	

V4 ☐   8

2b   If yes, please provide details about the course(s)/qualification:

1_____

2_____

3_____

4_____

5_____

V5   9-11
V6   12-14
V7   15-17
V8   18-20
V9   21-23

3a   How many purely research students (writing only a research thesis) do you supervise at present?

Master's	
Doctorate	

V10   24-25
V11   26-27

3b   Approximately how many postgraduate (master's and doctoral) students have you successfully supervised?

Master's students	
Doctoral students	

V12   28-30
V13   31-33

4a   Do you present specific subjects to students registered for tutored postgraduate courses?

Yes	
No	

V14 ☐   34

4b   Please list the specific subject(s) that you present to these students:

1_____

2_____

3_____

4_____

5_____

V15   35-37
V16   38-40
V17   41-43
V18   44-46
V19   47-49

4c   The subject(s) above form(s) part of the _____ degree.

V20   50-52

SECTION B: ACADEMIC LITERACY

5   Please indicate whether your postgraduate students are:

1 mostly primary language users of the language in which they study.	
2 mostly additional language users of the language in which they study.	
3 an even spread between options 1 and 2 above.	

V21 [ ]   53

6a   Do you believe that postgraduate students' level of academic literacy regarding the language in which they study (English or Afrikaans in this case) plays any significant role in the successful completion of their studies?

Yes	
No	

V22 [ ]   54

6b   Please substantiate your answer to 6a:

_____
_____
_____
_____

V23 [| |]   55-57
V24 [| |]   58-60
V25 [| |]   61-63

6c   How would you rate the general level of academic literacy of your postgraduate students?

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V26 [ ]   64

7   Do you believe that the students who are accepted for postgraduate studies in your department/centre/unit should already be sufficiently academically literate in the language of learning to cope with the demands of your discipline?

Yes	
No	

V27 [ ]   65

8a   Are you of the opinion that any student with relatively 'high' marks (60% and above, for example) for their previous degree will be academically literate enough in the language of learning in order to cope with the demands of your postgraduate degrees?

Yes	
No	
Not necessarily	

V28 [ ]   66

8b   Please substantiate your answer:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V29				67-69
V30				70-72
V31				73-75

9   Is it a requirement in your department to determine postgraduate students' level of academic literacy either before or after they have enrolled?

| Yes | |
| No | |

V32   76

9.1a   If yes, how do you determine students' level of academic literacy?

1 The overall average mark for the previous degree is used (with the obvious assumption that the student must be academically literate in the language of the discipline to have achieved the mark).	
2 Students write a test of academic literacy in the language concerned.	
3 Students must provide proof of previous academic writing proficiency (an article published in an accredited academic journal, for example).	
4 A specific final year secondary school symbol for the language concerned is used (please specify the symbol: _____).	
5 Other (please specify):	

V33		77
V34		78
V35		79
V36		80
V37		81
V38		82

9.1b   Is the information that is gained on literacy levels in 9.1a used as an access requirement?

| Yes | |
| No | |

V39   83

9.2a   Do you find your strategy of determining levels of academic literacy reliable and valid (in effect, is this a reliable and valid instrument in determining which students to admit to your postgraduate courses regarding academic language use, or alternatively, in identifying students who need extra support with language)?

Yes	
No	
Partly	

V40   84

9.2b   Please substantiate your answer above:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

V41				85-87
V42				88-90
V43				91-93

9.3a   If no specific strategy is used to determine your students' level of academic literacy, are you aware of any alternative method being used to determine whether students have reached an adequate level of academic literacy in order to cope with the demands of the degree?

| Yes | |
| No | |

| V44 | | 94 |

9.3b   If yes, please elaborate:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

V45				95-97
V46				98-100
V47				101-103

10   In your experience, what do you believe is the **most** difficult component of postgraduate studies for your students?

1 Mastering the literature of a specific subject/discipline (in the case of both tutored programmes and purely research studies)	
2 Identifying a suitable topic for research	
3 Writing the actual thesis/dissertation/report/assignment	
4 Other (please specify):	

| V48 | | | | 104-106 |

SECTION C: SPECIFIC WRITING DIFFICULTIES

11   The issues addressed below form part of a comprehensive definition of academic literacy. Please assess your postgraduate students' ability to:

11a Understand and use academic vocabulary in context:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V49 ☐ 107

11b Understand and use subject-specific terminology in context:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V50 ☐ 108

11c Write in an academic register/style with reference to the conventions that apply to the tertiary academic context:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V51 ☐ 109

11d Recognise and produce different genres (e.g. essays; reports; theses) and functional text types (e.g. description; factual texts; argumentation) within an academic context:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V52 ☐ 110

11e Interpret, use and produce information in graphic or visual format:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V53 ☐ 111

11f Structure sentences and paragraphs appropriately:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V54 ☐ 112

11g Use connecting devices (connectors such as 'because', 'therefore', 'as a result', etc.) effectively to connect ideas in sentences and between paragraphs in order to create a coherent text:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V55 ☐ 113

11h Interpret and produce structured texts that show an awareness of the logical development of texts, from introductions to conclusions:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V56 ☐ 114

11i   Distinguish between essential and non-essential information, fact and opinion, propositions and arguments and cause and effect; and classify and categorise data that make comparisons:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V57 ☐ 115

11j   Argue convincingly as a result of their understanding of what counts as 'evidence' in your discipline:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V58 ☐ 116

11k   Write persuasively and with an 'authoritative voice' in the academic context:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V59 ☐ 117

11l   Understand the implications of plagiarism:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V60 ☐ 118

12   How would you generally rate the level of **writing ability** of primary language postgraduate students and additional language postgraduate students respectively?

12a   Primary language students of the language of learning:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V61 ☐ 119

12b   Additional language students of the language of learning:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V62 ☐ 120

SECTION D: ACADEMIC WRITING REQUIREMENTS

13a   To what extent does your students' successful completion of their studies depend on the production of correct and meaningful written texts?

1 not at all	2	3	4	5 a very large extent

V63 ☐ 121

13b How much writing is typically required of your students? Please elaborate (e.g. for master's students - 3 long essays; a mini-dissertation)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V64				122-124
V65				125-127
V66				128-130

14a Do you believe that the language of your academic discipline is specific to the discipline?

| Yes | |
| No | |

V67   131

14b If you believe that discipline-specific language exists, in what way would you say is it specific to your discipline?

1 Using specific genres and functional text types (e.g. technical reports and descriptive texts)	
2 Using field/subject-specific terminology	
3 A combination of 1 and 2	
4 Other (please specify):	

V68   132-133

15 What genres and functional text types are your students expected to produce during their studies? Please list these in priority order by starting with '1' for the highest priority, '2' for the next most important option and so on. Please leave the options blank that you do not choose.

Genre	Priority	Functional text type	Priority
1 Research proposal		1 Description	
2 Thesis / dissertation		2 Factual writing	
3 Academic article		3 Argumentation	
4 Report (laboratory, technical, research report)		4 Other (please specify)	
5 Academic essay			
6 Other (please specify)			

Genre
V69		134
V70		135
V71		136
V72		137
V73		138
V74		139
V75		140

Text type
V76		141
V77		142
V78		143
V79		144
V80		145
V81		146

16a Is it generally important in your academic field that students should substantiate claims that they make?

Yes	
No	

V82 ☐ 147

16b If yes, what constitutes acceptable 'evidence' (empirical results, for example) in your field of study?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V83 ☐ ☐ 148-150
V84 ☐ ☐ 151-153
V85 ☐ ☐ 154-156

17a What referencing system do you expect students to use in the completion of academic writing tasks that involve the use of sources in your subject/degree?

1 The Harvard method	
2 Other (please specify):	
3 I am not aware of a specific name for the method	

V86 ☐ 157

17b How competent are students in acknowledging authoritative sources of information?

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V87 ☐ 158

17c Is the referencing system referred to in 17a used as a departmentally agreed upon/faculty agreed upon/university-wide system, or is it a personal preference not necessarily shared by your department/faculty/the university?

1 Departmental requirement	
2 Faculty requirement	
3 University requirement	
4 Requirement of the discipline	
5 Personal preference	

V88 ☐ 159
V89 ☐ 160
V90 ☐ 161
V91 ☐ 162
V92 ☐ 163

SECTION E: SUPERVISOR FEEDBACK

18a   Do you offer feedback on the language use of your postgraduate students throughout the writing process when they engage in more extensive writing tasks such as dissertation, thesis or report writing?

Yes	
No	

V93 ☐ 164

18b   If you do offer feedback on language during the writing process, what type of feedback do you provide (you may indicate more than one option)?

1 Feedback focusing on language correctness (spelling, grammar, etc.)	
2 Feedback focusing on style, register and structure	
3 Feedback focusing on clarity of meaning	
4 Feedback on the logical sequencing of ideas	
5 All of the above	
6 Other:	

V94 ☐ 165
V95 ☐ 166
V96 ☐ 167
V97 ☐ 168
V98 ☐ 169
V99 ☐ 170
V100 ☐ 171

19a   Do you make use of any specific marking scheme (with fixed sections and marks allocated for the assessment of, for example, structure, content, etc.) for the **final assessment** (the formal examination) of written work produced by postgraduate students?

Yes	
No	

V101 ☐ 172

19b   Is the way in which students' written work will be assessed (be it whether a formal marking scheme is used or not) discussed with them in detail **before** written work is handed in for final assessment?

Yes	
No	

V102 ☐ 173

19c   If you do make use of a marking scheme for **final assessment**, is there a section allocated to language use?

Yes	
No	

V103 ☐ 174

19d Does language use form part of the marks you award in the **final assessment** of written work?

Yes	
No	

V104 ☐ 175

19e If you do consider language use in the **final assessment** of written work, what are the language issues on which you focus (you may indicate more than one option)? Please prioritise the issues you choose by starting with '1' for the most important issue and continuing with '2', '3', etc.

1 Language correctness (grammar, spelling, punctuation, etc.)	
2 Style and register used (formality, impersonality, etc.)	
3 Logical flow of ideas expressed by the language (use of appropriate connectors such as "because", "therefore", "however", etc.)	
4 The overall structure of the text	
5 Clarity of meaning	
6 Other (please specify):	

V105 ☐ 176
V106 ☐ 177
V107 ☐ 178
V108 ☐ 179
V109 ☐ 180
V110 ☐ 181
V111 ☐ 182

SECTION F: LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE

20 Who do you think should be responsible for teaching students the academic discourse/writing of your subject/field?

1 Subject lecturers	
2 Language (writing) specialists	
3 A combination of 1 and 2	
4 Other (please specify):	

V112 ☐ 183

21 What kind of assistance (if any) can academic writing experts offer to postgraduate supervisors in supporting their students with academic writing?

1 Structuring student writing	
2 Acquiring stylistic features and the appropriate register of academic discourse	
3 Acquiring revision and editing strategies focusing on clarity	

V113 ☐ 184
V114 ☐ 185
V115 ☐ 186

3 Acquiring revision and editing strategies focusing on clarity of meaning as well as correctness of language	
4 Other (please specify):	

V116		187
V117		188

22   If language assistance were offered to your students, what kind of assistance would generally benefit your students **most**?

1 An editing service only (correcting language errors)	
2 An integrated academic literacy course focusing on the production of appropriate writing products as a consequence of the development of a more comprehensive academic literacy	
Other (please specify):	

V118		189

23a   Do you require students to have a final draft of a more extensive writing task language edited by a professional editor?

Yes	
No	

V119		190

23b   If you do not require formal language editing from your students, how do you ensure the language correctness of final drafts of the written texts they produce?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V120			191-193
V121			194-196
V122			197-199

24a   If a short, follow-up interview needs to be conducted on the academic writing of your students, would you be prepared to participate in such an interview?

Yes	
No	

V123		200

24b   If yes, please provide details as to where you could be contacted for further arrangements. Please be advised, that although your answers to the questionnaire will be treated confidentially, you will lose anonymity.

Tel: _____

E-mail: _____

Addendum B   Questionnaire – background in academic literacy (student profile)

Unit for Language Skills Development
University of Pretoria
Researcher: H.G. Butler
Tel: (012) 420 2269
Cell :   082 872 5631
E-mail: gustav.butler@up.ac.za

University of Pretoria
Universiteit van Pretoria

INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of research: A framework for course design in academic writing for tertiary education

Dear student

The questionnaire **'Background in academic literacy (student profile)'** forms part of a larger DPhil study in Linguistics that investigates academic writing in a tertiary academic environment. The study aims to develop a comprehensive, generative framework that could be applied to the design of writing courses aimed at the improvement of academic writing ability at the University of Pretoria (UP). In this study, the application of the designed framework will focus in particular on the academic writing needs of postgraduate students. A crucial component of the research is, therefore, to determine in what ways postgraduate students could be supported in the development of their academic writing ability.

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your personal contribution to the research is, however, extremely important in the sense that the researcher wishes to involve as many postgraduate students as is practically possible. Information obtained from the questionnaire will be used to make informed decisions about the content and structure of academic writing support offered to postgraduate students at the University. The data will be treated confidentially, in other words, you will not be personally implicated in the research. Your anonymity regarding the information that you provide is assured. At the completion of the study, the data will be incorporated into the ULSD database which consists of ongoing research data on academic literacy and language-related matters.

Would you please be so kind as to complete the consent form as well as the attached questionnaire, and return it to your lecturer during class time?

Ethical clearance for the study has been obtained from the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Pretoria.

Participant signature: _____ Date and place: _____

Researcher signature: _____ Date and place: _____

QUESTIONNAIRE – BACKGROUND IN ACADEMIC LITERACY (STUDENT PROFILE)

Instructions and additional information:

- *The term 'academic literacy' in the context of the questionnaire refers to the integrated academic language ability of students that enables them to cope with the demands of studying in a tertiary academic environment. Such ability incorporates, amongst others, aspects of how students deal purposefully with written texts in their interpretation and production of such texts. This mainly includes: an understanding of how different academic texts work (their structure, type of content and how language is employed to create this structure and content), strategies for selecting, arranging and generating information appropriately in their academic argumentation, and how students generally integrate their familiarity with academic language conventions (e.g. register, style and appropriateness and correctness of language) in their production of academic texts. In part, the purpose of this questionnaire is, therefore, to gather data on how students could be supported with different aspects of this integrated ability in order to arrive at an acceptable written product that could be presented for final assessment.*
- *'First language' refers to the student's mother tongue. In other words, this is the language a student acquired first.*
- *Postgraduate students should complete all five sections (A-E) of the questionnaire. Undergraduate students should not complete Section E, since this section is reserved for postgraduate students.*
- *Where necessary, indicate your choice with an 'X' in the appropriate space.*
- *Where requested, please provide a short motivation for your answer.*

SECTION A: PERSONAL INFORMATION

1   Age: _____

2   Gender:

Male	
Female	

3   Occupation: _____

---

4   Where did you complete you secondary (high) school education (school where you matriculated)?

School:	
Country:	

V5   ⊞   9-10
V6   11-12

5a   Are you engaged in undergradute or postgraduate study? Mark the appropriate box below:

Undergraduate study	
Postgraduate study	

V7   ☐   13

5b   Course registered for: _____

V8   ☐☐   14-15

SECTION B: LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

1   What   is   your   first   language   (mother   tongue)?
_____

V9   ☐☐   16-17

2   In what language did you receive your pre-tertiary education (use the 'Additional information' column for more specific information)?

Educational level	Language	Additional information
Primary school		
Secondary school		

V10   ⊞   18-19
V11   20-21

3   In what language are you studying at the University of Pretoria (the two languages of learning at the university are English and Afrikaans)?

English	
Afrikaans	

V12   ☐   22

4a   Did you receive any formal schooling in the language you have chosen for your studies at the University of Pretoria (studied the language as a subject at school/additional language classes)?

Yes	
No	

V13   ☐   23

4b   If yes, for how long did you receive formal schooling in English/Afrikaans?
_____ years

V14   ☐☐   24-25

5a   What was the final symbol/percentage (Std. 10/Grade 12/last year of schooling before tertiary education) you received in the language you chose for your studies at the University of Pretoria?

English	
Afrikaans	
Did not study either language before	

V15 ☐ 26

5b   If you have not received your pre-tertiary education through either English or Afrikaans, what was the final symbol (Std. 10/Grade 12/last year of schooling before tertiary education) you received for the language in which you primarily studied at school?

Language	**Symbol**

Language
V16 ☐☐ 27-28
Symbol
V17 ☐☐ 29-30

SECTION C: STUDENT PERCEPTIONS ABOUT THE LITERACY DEMANDS OF THEIR COURSES

1   The issues addressed below form part of a comprehensive definition of academic literacy. Please rate your own ability (in the language you use for your studies) to:

1a   Understand and use academic vocabulary in context:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V18 ☐ 31

1b   Understand and use subject-specific terminology in context:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V19 ☐ 32

1c   Write in an academic register/style (e.g. formality) with reference to the conventions that apply to the tertiary academic context:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V20 ☐ 33

1d   Recognise and produce different genres (e.g. essays; reports; theses) and functional text types (e.g. description; factual texts; argumentation) within an academic context:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V21   [ ]   34

1e Interpret, use and produce information in graphic or visual format:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V22   [ ]   35

1f Structure sentences and paragraphs appropriately:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V23   [ ]   36

1g Use connecting devices (connectors such as 'because', 'therefore', 'as a result', etc.) effectively to connect ideas in sentences and between paragraphs in order to create a coherent text:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V24   [ ]   37

1h Interpret and produce structured texts that show an awareness of the logical development of texts, via introductions to conclusions:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V25   [ ]   38

1i Distinguish between essential and non-essential information, fact and opinion, propositions and arguments and cause and effect; and classify and categorise data that make comparisons:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V26   [ ]   39

1j Argue convincingly as a result of your understanding of what counts as 'evidence' in your discipline:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V27   [ ]   40

1k Write persuasively and with an 'authoritative voice' in the academic context:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V28   [ ]   41

11 Understand the implications of plagiarism:

1 poor	2	3	4	5 excellent

V29 ☐ 42

2 In your opinion, what are the most important issues in producing quality academic writing? Please prioritise the options you select by starting with '1' for the most important issue and continuing with '2', '3', etc.

1 Correct language use (e.g. grammar, spelling)	
2 Appropriate style and register (e.g. formality of language, specific way of referencing)	
3 Quality of the content and argument	
4 Overall structure of the written text	
5 Other (please specify):	

V30 ☐ 43
V31 ☐ 44
V32 ☐ 45
V33 ☐ 46
V34 ☐ 47
V35 ☐ 48

3 How could one realistically improve the quality of one's own academic writing?

1 It is impossible to improve one's academic writing.	
2 One could learn more about the process of academic writing and improve one's ability to revise and edit one's own writing.	
3 Get a professional language editor to edit one's writing.	
4 Both 2 and 3	
5 Other (please specify):	

V36 ☐ 49
V37 ☐ 50

4a Do you think that academic discourse/language (the kind of language that is used in a tertiary academic environment) is different from other types of language?

Yes	
No	

V38 ☐ 51

4b If yes, in what way(s) is it different?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V39 ☐☐☐ 52-54
V40 ☐☐☐ 55-57
V41 ☐☐☐ 58-60

5a Do you believe that the language of your discipline/field is different from other disciplines/fields?

Yes	
No	

V42 ☐ 61

5b If yes, in what regard do you think is it different?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V43				62-64
V44				65-67
V45				68-70

6a Do you think that clear academic writing is important for the successful completion of your studies?

1 not important	2	3	4	5 very important

| V46 | | 71 |

6b Please substantiate your answer in 6a above:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V47				72-74
V48				75-77
V49				78-80

7 What types of writing tasks are expected of you in your studies for which you will be assessed (e.g. laboratory report; dissertation; thesis)?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V50				81-83
V51				84-86
V52				87-89
V53				90-92
V54				93-95
V55				96-98

8a Do you believe that students' level of proficiency in academic writing is important for their lecturers/supervisors ?

1 not important	2	3	4	5 very important

| V56 | | 99 |

8b Please substantiate your answer in 8a above:

_____

_____
_____
_____
_____

V57			100-102
V58			103-105
V59			106-108

SECTION D: PERSONAL WRITING NEEDS

1   What do you find most difficult in your own academic writing? Please prioritise your choice by starting with '1' for the most difficult issue and continuing with '2'; '3', etc. for the others:

1 Understanding/choosing a topic	
2 Finding relevant information	
3 Incorporating sources into your writing	
4 Organising the ideas in your written text in order to build a well –reasoned argument	
5 Finding the right words to express yourself	
6 Using language correctly	
7 Using language appropriately in terms of style/register	

V60		109
V61		110
V62		111
V63		112
V64		113
V65		114
V66		115

2   Make use of the scale below in your response to the following statement: 'I can benefit from relevant support with the development of my academic writing ability.'

1 strongly disagree	2	3	4	5 strongly agree

| V67 | | 116 |

3a   Do you think that you can benefit by attending an academic writing course?

1 no benefit	2	3	4	5 benefit greatly

| V68 | | 117 |

3b   Please explain your choice for 3a above:
_____
_____
_____

V69			118-120
V70			121-123
V71			124-126

_____

_____

SECTION E: POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS ONLY

1   At which university did you receive your first degree (and additional degrees, if any – please specify)?

Degree	University	Country
First degree		
Honours		
Master's		
Doctorate		

University
V72   127-128
V73   129-130
V74   131-132
V75   133-134
Country
V76   135-136
V77   137-138
V78   139-140
V79   141-142

2   In which language did you receive your lectures at this university / these universities?

Degree	University	Language
First degree		
Honours		
Master's		
Doctorate		

University
V80   143-144
V81   145-146
V82   147-148
V83   149-150
Language
V84   151-152
V85   153-154
V86   155-156
V87   157-158

3a   Have you previously attended any additional language support/academic literacy course in the language in which you have chosen to study at the University of Pretoria during your undergraduate studies?

Yes	
No	

V88   159

3b   If yes, was this a **general** academic language proficiency / academic literacy course or an academic **writing** course specifically?

General academic language proficiency/literacy course	
Academic writing course	

V89   160

3c   Was it compulsory for you to attend this course?

Yes	
No	

V90   161

3d Please indicate on the following scale whether you believe you benefited from the course or not:

1 no benefit	2	3	4	5 great benefit

V91	☐	162

3e Please substantiate your answer in 3d:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V92	☐☐☐	163-165
V93	☐☐☐	166-168
V94	☐☐☐	169-171

4a When you write longer academic texts, how many drafts/versions of a written assignment do you usually produce?

One draft	
Two drafts on average	
More than two drafts on average	

V95	☐	172

4b Please explain your choice above:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V96	☐☐☐	173-175
V97	☐☐☐	176-178
V98	☐☐☐	179-181

5 Which of the following steps form part of your approach to a longer academic writing assignment? Please provide a sequence for the steps you follow by starting with '1' for the first step and continuing with '2'; '3'; etc. for the following steps. (Please leave options blank that do not form part of your approach.)

1 Synthesising (putting together) the information into a coherent whole	
2 Revision and writing of subsequent drafts	
3 Writing a first draft	
4 Writing down everything you know about a topic	
5 Gathering information on the topic	
6 Editing and writing of the final draft	
7 Analysing the topic	

V99	☐	182
V100	☐	183
V101	☐	184
V102	☐	185
V103	☐	186
V104	☐	187
V105	☐	188
V106	☐	189

8 Planning your writing	

6a Did university lecturers offer relevant comments on the content of your written texts during your undergraduate studies or for any subsequent degrees?

Yes	
No	

V107 ☐ 190

6b If yes, did you benefit from such comments?

1 no benefit	2	3	4	5 great benefit

V108 ☐ 191

6c Please explain your choice in 6b:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V109 ☐☐☐ 192-194
V110 ☐☐☐ 195-197
V111 ☐☐☐ 198-200

7a Did university lecturers correct your language (e.g. grammar, spelling) during your undergraduate studies or for any subsequent degrees?

Yes	
No	

V112 ☐ 201

7b If yes, how much did you benefit from such correction?

1 no benefit	2	3	4	5 great benefit

V113 ☐ 202

7c Please explain your choice in 7b:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V114 ☐☐☐ 203-205
V115 ☐☐☐ 206-208
V116 ☐☐☐ 209-211

8   Has professional language editing (correction) ever been a requirement in previous degrees you completed?

Yes	
No	
I cannot remember	

V117 ☐   212

9   Is it a formal requirement of the degree for which you are currently registered that you have your academic writing (your thesis; dissertation; final project) edited (corrected) by a professional language editor?

Yes	
No	
I do not know	

V118 ☐   213

10   In your opinion, whose responsibility is it to correct your written academic language? You may choose more than one option.

Yourself	
Supervisor	
Professional language editor	

V119 ☐   214
V120 ☐   215
V121 ☐   216

11a   What do think are the capabilities one needs in order to correct one's own written language?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

V122 ☐☐☐   217-219
V123 ☐☐☐   220-222
V124 ☐☐☐   223-225

11b   What do you believe is your capability in correcting your own written academic texts?

1 incapable	2	3	4	5 very capable

V125 ☐   226

11c   Please substantiate your answer in 11b above:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

V126 ☐☐☐   227-229
V127 ☐☐☐   230-232
V128 ☐☐☐   233-235

Addendum C   Questions for the follow up supervisor interview on academic literacy and writing

Interviews – Agricultural and Food Sciences

In the analysis of the questionnaires, there is a clear indication that supervisors generally perceive their postgraduate students to experience academic literacy difficulties. Do you agree with this perception for both primary and additional language users? Are you increasingly faced with postgraduate applications of students who are additional language users of English?

1   It is interesting that contrary to supervisor perceptions (borne out by the results of TALL and a textual analysis of a written text your additional language students produced on the EOT 300 course), your students who completed the student questionnaire generally perceive their literacy ability to be 'good'. Why do you think is this so? How do you think can one address this apparent mismatch in perception between supervisors and students?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

2   What is the effect of low literacy levels on student achievement? What are the main consequences for you as supervisor?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

3   The majority of supervisors indicate that traditional ways of screening students for admission (using an average mark for the previous degree, for example) are not always reliable indicators of their academic literacy levels. What do you believe is a possible reason for this? Are you aware of any reliable way to determine AL levels? Is it important to determine this before admission?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Specific literacy difficulties of mostly additional language users are confirmed by the results of TALL as well as a textual analysis of a text that your students produced. What do you think is the best way of supporting such students with their literacy problems?

4 Although a majority of supervisors see academic writing as a major problem, some supervisors also indicate that students have problems reading and understanding the literature of their disciplines. Do you also think that reading is a problem? What appears to be students' main reading difficulties? (Reading difficulty is confirmed by the TALL results and the textual analysis for your additional language students).

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

5 If one wants to design a writing course that focuses in part on students' main writing difficulties, what do you think would be most valuable in such a writing course offered to your students? (vocabulary; register/style [do they understand?]; using genres [understand?]; general language use [grammar; sentence construction; connectors – signaling intentions]; sequencing ideas/arguing convincingly/writing with authority; do students plagiarise?).

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

6 How much writing is done by your postgraduate students? What are your typical writing assignments (genres) for postgraduate studies? (You indicated a thesis/dissertation.; essay; proposal; and report.) What type of writing is mainly involved here (argumentative; factual; descriptive)?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

7 What counts as evidence? (You indicated experimental results; literature; and photographs.) What kind of referencing system is generally used? (You indicated the Harvard method mainly.)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

8 Almost all supervisors indicate that they provide feedback on students' use of language as well as their ideas throughout the writing process. Do you focus more on correctness; style/register; logical flow of ideas; structure; clarity of meaning? In your experience, does this help to improve their texts (possible difference in how students respond to feedback focusing on language correctness vs. quality of ideas)? What are the most frequent language mistakes and content problems?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

9   Does language correctness play any part in the assessment of students' major written texts (e.g. theses, dissertations, research reports)?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

10   How do you ensure final correctness of student texts? Only 36% of your group of supervisors indicates that editing is a requirement – is this not a departmental or faculty requirement then?   The majority of students indicate that apart from their own responsibility, supervisors also have a responsibility towards ensuring the language correctness of their texts. Do you share this view?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Addendum D   Revision table

Revision table

Name of student (whose assignment you revised): _____

Name of the reviewer: _____

Question	Yes	No
1. Is there a clear introduction, body and conclusion (not only in terms of structure but also in function)?		
2. Is the problem that the writer investigated clearly stated in the introduction?		
3. Does the introduction guide the reader with regard to what to expect in the rest of the assignment?		
4. Does the evidence provided in the body of the assignment support the thesis?		
5. Does every paragraph have a main idea that is supported and elaborated by other ideas in the paragraph?		
6. Do all the sources quoted in the text appear in the list of references (and in the correct format)?		
7. Have all headings and sub-headings been used purposefully?		
8. Is the problem that the writer solved again emphasised in the conclusion?		

General comments about the assignment:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Addendum E   Error correction scheme for language and style

C	Capitalisation problem
⁓⁓⁓	Incorrect word order (correct word, but misplaced)
Λ	Missing word or words
P	Punctuation problem
—	Incorrect word form
SP	Spelling problem
art	Absence of or incorrect article usage (a/an/the)
S/V	Agreement between subject and verb (concord)
WW	Wrong word
X	Unnecessary
⌣	Combine
/	Split
(?)	I did not understand (try again)
F	Fragment (incomplete sentence)
R	Run-on sentence (sentence is too long)

Addendum F   Additional examples of writing tasks

1   General text structure and connecting devices

1.1   Read the text below carefully. You will notice that the text is scrambled in terms of the sequence in which the paragraphs are presented. Arrange the text in such a way that it adheres to the general structure of introduction / body / conclusion discussed in class. Number each paragraph in the margin in order to indicate the correct sequence for the paragraphs, e.g. start with '1' for the introductory paragraph. In addition, provide a heading for the text, as well as a concluding paragraph:

1	_____
2	
3	The greenhouse effect **and** global warming are already having adverse effects:
4	
5	• Changes in the climate have occurred in some areas with higher average
6	temperatures **and** changes in rainfall.
7	• Patterns **and** areas of food production have changed. In some parts of East
8	Africa, rainfall has decreased **and** food crops have failed more frequently than
9	before.
10	• Global warming has caused an overall melting of the polar ice caps **and** this
11	has resulted in rising sea levels with more frequent coastal floods.
12	
13	Some of the worst damage to our environment is caused by pollution. Most pollution
14	is caused by waste materials **and** waste energy from people's homes, vehicles,
15	industries, farms **and** other activities. The word pollution normally brings to mind
16	waste material **such as** sewage, sulphur dioxide **and** CFCs (chlorofluorocarbons).
17	**But**, pollution **also** includes excessive noise (e.g. from aircraft) **and** waste heat (e.g.
18	from power stations).
19	
20	The worst contributor to the global warming effect is carbon dioxide produced by the
21	burning of fossil fuels. **In addition** to molecules of carbon dioxide being larger, they
22	are heavier than the gases in clean air, **such as** oxygen **and** nitrogen. **Because** of this,
23	heat radiation cannot pass through carbon dioxide as easily as it passes through clean
24	air. **As a result** of the rising concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, less
25	heat escapes from the Earth **and** the temperature slowly rises. **In other words**,
26	carbon dioxide traps heat in the Earth like a greenhouse. This has led to the term
27	greenhouse effect.

28   **If** harmful emissions are not _____
29   _____
30   _____
31   _____
32
33   One of the most serious effects from waste gases **and** waste heat is the warming of the
34   Earth (global warming). **As a result**, different experts have estimated that global
35   warming will have increased the temperature of the Earth by between 1 and 3 degrees
36   Celsius by the year **2050**.
37
38   *(WESSA, 1998:122)*

1.2   What are the main functional characteristics of the paragraph(s) in the:

Introduction:_____

_____

Body:_____

_____

Conclusion:_____

_____

1.3   Make use of the text on global warming that you have already employed in the previous task to create a meaningful context for this task. All the words in bold are logical connectors and have the function of creating cohesion between ideas in the text. Locate the connectors mentioned below in the text and write down which ideas are connected by each of these connectors. Remember that we are not necessarily referring to complete sentences here, but ideas. The idea that you write down may, therefore, also be represented by a single word.

1   'and' (line 3)

Idea 1:_____
Idea 2:_____

2   'such as' (line 16)

Idea 1:_____
Idea 2:_____

3   'But' (line 17)

Idea 1:_____

Idea 2:_____

4   'in addition' (line 21)

Idea 1:_____

Idea 2:_____

5   'Because' (line 22)

Idea 1:_____

Idea 2:_____

6   'As a result' (line 24)

Idea 1:_____

Idea 2:_____

7   'In other words' (line 25)

Idea 1:_____

Idea 2:_____

8   'If' (line 30)

Idea 1:_____

Idea 2:_____

9   'As a result' (line 36)

Idea 1:_____

Idea 2:_____

10   '2050' (line 38)

Idea 1:_____

Idea 2:_____

1.4   Consult the reference list of connectors provided to you and see whether you can substitute the connectors you have used in 1.3 by at least one other connector from the same category in the list (do this in the original text by writing in the alternative just above the original word/phrase).

Reference list of logical connectors (signpost words)

- *Additive words* (these words usually add information to what has already been said)

also	further
and	furthermore
as well as	in addition
at the same time	likewise
besides	moreover
equally important	too

- *Amplification words* (these words usually expand or enlarge upon preceding ideas)

as	specifically
for example	such as
for instance	that is
in fact	to illustrate

- *Repetitive words* (a writer or speaker could use these words in order to repeat something with more emphasis or to make it more understandable)

again	that is
in other words	to repeat

- ***Contrast and change words*** (the writer will most probably use these words to introduce the 'other side of the story', or, in other words, the contrasting side of the argument)

but	notwithstanding
conversely	on the other hand
despite	still
even though	though
however	whereas
in contrast	yet

- ***Cause and effect words*** (these words are used when one wants to introduce or link ideas of causality and consequence)

accordingly	since
as a result	so
because	then
consequently	therefore
for this reason	thus

- ***Qualifying words*** (these words introduce important information that is usually necessary to make the data or concepts that are discussed valid. They, therefore, introduce conditions under which the data or concepts are to be considered)

although	providing
if	unless

- ***Emphasising words*** (these words are used to highlight or emphasise that of which the sender of a message wants the receiver to take special note)

<div style="border:1px solid">

above all

more / most important (ly)

more / most significant (ly)

</div>

- ***Order words*** (these words are used when the sender of the message wants to point to a specific sequence or order of events or data)

afterwards	now
at the same time	presently / today
before	subsequently
first (ly), second (ly)...	then
formerly	ultimately
last (ly)	until
later	while
meanwhile	historically
next	historical periods

- ***Summarising words*** (senders usually use these words when they would like to make sure that the receiver grasped the essence of their argument before they continue. It could be useful for both senders and receivers to check [by using these words] whether the main line of argument is understood)

briefly	in conclusion
in brief	to summarise / to sum up
in short	in summary

(Adapted from Orr and Schutte, 1992)

2 Referencing

When one wants to use quotations in a text that one is writing, the sources of such quotations should be properly acknowledged. The following are examples of how this should be done in the text itself and finally in the bibliography (list of references) at the end of one's assignment or research project:

For references in the text, the abbreviated Harvard method of reference should be used with no footnotes or endnotes:

Quoting **indirectly**:

According to Mokoena (1984:3), the role of …

… Behr (1983:42) states that …

Direct quote:

It is of utmost importance that "the student should take responsibility for his own learning " (Spengler, 1992:16).

The following are examples of typical entries in a list of references for the main types of sources (they have all been taken from the example list below):

- A book with one author:

Kotecha, P. 1994. *Communication for Engineers: an integrated approach to academic and language skills*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.

- A book with editors:

> Rose, M. 1998. The language of exclusion: writing instruction at the university. In: Zamel, V. & Spack, R. (Eds.) *Negotiating academic literacies*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum. pp. 9-30.

- A journal article:

> Badger, R. & White, G. 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2):153-160.

- An Internet reference:

> Beckleheimer, J. 1994. *How do you cite URL's in a bibliography?*   [Online] Available: http://www.nrlssc.navy.mil/meta/bibliograpy.html .
> [Accessed: 1995, 13 Dec.]

Example of a list of references:

REFERENCES

Badger, R. & White, G. 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2):153-160.

Beckleheimer, J. 1994. *How do you cite URL's in a bibliography?* [Online] Available: http://www.nrlssc.navy.mil/meta/bibliograpy.html [Accessed: 1995, 13 Dec.]

Du Toit, A.P., Heese, M. & Orr, M.H. 1995. *Practical guide to reading, thinking and writing skills*. Halfway House: International Thomson Publishing (Pty) Ltd.

Du Toit, A.P. & Orr, M. 1987. *Achiever's handbook*. Johannesburg: Southern Book Publishers.

Kotecha, P. 1994. *Communication for Engineers: an integrated approach to academic and language skills*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.

Morris, K.T., & Cinnamon, K.M. 1983. *A handbook of verbal group exercises*. San Diego: Applied Skills Press.

Orr, M.H. & Schutte, C.J.H. 1992. *The language of science*. Durban: Butterworths.

Rose, M. 1998. The language of exclusion: writing instruction at the university. In: Zamel, V. & Spack, R. (Eds.) *Negotiating academic literacies*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum. pp. 9-30.

Sebranek, P. & Meyer, V. 1990. *Basic English revisited*. Wisconsin.

University of Stellenbosch: Centre for Educational Development. 1995. *Edward de Bono's six thinking hats and thinking tools*. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.

2.1 The list of references below contains a number of inconsistencies with the Harvard method of referencing we discussed in class. Read through the list, encircle all such inconsistencies and make suggestions on the list as to how you would correct the entries:

Jay, R. 1994. How to write proposals and reports that get results. London: Pitman.

White, R. 1987. *Speaker's digest: business quotations*. London: W. Foulsham.

Hill, M.D. 1997. Oral presentation advice. Available http://www.cs.wisc.edu/ ~markhill/conference-talk.html.

Patterson, D.A. How to give a bad talk. 1983. Available http://www.cs.wisc.edu/ ~markhill/conference-talk.html.

Dickinson, S. 1998. *Effective presentation*. London: Orion Business.

Stuart, C. 2000. *Speak for yourself: the complete guide to effective communication and powerful presentations*. London: Piatkus.

Urech, E. *Speaking globally: effective presentations across international and cultural boundaries*. Dover, New Hampshire: Kogan Page.

Hager, P.J., H.J. Scheiber & N.C. Corbin. 1997. *Designing and delivering scientific, technical, and managerial presentations*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Chemical and Process Engineering, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. 2001. Presentation skills. Available http://lorien.ncl.ac.uk/ming/Dept/ Tips/present/present.htm.

Jay, R. & A. Jay. 2000. *Effective presentation: powerful ways to make your presentations more effective*. Prentice-Hall: London.

Tierney, EP 1999. *101 ways to better presentations. A hundred and one ways to make more effective presentations*. London: Kogan Page.

(Adapted from Weideman, 2003b)

2.2   Include the full bibliographical details of all the articles on 'desertification' that you have selected to read comprehensively in the form of a reference list below. Before you write this down, make sure again that you do this according to the format that we discussed in class (the Harvard method):

References:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.3   It usually makes a lot of sense, while busy reading, to also highlight possible quotes that you can use when you write up your research. Many students vaguely remember that somewhere in their extensive reading about a topic they read something they could have used to support an idea they wish to use in their writing. How many students will re-read all the material in order to find one quote? Not many, we think. Write down at least three direct quotes that you think could be useful in your literature survey on 'desertification' from the articles that you have selected. Make sure that you include the author as well as page references for these quotes (according to the Harvard method).

Also underline the keywords/key concepts in the quotes to show which issues you want to introduce or support by using the quote.

1   _____

   _____

   _____

2   _____

   _____

   _____

3   _____

   _____

   _____

3   Locating and organising main ideas

In the academic context, it is crucial to know that **not all information is equal**. If a paragraph, for example, were well constructed, there would usually be **one main idea** that is supported by evidence, for example, and/or other subsidiary/explanatory information. This is also how efficient students read academic texts – they select the main ideas from paragraphs in order to emphasise such ideas for themselves. Similarly, this is how effective writers write – by constructing a paragraph around one main idea.

It is further important to know that, when reading and interpreting a text, the main idea does not necessarily equate to a complete sentence. It is quite natural, for example, to read a sentence, pick out the keywords from the sentence and combine these words to form a main idea. This is exactly what should happen in Task 3.1 below.

3.1   Identify the main ideas in each paragraph in the following text by underlining or encircling them:

Genetically modified foods and organisms

What are Genetically Modified (GM) Foods?

Although 'biotechnology' and 'genetic modification' commonly are used interchangeably, GM is a special set of technologies that alter the genetic makeup of such living organisms as animals, plants, or bacteria. Biotechnology, a more general term, refers to using living organisms or their components, such as enzymes, to make products that include wine, cheese, beer, and yogurt.

Combining genes from different organisms is known as recombinant DNA technology, and the resulting organism is said to be 'genetically modified', 'genetically engineered', or 'transgenic'. GM products (current or in the pipeline) include medicines and vaccines, foods and food ingredients, feeds, and fibres.

Locating genes for important traits - such as those conferring insect resistance or desired nutrients - is one of the most limiting steps in the process. However, genome

sequencing and discovery programs for hundreds of different organisms are generating detailed maps along with data-analyzing technologies to understand and use them.

In 2003, about 167 million acres (67.7 million hectares) grown by 7 million farmers in 18 countries were planted with transgenic crops, the principal ones being herbicide- and insecticide-resistant soybeans, corn, cotton, and canola. Other crops grown commercially or field-tested are a sweet potato resistant to a virus that could decimate most of the African harvest, rice with increased iron and vitamins that may alleviate chronic malnutrition in Asian countries, and a variety of plants able to survive weather extremes.

On the horizon are bananas that produce human vaccines against infectious diseases such as hepatitis B; fish that mature more quickly; fruit and nut trees that yield years earlier, and plants that produce new plastics with unique properties.

In 2003, countries that grew 99% of the global transgenic crops were the United States (63%), Argentina (21%), Canada (6%), Brazil (4%), China (4%), and South Africa (1%). Although growth is expected to plateau in industrialized countries, it is increasing in developing countries. The next decade will see exponential progress in GM product development as researchers gain increasing and unprecedented access to genomic resources that are applicable to organisms beyond the scope of individual projects.

Technologies for genetically modifying foods offer dramatic promise for meeting some areas of greatest challenge for the 21st century. Like all new technologies, they also pose some risks, both known and unknown. Controversies surrounding GM foods and crops commonly focus on human and environmental safety, labelling and consumer choice, intellectual property rights, ethics, food security, poverty reduction, and environmental conservation.

(Ackerman, 2002:45)

3.2   Draw up a diagram of the main ideas in the text above. Make sure that you choose only keywords for inclusion in this summary of the text. Make use of the next page for completing a map-like representation of information in the text:

GM foods and organisms

Addendum G   Recordings of the supervisor interviews on DVD