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Introduction: The University of Groningen English Department

The English department at the University of Groningen (RUG) is host to one of the best English Language and Culture BA program in the Netherlands (rug.nl), and as such, offers several opportunities for interns hoping to gain teaching experience at a high-level of academic excellence. By pursuing this degree, students gain proficiency in the English language, exposure to literature and culture and writing theory. The degree consists of three years of study which start by laying a foundation in linguistic and literary theory, and lead to students producing a dissertation on a topic of their interest in the third and final year. To support this process, a series of proficiency courses have been integrated into the program to encourage and enhance the writing process of students to reach an advanced academic level.

These courses, each titled as a different aspect of English for Academic Purposes (EAP), include six levels, beginning in the first year with the formulation of paragraphs in Persuasive Expression and Composition. Subsequently, students learn to compose longer essays in Argumentation, and in the second year, apply this knowledge in Popular Contexts, Debate and Discussion, and finally Research Reports. The focus of my internship was on the third course in the EAP process: Argumentation, which hones students’ abilities to synthesize sources to support a stance and formulate their ideas into a coherent argumentative essay.

EAP: Argumentation Background

EAP: Argumentation is anchored by the ideas espoused by Wingate (2012), who devised a three-part framework of essay writing in order to alleviate the common problems found in university-level academic argumentative essays. The framework involves analyzing sources, establishing a position and structuring a coherent text and is used as the basis for each unit of EAP: Argumentation. Utilizing this foundation, students are exposed to a variety of sociolinguistic articles aimed at answering the underlying course question, “Does language represent who we are?” Through written essays and oral discussions, students are encouraged to answer this question using specific evidence from relevant sociolinguistic articles, which will prepare them for their own independent research in the future. The explicitly stated learning outcomes of the course are (1) to produce an academic sociolinguistic essay with sound argumentation, (2) analyze and synthesize sources to support an argument and (3) hold an academic discussion about sociolinguistic issues in English. Students are also expected to perform at a C1 level on the CEFR scale by the end of this course.
Intern Responsibilities

During the course of my internship in the English department, all first-year students were expected to complete EAP: Argumentation. Students were divided into five groups, and a team of five teachers (two mentor teachers and three interns) was responsible for leading the course. I was responsible for the sole instruction of one group throughout the semester, as well as supplemental instruction periodically for the other groups and preparation of materials. Instruction of the course included leading class discussions and the facilitation of writing workshops, as well as peer feedback sessions to ultimately prepare students for a two-part final examination process consisting of a written and oral assessment.

To assess my progress, an observation plan was devised with the mentor teacher based on my personal goals for the internship. For the first unit, the mentor teacher would observe all of my lessons and meet with me afterward to discuss feedback and points of improvement. For the next unit, I taught independently to work on implementing the feedback given previously, and during the final unit I was observed and assessed by the mentor teacher to gauge my improvement (see Appendix A for the final observation form). I also observed all lessons taught by both mentor teachers as well as the other intern throughout the entirety of the course and took notes and discussed feedback with each teacher individually. To assess my progress personally, I kept a weekly diary detailing my general impression of each lesson I taught followed by strengths and points of improvement. A sample diary entry is provided in Appendix B.

Aside from teaching, the internship also involved preparation and creation of materials throughout the semester. For the first two units, this included revising and updating reading, quiz and discussion questions; adjusting and preparing class materials such as PowerPoint presentations and worksheets; and facilitating communication with students through the Nestor digital course environment. This work was shared among the three interns and monitored through weekly meetings both with and without mentor teachers. As a team, all five teachers and interns met weekly to discuss each lesson. During these meetings, adjustments and improvements for the previous week’s lesson were discussed and delegated, and the next week’s lesson was planned. I took notes during each meeting to record proposed changes and tasks for the previous and upcoming lessons. A sample of meeting notes is included in Appendix C. As a team, the interns typically met additionally once prior and once after this meeting to prepare and enact all discussed actions.
To expand our responsibilities and gain independence in course organization, the third unit of the course was entirely devised and constructed by the team of three interns. This involved the selection of an article on which to base the unit and a three-week series of lessons related to the article and the theme of coherence and cohesion in academic writing, as well as delivery skills in academic discussion. The article chosen was *Sketching Muslims: A Corpus Driven Analysis of Representations Around the Word ‘Muslim’ in the British Press 1998–2009* by Baker, Gabrielatos and McEnery (2013). This article was chosen for the third unit for several reasons including clarity of information, presentation of data and overall coherence. It was necessary to choose a new article for this unit because the article used in the previous year had been deemed too complicated to be fully comprehended and synthesized by students. It was therefore vital to select an article that would be understandable while still meeting a challenging academic standard involving engaging subject matter. The article chosen dealt with an interesting topic (the portrayal of Muslims in British press) while clearly presenting a multitude of data that could be analyzed and interpreted by the students in their writing.

Once the article was selected, we created reading questions to assist in comprehension (see Appendix D), and a three-week lesson plan consisting of a discussion seminar, a writing workshop and a peer feedback session was devised. For each lesson we also constructed a PowerPoint presentation and a lesson plan to ensure the unit could be used easily in future years by other instructors. These slides and a sample lesson plan are also included in appendices E and F.

The first lesson of Unit 3, the discussion seminar, aimed to introduce the students to the article by relating the topic to the real world (see appendix E1). We used an interactive website as a warm-u activity to quiz students about the previous units in order to link the current topic to what had been previously covered. This was followed by a discussion with real-world examples of newspaper headlines about Muslims, which students could relate to what they had read in the article. The lesson continued with an in-depth analysis of all the data presented in the article to emphasize the importance of understanding and being able to synthesize evidence in writing. This was followed by a general discussion of the article to meet the learning outcome of being able to understand and summarize the main points of the article.

The second half of this lesson focused on discussion practice with an emphasis on delivery. This built upon previous lessons in which students had practiced oral discussions focusing on different skills laid out in the established rubric including interaction and argumentation. The
highlighted skill for this unit was delivery, for which we devised an activity to introduce the effect of different aspects of delivery such as emphasis and intonation on a message before proceeding to a mock oral discussion in preparation for the final exam.

We concluded the lesson by assigning homework designed to help students summarize the article and prepare for the next written assignment of the unit. Following this, the next lesson was a writing workshop focused on creating cohesion and coherence in academic writing (Appendix E2). For this, we utilized excerpts from the article to demonstrate a variety of cohesive devices including substitution, referencing and lexical links. We also introduced the students to several strategies of thematic progression using topic and comment to make their writing more coherent. Students were given time to practice using these strategies before we provided the writing assignment for the unit.

The third and final lesson of Unit 3 consisted of a peer feedback session in which students were given the opportunity to evaluate the work of their peers step-by-step in order to highlight the elements that would be evaluated in their writing (see Appendix E3 for slides). This lesson also included time for mock oral practice to ensure that all students were given an opportunity to practice and receive feedback on their oral discussion skills in class.

During the third unit, the interns were also given the opportunity to instruct all classes, meaning that in addition to my usual weekly class, I taught another full class and divided instruction of a third class with another intern for a total of two and half classes per week. This allowed me to perceive what worked well in class and to make adjustments for different classes to improve on the overall flow of the lessons. In general, the third unit of the class was successfully executed, and we received positive feedback from most of the students regarding the article and the lessons. We were also given verbal feedback from the mentor teachers that this unit would be used in future years. Planning and teaching a full unit independently allowed us to fully experience the teaching process and make useful adjustments for the future, including possibly reformulating the process of discussion practice to improve time management and create a more productive task for students such as creating a podcast.

The final task that the other interns and I were responsible for was the assessment of all written assignments the students produced throughout the year, as well as assisting in assessment of the final oral and written exams. This process was also built upon gradually as elements from the rubric were successively added to the assessment process for each assignment. For example, the first writing assignment was graded for main ideas only, while for the second and third assignments
structure and cohesion were added respectively. This allowed me to learn the grading process gradually and focus explicitly on one set of skills at a time. Over time, it became easier to assess multiple elements simultaneously until I was prepared by the final written exam to assess all elements of the rubric in conjunction. In anticipation of the final written exam, we compiled a document detailing the common issues found in the final essay to aid students in their writing, which is provided in Appendix H. This process helped immensely to prepare me to assess written work by identifying issues and providing constructive feedback.

Nearing the end of the course, the students were asked to complete a course evaluation which we created specifically for EAP: Argumentation. Students were asked to rate their experience of the course in regard to their mastery of the overall learning outcomes, usefulness of various course elements, difficulty of material and skills obtained. We also added a section with specific questions pertaining to Unit 3 of the course to assess the difficulty level along with students’ perception of how it fit with the course and how engaging and useful they found the material. Overall, all average scores met the acceptable threshold, and students seemed appropriately challenged and satisfied with the course in general. Pertaining to Unit 3, students seemed to find the first seminar and the focus on coherence and cohesion particularly useful. An additional section of the evaluation asked students to provide feedback on their instructor in terms of preparedness, instruction, approachability and several other areas. For this section my students reported high overall satisfaction with my instruction as well as some useful feedback to help improve the course. A summary of the entire student evaluation can be found in Appendix G.

Assessment and Reflection of Personal Learning Outcomes

At the onset of this internship, my personal learning goals were as follows: (1) to gain competence and experience teaching EAP at a university level, (2) to learn how to assess advanced academic writing and provide meaningful and actionable feedback, and (3) to apply theories of learning that I acquired in the first semester of this program in a productive environment. Through the tasks described above I feel that these outcomes were met with success to a sufficient degree, and I am pleased with how this placement has shaped my teaching abilities and created opportunities for me to pursue this field in the future. Regarding the first goal, this was especially important as I had previous teaching experience, but I was eager to elevate this to a more advanced academic setting. Through this internship, I received guided practice and eventually independent opportunities to instruct a class, which provided me with invaluable experience and
preparation to pursue this type of teaching as a career. Without this opportunity, the transition from elementary ESL classes to university-level academic writing would have proven far more daunting.

My next goal, which was also closely related but focused specifically on the element of writing assessment, was also developed thoroughly throughout this internship. As mentioned, the assessment process for the students’ writing assignments was built up gradually so that we analyzed broader elements to begin with (main ideas only), and later added more technical elements (structure, cohesion and language). This allowed more thorough marking at the beginning without becoming overwhelmed by attempting to assess all elements at once and was correspondingly also useful for students who could focus on different elements individually. Meeting with students one on one to discuss feedback directly also provided practice interacting with students individually and allowed me to gauge how my feedback was being received. This type of interaction enhanced the independence provided by this placement as I took complete responsibility for the marks I assigned and could help students use these to improve upon their work. Having had this experience, in which grading became a gradual process of added elements, I now feel confident in marking academic writing and identifying which elements are stronger or weaker. By extension, I am also able to provide actionable feedback to students on the various aspects of their writing in order to strengthen their arguments to the fullest extent of their abilities.

As a final goal of working on this internship, it was my intention to be able to incorporate the theoretical knowledge I acquired during the first semester of Applied Linguistics courses to a practical teaching environment. This was implemented to some degree in the existing model of instruction developed for the EAP courses in that there is no explicit grammar instruction, but instead a CLIL approach to teaching is enacted in which students are exposed to materials and given constructive rather than corrective feedback. The idea behind this is that students will learn more based on repeated exposure to high-quality input and through giving and receiving feedback. This approach seems to work well, especially at the already advanced level of students participating in this program. In order to take advantage of the system already in place, I was able to incorporate strategies gleaned from a dynamic usage-based (DUB) perspective of language-learning into my instruction practice as well in the form of providing scaffolding, constructive feedback, and an opportunity for students to interact with their peers in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) such as in a peer feedback session. This environment also served as an example of how DUB principles can be applied at an advanced level surpassing language acquisition and extending to academic usage and application. The background knowledge I acquired in the theory behind a DUB approach
prior to this internship created a foundation on which to practice my skills in a controlled environment, creating an overall meta effect of instructional experience.

To summarize, this internship met and exceeded my expectations regarding the ability to plan and instruct a university-level EAP course. Not only was I able to extend my prior experience as an English teacher to a higher level, I was also able to apply the theoretical knowledge and skills I acquired during the first semester of this program to a practical setting that prepared me to pursue teaching EAP professionally in the future. Through guided practice involving observation and assessment, I was able to gradually build confidence and competence to instruct this type of class independently. Additionally, I feel confident in my ability to adequately create and improve upon this type of course critically in the future, which I hope to implement in my career in the coming years.
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Appendix A

Teaching Observation Form

[See attached file]
February 20, 2018

*General Observations*

The main difference between this class and the previous two was evident in how comfortable I felt with the subject matter and the topics to be covered. I think it was apparent that this class was more difficult content-wise and it was more important to have clear answers to questions and issues instead of more of an open discussion that the previous topics allowed for. This made preparation more important and underlined the difficulty of adapting pre-made materials for my own use. In the future, I think it will be beneficial for me to download and make necessary changes to the material for my own purposes. This will help me feel more comfortable while teaching and ensure that I know the outline of the lesson and why it is planned in this manner.

*Strengths*

On a surface level, I was determined to learn the names of all my students which I was able to do by this class. This helped immensely in facilitating activities and keeping students accountable during the class. Besides this, it was helpful that I had my own answers to many of the questions prior to the class (e.g. a sample thesis statement) which really helped to frame the discussion in a meaningful direction.

*Points of Improvement*

I was not as confident about the structure of this lesson which lead to some clunky transitions and justifications for each activity. In the future I would like to work on personalizing the lesson materials prior to teaching so that I have a better grasp on the structure of the class and the purpose for this. At times when I’m not getting the answers I was looking for or expecting, I tend to move on to another student/activity and get rather flustered. I should work on really pressing the students to explain their answers and bring in others to clarify rather than to move on before it is really understood. What are the other teachers doing during individual work?

Careful planning before the lesson: what are the main objectives? How do the activities relate to these? Knowing what to spend more (and less) time on.
Appendix C
Sample Meeting Notes: Unit 2, Lesson 1

February 28, 2018

Week 4 changes

- Adjust quiz – question 1 (more general instead of close reading)
- Leave out discussion part – more time for feedback

Week 5

- Reading questions:
  - 5 – use of style: which elements are academic and would use, which are not (academic)/useful
- Quiz questions:
  - Adjust questions appropriately
- Update politicians
  - Remove all politicians not mentioned in article
- Update map to include 2016 election
- Warmer – include Trump quote – solidarity with public
- Plan intro activity – activate and tie into article ideas – political ideas based on how people speak (slides 1-8)
  - Politician quotes
- Cats are better than dogs – change question – something political?
- Different topics for discussion questions – easy question for slide 15 activity
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Appendix D
Unit 3 Reading Questions

**Reading questions for Baker, Gabrielatos & McEnery (2013)**

This article has been chosen for three reasons: 1) it gives an example of how corpus linguistic data can be used to understand trends in language and society; 2) it shows how to effectively represent large amounts of data and how to draw solid conclusions from them; 3) it is an example of a coherent and cohesive piece of writing, using not only linking words, but also a number of more sophisticated and subtle cohesive devices.

**Before reading:**

1. You might find it useful to watch this TEDx talk. Tony McEnery, the third author of the article, explains what the research focussed on and what conclusions they drew:

   [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nRz6PBDHJqc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nRz6PBDHJqc)

2. The study you are going to read uses several terms from corpus linguistics (a subdiscipline of linguistics which studies language through computer analysis of huge amounts of spoken and written text). Some of the terms may be unfamiliar to you, so they are listed here. Match them to their definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Tokens</th>
<th>Collocation Collocates</th>
<th>Discourse analysis Types</th>
<th>Discourse prosody Lemma</th>
<th>Qualitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. The study of written or spoken text in order to understand the relation between text and society
2. A phenomenon whereby two (or more) words occur together more often than chance would suggest. For example, *heavy* and *rain* tend to occur together, whereas *hard* and *rain* do not.
3. A type of analysis which relies on numeric data.
4. The individual words which make up a collocation.
5. The way that seemingly neutral words can carry negative or positive associations because of the words they collocate with. For example, *cause* may seem neutral, but usually collocates with negative words, e.g. *accident*, *disaster*.
6. The number of actual instances of a word in a text. For example, in the sentence *The cat sat on the mat*, there are two instances of the word *the*.
7. The number of different kinds of word in a text. For example, in the sentence *The cat sat on the mat*, there are five different kinds of word.
8. The dictionary form of a word. For example, *run*, *runs*, *running* and *ran* are parts of the same dictionary entry, with *run* as the dictionary form.
9. A type of analysis that focuses on non-numeric data.
Reading

Abstract

1. As we said when reading Wingate (2012), reading the abstract is a valuable exercise to help orient yourself when reading the article.
   - What argument do you expect the authors to make?
   - What do you think the conclusions of the article will be?
   - What analysis was used?

Introduction

2. Read the “Introduction” section (page 255-257).
   - Which paragraph states the purpose of the article?
   - In this paragraph, the writers make reference to their methods. What are they? (Don’t worry if you don’t understand them fully at this point.)
   - The introduction section also contains three paragraphs about the readership of newspapers in the UK. Why is this included in the introduction?

3. Read the last paragraph of the “Introduction” section (page 257). The paragraph begins with “The following section”.
   - What is the function of this paragraph?
   - Using the paragraph, make a note of the sections you expect to encounter in the article.
   - Now, quickly leaf through the article and find the headings you wrote down. How do these headings relate to each other to create overall coherence throughout the article?
   - Look again at your notes on the overall structure. How does this fit the pattern of broad to specific?

Note that not all genres of writing require this kind of explanatory introductory paragraph, and that for some writers and disciplines it is dispreferred. You should pay close attention to what other writers do in your discipline(s) and what your tutors think about this type of paragraph as well.

Research on media language and Islam

4. Read the first paragraph of this section (beginning “Research that has examined…”)
   - There are several different devices in this paragraph which help to make it a cohesive paragraph. One of these is the use of linking words, but there are others as well. Study the paragraph carefully and pick out as many cohesive devices as you can find.

5. In the last paragraph of the research review (p.259, top of the page), Fairclough’s textually oriented discourse analysis is said to provide: (a) description of the text, (b) interpretation of discourse processes and the text, and (c) explanation of those processes and society.
How does this relate to the idea, stated in Chapman (2012), that language can act as an index to human behaviour?

Data and Methods

6. Read the “Data and Methods” Section.
   - There are 5 paragraphs. What is the purpose of each one?
   - How does each paragraph build on the previous one?

7. Read the paragraph on page 260 which begins “The first stage of the analysis”.
   - If you are curious about what Sketch Engine is, you might want to watch this (short) video: https://www.sketchengine.co.uk
   - In the same paragraph, there is an example using the word WOMAN. How does this demonstrate Sketch Engine’s capabilities? Why is it included?

8. Read the last paragraph of this section (“A word sketch is…”)
   - “A word sketch is a somewhat broad brush approach.” (p.260). How does this phrase link to the introduction section, i.e. can you find it repeated in that section?

Results: Noun collocates of Muslim

9. Before reading the analysis of Table 1, it is worth spending a few moments getting to grips with the table first. Analyses are often much easier to read once you have interpreted the data yourself. You will be responsible for summarising the tables during class!
   - What do the words in the left-hand column represent?
   - “Frequency” is listed in the second column. However, frequency is relative: what is the overall size of the corpus in a) number of texts, and b) number of words? (Hint: check the methods section if you didn’t note this down the first time round.)
   - According to the table, what does “Salience” mean? (The calculation is quite technical so we won’t address it here.)
   - Look again at the left-hand column. Can you see words which are related? How would you categorize them into meaningful groups?
   - Woman is the third most common noun found with the adjective Muslim. Does this surprise you? How does it compare with the frequency of the word man? Why do you think woman is used so often with Muslim in the UK press?
   - The table shows only uses of the word Muslim as an adjective. What percentage is that of all the uses of the word Muslim in the corpus? (Hint: check the two paragraphs above the table).

10. Read table 2.
    - How does the data in table 2 relate to the data in table 1?
    - Were the categories decided on by the researchers or by a computer? (Hint: you might need to look in the text)
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- Are these categories similar to the ones you created for Table 1?
- Directly above the table is a paragraph which starts “What emerges from…” (p.262). Do you agree with the conclusions the researchers draw in this paragraph?

11. The following section (pages 263-265, top of page) describes each category in greater detail, providing excerpts from newspapers for each one. According to the text, how are these categories interconnected with one another?

12. Figures 2, 3 and 4 are related to each other. Knowing how they are related can help to deepen your understanding of what they show.

- In your own words, try to explain what Figure 2 shows, and how this data was collected from the database.
- Do the same with Figure 3.
- What is the difference between the data in Figure 2 and the data in Figure 3? (Hint: pay attention to the difference between token and type. If you still aren’t sure, go back to the pre-reading exercises.)
- Figure 4 revisualizes the data from these two Figures in a different way. Check the names of the axes of Figure 4. Now go back to Figures 2 and 3. Which axis represents Figure 2? Which axis represents figure 3?
- The authors refer to the idea of “lexical richness”. What does this mean?

Results: Muslim world and Muslim community

13. Read the first two sentences of this section.

- What do you notice about how each sentence begins?
- How do these cohesive devices develop the argument in this section?

14. Look at Figure 5. Analyze it and interpret it in your own words.

- What is the authors’ explanation for the difference in frequency of the phrases Muslim community and Muslim world over the period from 1998 to 2009?

Conclusion

15. Read the Conclusion section.

- What is the function of the first three paragraphs of this section? Why are they written first, rather than later?
- Which paragraph states the findings of the study most effectively? Which two sentences can be considered the conclusion of the article?
- Scan through these paragraphs again. What words or phrases are used to cohesively link the points the authors are making?
- Look at the topic sentence of each paragraph. How do they work to summarize the research the authors have done?
Before you finish reading: below, we’ve included the question which you’ll have to discuss in class and write for Writing Assignment 3. You might find it useful to make some notes on this topic before you come to class.

How does the language used in British newspapers create a distinction between Muslims and the rest of society?

You might want to consider:

- What evidence can you get from the data presented in the article (specifically tables and figures)?
- What arguments can your data support?
- Which arguments would be most useful in your discussion / writing assignment?
Appendix E

Unit 3 PowerPoint Presentations

[See attached file]
## Sample Lesson Plan: Unit 3, Lesson 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage (When?)</th>
<th>Aim (Why?)</th>
<th>Timing (How long?)</th>
<th>Slide numbers and notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>To introduce students to the agenda and learning outcomes</td>
<td>1-2 mins</td>
<td>(1-3) Make sure students are ready for mock orals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recap Quiz</td>
<td>To review main ideas from units 1 and 2 and remind students of importance throughout unit 3</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>(4) emphasize importance of retaining main ideas of Wingate/discussion skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activation: Newspaper headlines</td>
<td>To introduce students to new article and engage prior knowledge related to the topic</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td>(5-6) Push students to give thorough answers and be sure to connect to previous activity (keep skills from units 1 and 2 in mind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data activity*</td>
<td>To ensure understanding of data and figures used in article, to aid in comprehension and in preparing to write about/discuss the article</td>
<td>10-15 mins</td>
<td>(7-13) keep in mind what each graphic displays, including how they were obtained and what conclusions can be drawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion questions</td>
<td>To further ensure comprehension of article and prepare for discussion/writing</td>
<td>10-15 mins</td>
<td>(14) skip or briefly mention questions that have been covered in previous section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion practice, focus on delivery</td>
<td>To introduce students to the element of delivery and how to use it effectively in their discussions</td>
<td>5-10 mins</td>
<td>(16-19) elicit and point out important parts of rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock orals</td>
<td>To allow students to practice for their final oral exam as well as give and receive feedback on discussion skills</td>
<td>25-30 mins</td>
<td>(20-21) create relaxed environment, give feedback to each student on all elements, including teacher feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>To wrap up lesson with objectives for next week</td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>(22) remind that WA2 grades should be out by Wed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data activity notes:

**Figure 1**: shows decline of traditional newspapers – although sales are decreasing readership/influence is not – provides justification for study

**Table 1**: frequency of noun collocates, salience – significance of collocation

**Table 2**: divides collocates into groups, grouped by authors, subjectivity

**Figures 2 and 3**: types and tokens

**Figure 4**: supports 2 and 3

**Figure 5**: What can be said about spikes – correlation with terror attacks (home and abroad)
Appendix G

Student Evaluations Summary

Table 1: Student evaluation data, mean scores and standard deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please rate the extent to which you have mastered the following outcomes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 = very unconfident, 4 = very confident)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Being able to write a sociolinguistic essay</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being able to analyze and synthesize sources</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being able to discuss sociolinguistic issues in English</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Please rate how much the following activities prepared you for the final exams: | M     | SD  |
| (1 = unuseful, 4 = useful)                                                   |       |     |
| 1. Reading questions                                                         | 2.77  | 0.81|
| 2. Nestor quizzes                                                            | 2.80  | 0.77|
| 3. Discussing articles                                                      | 3.73  | 0.45|
| 4. Writing workshops                                                         | 3.55  | 0.63|
| 5. Speaking workshops                                                        | 3.43  | 0.63|
| 6. Giving peer feedback                                                     | 3.25  | 0.77|
| 7. Receiving peer feedback                                                  | 3.20  | 0.80|
| 8. Receiving feedback from lecturers on written tasks                       | 3.70  | 0.69|
| 9. Completing written assignments                                           | 3.68  | 0.58|
| 10. Mock oral exam                                                          | 3.39  | 0.68|
| 11. Mock speaking exam                                                       | 3.55  | 0.54|

| Please rate the difficulty of the articles used in the course.               | M     | SD  |
| (1 = too easy, 4 = too difficult)                                            |       |     |
| 1. Wingate (2012)                                                            | 2.27  | 0.55|
| 2. Chapman (2012)                                                            | 2.48  | 0.54|
| 3. Baker, McEnery and Gabrielatos (2013)                                     | 2.61  | 0.59|
| 4. Barrett (1998)                                                            | 2.68  | 0.56|

| Please rate your agreement with the following statements:                    | M     | SD  |
| (1 = disagree, 5 = fully agree)                                              |       |     |
| 1. The seminars helped me to better understand the material                  | 4.16  | 0.78|
| 2. The seminars contributed to the development of my oral and writing skills| 3.96  | 0.83|
| 3. The course contributed to my ability to conduct independent research      | 3.13  | 1.08|
| 4. The course taught me how I can present my work                            | 3.75  | 0.84|
| 5. The course was well-organised                                             | 4.30  | 0.63|
| 6. In general, I was satisfied with this course                              | 3.88  | 0.81|

| Please rate the following questions about Unit 3:                            | M     | SD  |
| (1 = not well at all; 5 = very well)                                         |       |     |
| 1. How well did the article fit into the theme of the course?                | 4.09  | 0.77|
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2. How interesting was the content of the article? 3.95 1.04
3. How effectively did the reading questions support your understanding of the article? 3.36 0.84
4. How effectively did the reading questions guide your reading process? 3.07 0.95
5. How effectively did the reading questions draw attention to cohesion and coherence? 3.02 0.86
6. How effectively did the first seminar of the unit support your understanding of the article? 3.98 0.77
7. How effectively did unit 3 help you to understand cohesion and coherence? 3.95 0.70
8. How useful was it to learn about cohesion and coherence? 4.29 0.78

N = 56.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please evaluate your instructor:*</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1 = completely disagree; 5 = fully agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The instructor was well-prepared</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor made it clear how the content of the lesson related to the overall course</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor created sufficient structure in the seminars</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor gave clear explanations</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor was approachable</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The instructor gave equal treatment to all members of the class</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The instructor encourage interaction with and between students during the seminars</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Applies to group 3 only, N = 11
Main ideas

- **Thesis statement**: this should be contained in one sentence and make reference to both of your arguments. It should be the last sentence of your introduction.
  - TS should directly answer the question asked. In WA3 the question referred specifically to how the UK press uses the word “Muslim” to create a distinction. This means arguments should be directly related to the use of the word Muslim - legitimation strategies such as printing reader comments would therefore not be a relevant argument.

- **Topic sentence**: this is preferably the first sentence of your body paragraph, and the link to the thesis statement should be explicit. You can make this clear by repeating key terms from the thesis statement in your topic sentence.

- **Quality of evidence**: in linguistics, what the author said is not considered good evidence. Good evidence for your argument is what the author(s) found. This means you should:
  - (a) avoid quoting the author. A good linguistics essay does not need to contain any quotes from the original text, and we do not expect to see extensive quoting in your essay.
  - (b) use the data from the article as your evidence (This can include sentences the author has found, e.g. Don Chapman’s internet quotes.). Be specific: what is it? Where is it from? How much / many?
    - Insufficient: According to Baker et al. (2013), the word Muslim “collocated most frequently and saliently with nouns” (p.260)
    - Good: Baker et al. (2013) conducted a frequency search in their corpus and found that the words world and community were the most frequent collocates of the word Muslim. Community was used 7676 times, while world was used 4928 times (p.261)
  - **Note**: When presenting specific data, your essay should stand alone. Avoid referring to tables or figures by name (e.g. Figure 2 shows [...] ). Instead, tell your reader what information from the table/figure you are using (e.g. Nouns related to ethnic/national identity made up the largest category, constituting 37.6% of all collocates.)

- **Relevance of evidence**: remember, we do not expect you to reinvent the wheel! Choose evidence which makes sense to you and which you think will support your argument well. In other words, don’t feel the need to search for more complex evidence (such as lexical richness, type/token ratio) if the basic frequency information about world and community will support your argument. Better to choose evidence which is simple but clearly relevant, than evidence which is more complex and perhaps more difficult to relate.

- **Significance of evidence**: nothing is self-evident until you’ve explained its significance. For example, world and community do distance Muslims from the rest of the UK, but how? Make sure you say this in one or two sentences.
  - Insufficient: “[Evidence] Therefore, Muslims are depicted as different by the UK press.”
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- **Sufficient / Good** : “[Evidence] Therefore, Muslims are frequently spoken of as a separate, distinct social group, which has the effect of making them seem different to the rest of the UK”

**Structure**
- One common issue was that paragraphs were sometimes in an illogical order. A way to recognise this is when an argument you make in paragraph 2 is partly referenced or used in paragraph 1.

**Cohesion**
- Generally, there was a good focus on making paragraphs cohesive.
- Pronouns and thematic progression (when misused) can cause jumpiness. In the exam, save some time to check your thematic progression and pronoun references: do they match up?
- One way to improve your paragraph transitions is not just to link your paragraphs with a linking word or phrase (e.g. *In addition*), but also to link their content, (e.g. *In addition to depicting Muslims as a distinct social group …*)

**APA comments**
- The first time you refer to an article in text, the reference should contain the name of all the authors, e.g.: “Baker, Gabrielatos, and McEnery (2013)” (last names only!).
- The following citations should include the first author and the year of publication. Note that *et al.* is an abbreviation, so is followed by a period. For example: Baker et al. (2013)
  - You do not need to include the name of the article in in-text citations. The name of the article only appears in the bibliography.
  - Include page references when you cite data.

**The revision process**
- Always revise your text! Spelling errors and grammatical issues are really easy to make while you’re writing, and taking time to proofread can make a big difference to the clarity of your essay.
  - [**Hint**]: If you are in the flow of writing and you know you will have to come back and e.g. enter a reference or enter a page number, then it’s useful to mark those sentences so you can’t miss them later. For instance, you can highlight the sentence or put it in square brackets, and this will mean you’re forced to come back and revise your sentence before you submit the essay.]