Dr. Diane Schallert   Office: SZB 504
232-4835 (direct with voice-mail)   Office hours: nearly always on
Home: 327-2676   Cell: (512) 826-4586 (I text)   Mon. 3-4:30; Thur 3-5; also other times
e-mail: dschallert@mail.utexas.edu   but it's a good idea to make an appt.

<u>Spring 2013</u>

PSYCHOLINGUISTICS

1. **Introduction to course** and descriptions of topics and themes: -----------Jan. 16
   1st theme: language as knowledge facilitator;
   2nd theme: the role of affect in the language-thought interaction;
   3rd theme: cultural contrasts in language use

2. **Cognition and Language**; **Language Acquisition**------------------------Jan. 23 & 30**
  A. Constructive processes in language use
  B. Which comes first--thought or language?
  C. What's learned when one learns a language?
  D. Contextual-cultural nature of language development

3. **Oral Language Use & Classroom Talk** -------------------------------------Feb. **6***, 13**,** 20**,
  A. The conversational contract in learning environments & 27
  B. Vygotskian views of knowledge acquisition/language use
  C. Effect of language on emotions and vice versa

TEST 1 (20 PTS.) TAKE HOME EXAM DUE by 11:59 pm ------------------Mar. 5

4. **Comprehension: Written Language** --Mar. 6, **20***, & 27**,
  A. What is "text"? & Apr. 3
  B. Models of reading comprehension & reading acquisition
  C. Comparing oral and written language use

5. **Written Language Production** --Apr. **10***, 17**, & 24
  A. Writing as process and as product
  B. Writing block & anxiety

6. **A Reprise on the three themes** (Last in-class meeting)--------------------May 7

PSYCHOLINGUISTIC PROJECT (20 Pts.)
   First draft due in electronic form by 5 p. m. **DEADLINE FIRM**------Apr. 16 (a Tuesday)
   Final draft (hard copy) due by 5 p. m. (deadline somewhat soft)-------May 7

ANALYSIS OF FACE-2-FACE COMPREHENSION 20 Pts. Anytime, but no later than May 10

ANALYSIS OF WRITTEN DISCUSSION 20 Pts. by 5 p.m. ------------------May 7

TEST 2 (20 Pts.) TAKE HOME EXAM DUE by 5 p.m. ----------------------May 10

_____
* On these days, we will have asynchronous Blackboard discussions; you will not need to come to campus so long as you can access the Internet.

**At these class meetings, we will engage in synchronous written discussion in the computer lab for which you'll need your student EID number.

READINGS

The official readings for the course are articles and chapters representing (most often) original sources and theoretical syntheses in research on language and cognition. These are available to you in the Document folder on Blackboard.

GRADE CONTRACT

This class is organized on a modified mastery plan, which means that the basis of evaluation is how much you learn and not how well you do in comparison to others in the class. Tests and the self-analysis reports are designed to allow you to demonstrate your understanding of the material and you will have a second chance to be evaluated on these if you so wish. You will also receive feedback on the first draft of the project.

Grades will be awarded as follows:

    100 points = A+
    91 - 99 points = A
    89 – 90 points = A-
    81 - 88 points = B
    79 – 80 points = B-
    71 - 78 points = C

FORMS OF EVALUATION

How will you and I know what you are constructing as an understanding of the materials of this course? Through 5 assignments each worth 20 points: Two TESTS, two ANALYSIS REPORTS, and one PSYCHOLINGUISTIC PROJECT.

Tests

The tests will consist of take-home short-answer essay questions asking you to integrate and synthesize the information presented in class and in the readings. Number of points and due dates are as follows:

TEST I   20 points   Mar. 5 by 11:59 pm (you'll receive the test on Feb. 28; bring in a hard copy to class on the 6th)
TEST II   20 points   May 10 (you'll receive the test on Apr. 24; I'd appreciate a hard copy if at all possible but let me know if you need to submit it electronically)

Analysis of Face-to-Face Discourse Comprehension

Psycholinguistics is a many varied topic. There are numerous ways of approaching the topic. To help me steer a reasonable path through this complex domain, I have for the last few years used themes to guide my selection of topics and readings and to organize their discussion. These themes are as follows:
1. The role of language in causing any kind of knowledge change or acquisition
2. The influence of affective variables on language use.
3. Cultural diversity in how thought and language interact.

I will discuss these themes at greater length in class throughout the semester. At this point I am listing them because as you do your assignments, it will be important that you directly relate what you say to one or more of these themes.

The purpose of the analysis of face-to-face classroom comprehension is to engage you in an observation of your own reaction to the language-thought interaction in a learning situation (Theme 1), with you as a learner in this course. You should be on the lookout for a situation that, for you, starts as an initial confusion or misunderstanding and ends with some sort of resolution, or an actual "ah-ha!" moment.

What you are looking for is a situation in which:

     A. you find yourself struggling, at least initially, to understand a construct presented in class lecture or discussion, or you notice an angle on the topic you had not previously thought of until the class discussion;
     AND

     B. you eventually become satisfied with your new understanding of the construct, either because you ask a question and make a comment that triggers a certain response on the part of the class (or me), or because someone else in class asks a similar question and gets an answer that satisfies your original concern.

Because you will be doing a self-analysis that will necessarily be retrospective in nature, it is important that you do your analysis as soon as possible after the event in class occurs. The following steps are **strongly** suggested:

     1. As soon as the situation has concluded (i.e., I've just said what you needed to hear to understand the construct, or you've just thought of the idea that solves the problem you had been experiencing), mark it in your mind so that you'll be able to find the right section on the audio recording. I will be taping every class session. The audiofiles will be posted on the Blackboard site for our class.

     2. Again, as soon as possible, during the break or immediately after class, write down your general impression of how you felt, of what you thought, and of what caused you to experience a breakthrough in your understanding.

     3. As soon as possible, listen to the audiofile but NOT TO TRANSCRIBE IT YET. Your task should be to listen to the file, all the while writing down how you felt and what you thought, moment-by-moment, as I talked and as you or other students talked. You may need to stop the recording, perhaps several times, to give yourself time to write your self-reflections as fully as you can recollect. Remember that what you are trying to do is capture what was on your mind (and in your heart, or gut, or wherever emotions are felt) at the time you actually first experienced the situation. Any thoughts or feelings you have now about the construct as you are listening to the tape are also very interesting but you should be sure to identify them as such.

     4. NOW you can go back and begin to transcribe the actual conversation as it occurred.

     5. Write your report. It need not be very long, 3 to 5 double-spaced typed pages might do it. There should be clearly identifiable sections where you are reporting from the actual transcript (use quotes or a different font). Following each segment of transcript, there should be an analysis in which you relate what was going on with you in terms of causing you difficulty or in terms of helping you understand. This is the stuff that particularly relates to Theme 1. In addition, you should, whenever appropriate, refer to any kind of affect or emotional reaction that was influencing you (Theme 2), and you should be on the lookout for difficulties that arise because of cultural factors (Theme 3).

The conclusion to the report should identify as clearly as you can what it was specifically that led you finally to understand.

The analysis of face-to-face discourse comprehension is worth 20 points and is due (in hard copy) as soon as possible after the event occurs and you are ready to hand it in, but no later than May 10.

Analysis of Written Discussion

Language use and classroom life are experiencing changes that have interesting implications for how we think about them. I have in recent years been using in all my classes different forms of written discussion that either makes use of linked, real-time, synchronous computer-mediated interactions or that take place through asynchronous bulleting board postings via Blackboard. At some of our class meetings, we will go to the computer lab for a portion of class and engage in a written discussion of the topics of the class. (By the way, **you will need your EID number** in order to log on for these written discussions.)

In addition, for three particular limited time periods during the semester (for a 36- to 48-hour time period around Feb. 6, Mar. 20, and Apr. 10), I will ask you to participate in asynchronous discussions on Bulletin Board. **We will NOT meet in our classroom for those three class days**.

The second analysis report is one in which I ask you to reflect on what happens to you as part of those discussions, to describe the kind of learning you experienced, and the kind of affective reactions the change to a written interaction pattern engenders in you. Like the analysis of in-class discourse comprehension, I will want you for this report to focus on the process by which you make sense of the contributions in the conversation.

Your general assignment is to reflect on what happens to you cognitively, linguistically, emotionally, and socially as you take part in these discussions, and to describe the kind of learning you experienced. Your self-reflective report should be organized in two general sections:

Part 1: Reflecting at a general level on how written discussions work

For this section, you are to reflect globally on your experiences of the synchronous and asynchronous discussions. I am interested in your comparison of the two to each other, in your comparison of both written discussions to the face-to-face discussions we are having in class, to any signs you notice that we are influenced by these written modes when we are in oral mode, whatever. I would expect to see some reference to the ideas we are reading about and discussing in class as you describe your own reaction to engaging in these kinds of discussions.

Part 2: The questionnaire

For the second section, I will ask you to respond to a questionnaire, made up of 10 (or so) rating type and short response questions, that will ask you to reflect on the special advantages and difficulties afforded by the written discussions in contrast to the oral discussions.

Again, I am thinking of a relatively short paper, no more than 3-5 pages for Part 1, with the answers to the questionnaire appended. The paper is due by May 8 and worth 20 points.

Psycholinguistic Project

This course generally involves a consideration of how language translates thought into meaning. One of my primary objectives is that you will be aware and appreciative of the multitude of ways of expressing a particular meaning and of the nearly infinite nuances of interpretation that can result when mind meets language, or more broadly when mind meets semiotic system. Psycholinguists, interested in demonstrating the separate but interdependent workings of language (and signs) and thought, have been fond of gathering and analyzing examples from naturally occurring linguistic events.

The purpose of this project is to follow in this tradition: to observe the language-thought interaction informally but systematically, with the aim of illustrating one (or more) of the constructs we're discussing in class.

Procedure

        1. Warming up. As a sort of warm-up and a way to increase your sensitivity to language use, one thing I ask you to do is to collect, daily, **psycholinguistic examples**. I recommend that you make it a habit of carrying a small notebook with you and of telling yourself that you should jot down EVERY DAY at least one psycholinguistic example. I've created a Pinterest board for us to use and I'm asking that at kleast 4 times per week, you pin something to the board. You may want to comment on others' examples, and you may want to add photos that go along with oral tidbits you hear. We will talk more about the Pinterest aspect of the project.

        2. Choosing your focus for the Psycholinguistic Project. These daily and weekly entries of psycholinguistic examples should be helpful in helping you choose a focus for the project. Your project should focus on 3 to 5 linguistic situations or examples that are somehow similar and that you can then analyze in some way. Some likely possibilities for your focus are interactions with children, between children, between any persons interacting at a distance (e.g., phone, e-mail), with persons acquiring a first or second language, etc. The language of billboards, ads, TV programs, professors, or teenagers might serve as perfect basis for a project.

Your focus should have the following characteristics:
    a. You should be observing a psycholinguistic phenomenon in everyday life, with one or more persons using language (written or oral) to construct meaning.
    b. The phenomenon should somehow reveal the language-thought interaction.
    c. You should observe related versions of the same phenomenon. Three to five samples should be plenty.
    d. Preferably, your samples should be brief (e.g., usually no more than one page of transcription per sample at most.)

    2. <u>Gathering your samples</u>. Once you've decided what to observe, capture your data as accurately as possible. You may want to use a recording device, a camera or audiorecording, to help you. In most cases, you will want to be as unobtrusive as possible so that the situation you are describing will be as natural as can be. <u>THIS IS IMPORTANT</u>: I am not interested in having you set up a contrived situation to fulfill a class project but in having you sharpen your observation of language as it is used by real people to do real things.

    3. <u>Analyzing the samples</u>. Having identified a likely linguistic situation, now choose a construct you will use to analyze the situation. Try to see, in the complex stimulus array you are observing, any of the constructs, theories, or findings that we are discussing in class. Once you have chosen one theory/construct to use as the basis of your analysis, begin to interpret what happened through the lens of the construct/theory you are using.

    4. <u>Reporting your observations</u>. Your report should include the following three sections:
    a. A 1/2 to 1 page description of your focus. Be specific. Tell us your focus and any relevant contextual information we may need.
    b. Report verbatim the samples you gathered (2-5 pages), using photos from your contributions to the Pinterest board.
    c. Discuss what was evident in your samples, making specific reference to particular words or phrases from your samples to support the theoretical construct or theory that interested you (2-3 pages). In most instances, you can assume that your reader knows about these constructs and doesn't need you to describe or define the constructs themselves to any great extent. You do need, however, to be quite specific about what you mean when you say that one theory or construct is <u>exemplified</u> in your observations.

An electronic draft of the report is due on Apr. 16 (a Tuesday) by 5 pm [VERY IMPORTANT DEADLINE -- CAN'T BE MISSED]. You should e-mail me the draft (make sure to save it as a word document with YOUR NAME.doc as the label for it). I will form groups of 3 to 4 people who have conducted similar projects and will announce the groups in class the next day (Apr. 17). BRING 3 TO 4 HARD COPIES TO CLASS so you can exchange your draft with your group members. During class on Apr. 24, the small groups will meet together to discuss their reactions to the papers.

The final version is due May 8. This assignment is worth 20 points.

    ****
Finally, you should feel free throughout the semester to let me know how things are going. I will be asking you to fill out the official course evaluation form at the end of the semester but I AM interested as well in any interim feedback you'd like to share with me. I promise to take your comments and suggestions in the spirit that I would like you to take my evaluation of YOU, which is as informative feedback and guidance to improvement.

READING LIST FOR PSYCHOLINGUISTICS, Schallert, Spring 2013
[somewhat tentative version]

Background Readings: There are two articles that I know some of you have read in previous courses with me. It would be good if you would re-read these two. Note that the two are most relevant to our discussion on the first topic on Cognition and Language, Jan. 24, but they serve as background throughout the semester.

1. Schallert, D. L., & Martin, D. B. (2003). A psychological analysis of what teachers and students do in the language arts classroom. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, J. R. Squire, & J. M. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (2nd ed., pp. 31-45). New York: Macmillan. (The first 4 pages are most relevant)

2. Wertsch, J. V. (1991). A sociocultural approach to socially shared cognition. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 85-100). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

_____

Cognition and Language
Jan. 23 Bruner, J. (1986). The language of education (Chap 9). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bloom, P., & Keil, F. C. (2001). Thinking through language. *Mind & Language, 16*, 351-367.

Yang, W. (2002). Communication slips and their sociocultural implications. *Language & Communication, 22*, 69-82.

Jackendoff, R. (2002). Chapter 1: The complexity of linguistic structure. From *Foundations of language: Brain, meaning, grammar, evolution*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Language Acquisition
Jan. 30 Namy, L. L. (2012). Getting specific: Early general mechanisms give rise to domain-specific expertise in word learning. *Language Learning and Development, 8*, 47-60.

Bloom, P. (2002). Mindreading, communication, and the learning of names for things. *Mind & Language, 17*, 37-54.

Trautman, C. H., & Rollins, P. R. (2006). Child-centered behaviors of caregivers with 12-month-old infants: Associations with passive joint engagement and later language. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 27*, 447-463.

Ely, R., & Gleason, J. B. (2006). *I'm sorry I said that*: Apologies in young children's discourse. *Journal of Child Language, 33*, 599-620.

Mayberry, R. I., & Lock, E. (2003). Age constraints on first versus second language acquisition: Evidence for linguistic plasticity and epigenesis. *Brain and Language, 87*, 369-384.

Oral Language & Classroom Talk
Feb. 6 Wells, G. (1987). The negotiation of meaning: Talking and learning at home and at school. In B. Fillion, C. N. Hedley, & E. C. DiMartino (Eds.), *Home and school: Early language and reading*, (pp. 3-25). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 44-58). New York: Academic Press.

Mehan, H. (1985). The structure of classroom discourse. In van Dijk, T. (Ed.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (Vol. 3, pp. 119-131). London: Academic Press.

Rhodes, S. C. (1993). Listening: A relational process. In A. D. Wolvin & C. G. Coakley (Eds.), *Perspectives on listening* (pp. 217-240). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Clark, A.-M., Anderson, R. C., Kuo, L.-J., Kim, I.-H., Archodidou, A., Nguyen-Jahiel, K. (2003). Collaborative reasoning: Expanding ways for children to talk and think in school. *Educational Psychology Review, 15*(2), 181-198.

Feb. 13 Person, N. K., Kreuz, R. J., Zwaan, R. A., & Graesser, A. C. (1995). Pragmatics and pedagogy: Conversational rules and politeness strategies inhibit effective tutoring. *Cognition & Instruction, 13,* 161-188.

Hogan, K., Nastasi, B. K., & Pressley, M. (1999). Discourse patterns and collaborative scientific reasoning in peer and teacher-guided discussions. *Cognition & Instruction, 17*, 379-432.

Anderson, R. C., Nguyen-Jahiel, K., McNurlen, B., Archodidou, A., Kim, S., Reznitskaya, A., Tillmans, M., & Gilbert, L. (2001). The snowball phenomenon: Spread of ways of talking and ways of thinking across groups of children. *Cognition & Instruction, 19*, 1-46.

Chevalley, E., & Bangerter, A. (2010). Suspending and reinstating joint activities with dialogue. *Discourse Processes, 47,* 263-291.

Feb. 20 O'Connor, M. C., & Michaels, S. (1997). Shifting participant frameworks: Orchestrating thinking practices in group discussion. In D. Hicks (Ed.), *Discourse, learning, and schooling* (pp. 63-103). Cambridge: University Press.

Wertsch, J. V., & Rupert, L. J. (1993). The authority of cultural tools in a sociocultural approach to mediated agency. *Cognition & Instruction, 11*, 227-239.

McIntyre, E., Kyle, D. W., & Moore, G. H. (2006). A primary-grade teacher's guidance toward small-group dialogue. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*, 36-66.

Singer, M., Radinsky, J., & Goldman, S. R. (2008). The role of gesture in meaning construction. *Discourse Processes, 45*, 365-386.

Feb. 27 Pasupathi, M., Alderman, K., & Shaw, D. (2007). Talking the talk: Collaborative remembering and self-perceived expertise. *Discourse Processes, 43*, 55-77.

Stein, N. L., & Albro, E. R. (2001). The origins and nature of arguments: Studies in conflict understanding, emotion, and negotiation. *Discourse Processes, 32*, 113-133.

Francis, L., Monahan, K., & Berger, C. (1999). A laughing matter? The uses of humor in medical interactions. *Motivation and Emotion, 23*, 155-174.

Do, S. L., & Schallert, D. L. (2004). Emotions and classroom talk: Toward a model of the role of affect in students' experiences of classroom discussions. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*, 619-634.

Comprehension: Written Language

Mar. 6 DeBeaugrande, R., & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to text linguistics*. New York: Longman. (Chapter 1 on "Basic Notions")

Olson, D. R. (2006). Oral discourse in a world of literacy. In Orality and literacy: A symposium in honor of David Olson. *Research in the Teaching of English, 41*, 136-143.

Alvermann, D. (2008). Why bother theorizing adolescents' online literacies for classroom practice and research? *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*, 8-19.

Mar. 20 Ehri, L. C. (1995). Phases of development in learning to read words by sight. *Journal of Research in Reading, 18*(2), 116-125.

Juel, C., & Minden-Cupp, C. (2000). Learning to read words: Linguistic units and instructional strategies. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*, 458-492.

Paris, S. G. (2006). Reinterpreting the development of reading skills. *Reading Research Quarterly, 40*, 184-202.

Mar. 27 Van den Branden, K. (2000). Does negotiation of meaning promote reading comprehension? A study of multilingual primary school classes. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*, 426-443.

Rubman, C. N., & Waters, H. S. (2000). A, B seeing: The role of constructive processes in children's comprehension monitoring. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*, 503-514.

Coiro, J., & Dobler, E. (2007). Exploring the online reading comprehension strategies used by sixth-grade skilled readers to search for and locate information on the Internet. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*(2), 214-257.

Moje, E. M., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(4), 415-437.

Apr. 3 Gaskins, R. W. (1996). "That's just how it was": The effect of issue-related emotional involvement on reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 31*, 386-405.

Aukerman, M. (2007). When reading it wrong is getting it right: Shared evaluation pedagogy among struggling fifth grade readers. *Research in the Teaching of English, 42*, 56-103.

Klauda, S. L., & Wigfield, A. (2012). Relations of perceived parent and friend support for recreational reading with children's reading motivations. *Journal of Literacy Research, 44*, 3-44.

Schallert, D. L., Song, K., and the D-Team. (2009, December). Shifts in positioning, trajectories in thought communities, and "wobbly" identities in computer-mediated classroom discussions, Presented at the annual meeting of the National Reading Conference/Literacy Research Association, Albuquerque. [Manuscript under review, Winter 2011]

Production: Written Language
Apr. 10 Faigley, L. (1986). Competing theories of process: A critique and a proposal.*College English, 48*, 527-542

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1984). Images, plans, and prose. *Written Communication, 1*, 120-160.

Wohlwend, K. E. (2009). Damsels in discourse: Girls consuming and producing identity texts through Disney princess play. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(1), 57-83.

Rowe, D. W., & Neitzel, C. (2010). Interest and agency in 2- and 3-year-olds' participation in emergent writing. *Reading Research Quarterly, 45*(2), 169-195.

Apr. 17 Brandt, D. (2001). *Literacy in American lives* (Chapter 5: "The sacred and the profane: Reading versus writing in popular memory" -- pp. 146-168). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fox, H. (1994). "Something inside is saying no." From *Listening to the world: Cultural issues in academic writing* (pp. 65-84). Urbana, IL: National Council for Teachers of English.

Moje, E. B. (2000). "To be part of the story": The literacy practices of gangsta adolescents. *Teachers College Record, 102*, 651-690.

Apr. 24 Chandler-Olcott, K., & Mahar, D. (2003). Adolescents' *anime*-inspired "fanfictions": An exploration of multiliteracies. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 46*, 556-566.

Vasudevan, L., Schultz, K., & Bateman, J. (2010). Rethinking composing in a digital age: Authoring literate identities through multimodal storytelling. *Written Communication, 27*(4), 442-468.

Klein, P. D., & Rose, M. A. (2010). Teaching argument and explanation to prepare junior students for writing to learn. *Reading Research Quarterly, 45*(4), 433-461.

Yagelski, R. P. (2009). A thousand writers writing: Seeking change through the radical practice of writing as a way of being. *English Education, 42*(1), 6-28.

May 8

Eubanks, P., & Schaeffer, J. D. (2008). A kind word for bullshit: The problem of academic writing. *College Composition and Communication, 59*, 372-388.