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Abstract

To internationalize higher education, non-English dominant nations have increased English-medium instruction, posing challenges to non-native speaker (NNS) students’ written English ability. The present study examines nine American professors’ literacy brokerage at an English-medium summer school in China, where they taught courses in art history, history, philosophy, political science, psychology, and sociology. The professors identified vocabulary knowledge, disciplinary thinking, and personal voice as the major challenges for their Chinese students. They developed a series of adaptive strategies to facilitate subject learning: adjusting writing tasks by adopting short papers and short answer questions; assisting with major writing assignments through workshops, worksheets, group discussions, and detailed comments on student writings; valuing students’ multilingual resources by allowing Chinese in-group discussions and written exams; and connecting subject matter to the students’ home cultures. The article ends by both suggesting implications and raising questions for the teaching of English-medium content courses to NNS students.
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Introduction

Non-native English speaking (NNES) students’ literacy challenges are figuring prominently in higher education these days. English is being increasingly used as a medium of instruction in non-English dominant nations in Asia, Europe, and South America in their drive to internationalize higher education (Byun et al., 2011; Coleman, 2006; Craig, Poe, & Rojas, 2010; Fortanet-Gómez, 2011; Harder, 2009; Kirkpatrick, 2011; Wächter & Maiworm, 2008; Yonezawa, 2007; You, 2010). English-dominant nations also compete against each other in recruiting international students to compensate for state funding cuts and/or to internationalize their higher education. L2 writing researchers have identified an array of challenges that NNES students often encounter in content courses, including limited command of written English, restricted goals for writing, and mismatches in expectations for writing between students and teachers (Enright & Gilliland, 2011; Kibler, 2011; Kong, 2010; Leki, 2007). Other contingent issues, such as the inadequate training and unwillingness of local staff to teach in English, the inability of native speaker teachers to adapt to their NNES students, or loss of confidence and failure to adapt among the students (Smith, 2004), will only exacerbate the students’ literacy challenges.
While numerous studies have examined NNES students’ literacy challenges, very few have explored how university content teachers have accommodated these students in the aspect of written English to facilitate learning. Among the available studies, most have focused on secondary schools or Anglophone university classes where NNES students are the minority. For example, studying the discipline-specific writing practices of secondary school students in a U.S. school district, Wilcox (2011) discovered that subject teachers tend to have the same expectations for their NNES students as for low-performing native English speaking (NES) students. To improve their English, school administrators often place these students in “pull-out” programs in which they work one-on-one with ESL teachers, an option not available in non-English dominant contexts. The widespread English-medium instruction fueled by the internationalization of higher education requires that we understand how content teachers may accommodate NNES students’ written English in contexts where these students are the majority.

To explore content teachers’ accommodations, we studied American professors’ practices in using writing to facilitate learning at an English-medium summer school in China. All professors came from well-ranked American universities and taught a variety of courses typically offered to freshmen and sophomores in their home institutions. Focusing on humanities and social sciences professors, the study has identified several major accommodations these professors made for their Chinese students. We conclude the study by discussing implications for assisting NNES students with their written English in university content courses. The professors’ practices also raise questions about higher education in English-dominant nations.

Adapting to NNES writers in content courses

Due to less exposure to and less experience with various academic genres in English, NNES students may have less in-depth lexical, grammatical, and rhetorical knowledge than native-language students. Compared with the latter, they are likely to have less intuitive textual knowledge, or to lack what Leki (2007) has described as a “backlog of experiences with English grammatical and rhetorical structure to fall back on” (p. 59). In addition, Kibler (2011) found that some adolescent NNES students “shared a frustration that they do not have ‘backlog’ of vocabulary knowledge, saying they did not understand or know how to use the more ‘formal’, ‘good’, ‘difficult’, or ‘big’ words they felt were expected in content area writing” (p. 223).

Like some NES students, NNES students are often found to have restricted goals for writing. Rather than a mode of expressing, consolidating, and constructing disciplinary content, they may view writing as a medium for reproducing information (Enright & Gilliland, 2011; Kong, 2010; Liu, 2008; Liu & You, 2008; Wilcox, 2011; You, 2004). For example, Kong (2010) examined the written English in biology and history classes at a Hong Kong high school; the students were all native speakers of Cantonese. Although they had received much of their instruction in English, their class writing was limited, geared more toward answering exam questions than to exploring subject matter. Rather than supporting content and language learning, writing largely served as a means for students to regurgitate memorized information and a tool for teachers to check students’ retention of factual information in preparation for standardized tests. In an American school district, Wilcox (2011) also found that the attention given to preparing students for high-stakes tests was detrimental to learning, as it overrode other writing goals and stressed restricted types of knowledge and forms of writing.

Like NES writers, NNES writers are sometimes found to have difficulty aligning with their teachers’ expectations for writing across the curriculum. Writing is affected by the unique instructional niches shaped by a teacher and his or her students in a particular classroom. When teacher and student expectations for writing assignments are identical or similar, the students’ literacy activities can be the most effective (Harklau, 1999). However, studying a linguistically diverse high school in California, Kibler (2011) found that there the NNES students’ understanding of genre varied and only partially overlapped with that of their teachers. In addition, the students’ revisions to their essays suggest that teachers’ intuitive notions of content area writing, like being “clear,” may be shared by adolescent NNES students but are difficult to achieve.

For NNES students, teachers are probably the most important literacy brokers. Brandt (2001) defines literacy brokers as “any agents, local or distant, concrete or abstract, who enable, support, teach, and model, as well as recruit, regulate, suppress, or withhold, literacy” (p. 19). From a socially situated view toward academic literacy, other important brokers include parents, school administrators, examination systems, and educational policies among others (Johns, 1997). Most scholarship on how teachers broker NNES students’ academic literacy development in the aspect of written English has focused on bilingual or immersion programs at K-12 levels in North America and Asia.
Enright and Gilliland (2011) found that promoting simplification of writing goals and a focus on surface-level editing and mechanics. In a study that examines students from the main class activities through “pull-out” programs have detrimental effects on their learning, Wilcox further found that teacher and administrator perceptions of NNES students and separation of these uses, and cognitive dimensions in writing differ for NNES students as compared to other high-performing NES. After studying four core subjects across three grade levels, she found that the expectations in terms of length, variety of backgrounds were being exposed to and acquiring discipline-specific writing practices in an American school district. Similarly, Fra´nquiz and Salinas (2011) found that when allowed to use their home language in a social studies class at a Texas high school, newcomer NNES students became engaged in their history papers and created their identity narratives, American professors representing anthropology, philosophy, nursing, literature, sociology, and Asian American studies revealed their adaptive strategies in the areas of language, communication mode, and culture. For example, one literature professor tried to overlook the NNES students’ language issues by focusing on the ideas expressed in their writings. One philosophy professor used dialogic activities to help an Indian student grasp class readings and complete writing assignments. The anthropology and Asian American studies professors encouraged the NNES students to incorporate their diverse cultural experiences into their writing. These narratives shed important light on how individual teachers engage multilingual students in subject learning by using writing assignments.

Despite their rich information on how to engage NNES students, however, these narratives are limited in their ability to explicate or uncover content teachers’ adaptive strategies. First, these first-person narratives have each focused on one or two case scenarios in which the professors successfully engaged the NNES students. There is no dialog between these professors or between Zamel and Spack and the professors to explicitly address adaptive strategies in writing assignments. Second, as the NNES students were the minority in their classes, the professors hardly found it necessary to adapt their assignments to these students’ literacy challenges. Almost all of the professors conclude their narratives by emphasizing how their assignments promoted learning and thus fit all students. In contexts where the NNES students are the majority, adaptive strategies may be needed. Third, the professors focused on courses at different levels, a choice which makes it hard to generalize about their adaptive strategies. Research has shown that NNES students encounter different literacy challenges in different stages of their university education (Leki, 2007; Spack, 1997).

Among the studies in secondary schools, content teachers were sometimes found to accommodate the NNES students by allowing them to use their first language. For example, Kibler (2010) observed NNES students using Spanish to broker English interactions at a northern California high school. She analyzed oral interactions among five adolescent Spanish-speaking students during an extended history-related writing activity in a humanities course. Her analysis indicates that Spanish use offered strategic opportunities for student–teacher conversation and blurred traditional boundaries between “expert” and “novice” writers. The students used Spanish to assert expertise in rhetorical, academic, linguistic, or procedural elements of the task, moving between expert and novice roles. Similarly, Fráñquiz and Salinas (2011) found that when allowed to use their home language in a social studies class at a Texas high school, newcomer NNES students became engaged in their history papers and created their identity texts.

In consideration of some NNES students’ needs, secondary school teachers often lowered their expectations. For example, Wilcox (2011) investigated to what extent students in different academic tracks and from diverse linguistic backgrounds were being exposed to and acquiring discipline-specific writing practices in an American school district. After studying four core subjects across three grade levels, she found that the expectations in terms of length, variety of uses, and cognitive dimensions in writing differ for NNES students as compared to other high-performing NES students. Wilcox further found that teacher and administrator perceptions of NNES students and separation of these students from the main class activities through “pull-out” programs have detrimental effects on their learning, promoting simplification of writing goals and a focus on surface-level editing and mechanics. In a study that examines the writing experiences of NNES students in high school subject courses, Enright and Gilliland (2011) found that classroom practices related to current U.S. education standards and accountability climate socialized adolescent NNES students into narrow, restrictive norms of academic writing, with the most restrictive norms occurring in the classes with the greatest enrollment of NNES writers.

Most studies on content teachers’ literacy brokerage have either focused on the North American context or secondary school classrooms. However, as we noted earlier, English is increasingly used as a medium of instruction in
higher education in non-English dominant nations. Numerous initiatives have been implemented in Asian, European, and North American (Mexican) universities to help content teachers transition from local languages to English in their instruction (Craig et al., 2010; Fortanet-Gómez, 2011; Harbord, 2010; Harder, 2009; Kam & Meinema, 2005; Poe & Craig, 2011; Wilkinson, 2004). For example, Harbord (2010) noted three types of writing initiatives across eight universities in Hungary, Lithuania, Georgia, Romania, Slovakia, and Ukraine. In American-style universities, the initiatives focused on the teaching of academic English writing across the curriculum by language teachers; in state university English departments, they focused on the teaching of English language more than on writing; initiatives in three state universities outside the English departments focused on genre analysis and writing in the disciplines in both English and local languages.

In initiatives that focused on writing across the curriculum, faculty in subject areas and language typically worked together to identify and deal with issues in English-medium instruction. For example, before implementing the Bologna Agreement (a set of reforms intended to harmonize higher education in Europe), a team consisting of content and language teachers at Universitat Jaume I of Spain discussed the results of university-wide surveys on students’ needs for courses delivered in English and disciplinary differences in modes of teaching and pedagogical strategies (Fortanet-Gómez, 2011). At the University of Groningen, Netherlands, the Expert Centre on Language, Communication and Education designed workshops in close cooperation with the faculty members. In the workshops, a course schedule was proposed in which several elements of teaching writing were integrated: choosing a specific disciplinary genre as the writing task, planning the writing process within a disciplinary module, selecting which elements of the writing process to support explicitly, and supporting writing in groups (Kam & Meinema, 2005).

Despite the widespread English-medium instruction in universities in non-English dominant nations, as our review has shown, only a few studies have tangentially examined content teachers’ literacy brokerage in these contexts. Most studies have focused on either K-12 levels or Anglophone universities where the NNES students are the minority. What about teachers’ adaptive strategies in university classrooms where the NNES students are the majority? If lowering expectations for NNES students in high schools in Hong Kong and the United States negatively affected the students’ learning, as Enright and Gilliland (2011), Kong (2010), and Wilcox (2011) have discovered, what about teachers’ adaptations in universities? To understand their literacy brokerage in university classrooms where multilingual writers are the majority, we pose the following research questions:

a. What challenges do university professors perceive in NNES students’ use of written English in subject learning in non-English dominant contexts?
b. What adaptive strategies do the professors adopt to help students achieve the standards set in their courses?

Methodology

Context and participants

We studied American professors’ beliefs and practices in using writing assignments at a summer school in Shanghai, China in 2011. The school epitomizes the push and pull of China’s drive for internationalizing its higher education. Over the last decade, fueled by economic growth and a desire for better education, a large number of Chinese students have gone to English-dominant nations for university, leading to an economic loss and brain drain. To counter these tendencies, like their peers in some Asian and European nations, Chinese universities started offering English-taught courses in the humanities, business, and medicine to both domestic and international students at the turn of the century (Hayhoe, Li, Lin, & Zha, 2011; Kirkpatrick, 2011). Meanwhile, some Anglo-American universities have established offshore programs in China. Internationalization of higher education has meant for China not only the global exchange of ideas, technologies, and educational practices but also a fight for a share of the highly lucrative education market. The summer school that we studied was conceived as a for-profit institution in response to these economic forces in Chinese higher education. Established by a group of U.S.-educated Chinese nationals in 2009, the school offers entry-level courses typically found in American universities. The school appeals to Chinese parents and students by promising them an American, English-medium education in China. In this six-week program, each course meets daily for an hour and a half, Monday through Thursday.

The professors, tenured or tenure-track, come from top American universities, as determined by the U.S. News and World Report ranking (U.S. News, 2012). In the year of this study, three professors, all in social sciences, had taught at
the summer school in the previous year. Most courses offered are general education courses typically taken by U.S. students in their freshman and sophomore years, including American Culture and Society, American Government, Calculus, Classical Philosophy, English Writing, Public Speaking, Introduction to Finance, Introduction to Psychology, Introduction to Sociology, Introduction to Statistics, Introduction to Western Art, and World Politics. Having professors from reputable U.S. universities teach in the school is a way to make the courses compatible with those offered in the United States. Each professor is provided with Chinese undergraduate teaching assistants in the same or related area of study, who have studied for at least one year in American universities. They are expected to help the professors prepare for everyday teaching, answer student questions, and grade papers and examinations. In the present study, we will only focus on nine professors (and their teaching assistants) in the humanities and social sciences. Among them, two are of an ethnic minority and multilingual speakers: Professor Chang originally came from Taiwan and Professor Walker is African American. The rest are Caucasians and primarily English speakers, except Professor Smith, who also spoke fluent Chinese.

The summer school attracts mostly Chinese students who have enrolled or plan to enroll in American universities. The students are multilingual, typically speaking English, Standard Chinese, and a local Chinese dialect (such as Mandarin, Wu, Min, Cantonese, and Hakka) or a minority language (such as Korean, Mongolian, and Tibetan) (also see a sociolinguistic profile of Chinese university students in You, 2011). To ensure that students have adequate English proficiency, the school has adopted admission standards comparable to those of American institutions: The students must have a valid Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) score higher than 80 (Internet-based test) or equivalent scores in other forms of TOEFL, have a valid International English Language Testing System (IELT) score higher than 6.0, or have studied at or graduated from an institution where English is the primary language of instruction. As most American universities allow study-abroad credits for fulfilling graduation requirements, and the students are able to transfer most, if not all, credits gained in the summer school to their home institutions, the school attracted more than 500 students the year of this study.

Data collection

The data came from several sources, including interviews (with the professors, their teaching assistants, and their students), class observations, faculty meetings, course materials (syllabi and handouts), and the students’ written work. We conducted our interviews starting from Week 3 and continued until the end of the semester. We first interviewed the professors on their use of writing tasks to facilitate student learning at the summer school and their customary practice in the United States (see Appendix I). We interviewed each of them multiple times during the four weeks. Second, we interviewed the teaching assistants about their professors’ use of writing in facilitating student learning and how they graded the quizzes and exams (see Appendix II). Third, we also interviewed some students for their opinions about writing in content courses, their attitude toward the professors’ writing assignments, and their evaluation of their own writings (see Appendix III).

We also collected student writings, observed classes, and attended faculty meetings. We collected student writings performed in and outside of class in the summer school. We intended to investigate, on the one hand, how students performed the writing assignments and whether their performance had lived up to the expectation of their professors; and on the other hand, whether the writing assignments accorded with the professors’ beliefs about writing in content courses. We did not collect the professors’ U.S.-based assignments and had to trust their own descriptions in the interviews. We also collected the course materials, such as syllabi and handouts, which these professors used in the summer school. We observed the professors’ classes (11 classes in total) each at least twice during the semester, totaling 25 observations. We attended three faculty meetings and multiple informal faculty gatherings to further understand their concerns in teaching Chinese students.

Data analysis

To identify the professors’ adaptations, we adopted the following procedure in the data analysis. First, we examined their claims about how they taught the courses and assessed student learning in both China and the United States.

1 The names of the professors used in this paper are pseudonyms.
Second, we triangulated these claims with our class observations, interviews with their teaching assistants, course materials, and student writings; then we identified the differences in their pedagogical practices across the two locations. The differences could exist in their beliefs, perceptions of their students, pedagogical techniques, and assessment techniques. Third, we marked the differences with codes. We then grouped the codes into similar concepts in order to make them more workable. From these concepts, categories of pedagogical adaptations gradually emerged.

Findings

Students’ literacy challenges as perceived by the professors

Our interviews and the faculty meetings reveal perceptions of multiple challenges in the students’ use of English, particularly written English, in subject learning. These challenges include limited vocabulary knowledge, unfamiliarity with thinking and communication in the disciplines, and lack of personal voice. The professors also recognized the students’ low English proficiency in general and difficulty in organizing thoughts into a coherent passage, challenges we will elaborate on when discussing the professors’ adaptive strategies.

A common challenge identified by the professors was the students’ limited vocabulary knowledge. At the second faculty meeting held in Week 3, the professors concurred that a majority of the students lacked vocabulary knowledge, particularly that of special terms, which hindered not only their comprehension of lectures but also their classroom participation and written work. At the same time, some professors expressed the understanding that lacking knowledge of special terms was not an issue unique to multilingual students but common to freshmen who were new to a subject area. A few professors not only recognized the issue but also took every opportunity to help the students enrich their lexical knowledge. For example, Professor Jones, an art history faculty member, shared at the meeting her efforts in integrating language lessons into her teaching:

I put a lot of emphasis on language here. Like I put up a sculpture today of a dying soldier. Usually in the States I will talk about pathos and things like that. And here I said okay, what does pathos mean? We have sympathy, empathy, these kinds of closed-in syndromes [These all come from the same word]. What’s the difference between sympathy and empathy? What’s the difference between sympathy and finding something pathetic? And I feel like at the end of the language lesson, they’ve learned some subtleties of language but also they can apply these notions they identified to the work of art in the end. (July 21, 2011)

Without understanding those closed-in syndromes, the students would have difficulty understanding Professor Jones’ lectures, demonstrating art appreciation, and expressing criticisms in their writing tasks.

Another area that the professors recognized as hindering the students from performing quality written work was their unfamiliarity with disciplinary thinking. New entrants to subject areas, the students were strangers to the reasoning patterns expected therein. Thus they sometimes could not fully comprehend the writing assignments. Several professors shared this observation in our interviews. For example, Professor Smith, a history professor, noted this transitional issue in a midterm exam. In his Chinese history course, the class studied a peasant rebellion in the late Ming Dynasty (1368 CE–1644 CE). In an interview, Prof. Smith commented on his students’ failure to grasp the historical significance of this event in an exam question: “A lot of them have learned this, but they have learned it in a high school way, in which it’s black and white, it’s good, bad, without looking at the social context or the historical context in which these developments happened” (July 30, 2011). Without knowing the disciplinary ways of reasoning, the students tended to answer questions in a more simplistic manner or by ignoring the prompt.

In comparison with American academic conventions, the students were also viewed as lacking individual voice and personal reflection in their written work. Several professors expressed this opinion in our interviews. They noted that the students were good at imitating and memorizing materials but poor at expressing their perspectives on issues. For example, Professor Taylor, a political science professor, touched on this point when describing a research paper assignment in her World Politics class:

Take a problem in contemporary world politics, global warming, or, you know, nuclear weapons, anything they want to study. Take a problem and then research, find at least two articles on each side of a controversy, evaluate them and write a paper, giving those sides and then giving your side. Giving your side is something that they have trouble with. (August 4, 2011)
The professor emphasized the importance of weighing an argument on both or multiple sides and then taking one’s own stand. Like Professor Taylor, a few other professors characterized their Chinese students as feeling reluctant to state their perspectives on issues.

The professors did not simply identify their students’ literacy challenges. Proactively, they developed adaptive strategies to help the students learn, and now to these strategies we turn.

Adjusting the writing tasks

Due to the shorter length of the summer term, all professors had to adjust the writing tasks used in their courses. A common adaptation, used by five professors, was to keep the term paper as the staple assignment (see Appendix IV) but with modified expectations. In the interviews, these professors indicated that term papers were commonly assigned when they taught in the United States but that they adjusted the paper requirements in China. Some assigned it in the middle of the semester and asked the students to hand it in one week before the semester ended. In the United States, they typically requested this paper at the end of the semester. In assigning an early due date, the professors hoped that the students would seek their help early if they needed it. Some also required a shorter paper. In an interview, Professor Jones attributed the choice of one short term paper to her own unfamiliarity with the pedagogical context:

I don’t think it is about lowering standards necessarily, but also about being able to adjust to the needs of your students, which is something I do at home too. I give out midterm evaluations at home so I can adjust. So I did not want to sort of experiment with something that maybe won’t be suitable to the context. But I’d rather to have the expectations be a little bit lower and be able to work with them intellectually, and not having them be so worried. (July 28, 2011)

Originally the professor built two short essay assignments into her syllabus, but eventually kept one. In the interview, she emphasized the importance of understanding the students’ needs and being able to adjust the assignments accordingly. She practiced this principle regardless of the geographical location, believing that requiring one short paper did not lower the course standards.

The professors also adjusted their expectations for the essay questions in the midterm and final exams. Recognizing the students’ challenges in writing, five of them tried to tap into students’ strengths by using short answer questions. Professor Walker, a sociology professor, for example, typically gave two multiple-choice question quizzes, one essay exam, and one final paper in the United States. At the summer school, she opted instead for three quizzes, each consisting of multiple choice and short answer questions. She made the change based on her unsuccessful experience with essay exams in the summer school in the preceding year. In an interview, she exclaimed “too much of the weight was based on their writing... I didn’t think it's fair.” She claimed that the students would find it easier to just transfer ideas from their memory to paper than to construct a coherent passage. In the interview, Professor Walker used a short answer question from the first Principles of Sociology quiz to illuminate her students’ strengths and weaknesses:

One of the questions was – “Define the strengths and weaknesses of two of these research methods: experiments, survey, and participant observation.” Most of the students who did not want to write an essay were able to create some configuration like this: survey, participants, advantages, and disadvantages, like bullet points. They knew the information. They did not write an essay. But they answered the questions. And many of them did well. But if you look at their writing in other areas, it’s very bad. So through memorization they can do it. But through writing it as a narrative, they have difficulty in doing that. They can talk it, they did understand it, but they do not have the mechanics, and because I said you cannot use spelling machines... they cannot get their ideas out of their head. (July 27, 2011)

Professor Walker recognized that her students were able to orally and graphically present the information required by a question, but they found it difficult to construct a coherent essay. In a short answer that the professor showed us in the interview, the student created a table to configure the kinds of information in his comparison of two research methods: experiments, survey, and participant observation. Most of the students who did not want to write an essay were able to create short sentences or phrases without having to create a prose passage. After identifying her students’ strengths in memorizing information, the professor began assessing learning by tapping into these strengths: “They do very well, very well in this, in this kind of scenario. So I am trying to design the next quiz towards this strength because it’s not fair to assume they don’t know the information. It’s just, I’ve got to try to find more formula, that they can bring
information forward.” The interview indicates that while the professor recognized the students’ writing ability as a weakness, she also sought to understand their strengths. She viewed capitalizing on their strengths as the key to assessing and encouraging learning.

However, not every professor who chose short answer questions was able to adapt to the students’ strengths. For example, according to Professor Smith, when taking a midterm in the United States, his students would need to answer two short essay questions and two out of five identification questions. In the summer school, he only adopted multiple-choice and short answer questions. He justified his adaptation with three reasons: First, the Chinese students had difficulty writing essays, or in his words, “I have no confidence that they could write an essay.” Second, teaching more than 150 students in three classes, he did not have time to grade papers. And third, he felt that his Chinese teaching assistant was not helpful, or, in his words, they were “useless” in helping him prepare for teaching or grading papers. In the short answer format, Professor Smith would have posed broader questions in the United States, asking students to identify facts and then explain their significance. He would, for example, ask his students to write on the topic of rice. However, when writing questions for the Chinese students, he narrowed down the topics and tried to be specific. On the midterm for his Chinese history course, he asked the students to answer six questions “in as few words as possible.” One of the questions asked, “In the correct order, what are the ‘five relations’ and why are they significant in Confucian thought?” The students only needed to use short phrases to enumerate the five relations and then two or three sentences to explain their significance to Confucianism. Professor Smith’s preference for short answers over essays came from both the contextual constraints and his beliefs of his students’ writing ability.

Providing support for major writing assignments

Several professors provided explicit instruction for the major writing assignments. They tended to focus on helping students develop ideas and structure their essays. However, they did not feel comfortable helping students with surface-level language issues and typically asked their students to use the writing center services. The professors’ in-class activities included workshops, group discussions, introducing worksheets, and providing detailed feedback on student writings.

These activities trained the students to reason and communicate within various academic fields. For example, one of the philosophy professors, Professor Chang, designed worksheets to guide her students in their reading and writing process. The purpose of these worksheets was to teach the students how to engage in an argument in philosophy. When the students read a passage, they needed to answer three heuristic questions in the reading worksheet:

- What is the thesis?
- What are the premises?
- Possible objections?

When they wrote a short essay responding to a philosophical passage, they were expected to be able to address similar questions. In the draft worksheet, the students were asked to include the following sections in their essay:

- Introduction
- Summary of the author’s argument
- My objection to this argument
- Response
- My reply

Clearly the second and the third bullet points in the draft worksheet were a synthesis of the three bullet points in the reading worksheet, intending a conversation with the author. The fourth and fifth bullet points encouraged the students to further their philosophical engagement with the author. The draft worksheet helped the students transition from reading to writing; it also provided them an organizational frame for their essays. Throughout the semester, Professor Chang’s students composed four short essays by using the two worksheets. If necessary, the professor would conference with them to improve both the substance and style of their essays.

Professor Chang attributed this regimental method in teaching reading and writing to her awareness of the students’ challenges. When she taught at a private university in California, she did not use these worksheets because she
team-taught with a writing instructor who took care of the writing component. Later, when teaching independently at a California state university, where her students were not as strong in reasoning and writing, she designed these worksheets to help them. Code-switching in an interview, she offered two reasons for adopting these worksheets in the Chinese context: First, philosophy papers are written differently from those in other disciplines in terms of reasoning pattern and style (“Philosophy paper is different from paper in other disciplines”). The students needed to receive special training to be able to think like philosophers. Second, the Chinese students’ English proficiency was relatively low and they typically did not value analysis and logical reasoning in their writing (“low level, don’t value things like analysis, logic, and thinking”). Professor Chang believed that these worksheets would assist the Chinese students and the California state university students to think and communicate like philosophers.

When the professors offered support in student writing, most of them did not feel comfortable discussing surface-level language issues. Philosophy professors Grieco and Chang offered the most written feedback to their students’ writing. For example, Professor Grieco extensively commented on his students’ short essays in the Introduction to Philosophy midterm. He circled or underlined various items in the essays and numbered them. In the margins or at the end, he offered several numbered comments that corresponded to the numbered items in the essays. Seldom did the professor comment on surface-level language issues, either in grading the essays or when returning them in class. For the prompt “In the lion’s share of your essay, explain the argument discussed in class for why free will and determinism are incompatible,” Professor Grieco offered the following comments on one student’s essay, which received a B−/C+ grade:

1. But this is not what the question asks for.
2. You need to explain this.
3. What do you mean by “choice”? Why not “many” instead of “none”?
4. Theoretically but not practically predictable. You are supposed to explain this.
5. Explaining this argument is what the question asked for. You stated it, but explained nothing.
6. All this is irrelevant to the question. It is as if you did not read the question that you were supposed to be answering.

These comments strongly indicate the professor’s focus on how well the student had answered the essay question. The most used words in these comments are “question” and “explain.” The student was urged to explain the argument, as required in the essay question. Offering detailed comments on the students’ midterm essays served as a type of instruction in philosophy writing. The students learned what the professor valued in their writing; like Professor Chang, Professor Grieco seemed to value analysis and logical reasoning.

Valuing the students’ multilingual resources

About half of the professors allowed, and a few even encouraged, the students to use Chinese in their written work and class discussions. They did not view Chinese as an obstacle or interference to student learning. Professor Taylor was one of them, allowing her students to use Chinese in group discussions. For example, when she assigned her students a group paper in her American Government course, she let them sit in groups to discuss how they would carry out this collective project. The students were asked to examine the movement of the Affordable Healthcare for America Act, passed in March 2010, through the American political system. In the political system chart that the professor presented in a PowerPoint slide and repeatedly referred to later, there are four components—the inputs, the decision-making core, the outputs, and the feedback. In the group that we sat with, assignment sheet in hand, the students discussed the following items predominantly in Chinese:

1. How to divide up the different sections of the group essay for each member
2. How to write up the sections suggested in the assignment sheet
3. The weight of the group essay in the final grade and the professor’s practices in designing exams
4. The students’ preference for short essays over multiple-choice questions on the midterm
5. The meanings of some bullet points in the assignment sheet
6. The motivations for choosing this course and the unexpected challenges
7. The structure and the length of the group essay
The list indicates that students stayed focused on the writing assignment throughout most of the group discussion; Chinese enabled them to accomplish the major goals of the group discussion. To gain a better sense of how Chinese mediated the discussion, we may examine a scenario under Item 5, when the group was discussing some bullet points on the assignment sheet.

M: 后面的那个理论是, 利益集团, 宪法, 国会, 司法, 还有那个, 还有那个官僚集团那些... ... [The latter part of the theory involves interest groups, election, parliament, judicial, and that, and that bureaucracy and so forth...]
W: 官僚干什么啊？它到底是什么 [Why bureaucracy? What is it?]
M: Bureaucracy 它其实就是... ... 就相当于代表政府的 Department of State. Bureaucracy 就是一个机构, 为了去 serve 某个 purpose [Bureaucracy actually is... ... actually equals to Department of State, which represents the government. Bureaucracy is an organization, designed to serve a certain purpose.]
W: 但是没有太大用... ... [But it is not very useful...]
M: 你要理解它的... ... 超三角关系, 超三角关系, 其实就是帮政府服务的一个机构。就是把这些 大的 concept 解开. [You need to understand it’s... ... super triangular relationship. It is an organ to serve the government. We need to dissect these broad concepts]
(August 4, 2011)

In this brief exchange, Chinese performed several pragmatic functions. First, a male student directed the group’s attention to the different components of the political system. Second, he clarified a difficult concept, “bureaucracy,” for a female student. Third, in the last sentence, he commented on how to write the group essay—to identify the major components of the political system and analyze how each worked in the movement of the Healthcare Act. Chinese enabled the students to delve deep into the political system chart and the writing assignments. The students effectively used their mother tongue, code-switching between Chinese and English, to achieve the purposes of the group discussion.

Professor Taylor allowed Chinese in group discussions but not in class discussions. In an interview, she said that this was because she would not be able to understand them. In the United States, she taught at a liberal arts college where the majority of her students were native English speakers. She did not allow her students to use languages other than English in class, but she was aware of bilingual professors in her college who used Spanish or allowed their students to use Spanish in content courses:

We have had courses though in [college name] because some faculty who were bilingual in Spanish and English who worked with things like Introductory Economics in Spanish, and it was offered that way so students who were Spanish majors could get some credits towards their Spanish language. So it wasn’t just heritage speakers who took this course but American students whose first language is English also took the course. And Latin American History too, I think, speaks the same language. (August 12, 2011)

Professor Taylor’s remarks indicate that she had been exposed to the idea of using languages other than English in content courses. However, she viewed herself and her students in the United States as monolingual, and therefore she did not use or let her students use other languages in class. She made the change in China simply because she found herself a minority in a multilingual classroom.

In addition to allowing Chinese in group discussions, a psychology professor also allowed it in written exams. In the quizzes of his two courses, the instructions stated that “If you cannot remember the English word for a concept, you may use the Chinese word.” Apparently, he wanted to accommodate students who had limited knowledge of special terms. The professor usually asked his teaching assistant to grade the quizzes, therefore bilingual answers did not pose an issue. However, while the instructions only allowed Chinese for concepts whose English equivalents the students did not remember, neither the professor nor the teaching assistant penalized the students if they used Chinese for more than these concepts and answered the question correctly. For example, a question was asked in the second quiz of the Principles of Psychology course: “How is Life Expectancy defined?” The teaching assistant placed a check mark on the following answers by two students, giving both full credits:

Life Expectancy mean 平均寿命, or 預期壽命. Life expectancy is the expected number of years of life remaining at a given age, and from birth is a frequently utilized and analyzed component of demographic data for the countries of the world.
Life expectancy means how long you can expect to live, when you live, which life standard you have.

To estimate how many years you will live based on, first, measuring how long the older generations have lived and, second, your health condition.

While the first answer uses a complete English sentence, the second one contains an incomplete one followed by a complete Chinese sentence. The incomplete English sentence offers an inaccurate and partial definition, which was then improved on by the Chinese sentence. In an interview, the teaching assistant explained that short answer questions were typically used in low-level psychology courses for non-majors in the United States. When she graded them, she looked for main points and keywords: “几项主要观点，几个关键词” (When I spotted several main points and keywords, I would mark the answer as correct) (August 12, 2011). She further indicated that she might take a few points off if a student made errors in English spelling or syntax. Mixing English with Chinese was not an issue as long as the students could explain themselves clearly to her. In another interview, a student confirmed the possibility of extensive use of Chinese in the psychology exams:

You can write Chinese in your exam. . . But like, it depends on what the definition of a special term is. Like, like, the questions asked, you can write in a sentence. And it can be in Chinese because the sentence contains about seventy percent of special terms. . . Lots of the students are, they are like, not proficient in English. (August 2, 2011)

The availability of the Chinese-speaking teaching assistant allowed the psychology professor to compensate for some students’ limited vocabulary knowledge and lower English writing ability.

Connecting to the students’ home cultures

In addition to the students’ native language, the professors also connected the students’ home culture to their teaching. For example, the art history professors arranged a day trip to the Shanghai Museum. One of them assigned her students to compare two pieces of Chinese artwork for their term paper. Professor Taylor, when assigning one of the papers in her American Government class, asked her students to “compare and contrast American and Chinese political systems by examining at least two of the following: political culture, political participations, political parties, legislatures, executives, rights, and the role of the media in the political system” (American Government Essay Assignments, p. 1).

The extent to which a professor could bring Chinese culture into his or her teaching had much to do with what the course was. There were a few courses that focused on China, such as Chinese History: Late Imperial China, Investment in China, and East Asian Economic Development. Among the courses that did not deal with China directly, Professor Walker’s Principles of Sociology class used Chinese cultural materials the most extensively. The textbooks and the handouts used were published in the United States and thus largely drew upon American cultural examples. However, in our observations of her class, for nearly every concept and principle introduced, she encouraged her students to find examples in Chinese society. She assigned them to collect materials published in China for class discussions, such as newspaper articles, picture books, and advertisements. She invited guest speakers from local communities to speak to them. She asked her students to design questionnaires on sexual harassment and conduct a survey on the summer school campus. In her quizzes, Professor Walker would always ask one short answer question related to China. In an interview, she explained the importance of local context in enabling student learning:

Can you apply this to something? And there is a question, that’s always like, about China. I explained that in the American context. Can they show me how this idea might fit China? . . . And more than half of the students will pick that one [question]. More than half of the students will pick something that they can then apply to China, which I appreciate. There’s learning for me. But also I don’t care if they have applied to Venezuela. Just show me that you have been applying with the ideas. (July 27, 2011)

The professor’s remarks indicate an emphasis on her students’ ability to apply ideas discussed in class to actual social phenomena in China or elsewhere. The short answer question enabled the students to think and learn rather than to reproduce information. The option of examining their own cultures apparently was inspiring as “more than half of the students” would pick the China question.
Connecting to their home culture enabled the students to make connections between Chinese and English. When her Introduction to Sociology class discussed issues of education and human development, Professor Walker let her students watch a video online, followed by a guest lecture by a Chinese woman writer, also a former middle school teacher. Then she asked her students to discuss, in writing, the connections between the video and the lecture. The video was an animated lecture given by a British education and creativity expert Sir Ken Robinson on changing education paradigms. The guest lecturer discussed her unique approach to teaching: Instead of teaching to the standards set by educational authorities, she encouraged her students to find their true desires and to think about the value of life. One of the students described how the guest lecturer encouraged them to take hold of their lives:

In response to the second and third questions she brought to us, she told us several traditional Chinese concepts and sent my classmates some of her calligraphy that could embody those concepts. By “处下” (Chu’xia, literally meaning stay in low position), she said that we should keep a low profile to get adapted to our (social) environments. Also, we need to treat the changing world with inner peace (“靜”, Jing). She then mentioned that we should “never say ‘I am busy’” (“勿稱忙”) because the character 忙 is a combination of “耳 (meaning hear/ mind) and 死 (death/loss)”, which means that if you always say busy, you will lose your mind. Besides she remind us to think about ourselves everyday and get an insight of anything we encounter from superficial level.

The guest lecturer drew on Chinese cultural concepts as principles to deal with boisterous everyday situations. The above passage indicates that in this writing assignment the students’ composing process was multilingual and cross-modal. After watching an animated lecture in English and attending a live lecture in Chinese, the students articulated the connections between the two sources in written English. In the above passage, the student synthesized the lecturer’s key points in translation and transcribed the key Chinese cultural concepts. Composing for Professor Walker, who knew little Chinese, they had to adopt translation, transcription, and exposition strategies in their essays. The students came to experience, and perhaps to perceive, the importance of being able to function competently in multiple languages in the academic disciplines.

Discussion

The professors recognized that the Chinese students faced challenges in their English writing. However, their perceptions were typically limited to the idea that some students had a hard time constructing coherent passages and expressing personal voice, and some professors were unsure how to help students with their English. In addition to the linguistic challenges, some noted the students’ unfamiliarity with the ways that scholars reason and communicate in their disciplines. They felt more comfortable addressing disciplinary conventions in the student writing. Roberts and Cimasko (2008) made a similar observation that social science and engineering professors tend to edit semantic gaps as opposed to grammatical items in NNES student writing. Previous studies in the United States have revealed that undergraduate students generally do not view academic writing in the same ways as disciplinary specialists, especially for non-majors in general education courses (Geisler, 1994; Haas, 1994; Russell & Yanez, 2003). Therefore, the Chinese students’ difficulties in reasoning and communicating in specific courses may or may not be related to their NNES status (Buell, 2004; Casanave, 2002). Second language writing scholars can examine how NNES students perceive and practice writing in their early years versus their later years of college, when they will focus on the required courses of their majors. Such studies will help identify the differences between the student perceptions and the content teacher expectations of academic writing in different stages of the students’ university studies.

Most of the professors adjusted their expectations for the student writing by reducing the writing load and adopting short essays and short answer questions as the key assessment tools. They recognized that understanding the students’ needs and the pedagogical contexts was more important than assigning an equal amount of writing as they did in the United States. Teaching an intensive summer program also prompted them to reduce the writing load, a practice commonly found in the United States. As also found in Australian and Korean universities, using short answer questions instead of essay questions would put less stress on the students’ weak writing ability (Byun et al., 2011); they could practice some basic modes, such as narration, description, and comparison/contrast, before transitioning to more challenging ones such as argument and persuasion (Drury, 2001). These questions also allowed students to bring other information organization and presentation skills into their answers, such as using short sentences, phrases, bullet points, charts, diagrams, and hand-drawn images. In addition to traditional essays, second language writing scholars
and teachers need to further understand the diverse modes of meaning making across the disciplines (Johns, 1998; Tardy, 2005), and incorporate these modes (such as, written, oral, visual, and aural) into their research and teaching agendas.

The professors adjusting their expectations for writing did not necessarily lower the standards of learning. In their studies of NNES students’ writing in subject courses in high schools, Kong (2010) and Wilcox (2011) suggested that teachers and administrators lowering their expectations for NNES students had detrimental effects on their learning, promoting simplification of writing goals and a focus on surface-level editing and mechanics. In one of the faculty meetings, the professors discussed whether they should lower academic standards in view of the students’ levels of English proficiency and writing ability. They concurred that the standards should not be lowered; if they were, the students would not be able to succeed in American universities. It was also impermissible because the students might later request to transfer credits to their American institutions. Therefore, most professors kept the term paper as the cardinal assignment and the short answer questions in midterms and finals as the key assessment instrument. Additionally, some professors required other types of writing during the semester as they did in the United States. For example, Professor Walker asked her students to write personal narratives, poetry, article summaries, lecture reports, and survey reports in her sociology classes. These types of writing asked the students to make sense of reading materials, connect them with their life experiences, and reorganize their subject knowledge. The wide array of genres that the students needed to perform in the two or three courses they took at the summer school gave them opportunities to pursue multiple goals for writing. In the end, the students were assessed on how well they had accomplished learning typically expected in a university course.

Like some subject teachers in secondary school classrooms (Fránquiz & Salinas, 2011; Gorgorio & Planas, 2001; Kibler, 2010, 2011), a majority of the professors capitalized on the students’ multilingual and multicultural resources to facilitate teaching and learning. They managed “teaching to their [students’] strengths,” as Professor Walker remarked in one of the interviews. Some allowed Chinese in group discussions and in quizzes, making it an important scaffolding tool for the students to consolidate and construct their subject knowledge. In addition to recognizing the importance of their mother tongue, by connecting the students’ home culture to the subject matter the professors further attached a positive tag to local cultures and languages, a practice highly valued in English-medium instruction in non-English dominant contexts (Coleman, 2006; Harder, 2009; Kirkpatrick, 2011). Even in courses that did not explicitly focus on China, the students were encouraged to bring Chinese publications into class discussions and use those materials in their writing assignments, which confirmed the importance of their home cultures and languages while helping to establish important connections between Chinese and English.

The professors’ ability to accommodate the students’ literacy challenges seems to be connected with their own multilingual–multicultural experience. For example, Professor Walker, an African American, studies language, gender, and identity issues in her own scholarly research. Professor Chang received academic training in Taiwan before pursuing doctoral studies in the United States. She taught for seven years in multilingual university classrooms in California before the summer school. Professor Taylor was familiar with multilingual professors who taught content courses in Spanish at her college. However, multilingual–multicultural exposure does not necessarily lead to conscientious accommodations. For example, Professor Smith studied applied linguistics for his MA and Chinese history for his PhD. He spoke fluent Chinese, but hardly accommodated his students linguistically. His adoption of multiple choice questions and short answer questions in assessing learning had more to do with the contextual constraints—a large class size and an unhelpful teaching assistant.

The findings bear implications for teaching NNES students in English-medium higher education. First, to assess learning, in addition to essay questions, content teachers may focus on short answer questions, which will put less pressure on the NNES students’ writing ability but will probably still allow them to communicate subject knowledge adequately. Second, despite the professors’ lowered expectations, writing still played a central role in facilitating learning. Content teachers can design a variety of writing tasks, such as personal narratives, poetry, article summaries, and research reports in their teaching, as suggested by Young (2006) and conscientiously practiced by Professor Walker in our study. Third, content teachers are familiar with the ways of reasoning and communication in their disciplines; Therefore, they can explicitly teach the disciplinary conventions through workshops, worksheets, and feedback on student writings. Fourth, a significant space should be given to the students’ use of their other languages—not only in their writing process but also in all aspects of their literacy activities (Jääppinen, 2005; Kibler, 2010). We should train our students to shuttle between their first and second language academic communities (Canagarajah, 2006; Casanave, 1998; Cho, 2010; Gentil, 2005; Jarratt, Losh, & Puente, 2006). Encouraging the students to make
connections between the subject matter and their home culture will motivate them and develop their multilingual academic abilities, such as translation skills and personal voice.

In addition to these implications for English-medium higher education in general, the study also raises questions for English-dominant contexts. First, as international students continue to flood higher education in English-dominant nations, to what extent should universities and colleges also adjust their assignments to meet the needs and skills of these students? Second, if they are going to adjust their assignments, how does that change curricular objectives, course expectations, and learning outcomes? Third, if we recognize that students, both international and domestic, are able to draw resources from multiple languages and cultures to facilitate subject learning, should learning and assessment of learning be performed solely in English or based on Anglophone academic conventions? These questions beg in-depth research on how content teachers and academic programs in these institutions are adjusting or can adjust their curricular objectives, course expectations, and assignments for the increased number of NNES students (Matsuda, Ortmeier-Hooper, & You, 2006).

Conclusion

The drive to internationalize higher education has led many non-English dominant nations to increase the number of university courses taught in English. At the same time, international students continue to flood universities in English-dominant nations. English-taught university courses pose challenges to NNES students, who reportedly often struggle with academic writing. Helping these students meet their challenges is not only the language teachers’ responsibility; content teachers also need to accommodate them to facilitate learning. Instructors need to help NNES students develop their multiliteracies (Cope & Kalantzis, 1999; Shin & Cimasko, 2008; Tardy, 2005; You, 2007), including their multilingual literacies—the ability to function literately in and across multiple speech communities (Martin-Jones & Jones, 2000). Both second language writing and content teachers play a crucial role in fostering these literacies, hence producing literate citizens who can fully participate in the digital and multilingual society.

The present study reveals that the American professors brokered Chinese students’ multilingual academic literacies by developing a series of adaptive strategies, many similar to those found among EAP teachers and secondary school subject teachers. They adjusted the writing tasks based on student needs, student strengths, and contextual constraints; they used conceptual activities to prepare students for major writing assignments; and they valued the students’ multilingual and multicultural resources in their teaching. Our study has focused on American professors’ adaptations in the Chinese context. In view of the paucity of research on content teachers’ adaptations in writing assignments in multilingual university classrooms, particularly in non-English dominant contexts, future studies can focus on both these contexts and local teachers’ practice in English-medium courses.
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Appendix I. Interview questions for the American professors

The following questions were prepared prior to the interviews. They were often followed by spontaneous follow-up questions.

1. Do you use any writing assignments in your teaching?
2. What kind of written work have you assigned or planned to assign?
3. What kind of writing do your students need to do in their midterm?
4. Do you use the same writing assignments when teaching in the United States? What are the major differences and considerations when you designed the assignments for this summer school?
5. What are the major challenges that your Chinese students have with their writing?
6 In terms of the writing assignments, do you plan to make any adjustments in the rest of the semester? What are they?

Appendix II. Interview questions for the Chinese teaching assistants

The following questions were prepared prior to the interviews. They were often followed by spontaneous follow-up questions.

1. How often does the professor use group work in class?
2. How many quizzes and exams are there in this course?
3. What kind of writing do the students need to perform in this course?
4. Does the professor allow the students to use Chinese in group discussions or in their writings?
5. How do you grade the student written work in the quizzes and examinations?

Appendix III. Interview questions for the Chinese students

The following questions were prepared prior to the interviews. They were often followed by spontaneous follow-up questions.

1. What are the kinds of writing assignments used in your _____ class?
2. Among these assignments, which one is the most challenging and why?
3. What is the most challenging part of the _____ assignment?
4. What does the professor or the teaching assistant do to help you with the assignment?
5. How does the professor or the teaching assistant grade the assignment?

Appendix IV. American professors and the written components in their courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Written components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>Introduction to Philosophy</td>
<td>Short answer questions and 1 short essay question in both midterm and final, 4 short essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grieco</td>
<td>Classical Philosophy; Modern Philosophy</td>
<td>1 short essay question in midterm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Introduction to Western Art: Ancient to Medieval;</td>
<td>Short answer questions in both midterm and final, 1 term paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Western Art: Renaissance to the Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrison</td>
<td>Principles of Psychology; Human Growth and Development</td>
<td>3 in-class quizzes (10 short answer questions in each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Introduction to Western Art: Renaissance to the Present</td>
<td>Short answer questions in both midterm and final, 1 term paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>American History: Since the Civil War; Chinese History:</td>
<td>Short answer questions in both midterm and final, 1 term paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Imperial China; World History: World Religions in Historical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>American History: Since the Civil War; American History to 1865</td>
<td>1 term paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Introduction to American Government; Introduction to World Politics</td>
<td>Short answer questions in both midterm and final, 1 short essay, 1 group essay (term paper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>Principles of Sociology: American Culture and Society;</td>
<td>Short assignments (poems, summaries, questionnaires, reports), short answer questions in three quizzes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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