

Appendix

Table of contents

1	Pre-semester survey: German	1
2	Pre-semester survey: English	7
3	Pre-semester writing assignment	13
4	Bilingual writing assignment with reflective component in week 11.....	14
5	Post-semester writing task	17
6	Post-semester survey: German.....	18
7	Survey components	24
8	Feedback example.....	26
9	Source texts: Reading ease measurements.....	30
10	Source texts: Students' perceptions.....	30
11	Model summaries for pre-semester writing assignment.....	31
12	Rater table for pre-semester writing assignment.....	35
13	Model summaries for post-semester writing assignment	36
14	Feedback summary for raters after final training round	40
15	Guide for the transcription of the think-aloud protocols	41
16	Schedule with multilingual practices.....	44
17	Language distribution per sub-process	46

Tables in the Appendix

App-Table 1: Relevance of writing	24
App-Table 2: Self-efficacy FL	24
App-Table 3 Self-efficacy L1.....	24
App-Table 4: Motivation for multilingual writing	25
App-Table 5: Writing for learning	25
App-Table 6: Reading ease for Pre/Post source texts	30
App-Table 7: Students' response to source texts	30
App-Table 8: Rating example	35
App-Table 9: FL per sub-process of writing (pre), group comparison (n = 28)	46
App-Table 10: FL per sub-process of writing (post), group comparison (n = 28).....	47



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

1 Pre-semester survey: German

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme! Die Umfrage dient dazu, Informationen für die Verbesserung der didaktischen Methoden in fremdsprachlichen Seminaren und Vorlesungen zu gewinnen.

Wir sind daran interessiert, wie Sie Textproduktionsaufgaben im Studium bearbeiten. Wir möchten auch erfahren, wie Sie Ihre verschiedenen Sprachen im Studium benutzen. In der Befragung ist mit ‚Muttersprache‘ diejenige Sprache gemeint, in der Sie sich am sichersten fühlen. Das kann, muss aber nicht die Sprache sein, die Sie zuerst gelernt haben.

Diese Befragung dient nicht zur Beurteilung Ihrer Studienleistungen. Sie wirkt sich in keiner Weise auf Ihre Benotung in diesem Kurs aus.

Wie gehen Sie vor?

Lesen Sie alle Aussagen aufmerksam durch und kreuzen Sie die Option an, die auf Sie zutrifft. Hier gibt es keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten, es kommt uns auf Ihre persönliche Meinung an.

Wenn Sie sich bei einer Aussage nicht entscheiden können, wählen Sie bitte die Option, die am besten auf Sie zutrifft.

Datenschutz

Sämtliche Daten werden streng vertraulich und anonym verwendet und weiterbearbeitet.

In Publikationen werden die erhobenen Daten und gewonnenen Erkenntnisse ausschließlich in anonymisierter Form erwähnt.

Durch das Ausfüllen und Abgeben des Fragebogens erklären Sie sich mit der Speicherung, Auswertung und anonymen Publikation der Daten einverstanden.

Vielen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme!

Zum Zweck der Anonymisierung bitten wir Sie, einen 8-stelligen Code zu generieren, über den die Zusammenführung verschiedener Daten erfolgen kann. Nach diesem Code werden Sie im Laufe des Kurses wieder gefragt werden. Damit Sie ihn sich nicht merken müssen, sondern ihn immer wieder leicht herleiten können, ist er wie folgt aufgebaut:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
erster und letzter Buchstabe des Vornamens Ihrer Mutter	erster und letzter Buchstabe des Vornamens Ihres Vaters	erster und letzter Buchstabe Ihres Vornamens	Tag Ihres Geburtstags (z. B. 07. Mai = 0 7)				

Bitte tragen Sie Ihren Code oben in die grauen Felder ein.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Schreiben und Beruf	trifft nicht zu					trifft sehr zu
	<input type="radio"/>					
Ich strebe einen Beruf an, in dem ich viel schreiben werde, z. B. E-Mails, Infomaterial und Protokolle.	<input type="radio"/>					
Das Schreiben im Beruf unterscheidet sich vom Schreiben an der Universität.	<input type="radio"/>					
Im Beruf werde ich ähnliche Texte wie im Studium schreiben.	<input type="radio"/>					
Akademische Schreibkompetenz ist in meinem gewünschten Beruf ein Erfolgsfaktor.	<input type="radio"/>					
Formulierungen aus akademischen Texten kann ich auch beim Schreiben im Beruf verwenden.	<input type="radio"/>					
Das Vokabular im akademischen Schreiben und das Vokabular im Schreiben im Beruf unterscheiden sich.	<input type="radio"/>					
Im Beruf werde ich auf Englisch schreiben müssen.	<input type="radio"/>					
Beim akademischen Schreiben muss ich anderes Vokabular verwenden als beim Schreiben im Beruf.	<input type="radio"/>					
Im Beruf werde ich auf Deutsch schreiben müssen.	<input type="radio"/>					

Schreiben im Studium	trifft nicht zu					trifft sehr zu
	<input type="radio"/>					
Ich schreibe gern.	<input type="radio"/>					
Die Tatsache, dass meine englischen Texte an der Universität benotet werden, macht mich nervös.	<input type="radio"/>					
Mir macht das akademische Schreiben auf Deutsch Spaß.	<input type="radio"/>					
Mir macht das akademische Schreiben auf Deutsch Spaß, wenn es mir leichtfällt.	<input type="radio"/>					
Beim akademischen Schreiben auf Deutsch fühle ich mich unsicher.	<input type="radio"/>					
Mir macht das akademische Schreiben auf Englisch Spaß.	<input type="radio"/>					
Wenn ich das Thema mag, macht mir das akademische Schreiben auf Englisch Spaß.	<input type="radio"/>					
Beim akademischen Schreiben auf Englisch fühle ich mich unsicher.	<input type="radio"/>					
Die Tatsache, dass meine deutschen Texte an der Universität benotet werden, macht mich nervös.	<input type="radio"/>					
Mir macht das akademische Schreiben auf Englisch Spaß, wenn es mir leichtfällt.	<input type="radio"/>					
Wenn ich das Thema mag, macht mir das akademische Schreiben auf Deutsch Spaß.	<input type="radio"/>					

Schreiben lernen	trifft nicht zu					trifft sehr zu
	<input type="radio"/>					
Gutes Schreiben muss man schon in der Schule lernen, sonst lernt man es nie richtig.	<input type="radio"/>					
Meine deutsche Schreibkompetenz für Texte im Beruf (E-Mails, Protokolle, etc.) kann ich noch verbessern.	<input type="radio"/>					
Leute, die im Beruf gute Texte schreiben, haben eine besondere Veranlagung.	<input type="radio"/>					
Mit meiner englischen Schreibkompetenz komme ich an der Universität gut zurecht.	<input type="radio"/>					
Im Schreiben war ich schon in der Schule gut.	<input type="radio"/>					
Meine Texte auf Englisch werden so verstanden, wie ich es beabsichtige.	<input type="radio"/>					
Meine Kenntnisse für das Schreiben im Beruf kann ich eher verbessern als meine Kenntnisse im akademischen Schreiben.	<input type="radio"/>					



Schreiben lernen	trifft nicht zu	trifft sehr zu			
	<input type="radio"/>				
Um gute akademische Texte schreiben zu können, muss man talentiert sein.	<input type="radio"/>				
Um mein akademisches Schreiben auf Deutsch zu verbessern, müsste ich zu viel Zeit investieren.	<input type="radio"/>				
Wenn ich meine Schreibkompetenz verbessere, hilft mir das sowohl an der Universität als auch im Beruf.	<input type="radio"/>				
Meine englische Schreibkompetenz für Texte im Beruf (E-Mails, Protokolle, etc.) kann ich noch verbessern.	<input type="radio"/>				
Meine Texte auf Deutsch werden so verstanden, wie ich es beabsichtigte.	<input type="radio"/>				
Mit meiner deutschen Schreibkompetenz komme ich an der Universität gut zurecht.	<input type="radio"/>				
Um mein akademisches Schreiben auf Englisch zu verbessern, müsste ich zu viel Zeit investieren.	<input type="radio"/>				

Schreiben und Lernen I	trifft nicht zu	trifft sehr zu			
	<input type="radio"/>				
Ich benutze akademisches Schreiben zum Lernen.	<input type="radio"/>				
Ich beschäftige mich lieber mit Fachinhalten als mit der Verbesserung meiner akademischen Schreibkompetenz.	<input type="radio"/>				
Ich verstehe Sachverhalte besser, wenn ich sie in einem längeren Text erklären muss.	<input type="radio"/>				
An Informationen aus meinen Hausarbeiten kann ich mich so gut erinnern wie an Informationen, die ich für eine Klausur gelernt habe.	<input type="radio"/>				
Schreiben hilft mir dabei, meine Gedanken über einen Sachverhalt zu ordnen.	<input type="radio"/>				
Beim Lernen hilft es mir, Sachverhalte schriftlich festzuhalten.	<input type="radio"/>				
Zusammenhänge werden mir klar, wenn ich sie präzise aufschreibe.	<input type="radio"/>				
Fachinhalte sind mir genauso wichtig wie die Verbesserung meiner akademischen Schreibkompetenz.	<input type="radio"/>				
Ich lerne besser durch andere Lerntechniken als durch Schreiben.	<input type="radio"/>				
Das akademische Schreiben hilft mir beim Lernen.	<input type="radio"/>				
Was ich in einem akademischen Text erkläre, bleibt mir länger in Gedächtnis als Details aus einer Klausur.	<input type="radio"/>				

Schreiben und Lernen II	trifft nicht zu	trifft sehr zu			
	<input type="radio"/>				
Für mich ist der Zweck des akademischen Schreibens, den Dozierenden eine Grundlage für meine Benotung zu liefern.	<input type="radio"/>				
Beim akademischen Schreiben kommt es nicht auf meine Meinung, sondern auf die Expertenmeinung an.	<input type="radio"/>				
Beim akademischen Schreiben verwende ich Informationen aus Büchern und Artikeln für meine eigene Argumentation.	<input type="radio"/>				
Beim akademischen Schreiben muss man der Expertenmeinung kritisch gegenüberstehen.	<input type="radio"/>				
Es geht beim akademischen Schreiben darum, wieder-zugeben, was Spezialisten über ein Thema gesagt haben.	<input type="radio"/>				
Beim akademischen Schreiben geht es mir in erster Linie darum, Klarheit über ein Thema zu gewinnen.	<input type="radio"/>				



Bitte kreuzen Sie hier an, auf welche Art des Schreibens die folgenden Aussagen Ihrer Meinung nach zutreffen. Hier gibt es keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten, es kommt uns auf Ihre persönliche Meinung an. Sie können pro Aussage auch mehrere Kreuze setzen.

	Akademisches Schreiben	Schreiben im Beruf	weder noch
Die Beschreibungen im Text müssen für die Empfänger nachvollziehbar sein.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man darf nur Ausdrücke verwenden, deren Bedeutung den Empfängern klar ist.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man muss sich die Reaktion der Empfänger vorstellen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man muss berücksichtigen, welche Informationen die Empfänger brauchen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Die Texte müssen einem klaren Ziel folgen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Die Texte müssen einen logischen Aufbau haben.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Die Texte müssen auch ohne Kontakt zum Autor verständlich sein.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man kann alles im Text unterbringen, was man zu einem Thema weiß.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Es ist nicht nur der Inhalt, sondern auch die Form wichtig.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Die Texte müssen sowohl sachlich richtig als auch gut zu lesen sein.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man muss sich klar und präzise ausdrücken.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man muss auf mehrdeutige Formulierungen verzichten.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Kreuzen Sie im Folgenden die Option an, die auf Sie zutrifft. Hier gibt es keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten, es kommt uns auf Ihre persönliche Meinung an. Wenn Sie sich bei einer Aussage nicht entscheiden können, wählen Sie bitte die Option, die am besten auf Sie zutrifft.

Fremdsprachen an der Universität	trifft nicht zu	trifft sehr zu
Um einen englischen Text gut schreiben zu können, muss ich während des Schreibens die ganze Zeit auf Englisch überlegen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Um beim Schreiben auf Englisch in meiner Muttersprache zu überlegen, brauche ich die Fachbegriffe in der Muttersprache.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch auch andere Sprachen zu benutzen, kann meine Schreibprozesse erleichtern.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch nutze ich alle meine Sprachen zum Überlegen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Überlegen zwischen Englisch und meiner Muttersprache zu wechseln, strengt mich an.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meine Dozierenden wollen, dass wir zum Überlegen in den englischen Sitzungen nur Englisch benutzen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch die Muttersprache benutzen zu müssen, ist ein Zeichen von mangelnden Englischkenntnissen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Schreiben benutze ich zunächst mehrere Sprachen und vereinheitliche den Text später.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wenn man beim Schreiben auf Englisch auf die Muttersprache zurückgreift, lernt man das Schreiben auf Englisch nie richtig.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meine Dozierenden wollen, dass wir zum Kommunizieren in den englischen Sitzungen nur Englisch benutzen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wenn man beim Überlegen auf Englisch auf die Muttersprache zurückgreift, lernt man das Überlegen auf Englisch nie richtig.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Für Sachverhalte aus englischen Veranstaltungen kenne ich nur die englischen Fachbegriffe.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Um beim Überlegen für einen Text zwischen mehreren Sprachen wechseln zu können, muss man talentiert sein.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch kostet es mich Zeit, meine Ideen erst in meiner Muttersprache zu formulieren und sie dann zu übersetzen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Antworten Sie hier weiterhin ehrlich und spontan und begründen Sie Ihre Meinung:

Halten Sie es für sinnvoll, dass an der Universität der Erwerb akademischer Schreibkompetenz von Ihnen erwartet wird?

Antworten Sie hier weiterhin ehrlich und spontan und begründen Sie Ihre Meinung:

Halten Sie es für sinnvoll, beim Schreiben in der Fremdsprache z. B. zum Überlegen und Strukturieren auch von anderen Sprachen, wie der Muttersprache, Gebrauch zu machen?

Datenerhebungsformular zur Person und (Vor-)Bildung

Geschlecht (weiblich/männlich/anderes): _____ Alter (in Jahren) _____

Muttersprache/n: _____

— Haben Sie eine Schule im Ausland besucht? Ja O Nein O

Falls ja, in welcher Sprache hat der Unterricht dort stattgefunden? _____

Haben Sie eine internationale Schule besucht? Ja O Nein O

Falls ja, in welcher Sprache hat der Unterricht dort stattgefunden? _____

Wie viele Jahre haben Sie insgesamt Englisch gelernt? _____

Haben Sie länger als 14 aufeinanderfolgende Tage im Ausland verbracht (nicht Freizeit)? Ja O Nein O

Falls ja, wo und wie lange? _____

Falls ja, zu welchem Zweck (Austausch, Studium, Work & Travel etc.)? _____

Gibt es weitere Faktoren, die für Ihre Englischkompetenz relevant sein könnten, z. B. regelmäßiger Kontakt mit englischsprachigen Freunden, Filme auf Englisch, Job etc.? _____

Welche Sprachen beherrschen Sie **neben** Ihrer/n Muttersprache/n?

Tragen Sie diese bitte in die erste Spalte der nachfolgenden Tabelle ein, und kreuzen Sie an, wie gut Sie jede der Sprachen beherrschen. Beziehen Sie bitte sowohl Ihre mündlichen als auch Ihre schriftlichen Kenntnisse mit ein.

Fremdsprache		sehr gut (C2)	gut (C1)	mittel (B2)	mäßig (B1)	schwach (A2)	elementar (A1)
	mündlich						
	schriftlich						
	mündlich						
	schriftlich						
	mündlich						
	schriftlich						



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Welche Textsorten verfassen Sie im Studium?

Bitte geben Sie zu jeder Textsorte an, in welcher Sprache Sie sie verfassen und wie oft Sie diese schon verfasst haben. Hier geht es nur um **Schätzungen** (Beispiel: Englisch → 5, Deutsch → 12).

Zusammenfassung:

Essay:

Referatsausarbeitung:

Hausarbeit:

Anderer:

Haben Sie Übersetzungskurse besucht?

Bitte listen Sie auf, welche Kurse in welchen Sprachen Sie besucht haben.

1.

2.

3.

4.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

2 Pre-semester survey: English

This English-language survey is a translation of the validated German version above. The translated version has not been validated.

In order to design suitable teaching materials, we need to know how you use your multilingual repertoire while completing English academic writing assignments. This survey has been designed to help us determine how you organize your academic writing processes and which kind of (multilingual) writing strategies you can already make use of for your own benefit. For example, you will be asked to indicate whether and in how far you use your dominant language during your English writing processes. Your dominant language is the language in which you feel most flexible and confident. This may be, but must not be, the language that you have acquired first in your life.

This survey will not be used to assess your performance in your studies. This survey will not affect your grades in any way.

What do you have to do?

Read the instructions and indications **carefully**. On a scale from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 4 ("strongly agree"), please select the response that best describes your personal position. Reply honestly. There are no right or wrong answers, you are asked to provide your personal opinion.

Data protection

The data obtained in the study will be treated as **strictly confidential**.

In publications, the data will be included only in **anonymized** form.

By completing this survey, you agree to the storage, processing, and publication (in **anonymized** form) of the data obtained in this study.

In order to ensure anonymity, we would ask you to generate the following code:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
First AND last letter of your mother's first name		First AND last letter of your father's first name		First AND last letter of your own first name		Day of your birthday (e.g., May 07 = 0 1 7)	



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Writing in the professions	I strongly disagree	I disagree	I agree	I strongly agree
In my future profession, text production, i.e., writing reports or emails, will be a substantial part of my job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional writing is different from academic writing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The professional texts I will have to produce are similar to the academic texts I have to produce at university.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Academic writing competence is required in my future profession.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Formulations from my academic texts will also be useful for my texts in my future profession.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In my future profession, I will have to write in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In my future profession, I will have to write in my dominant language.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Academic Writing	I strongly disagree	I disagree	I agree	I strongly agree
I enjoy academic writing in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel nervous when my English academic texts are graded at university.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I enjoy academic writing in my dominant language.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel insecure when writing academic texts in my dominant language.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel insecure when writing academic texts in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I feel nervous when my academic texts in my dominant language are graded at university.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Learning to write	I strongly disagree	I disagree	I agree	I strongly agree
Writing skills need to be acquired early in life, rather than later, at university.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Good writers have a special gift or talent.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My English academic writing skills are well enough developed for my studies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I already was a good writer in secondary school.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The texts I produce in English are understood in the way that I intend them to be understood.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing my English writing skills still further would require too much time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The texts I produce in my dominant language are understood in the way that I intend them to be understood.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My academic writing skills in my dominant language are well enough developed for my studies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing my writing skills in my dominant language still further would require too much time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Writing and Learning	I strongly disagree	I disagree	I agree	I strongly agree
I use academic writing as a learning technique.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I prefer working on content problems rather than on my academic writing skills.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Writing longer texts about facts and findings from my field of studies helps me understand these facts and findings better.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Writing helps me to structure and organize my ideas about the topics from my field of studies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Putting facts and findings from my field of studies down in writing helps me to understand these facts and findings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Relationships between ideas become clear to me when I have to write down precise descriptions of the ideas.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Writing texts about facts and findings from my field of studies helps me remember these facts and findings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I prefer other learning techniques over writing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Writing and Learning II	I strongly disagree	I disagree	I agree	I strongly agree
The purpose of academic writing for me is providing the lecturers with something they can grade.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In academic writing, the experts' opinion, and not my own opinion, is relevant.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In academic writing, I use other people's publications for my own argumentation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In academic writing, I have to take a critical perspective towards other people's publications.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In academic writing, the goal is to present what experts have found concerning a certain topic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The purpose of academic writing for me is reflecting on ideas from my field of studies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Multilingual writing	I strongly disagree	I disagree	I agree	I strongly agree
In order to write a good English text, I need to think in English during the entire writing process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I can think in my dominant language during my English writing processes only if I know the specialized vocabulary in my dominant language.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Resorting to my dominant language during my English writing processes can ease my writing processes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
During my English writing processes, I use all of my languages for my reflections.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Switching between English and my dominant language during my English writing processes exhausts me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Multilingual writing	I strongly disagree	I disagree	I agree	I strongly agree
The lecturers at university want us to use only English for our thinking processes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Using your dominant language during English writing processes indicates that your English writing skills are poorly developed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When you use your dominant language during your English writing processes, you will never really learn writing in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The lecturers at university want us to use only English for our communication at university.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When you use your dominant language during your English thinking processes, you will never really learn thinking in English.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In order to be able to switch between languages during your English writing processes, you need to have a special gift or talent.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Formulating my ideas first in my dominant language and then translating them into English would take up too much time.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In the following, please indicate your opinion on each of the listed statements: for which type of writing are the statements true? You can tick one or more boxes per statement.

	Academic writing	Professional writing	neither
The explanations in the texts need to be comprehensible for the readers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When writing, you need to anticipate your readers' reactions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
When writing, you need to take your readers' prior knowledge into account.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The texts need to have a specific purpose and function.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The texts need to be structured in a coherent, logical manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The texts need to be comprehensible to the readers even if the readers cannot ask the authors for clarification.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
In the texts, you can incorporate everything you know about the given topic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Not only the content but also the form of the texts is important.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The texts need to be correct on the content level and easy to read.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
You have to choose clear and precise formulations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
You must avoid ambiguous or vague formulations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Gender (female/male/other):

Age (in years)

Language you
acquired first:

Dominant Language:

In which country have you completed your secondary
education?

yes no

In which language(s) were classes during
your secondary education (other than
language classes) held?

Have you attended an international school?

yes no

If so, in which language(s) were classes
other than language classes held?

How many years have you been learning English?

Which languages other than your dominant language do you have skills in?

Please indicate all of your languages in the table below and tick the corresponding boxes to indicate
your level of proficiency. Please indicate your levels of proficiency separately for your oral and your
written skills.

Language		Highly proficient (C2)	proficient (C1)	Highly independent (B2)	independent (B1)	basic (A2)	elementary (A1)
	oral						
	written						
	oral						
	written						
	oral						
	written						
	oral						
	written						

Which text types have you already produced during your studies?

Please indicate which text types you have already produced and in which language you have produced
these texts.

Summaries :

Essay:

Report:

Term paper:

Thesis:



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license,
visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Have you already taken classes in translation or interpreting?

Please list for which languages you have taken classes in translation or interpreting.

1.

2.

3.

4.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

3 Pre-semester writing assignment

Assignment

Write a summary of the study by Costa et al. (2014). You know this type of summary assignment from our previous summaries. Summarize the study by Costa et al. (2014) for fellow students who do not take part in the 'Psycholinguistics' seminar and who have not read the article by Costa et al. (2014). Make sure that your summary fulfils the following requirements:

- The summary must inform your fellow students of Costa et al.'s (2014) hypothesis as well as the theories and findings from which they derived this hypothesis.
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of how the hypothesis was tested (material, task, number & type of participants, etc.).
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of Costa et al.'s (2014) observations.
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of the conclusions Costa et al. (2014) drew based on their observations.
- **While you are reading&writing, please verbalize, loudly and spontaneously, absolutely everything that comes to your mind in whatever language it comes to your mind.**
- The length of your text: max. 600 words
 - The language of your text: **English**
 - **Use your own words, quotations are not permitted.**
 - The language of your text must be sufficiently formal for academic writing.
 - The text must be self-contained and well-structured.
 - Permitted resources: any online resources that you normally use.
 - Time: You can take as much time as you need.
- Once you are happy with the completeness and quality of your summary: **SAVE** your document by clicking on the floppy disk symbol:

Thank you and enjoy the process!



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

4 Bilingual writing assignment with reflective component in week 11

Out-of-class writing assignment based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002)

This writing assignment will result in TWO texts and one report. Complete parts I, II, and III in the order specified in the present instructions.

PART I

- Download the text based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) from StudIP.
- Write a summary in your NATIVE¹ language of the text based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002). You know this type of summary assignment from our previous summaries. Summarize the text based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) for fellow students who do not take part in the 'Psycholinguistics' seminar and who have not read the article by Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002). Make sure that your summary fulfils the following requirements:
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of the specific factors that Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) took into account in their experiments.
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of Van Hell/Dijkstra's (2002) specific hypotheses as well as of the theories and findings from which they derived these hypotheses.
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of the experimental design in the three experiments in the text based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) (material, task, number & type of participants, etc.).
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of Van Hell/Dijkstra's (2002) observations.
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of the conclusions Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) drew based on their observations.
- The length of your summary: max. 600 words
- The language of your summary: your NATIVE language
- Use your own words, word-for-word translations are not permitted.
- The language of your summary must have the same level of formality as you find in academic articles.
- The summary must be self-contained and well-structured.
- Permitted resources: any online resources that you normally use.
- Please save your text as .doc/.docx or .pdf and send the document to the lecturer for feedback. Adhere to our file-naming conventions.
- Please submit your native language summary by Sunday, 25 June, 02 p.m.

¹ This applies to all participants. So, if your NL is German, write the summary in German. If your NL is Turkish, write the summary in Turkish, etc.



Out-of-class writing assignment based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002)

PART II

- Read the text based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) again.
- Write a summary in English of the text based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002). You know this type of summary assignment from our previous summaries. Summarize the text based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) for fellow students who do not take part in the 'Psycholinguistics' seminar and who have not read the article by Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002). Make sure that your summary fulfils the following requirements:
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of the specific factors that Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) took into account in their experiments.
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of Van Hell/Dijkstra's (2002) specific hypotheses as well as of the theories and findings from which they derived these hypotheses.
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of the experimental design in the three experiments in the text based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) (material, task, number & type of participants, etc.).
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of Van Hell/Dijkstra's (2002) observations.
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of the conclusions Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) drew based on their observations.
- The length of your second summary: max. 600 words
- The language of your second summary: ENGLISH
- Use your own words, quotations are not permitted.
- The language of your summary must have the same level of formality as you find in academic articles.
- The summary must be self-contained and well-structured.
- Permitted resources: any online resources that you normally use.
- Please save your summary as .doc/.docx or .pdf and send the document to the lecturer for feedback. Adhere to our file-naming conventions.
- Please submit your English summary by Sunday, 25 June, 02 p.m.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Out-of-class writing assignment based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002)

PART III

Write a short report in which you reflect on how you wrote the summary of the text based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) in your native language and how you wrote the summary in English. Compare your experiences in the two writing processes. Write the report for fellow students who are not sure whether to use their native language or English for making sense of articles in Linguistics. Make use of these guiding questions:

- Were there similarities between writing in your native language and writing in English?
Which similarities exactly? How did you notice them?
 - Were there differences between writing in your native language and writing in English?
Which differences exactly? How did you notice them?
 - In which of the processes was thinking about the CONTENT of the text based on Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) more effortful? Why exactly?
 - Did writing the text in your native language first influence the way in which you read the text a second time? If so, how exactly? Did writing the text in your native language first influence your writing process in English? If so, how exactly?
-
- The length of your report: max. 300 words
 - The language of your report: ENGLISH OR GERMAN
 - The language of your report must be comprehensible and precise.
 - The report must be self-contained and well-structured.
- Please save your report as .doc/.docx or .pdf and send the document to the lecturer.
Adhere to our file-naming conventions.
 - Please submit your report by Sunday, 25 June, 02 p.m. ■



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

5 Post-semester writing task

Assignment

Write a summary of the study by Lemhöfer et al. (2004). You know this type of summary assignment from our previous summaries. Summarize the study by Lemhöfer et al. (2004) for fellow students who do not take part in the 'Psycholinguistics' seminar and who have not read the article by Lemhöfer et al. (2004). Make sure that your summary fulfils the following requirements:

- The summary must inform your fellow students of Lemhöfer et al.'s (2004) specific hypotheses as well as the theories and findings from which they derived these hypotheses.
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of how the hypotheses were tested (stimuli, task, number & type of participants, etc.).
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of Lemhöfer et al.'s (2004) observations.
 - The summary must inform your fellow students of the conclusions Lemhöfer et al. (2004) drew based on the observations.
- While you are reading & writing, please verbalize, loudly and spontaneously, absolutely everything that comes to your mind in whatever language it comes to your mind.
- The length of your text: max. 600 words
 - The language of your text: **English**
 - **Use your own words, quotations are not permitted at all.**
 - The language of your text must have the same level of formality as you find in academic articles.
 - The text must be self-contained and well-structured.
 - Permitted resources: any online resources that you normally use.
 - Do NOT change the settings in WORD, unless for formatting reasons.
 - Time: You can take as much time as you need.
- Once you are happy with the completeness and quality of your summary: **SAVE** your document by clicking on the floppy disk symbol:

Thank you and enjoy the process!



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

6 Post-semester survey: German

Herzlichen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme! Die Umfrage dient dazu, Informationen für die Verbesserung der didaktischen Methoden in fremdsprachlichen Seminaren und Vorlesungen zu gewinnen.

Wir sind daran interessiert, wie Sie Textproduktionsaufgaben im Studium bearbeiten. Wir möchten auch erfahren, wie Sie Ihre verschiedenen Sprachen im Studium benutzen.

Diese Befragung dient nicht zur Beurteilung Ihrer Studienleistungen. Sie wirkt sich in keiner Weise auf Ihre Benotung in diesem Kurs aus.

Wie gehen Sie vor?

Lesen Sie alle Aussagen aufmerksam durch und kreuzen Sie die Option an, die auf Sie zutrifft. Hier gibt es keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten, es kommt uns auf Ihre persönliche Meinung an.

Wenn Sie sich bei einer Aussage nicht entscheiden können, wählen Sie bitte die Option, die am besten auf Sie zutrifft.

Datenschutz

Sämtliche Daten werden streng vertraulich und anonym verwendet und weiterbearbeitet.

In Publikationen werden die erhobenen Daten und gewonnenen Erkenntnisse ausschließlich in anonymisierter Form erwähnt.

Durch das Ausfüllen und Abgeben des Fragebogens erklären Sie sich mit der Speicherung, Auswertung und anonymen Publikation der Daten einverstanden.

Vielen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme!

Zum Zweck der Anonymisierung bitten wir Sie, einen 8-stelligen Code zu generieren, über den die Zusammenführung der Daten erfolgen kann.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
erster und letzter Buchstabe des Vornamens Ihrer Mutter	erster und letzter Buchstabe des Vornamens Ihres Vaters	erster und letzter Buchstabe Ihres Vornamens	Tag Ihres Geburtstags (z. B. 07. Mai = 07)				

Bitte tragen Sie Ihren Code oben in die grauen Felder ein.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Schreiben und Beruf	trifft nicht zu					trifft sehr zu
	<input type="radio"/>					
Ich strebe einen Beruf an, in dem ich viel schreiben werde, z. B. E-Mails, Infomaterial und Protokolle.	<input type="radio"/>					
Das Schreiben im Beruf unterscheidet sich vom Schreiben an der Universität.	<input type="radio"/>					
Im Beruf werde ich ähnliche Texte wie im Studium schreiben.	<input type="radio"/>					
Akademische Schreibkompetenz ist in meinem gewünschten Beruf ein Erfolgsfaktor.	<input type="radio"/>					
Formulierungen aus akademischen Texten kann ich auch beim Schreiben im Beruf verwenden.	<input type="radio"/>					
Das Vokabular im akademischen Schreiben und das Vokabular im Schreiben im Beruf unterscheiden sich.	<input type="radio"/>					
Im Beruf werde ich auf Englisch schreiben müssen.	<input type="radio"/>					
Beim akademischen Schreiben muss ich anderes Vokabular verwenden als beim Schreiben im Beruf.	<input type="radio"/>					
Im Beruf werde ich auf Deutsch schreiben müssen.	<input type="radio"/>					

Schreiben im Studium	trifft nicht zu					trifft sehr zu
	<input type="radio"/>					
Ich schreibe gern.	<input type="radio"/>					
Die Tatsache, dass meine englischen Texte an der Universität benotet werden, macht mich nervös.	<input type="radio"/>					
Mir macht das akademische Schreiben auf Deutsch Spaß.	<input type="radio"/>					
Mir macht das akademische Schreiben auf Deutsch Spaß, wenn es mir leichtfällt.	<input type="radio"/>					
Beim akademischen Schreiben auf Deutsch fühle ich mich unsicher.	<input type="radio"/>					
Mir macht das akademische Schreiben auf Englisch Spaß.	<input type="radio"/>					
Wenn ich das Thema mag, macht mir das akademische Schreiben auf Englisch Spaß.	<input type="radio"/>					
Beim akademischen Schreiben auf Englisch fühle ich mich unsicher.	<input type="radio"/>					
Die Tatsache, dass meine deutschen Texte an der Universität benotet werden, macht mich nervös.	<input type="radio"/>					
Mir macht das akademische Schreiben auf Englisch Spaß, wenn es mir leichtfällt.	<input type="radio"/>					
Wenn ich das Thema mag, macht mir das akademische Schreiben auf Deutsch Spaß.	<input type="radio"/>					

Schreiben lernen	trifft nicht zu					trifft sehr zu
	<input type="radio"/>					
Gutes Schreiben muss man schon in der Schule lernen, sonst lernt man es nie richtig.	<input type="radio"/>					
Meine deutsche Schreibkompetenz für Texte im Beruf (E-Mails, Protokolle, etc.) kann ich noch verbessern.	<input type="radio"/>					
Leute, die im Beruf gute Texte schreiben, haben eine besondere Veranlagung.	<input type="radio"/>					
Mit meiner englischen Schreibkompetenz komme ich an der Universität gut zurecht.	<input type="radio"/>					
Im Schreiben war ich schon in der Schule gut.	<input type="radio"/>					
Meine Texte auf Englisch werden so verstanden, wie ich es beabsichtige.	<input type="radio"/>					
Meine Kenntnisse für das Schreiben im Beruf kann ich eher verbessern als meine Kenntnisse im akademischen Schreiben.	<input type="radio"/>					



Schreiben lernen	trifft nicht zu	trifft sehr zu
Um gute akademische Texte schreiben zu können, muss man talentiert sein.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Um mein akademisches Schreiben auf Deutsch zu verbessern, müsste ich zu viel Zeit investieren.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wenn ich meine Schreibkompetenz verbessere, hilft mir das sowohl an der Universität als auch im Beruf.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meine englische Schreibkompetenz für Texte im Beruf (E-Mails, Protokolle, etc.) kann ich noch verbessern.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meine Texte auf Deutsch werden so verstanden, wie ich es beabsichtige.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mit meiner deutschen Schreibkompetenz komme ich an der Universität gut zurecht.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Um mein akademisches Schreiben auf Englisch zu verbessern, müsste ich zu viel Zeit investieren.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Schreiben und Lernen I	trifft nicht zu	trifft sehr zu
Ich benutze akademisches Schreiben zum Lernen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ich beschäftige mich lieber mit Fachinhalten als mit der Verbesserung meiner akademischen Schreibkompetenz.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ich verstehe Sachverhalte besser, wenn ich sie in einem längeren Text erklären muss.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
An Informationen aus meinen Hausarbeiten kann ich mich so gut erinnern wie an Informationen, die ich für eine Klausur gelernt habe.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Schreiben hilft mir dabei, meine Gedanken über einen Sachverhalt zu ordnen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Lernen hilft es mir, Sachverhalte schriftlich festzuhalten.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Zusammenhänge werden mir klar, wenn ich sie präzise aufschreibe.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fachinhalte sind mir genauso wichtig wie die Verbesserung meiner akademischen Schreibkompetenz.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Ich lerne besser durch andere Lerntechniken als durch Schreiben.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Das akademische Schreiben hilft mir beim Lernen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Was ich in einem akademischen Text erkläre, bleibt mir länger in Gedächtnis als Details aus einer Klausur.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Schreiben und Lernen II	trifft nicht zu	trifft sehr zu
Für mich ist der Zweck des akademischen Schreibens, den Dozierenden eine Grundlage für meine Benotung zu liefern.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim akademischen Schreiben kommt es nicht auf meine Meinung, sondern auf die Expertenmeinung an.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim akademischen Schreiben verwende ich Informationen aus Büchern und Artikeln für meine eigene Argumentation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim akademischen Schreiben muss man der Expertenmeinung kritisch gegenüberstehen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Es geht beim akademischen Schreiben darum, wieder-zugeben, was Spezialisten über ein Thema gesagt haben.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim akademischen Schreiben geht es mir in erster Linie darum, Klarheit über ein Thema zu gewinnen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Bitte kreuzen Sie hier an, auf welche Art des Schreibens die folgenden Aussagen Ihrer Meinung nach zutreffen. Hier gibt es keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten, es kommt uns auf Ihre persönliche Meinung an. Sie können pro Aussage auch mehrere Kreuze setzen.

	Akademisches Schreiben	Schreiben im Beruf	weder noch
Die Beschreibungen im Text müssen für die Empfänger nachvollziehbar sein.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man darf nur Ausdrücke verwenden, deren Bedeutung den Empfängern klar ist.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man muss sich die Reaktion der Empfänger vorstellen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man muss berücksichtigen, welche Informationen die Empfänger brauchen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Die Texte müssen einem klaren Ziel folgen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Die Texte müssen einen logischen Aufbau haben.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Die Texte müssen auch ohne Kontakt zum Autor verständlich sein.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man kann alles im Text unterbringen, was man zu einem Thema weiß.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Es ist nicht nur der Inhalt, sondern auch die Form wichtig.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Die Texte müssen sowohl sachlich richtig als auch gut zu lesen sein.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man muss sich klar und präzise ausdrücken.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Man muss auf mehrdeutige Formulierungen verzichten.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Kreuzen Sie im Folgenden die Option an, die auf Sie zutrifft. Hier gibt es keine richtigen oder falschen Antworten, es kommt uns auf Ihre persönliche Meinung an. Wenn Sie sich bei einer Aussage nicht entscheiden können, wählen Sie bitte die Option, die am besten auf Sie zutrifft.

Fremdsprachen an der Universität	trifft nicht zu	trifft sehr zu
Um einen englischen Text gut schreiben zu können, muss ich während des Schreibens die ganze Zeit auf Englisch überlegen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Um beim Schreiben auf Englisch in meiner Muttersprache zu überlegen, brauche ich die Fachbegriffe in der Muttersprache.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch auch andere Sprachen zu benutzen, kann meine Schreibprozesse erleichtern.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch nutze ich alle meine Sprachen zum Überlegen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Überlegen zwischen Englisch und meiner Muttersprache zu wechseln, strengt mich an.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meine Dozierenden wollen, dass wir zum Überlegen in den englischen Sitzungen nur Englisch benutzen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch die Muttersprache benutzen zu müssen, ist ein Zeichen von mangelnden Englischkenntnissen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Schreiben benutze ich zunächst mehrere Sprachen und vereinheitliche den Text später.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wenn man beim Schreiben auf Englisch auf die Muttersprache zurückgreift, lernt man das Schreiben auf Englisch nie richtig.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Meine Dozierenden wollen, dass wir zum Kommunizieren in den englischen Sitzungen nur Englisch benutzen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Wenn man beim Überlegen auf Englisch auf die Muttersprache zurückgreift, lernt man das Überlegen auf Englisch nie richtig.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Für Sachverhalte aus englischen Veranstaltungen kenne ich nur die englischen Fachbegriffe.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Um beim Überlegen für einen Text zwischen mehreren Sprachen wechseln zu können, muss man talentiert sein.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch kostet es mich Zeit, meine Ideen erst in meiner Muttersprache zu formulieren und sie dann zu übersetzen.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Antworten Sie hier weiterhin ehrlich und begründen Sie Ihre Meinung:

Halten Sie es für sinnvoll, dass an der Universität der Erwerb akademischer Schreibkompetenz von Ihnen erwartet wird? Inwiefern können Sie von der Schreibkompetenz, die Sie im Studium erwerben, auch außerhalb der Universität Gebrauch machen? Antworten Sie präzise.

Halten Sie es für sinnvoll, beim Schreiben in der Fremdsprache auch von anderen Sprachen, wie der Muttersprache, Gebrauch zu machen, z. B. zum Überlegen und Strukturieren? Antworten Sie präzise.

Im Kurs ‚Psycholinguistics‘ haben Sie im Laufe des Semesters Feedback auf mehrere Texte bekommen. Außerdem wurden Musterzusammenfassungen bereitgestellt (StudIP/E-Mail). Beurteilen Sie das Feedback und die Mustertexte. Welche Hinweise/Instruktionen haben Ihnen gefehlt? Welche Hinweise/Instruktionen fanden Sie nützlich? Antworten Sie präzise.

z. B. „Nützlich: Die Kommentare haben mir geholfen, mehrdeutige Formulierungen zu erkennen und zukünftig zu vermeiden. Sollte verbessert werden: Ich hätte mehr konkrete Formulierungsbeispiele gebraucht.“

Datenerhebungsformular zur Person

Haben Sie in der Schule bilingualen Unterricht besucht? Ja Nein

Falls ja, wie viele Jahre und in welchen Fächern?

Falls ja, in welchen Sprachen hat der Unterricht stattgefunden?

Sind Sie LinkshänderIn? Ja Nein

Haben Sie bereits einen Sprachtest für Englisch abgelegt (z. B. TOEFL, IELTS)? Ja Nein

Test: _____ Jahr: _____ Resultat (Punkte oder Niveau): _____

Schreiben Sie in Ihrer Freizeit (z. B. Tagebuch, Poesie, usw.)? Ja Nein

Falls ja: Listen Sie auf, welche Texte Sie schreiben, wie häufig Sie diese schreiben (Schätzung) und in welchen Sprachen,

z. B. „Tagebuch, ca. jeden zweiten Tag, Polnisch“.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Schreiben Sie im Beruf (z. B. Newsletter, Protokolle, usw.)? Ja Nein

Falls ja: Listen Sie auf, welche Texte Sie schreiben, wie häufig Sie diese schreiben (Schätzung) und in welchen Sprachen,

z. B. „Protokolle von Teamsitzungen, einmal pro Woche, Deutsch“.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____



Geben Sie schriftlich/mündlich Feedback auf Texte, die andere geschrieben haben? Ja O Nein O

Falls ja: Listen Sie auf, auf welche Texte Sie Feedback gegeben haben, wie häufig (Schätzung), in welcher Sprache die Texte waren und in welcher Sprache Sie Feedback gegeben haben, z. B. „Einige Kapitel der BA-Thesis meines Freundes (Ethik), 2 Mal, Text: Deutsch, Feedback: schriftlich Deutsch“.

1.

2.

3.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

7 Survey components

App-Table 1: Relevance of writing

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Ich strebe einen Beruf an, in dem ich viel schreiben werde, z. B. E-Mails, Infomaterial und Protokolle.	3.45	1.065	150
Das Schreiben im Beruf unterscheidet sich vom Schreiben an der Universität. (recoded)	2.12	0.851	150
Im Beruf werde ich ähnliche Texte wie im Studium schreiben.	2.25	0.861	150
Akademische Schreibkompetenz ist in meinem gewünschten Beruf ein Erfolgsfaktor.	3.15	1.089	150
Formulierungen aus akademischen Texten kann ich auch beim Schreiben im Beruf verwenden	3.42	1.057	150
Das Vokabular im akademischen Schreiben und das Vokabular im Schreiben im Beruf unterscheiden sich. (recoded)	2.59	1.075	150
Beim Schreiben im Beruf muss ich anderes Vokabular verwenden als beim Schreiben im Beruf. (recoded)	2.43	0.979	150
Wenn ich meine Schreibkompetenz verbessere, hilft mir das sowohl an der Uni als auch im Beruf.	4.23	0.868	150

App-Table 2: Self-efficacy FL

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Die Tatsache, dass meine englischen Texte an der Universität benötet werden, macht mich nervös. (recoded)	3.32	1.320	150
Beim akademischen Schreiben auf Englisch fühle ich mich unsicher. (recoded)	4.03	0.709	150
Um mein akademisches Schreiben auf Englisch zu verbessern, müsste ich zu viel Zeit investieren. (recoded)	3.93	0.885	150
Meine Texte auf Englisch werden so verstanden, wie ich es beabsichtige.	3.20	1.118	150
Mit meiner englischen Schreibkompetenz komme ich an der Universität gut zurecht.	3.23	1.171	150

App-Table 3 Self-efficacy L1

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Die Tatsache, dass meine deutschen Texte an der Universität benötet werden, macht mich nervös. (recoded)	3.45	1.265	150
Beim akademischen Schreiben auf Deutsch fühle ich mich unsicher. (recoded)	3.63	1.222	150
Um mein akademisches Schreiben auf Deutsch zu verbessern, müsste ich zu viel Zeit investieren. (recoded)	3.47	1.145	150
Meine Texte auf Deutsch werden so verstanden, wie ich es beabsichtige.	4.48	0.771	150
Mit meiner deutschen Schreibkompetenz komme ich an der Universität gut zurecht.	4.32	0.802	150



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

App-Table 4: Motivation for multilingual writing

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Um einen englischen Text gut schreiben zu können, muss ich während des Schreibens die ganze Zeit auf Englisch überlegen. (recoded)	3.04	1.291	150
Um beim Schreiben auf Englisch in meiner Muttersprache zu überlegen, brauche ich die Fachbegriffe in der Muttersprache. (recoded)	3.43	1.300	150
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch auch andere Sprachen zu benutzen, kann meine Schreibprozesse erleichtern.	3.25	1.203	150
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch nutze ich alle meine Sprachen zum Überlegen.	3.28	1.434	150
Beim Überlegen zwischen Englisch und meiner Muttersprache zu wechseln, strengt mich an. (recoded)	3.80	1.213	150
Meine Dozierenden wollen, dass wir zum Überlegen in den englischen Sitzungen nur Englisch benutzen. (recoded)	3.16	1.447	150
Beim Schreiben auf Englisch die Muttersprache benutzen zu müssen, ist ein Zeichen von mangelnden Englischkenntnissen. (recoded)	4.05	1.038	150
Beim Schreiben benutze ich zunächst mehrere Sprachen und vereinheitlichte den Text später.	1.55	0.934	150
Wenn man beim Schreiben auf Englisch auf die Muttersprache zurückgreift, lernt man das Schreiben auf Englisch nie richtig. (recoded)	3.92	1.013	150
Meine Dozierenden wollen, dass wir zum Kommunizieren in den englischen Sitzungen nur Englisch benutzen. (recoded)	1.50	0.814	150
Wenn man beim Überlegen auf Englisch auf die Muttersprache zurückgreift, lernt man das Überlegen auf Englisch nie richtig. (recoded)	3.87	1.137	150
Für Sachverhalte aus englischen Veranstaltungen kenne ich nur die englischen Fachbegriffe. (recoded)	2.88	1.109	150
Beim Schreiben auf Eng kostet es mich Zeit, meine Ideen erst in meiner Muttersprache zu formulieren und sie dann zu übersetzen. (recoded)	3.31	1.303	150

App-Table 5: Writing for learning

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Ich benutze das akademische Schreiben zum Lernen.	2.42	1.048	150
Ich beschäftige mich lieber mit Fachinhalten als mit der Verbesserung meiner Schreibkompetenz. (recoded)	2.38	0.992	150
Ich verstehe Sachverhalte besser, wenn ich sie in einem längeren Text erklären muss.	2.76	1.136	150
An Informationen aus meinen Hausarbeiten kann ich mich so gut erinnern wie an Informationen, die ich für eine Klausur gelernt habe.	2.98	1.225	150
Schreiben hilft mir dabei, meine Gedanken über einen Sachverhalt zu ordnen.	3.89	0.935	150
Beim Lernen hilft es mir, Sachverhalte schriftlich festzuhalten.	4.28	0.842	150
Zusammenhänge werden mir klar, wenn ich sie präzise aufschreibe.	4.06	0.954	150
Fachinhalte sind mir genauso wichtig wie die Verbesserung meiner akademischen Schreibkompetenz.	3.38	1.045	150
Ich lerne besser durch andere Lerntechniken als durch Schreiben.	3.34	1.155	150
Das akademische Schreiben hilft mir beim Lernen.	2.78	1.045	150
Was ich in einem akademischen Text erkläre, bleibt mir länger in Gedächtnis als Details aus einer Klausur.	3.41	1.250	150



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

8 Feedback example

The text below was composed by a student in the pre-semester writing session. The comments provided by the lecturer and the writing fellow were inserted directly into the word document, using the comment function. In the present example, the comments are displayed as numbered footnotes.

In¹ the text at hand written by Costa, Albert et al. in 2014, Costa, Albert et al. claim² that languages have a huge influence on decision making and dilemma situations³. This means that people being in a moral dilemma are used to⁴ decide differently when using a foreign language than they would when using one's native tongue. They⁵ form the hypothesis that the use of a foreign language is connected to being able to make utilitarian decisions in dilemma situations more easily and rational⁶ than when using a native language.

Here, Costa differentiates between two types of processes⁷ while making judgements⁸. On the one hand there exist⁹ the „automatic“¹⁰ and emotinal¹¹ driven decision in which one's own personal rights¹² are put into focus. On the other hand, rational and in a way more canopied¹³ decision making is putting the overall good in the center of the focus¹⁴. Here, evidence¹⁵ shows that the mentioned process of utilitarian¹⁶ processes¹⁷ being facilitated by rational decision making are part of the canopied judgement making and thus rely on cognitive resources. In addition, the increasing of cognitive resources is often supported by using a foreign language. Thus, one could guess that the use of a foreign language in a decision making process while being in a dilemma situation might decrease utilitarian decision making¹⁸.

However, Costa, Albert et al. claim that the use of a foreign language in such a situation has the oposite effect of raising utilitarian choice-making¹⁹. This is because the use of a foreign language normally is considered as being less emotionally affected than when using²⁰ one's native language. This, in the end leads to being able to have more control over making decisions in a certain situation and thus might increase utilitarian choice.

For analysing²¹ the given hypothesis, Costa, Albert et al. prepared an experiment in which they investigated utilitarian choices²² using the footbridge dilemma situation. The question is whether people would kill one person in order to save the life of five others. For doing so, participants from different countries²³ (US, Korea, France, Israel) were asked to answer how they would decide in such a situation. While investogating, results²⁴ show that the majority²⁵ when using a none native language tend to utilitarion decision making. Espacially in Israel, 75 % of the interviewed participants answered



with yes when using their acquired foreign language. In comparison, when using their native language more people tend to decide for not killing one person in order to save the life of five others.

To conclude, the experiment proves that the use of a foreign language supports utilitarian decision making more than when using one's native tongue. The investigation shows that utilitarian choices are made twice as much²⁶ when using a foreign language. For this reason, the hypothesis²⁷ made by Costa, Albert et al. is being proved. People do tend to make more utilitarian choices when not using one's first language because the foreign language seems to be less emotionally affected than the mother tongue and thus let²⁸ people rather make utilitarian decisions.

¹ LECTURER

Dear student,

You have included many of the details that were needed to properly explain the study. The macro-structure of your text is logical, well done!

Here is what you would need to train for the future:

Some of your formulations are hard to understand for your readers. Vergewissern Sie sich nochmals ganz genau, für wen Sie schreiben. Da muss man präziser formulieren als man das z. B. für sich selbst machen würde. Überprüfen Sie jeden Satz nochmal und fragen Sie sich: versteht das jemand außer mir? Man selbst denkt immer (das ist auch oft bei uns Dozenten so): Ja, ist doch ganz klar, was ich hier meine. Man muss da gedanklich noch einen Zwischenschritt einlegen und sich den Leser vorstellen.

Also, please differentiate more carefully between details that we need and details that are superfluous. Remember: a summary is not a report. You are not supposed to retell every single detail. When you select details, you focus on the broad rationale of the study. Anything that is just a special case or interesting side note that does not really affect the hypothesis, the design or the conclusions to be drawn? Skip that.

Your grade: 10

² FELLOW

CONVENTION

Providing information about the source you are using is very good and important! However, the way we refer to sources in academic writing differs from the typical style which we are so used to from school. For example, you would rather use a formulation like: Costa et al. (2014)... Furthermore, we do not mention the text itself in our summary, but only include content information.

³ LECTURER

SENSE

What do you mean here? You should choose formulations that are precise and specific.

⁴ FELLOW

CONTENT

What do you mean here?

⁵ FELLOW

GRAMMAR

Please check the pronoun reference again. At the moment, "they" refers to "people being in a moral dilemma".

⁶ FELLOW

CONTENT

What exactly did you want to say here? Utilitarian decisions result out of rational decision-making processes, so you cannot say that foreign language use enables people to make utilitarian decisions more rationally. Only that decisions made in a foreign language are assumed to happen more rationally than in a native language, which leads to utilitarian judgments, but you mention this point later in your text)

⁷ FELLOW

CONVENTION



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Take a closer look at the original text to indicate the correct source of this information; it is not Costa et al. (2014) to whom you can attribute this concept.

⁸ FELLOW

GRAMMAR

Please try to rephrase. At the moment, “while making judgements” refers back to Costa. It sounds as if you were saying that he does two things at the same time: differentiating while making judgements.

⁹ FELLOW

GRAMMAR

Please consider the subject-verb-agreement again. (Either you choose exist& decisions, or exists& decision.)

¹⁰ FELLOW

CONVENTION

In English, both quotation marks appear at the top of the word. Added to that, their use already implies that you have to cite a source.

¹¹ FELLOW

GRAMMAR

You need the adverb here.

¹² FELLOW

CONTENT

This is not completely true. It does not matter whether your OWN rights are concerned in a certain situation, but the rights of individuals in general. → The rights do not have to be only yours, but you also look at those of other people involved in a situation, too.

¹³ FELLOW

LEXIS

Please check the meaning of this word again. It is not equivalent to the “überdacht/bedacht” that you probably intended to say.

¹⁴ FELLOW

LEXIS

Semantically, you are repeating yourself with “center” and “focus”.

¹⁵ FELLOW

CONVENTION

Please indicate the source you are referring to.

¹⁶ FELLOW

CONTENT

As you are writing for someone who has not read the original text, you need to explain important terms. The meaning of “utilitarian judgment” does not become completely clear, because it is unclear to which process you are referring.

¹⁷ LECTURER

SENSE

Utilitarian processes? What do you mean?

¹⁸ LECTURER

CONTENT

Man versteht hier nicht so ganz, worauf Sie hinauswollen, aber ich kann mir denken, dass Sie die Hypothese beschreiben wollen, die im Text zuerst genannt wird. Aber: das ist nicht die Hypothese, die Costa et al. (2014) letztendlich vertreten. Deshalb: einfach löschen. Sie sollen die Studien, die Sie lesen, ja nicht im Detail nacherzählen. Das ist nur eine Zusammenfassung. Was wollten die rausfinden? Auf welcher Grundlage? Wie? Was haben sie beobachtet? Was für Schlüsse ziehen sie? Die Diskussion von Besonderheiten und Nebenschauplätzen gehört da nicht in die Zusammenfassung.

¹⁹ FELLOW

LEXIS

“The opposite effect of raising utilitarian choice-making” would be decreasing utilitarian choices. This is not what you wanted to say, so you need to slightly adjust your formulation here.

²⁰ FELLOW

GRAMMAR

Great that you pay attention to using complete comparative constructions! But in this case, you need to correct the formulation. “The use of ... is ... than THE USE OF ...” .

Additionally, please indicate where you take this information from.

²¹ LECTURER

STRUCTURE



Ja, gut! Es ist sinnvoll, hier einen neuen Paragraphen anzufangen, denn Sie gehen von der Hypothese zur Versuchsbeschreibung über, gut!

²² FELLOW

CONTENT

You could be a little bit more precise. They did not investigate utilitarian choices in general, but how often this type of choice occurs in foreign language use vs. in native language use.

²³ LECTURER

CONVENTION

In academic AND in scientific writing, we often judge the relevance and reliability of results by the size of the group they were obtained with. Nochmal: sowohl im wissenschaftlichen als auch im akademischen Schreiben nutzen wir die Anzahl von Probanden in einer Studie, um zu beurteilen, ob die Studie auch was taugt. Also, wenn mir jemand RT Messungen mit 5 Leuten vorlegt, dann denke ich: ja, schön für dich, aber wie lässt sich das generalisieren. Daten von 300 Probanden, das klingt schon besser. Deshalb müssen Sie auch in den Zusammenfassungen immer die Nummer der Teilnehmer angeben.

²⁴ LECTURER

GRAMMAR

What you have said here is that the results are doing the investigation.

²⁵ LECTURER

CONTENT

This is not true. You would have to rewrite the entire section about the observations. Please describe what was actually observed and leave out the discussion of particular populations.

²⁶ FELLOW

CONTENT

This is not correct, please take a closer look at the original text. (→“we find that the rate of utilitarian decisions in a foreign language was **increased by more than half** compared to the native tongue (from **20% to 33%**)”)

²⁷ LECTURER

CONVENTION

Sehr gut! Machen Sie das immer genau so! Wenn Sie Studien für Ihre Hausarbeiten oder Thesis zusammenfassen, dann kommt am Schluss immer die Conclusion. Darin nehmen Sie dann direkt Bezug auf die eingangs formulierte Hypothese. Very good!

²⁸ FELLOW

GRAMMAR

Please check the subject-verb-agreement.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

9 Source texts: Reading ease measurements

App-Table 6: Reading ease for Pre/Post source texts

Indicator	Costa et al. (2014)	Lemhöfer et al. (2004)
Coleman Liau index:	13.21	11.79
Flesch Kincaid Grade level:	13.23	10.46
ARI (Automated Readability Index):	13.52	10.27
SMOG:	14.55	12.57

10 Source texts: Students' perceptions

After the second writing session at the end of the semester, students were asked to write two short reflective texts, detailing their impression of the texts that they had worked with and their impression of the experimental design that asked them to verbalize their thoughts out loud. 54 of the 56 students in the two courses completed the questionnaire concerned with (a) the comparison between the source texts used at the beginning of the semester and at the end of the semester, and (b) their experience of having to think out loud while completing the writing tasks. This questionnaire was given to the participants to fill out immediately after the second writing session.

App-Table 7: Students' response to source texts

Indicator	equal	Pre-session text	Post-session text	n.a.
Relevance	35% (19)	0% (0)	9% (5)	56% (31)
Comprehensibility	20% (11)	11% (6)	62% (34)	7% (4)
Perceived length	18% (10)	18% (10)	5% (3)	58% (32)
Summarizability	11% (6)	2% (1)	5% (4)	82% (45)



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

11 Model summaries for pre-semester writing assignment

List of relevant details based on: Costa, Albert et al. (2014). "Your Morals Depend on Language." *PLoS ONE* 9(4): e94842. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0094842PDF.

Costa et al. (2014)
BASIS and HYPOTHESIS
Human moral decision-making relies on two kinds of processes: deliberate/rational and intuitive/emotional.
Deliberate processes tend to result in choices that place the greater good over the rights of individuals.
OR
Emotionally driven processes tend to protect the individual, regardless of the greater good.
Emotional responses tend to be attenuated in response to material in a foreign language as opposed to in a native language.
Hypothesis: Participants should be more likely in the foreign language condition than in the native language condition to opt for the choice that places the greater good over the protection of an individual.
DESIGN
Participants n=317
Imaginary moral dilemma
Either NL or FL presentation
Option 01: let a group be harmed
Option 02: sacrifice an individual to protect the group
OBSERVATIONS
Significant difference between native and foreign language presentation
Percentage of people who would harm the individual in favor of the group higher in FL condition than in NL condition
CONCLUSIONS
The foreign language may have attenuated the participants' emotional response.
The reduced emotional response have permitted a higher percentage of participants to favor the group over the individual.

Model summary 01 based on: Costa, Albert et al. (2014). "Your Morals Depend on Language." *PLoS ONE* 9(4): e94842. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0094842PDF.

In a study on the influence of foreign language use on decision making, Costa et al. (2014) investigated whether the decision people made would differ depending on whether the description of the options was given to them in their native or in a foreign language.

Costa et al. (2014) draw on Haidt (2007) to base their experiment on models presented in moral psychology, according to which two types of mental processes are involved in moral decision making: one type is characterized by rationality and control. The other type is characterized by intuition and emotionality. Costa et al. cite previous studies, such as Paxton et al. (2011) where it had been shown that people, when processing a choice rationally and deliberately, tend to regard the benefit for a group as more important than the rights of individuals. Foreign language use appears to influence whether people will react rationally or emotionally: it has been reported that emotional reactions are less intense in response to foreign language material than to native language material (Harris 2004, cited in Costa et al. 2014). Consequently, Costa et al. (2014) assumed that people would be more likely to favor the protection of a group over the protection of an individual when faced with the choice in a foreign and not in their native language.

Costa et al. (2014) recruited four groups of participants. Group 1 (n = 112) consisted of English native speakers with Spanish as a foreign language. In group 2 (n = 80), people were native speakers of Korean with English as a foreign language. Group 3 (n = 107) consisted of English native speakers



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

with French as a foreign language. In group 4 ($n = 18$), people were native speakers of either English or Spanish with Hebrew as a foreign language. Participants were presented with the experimental material either in the foreign or in their native language: the participants read the description of an imaginary scene in which the participants would be able to save a group of five people from being killed by an oncoming train. In order to save the five people, participants would have to push a single individual in front of the train.

Costa et al. (2014) reported that a significantly higher percentage of the people who had been given the description in a foreign language than of the people who had been given the description in their native language were willing to push the man in front of the train. Costa et al. (2014) concluded that their hypothesis had been supported since the description in the foreign language may have lead people to react less emotionally to the moral choice and, consequently, to agree to killing one individual in order to protect five people. (words: 444)

Model summary 02 based on: Costa, Albert et al. (2014).

Costa et al. (2014) investigated whether the language in which people read about a moral problem influences people's response to that problem. In previous publications, it had been proposed that human beings, when making moral choices, rely on two types of mental processes, with one type being emotional and intuitive and the other controlled and rational (Haidt 2007, cited in Costa et al. 2014). Depending on which type of processes happens to dominate a given decision-making process, people tend to make different choices. For instance, when people have to weigh an individual's rights against what would be beneficial for a group, they tend to decide in favor of the group when they base their choice on a rational analysis of the options instead of on their emotional response to the options (Paxton et al. 2011, cited in Costa et al. 2014). Also, Costa et al. use Harris (2004) where it had been reported that phrases in a foreign language tend to cause less intense emotional reactions in people than phrases in people's native language. Based on these premises, Costa et al. (2014) hypothesized that people would be more likely to favor the wellbeing of a group over that of an individual when presented with the choice in a foreign as opposed to in their native language.

Costa et al. (2014) asked 317 participants (mean age: 21; mean age when starting to learn the foreign language in question: 14) to imagine that they were standing on a bridge over a train track, seeing how a train was coming towards five people. Participants had to imagine that they might let the train kill the group of people or, in order to save them, push a man off the bridge onto the tracks. Half of the participants were presented with the description of the scene in their native language, the other half in a foreign language.

It was observed that the language in which the participants received the moral problem played a role: in the foreign language condition, a significantly higher percentage of the participants than in the native language condition were willing to push the man off the bridge in order to save the group.

Costa et al. (2014) concluded that their initial hypothesis had been supported since the description of the moral dilemma in the participants' foreign language might have attenuated the participants' emotional response to the dilemma, allowing more of them than in the native language condition to protect a group even if they would have to harm an individual. (words: 406)



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Model summary 03 based on: Costa, Albert et al. (2014).

Costa et al. (2014) investigated whether presenting people with a moral choice described in a foreign as opposed to in their native language would influence people's decision. The authors based their investigation on three tenets: Firstly, it had been proposed that human beings, when making moral choices, rely on two types of mental processes, with one type being intuitive and emotional and the other controlled and rational (Haidt 2007, cited in Costa et al. 2014). Secondly, it had been observed that speakers tend to react less emotionally in response to phrases in a foreign language than to phrases in their native language (Harris 2004, cited in Costa et al. 2014). Finally, studies had reported that decision-making processes in which people have to weigh an individual's rights against what would be beneficial for a group tend to result in favor of the group when people base their choice on their controlled and not on their intuitive response to the options (Paxton et al. 2011, cited in Costa et al. 2014). Consequently, Costa et al. (2014) expected that people would be more likely to sacrifice an individual in favor of a group when presented with the choice in a foreign language than when presented with the choice in their native language.

Costa et al. (2014) presented participants ($n = 317$) with an imaginary moral dilemma in either the participants' native language or in a foreign language. The participants had to decide whether they would let harm come to a group of people or harm an individual, in which case the group would remain unharmed.

A significant difference was observed between the foreign language condition and the native language condition: the percentage of people who would harm the individual in order to protect the group was significantly higher in the foreign language condition than in the native language condition.

Costa et al. (2014) concluded that their hypothesis had been supported: being presented with the choice in a foreign language may have attenuated the participants' emotional response to the options and this may have permitted more of them than in the native language group to sacrifice an individual in order to keep a larger group of people safe. (words: 349)

Insufficient summary based on: Costa, Albert et al. (2014).

People separate moral judgement in right or wrong and resulting deep thoughtful principles, which should be irrelevant for the moral dilemma. The evidence of this all shows us that using our foreign and native language influences on our judgements and get different, when people starting facing on a moral dilemma. We are distinguishing the moral judgment in two forces: the intuitive process, which is promoted by the emotional content and of a dilemma that is given and the rational force, which is controlled by the evaluation of the potential outcomes. The moral judgment is also distinguished. First there is the deontological judgment- this means this process supports the judgment favoring the essential right of a person. The utilitarian judgment means that is supporting the greater good. In today's study explores how these two processes impact on the foreign language. Experts are expecting that the use of the foreign language reduces on the utilitarian judgment on a moral dilemma. Also it says that cognitive load and anxiety of using the foreign language also influences on the utilitarian choice. All in all we can say that the use of the foreign language elicits less emotional on the less emotional rather if we would use the native language. Also we can say that utilitarian language is more common in the foreign language if are facing to a moral dilemma than in the native language. The text includes an experiment, which is called the footbridge version. That means that we are standing on a bridge and a small train is about to kill five people, except we are pushing a heavy man



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

in front of the train to save the five people. Method: there are 4 groups of participants which speaks a native and a foreign language. All participants are late learners of the foreing language and don't speak the language at home. How they did it was the participants have to face a moral dilemma, which means they are reading a packet of scenarios and have to indicate their decion. After that they have to answer several questions on demographic and language background. Result: The result show us that more participants were choosing the utilitarian choice and rather would save 5 people by killing one. The difference between the foreign and native language was by 7.5%. In conclusion the experiment supports the idea of the experts that the emotional resonance of a foreing language is less affected on the emotional aversion and this allows more utilitarian choices and decisions.

Average summary 01 based on: Costa, Albert et al. (2014).

The text begins with the authors (Costa, Albert et al.) exposing their theory about decision making in the case of moral dilemmas. Based on models of moral psychology, they distinguish two possible processes: one intuitive – which they refer to as “deontological judgments” – and the other more rational – “utilitarian judgments”. Using those two models, they then form their actual hypothesis, which is that the use of a foreign language could influence the choice of a person during a moral dilemma, and more precisely, that it would make them take a more “utilitarian” option.

As evidence to this claim, the authors quote previous researches where it was shown that the use of a foreign language reduces emotional response compared to the use of the native language. Therefore, this reduction would lead to a more reasoned thinking, and so, lead to more utilitarian judgments.

In order to test this hypothesis, the authors decided to use the “footbridge” version of the trolley dilemma on participants who were late learners of a foreign language – all of them having the same average language proficiency, as tested in a comprehension test given to them. The participants were people who spoke English as a native language, and Spanish as a foreign language (N= 112) in the US, Korean who spoke English (N = 80) in Korea, English who spoke French (N =107) in France, and Spanish or English who spoke Hebrew (N = 18) in Israel. The experiment consisted in them taking a decision in this dilemma, and answering questions on demographic and language background; this was randomly assigned in their native language (N=158) or the foreign one (N=159).

What was observed was that the results were unanimous, in that the utilitarian choice was chosen the most when the participant was assigned the test in a foreign language; more precisely, the percentage of participants choosing the utilitarian choice in the foreign language compared to their native one, was increaed by more than a half. However, the authors also noticed the variety in the results – the theories they have about this are, amongst others, cultural, and they recognize that the results just taken as such are not entirely reliable.

Based on those observations – being, after re-evaluation, 21% in native language to 31% in foreign language – the authors observe that, since the utilitarian response was chosen more frequently in the foreign language, the emotional response must have decreased when making the decision in this trolley dilemma.

Therefore, their expectations have been met, as they have proved that the use of the foreign language in moral dilemmas leads people to have a more utilitarian judgment than in their native language.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

12 Rater table for pre-semester writing assignment

App-Table 8: Rating example

	factor	grade									
		Excellent range			Good range			Average range			Sufficient range
Overall: Overall, the text fulfill the content requirements and the structural requirements specified in the task description. Overall, the text is equal in terms of content and structural coherence to the model texts provided for excellent products. Overall, the text is geared towards the target audience specified in the task description.	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+
All relevant pieces of information as asked for in the task description and exemplified in the model texts are included. The details are factually correct. The text is self-contained, no other sources or additional reading are necessary to understand the content. The text contains explanations of terms that might not be known to the target audience specified in the task description.	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+
The text does not contain irrelevant details. The text does not contain redundancies.	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	-
Structure: macro: micro: structure: culture: lexis:	The structure is logical and follows the conventional outline of academic texts. The argumentative structure is apparent in the formatting.	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+
Content: Focus: Context:	The sentences have a logical order. The sentences are connected in a logical manner. Connectors are used appropriately.	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	-
Style: Sarcasm:	English for Academic Purposes The text contains vocabulary that is characteristic for English in academic contexts.	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	-
Linguistic Sources	The text does not contain colloquial formulations. Example: *The initial hypothesis was supported, instead of *This proved that they were right. The text does not contain stylistically awkward formulations. Example: *The participants participated in a study.	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+
Linguistic Corrections	The text does not contain vague, ambiguous formulations. Example: In response to cognates, the participants committed significantly fewer mistakes than in response to control words. Instead of *The participants had fewer problems.	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	-
Linguistic Punctuation and spelling Choice of EITHER American OR British English	The sources have been indicated as exemplified in the green model texts. The text does not contain plagiarized passages.	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	++ + +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	+++ ++ +	X



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

13 Model summaries for post-semester writing assignment

List of relevant ideas for Lemhöfer, K., Dijkstra, T., & Michel, M. (2004). "Three languages, one ECHO: Cognate effects in trilingual word recognition." *Language and cognitive processes* 19.5: 585-611. PDF.

Lemhöfer et al. (2004)
BASIS and HYPOTHESIS
Bilingual cognate effect with trilinguals already observed
Definition of cognates as lexemes that share form and meaning across two or more languages (but the name does not have to be used)
Hypothesis I: Standard cognate effect
Hypothesis II: Cumulative cognate effect
DESIGN
Participants n=28
Unbalanced
Lexical decision task in L3 German
DGE, DG, or purely German controls
task description in German as well
OBSERVATIONS
Triple cognates faster and more accurate than double cognates
Cognate effect for double cognates for speed but not accuracy
CONCLUSIONS
First hypothesis partly supported
Second hypothesis supported

Model summary 01 based on Lemhöfer, K., Dijkstra, T., & Michel, M. (2004). "Three languages, one ECHO: Cognate effects in trilingual word recognition." *Language and cognitive processes* 19.5: 585-611. PDF.

Lemhöfer et al. (2004) investigated whether, when trilinguals process language, knowledge from all their three languages is accessed in communicative situations which require the use of one language only. Studies with bilingual speakers had already demonstrated that both of the speakers' languages are active during monolingual language processing (Dijkstra et al. 1999, cited in Lemhöfer et al. 2004). In another study, Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) had observed that, in a native language task, trilingual participants reacted significantly faster to words that have the same meaning and the same or a very similar form in the participants' L1 and L2, than to words which exist only in the participants' L1. The same pattern was observed for words that have the same meaning and the same or a very similar form in the participants' L1 and L3 (Van Hell/Dijkstra 2002). Based on these findings, Lemhöfer et al. (2004) hypothesized that trilinguals, in an L3 task, would react faster and more accurately to words with the same meaning and the same or a very similar form in the participants' L1 and L3 compared to exclusively L3 words. In contrast to Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002), who presented their trilingual participants with stimuli sharing meaning and form in only two of their three languages, Lemhöfer et al. (2004) also included words that shared meaning and form in all of the participants' three languages. It was expected that the participants' reactions to these words would be even faster and more accurate than to words present in only two of the participants' three languages.

The participants in Lemhöfer et al. (2004) ($n = 28$) were native speakers of Dutch who rated their proficiency in their L2 English and their L3 German as lower than in their native language. The stimuli



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

set comprised non-words, exclusively German words, words sharing meaning and form in Dutch and German, and words sharing meaning and form in Dutch, German, and English. Participants were asked to indicate as quickly and accurately as possible whether the letter strings presented to them were real German words or not. The task description was provided in German only.

It was observed that the participants reacted significantly faster to words that shared meaning and form in German and Dutch than to exclusively German words. Importantly, significantly lower reaction times in response to Dutch/English/German words than to Dutch/German words were observed. While participants exhibited the same degree of accuracy for Dutch/German words as for exclusively German words, they responded significantly more accurately to Dutch/German/English words than to Dutch/German words. These observations support both hypotheses that were put forward by Lemhöfer et al. (2004). Thus, it was concluded that both, knowledge from the native language and also knowledge from an additional foreign language, influence language processing cumulatively when trilinguals process monolingual foreign language tasks. (words: 458)

Model summary 02 based on Lemhöfer, K., Dijkstra, T., & Michel, M. (2004).

In a study with trilingual speakers, Lemhöfer et al. (2004) tested whether knowledge of three languages is activated during language processing even in monolingual foreign language tasks. Previously, Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002), for instance, had already observed a standard cognate effect in their trilingual participants' reactions. This means that the participants reacted significantly faster in response to cognates, i.e., words that have the same meaning and the same or a very similar form in two or more languages, than to exclusively L1 words. The participants in Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) showed this processing advantage in response to cognates in their L1 and L2 and to cognates in their L1 and L3. Based on these findings, Lemhöfer et al. (2004) developed an experimental design in which trilingual participants were presented with cognates in their L1 and L3, cognates in their L1, L2, and L3, and with exclusively monolingual L3 words. Lemhöfer et al. (2004) expected a standard cognate effect in their participants' responses to the L1/L3 cognates, similar to what had been observed in Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002). In addition, Lemhöfer et al. (2004) expected even faster and more accurate responses to words that are cognates in all three of the participants' languages than to cognates in only two of the participants' languages, provided that knowledge from all three languages is activated non-selectively when trilinguals process language.

Twenty-eight participants who were less proficient in their L2 English and L3 German than in their L1 Dutch were asked to carry out a lexical decision task in their L3 German: participants had to indicate as quickly and accurately as possible whether the letter strings presented to them were actual German words. The stimuli comprised Dutch/German cognates, Dutch/German/English cognates, purely German words as control words and non-words based on existing German words. The task description was exclusively German.

The standard cognate effect in response to Dutch/German cognates was not observed for accuracy, but it was observed for reaction time. This means that participants reacted significantly faster to Dutch/German cognates than to German control words. Notably, a cumulative cognate effect was observed for L1/L2/L3 cognates in comparison to L1/L3 cognates: participants reacted significantly faster and more accurately to the former than to the latter. These findings support both hypotheses put forward by Lemhöfer et al. (2004). Consequently, the authors concluded that knowledge from all three languages



becomes available when trilingual speakers process language, even in situations in which speakers have to react to only their L3 and not their L1 or L2. (words: 413)

Average summary based on Lemhöfer, K., Dijkstra, T., & Michel, M. (2004).

For a long time a lot of studies debates about bilinguals, which only activating only their relevant language or do they activate both languages at the same time during language recognition. The research on this phenomena demonstrate a considerable amount of interaction of the languages bilinguals know and speak. Most researcher think that lexical access of bilinguals is non-selective with respect to other the languages. In short- the bilinguals always activate their second language even in situations when they only occur in one language. So the question is how much languages it extend and if polyglot, who speaks three, four, five languages also always activate all languages without a breakdown of the language system? Dijkstra's study show us that trilinguals co- activate all languages in a monolingualistic task and make use of cognates. Bilingual studies also show us that there is a difference between using cognates and control words and these studies demonstrate us that the lexical decision on cognates were faster and accurately than in those on control words.

In this study they will use more directly tests on a language non- selective view, by using both standart cognates, which existing in two languages and some cognates, which exist in three langauges at the same time. In this experiment 28 Dutch-English-German participants participate with their mother tongue Dutch, second language German and third language English. The participants were all between 18 and 46 years old and most of the were students of the German department in Utrecht. All participants were right-handed. In this experiment the participant had the task called lexical decision task in their weaker language. The Dutch-German-English trilinguals carried out the lexical decision task in German and they had to decide quickly and possible if it is a German word or not. The words poped up at the screen of the computer. The stimulus of this task consisted of 192 items and half of them were actually German words.

This task contained three critical groups of words, which were compared with respect to the latencies and accuracy of their recognition. In the first group the German control words were different from the Dutch and English translation. In the second group the Dutch-German cognates were not cognates to English and in the third group there were overlapped cognates in orthography and meaning in all three languages.

It turns out that the cognates of the Dutch-English-German were recognized faster than the Dutch-German cognates and also there are significantly more errors on the Dutch-German cognates than in the Dutch-German-English cognates. The significance between the difference of the Dutch-German cognates and German control was not reached.

Average summary based on Lemhöfer, K., Dijkstra, T., & Michel, M. (2004).

The 2004 study by Lemhöfer et al. entitled "Three languages, one ECHO: Cognate effects in trilingual word recognition." aimed to build on prior research on the theory of non-selective lexical access in bilinguals. Preceeding studies suggest that multilinguals draw on all of their linguistic knowledge, regardless of language, even in monolingual contexts. This has been tested for bilinguals, but Lemhöfer et al. (2004) wanted to investigate whether this also held true for trilinguals. The researchers hypothesized



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

that even speakers of three languages activate their entire lexicon when performing tasks in a single language.

To test this, the researchers employed the use of cognates. Cognates are words that are semantically and orthographically similar over two or more languages. Previous studies used cognates of two languages in lexical decision tasks, in which the participants must determine whether a letter-string is a lexeme or not. In this study, the researchers used cognates of three languages to investigate whether trilingualism impacts lexical decision making the same way bilingualism does.

28 unbalanced trilinguals participated in this study. This means their native language was Dutch, with English and German as second and third languages, but had differing levels of proficiency in each language. All participants were students of German at the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands. The study was conducted in German, which was the third language of the participants.

The researchers compiled 192 letter strings, half (96) of which were German nouns, and the other half were non-words that had been created by changing one or more letters from an existing German lexeme. Of the German nouns, 24 were cognates with only their Dutch translations, and another 24 were cognates with both their English and Dutch translations. The remaining 48 German nouns were control words, unrelated to the other two languages spoken by the participants. The participants were sat in front of a computer, and given instructions in German. This ensured that the experiment remained monolingual. Letter-strings appeared on the screen, and the participants were required to indicate if the letters formed a German word.

As expected, the participants were quicker at recognizing lexemes that were cognates to their Dutch and English translation than they were at recognizing lexemes that were only cognates to Dutch. The significance of these results was confirmed with a P-value less than 0.05 (minimum threshold for significance). The participants responded particularly quickly to cognates of Dutch and German, as the P-value of 0.01 shows a great significance. The error rate was higher in the Dutch/German cognates than in the Dutch/German/English cognates. However, the difference in the error rates between the Dutch/German cognates and the German control words was not significant.

These results show that non-selective lexical access also extends to trilinguals. The cognate status of the lexeme of three languages increased the reaction time, and decreased the error rate from that of cognates in two languages. This demonstrates that multilinguals don't just draw on their mother tongue when recognizing lexemes in monolingual contexts, but also on their second language.



14 Feedback summary for raters after final training round

Dear raters, Thank you very much for completing the training for the rating! Every rater has completed two rounds of training and has received individual feedback on their assessments. What follows is a summary of all the explanations and clarifications that I have offered. Please read the summary carefully and use it when you do the actual ratings.

For both, B and K, we need to keep in mind:

- a. It is extremely important that you verify the document name carefully and that the document name you copy into the assessment rubric matches the name of the document you are assessing.
- b. The texts were produced by students in post-secondary education, NOT by pupils in secondary education. Our assessments need to be stricter for students than they would have to be for pupils.
- c. The intended readership are students from the same cohort. These students are familiar with general EAP, but they are not familiar with specialized terminology in the field of Psycholinguistics.
- d. None of the documents sent to you for rating contain any titles or headings. The documents contain only the complete texts, as submitted by the participants.

For the parameter *completeness*, we need to keep in mind:

- a. When assessing the parameter 'completeness', we need to check whether the details mentioned in the text are **correct**. For instance, participants are NOT allowed to say that the utilitarian option in B was chosen more often in the foreign-language condition. This formulation is misleading. With one exception (that is: except in one group), more participants chose the deontological option, irrespective of language condition. However, in the foreign-language condition, the margin between deontological and utilitarian was smaller. For K, for example, we need to check whether participants truly state that for both, accuracy and reaction time, a triple-effect was observed.
- b. Whenever participants offer definitions of key terms, such as *deontological* or *cognate*, it needs to be clear that they are actually defining the term. It is not enough for a definition to appear somewhere in the text, without indications to the reader that the definition belongs to the term in question.

For the parameter *focus*, we need to keep in mind:

- a. Irrelevant details may be especially misleading for a readership like the students specified in the task description. As you have seen in the model summaries, there is not only one correct way of differentiating between relevant and irrelevant pieces of information. However, the model summaries exemplify the range that is acceptable.

For the parameter *macrostructure*, we need to keep in mind:

- a. In terms of paragraph structure, it is actually NOT good if the participants create a separate paragraph for each element, especially not good if the resulting paragraphs comprise only one sentence, spanning only one or two lines. That is, in a way, comprehensible, but it is unconventional. We would rate this as average.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

b. Students were allowed to use aligned margins or left-justified. No other options were allowed and it was also NOT allowed to mix the two permissible options.

For the parameter *microstructure*, we need to keep in mind:

a. The main question here is not only whether connectors are used at all, but whether the connectors are used according to the function that they can actually fulfil.

For the parameter *sources*, we need to keep in mind:

a. When participants indicate the main source only once, then this is to be rated as 'sufficient, +', but **only** if the source is indicated in a conventionally academic format. Important: it is NOT okay, i.e. it is to be rated as 'insufficient', when participants list other sources in undifferentiated parentheses. Also, students may not just put other sources relevant for the text in parentheses as if the students had actually read these sources. From the recorded processes, we can tell that they have not and, in any case, that would be plagiarism. What they ARE allowed to do is use formulations like "Costa et al. (2014) use findings from XXXX (year) to argue that..." I have updated the model texts accordingly. For K, we know that the participants have actually read Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002). Here, students are allowed to refer to this study in their summary of Lemhöfer et al. (2004) without using hedges such as "Lemhöfer et al. (2004) use findings from Van Hell/Dijkstra (2002) to argue that..."

Below, you will find the Master ratings for all training texts, updated in response to the conversations that I have had with you. You will also find the updated model texts below. Thank you again so much for your time!

15 Guide for the transcription of the think-aloud protocols

TRANSKRIBIERT werden Äußerungen der Probanden sowie nonverbale Tätigkeiten (z. B. Seufzen, Lachen, Gähnen, Trinken). Prosodie wird in unserem Fall nicht berücksichtigt.

VOR JEDER Transkriptionssitzung muss eine Sicherungskopie erstellt werden, damit der Arbeitsstand gesichert wird, selbst wenn beim Transkribieren etwas schiefgeht. Klicken Sie im oberen Menü links auf Projekt → Kopie des Projektes speichern unter... In MAXQDA ist ein Systemort voreingestellt. Wir lassen diesen Systemort, denn dadurch werden auf den Rechnern lokale Kopien erzeugt. Falls es also dazu kommt, dass eine der Festplatten eine Fehlfunktion haben sollte, dann liegen die Sicherungen auf einem Gerät, das davon nicht betroffen ist.

PAUSEN werden angegeben, wenn im Recording keine beobachtbare/hörbare Tätigkeit stattfindet, wenn die Teilnehmer also weder sprechen noch tippen, klicken, zwischen Fenstern wechseln, etc. Pausen werden in Klammern angegeben. Man unterscheidet zwischen Pausen < 2 sec und Pausen > 2 sec, also (.) oder z. B. (13).

IN PAUSEN können nichtsprachliche Aktivitäten auftreten (z. B. Gähnen, Seufzen, Husten). Dies wird NICHT transkribiert. Die Pausen werden einfach durchgezählt.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

WEB-SEARCHES can take place on websites with different versions per language. Unless the URL is clear, e.g. wikipedia.DE, please also add the language indication in the double parentheses like so ((leica.org: German)).

NICHTSPRACHLICHE Laute (z. B. Anzeichen von Zögern oder Verwirrung) werden in der Verschriftlichung dem sprachlichen Kontext angepasst (z. B. *äh weiß nicht* oder *uh don't know*; ebenso *hää wie jetzt* oder *huh what was that*)

ÄUßERUNGEN werden in Anlehnung an die standardisierte Schriftsprache transkribiert (z. B. ausgeschriebenes *haben wir* für ausgesprochenes *ham mer*). Folgende Abweichungen von der standardisierten Schriftsprache werden im Transkript benutzt: 1) keine Unterscheidung zwischen Groß- und Kleinschreibung, 2) keine Verwendung von Satzzeichen. For English, e.g., 'cause instead of *cuz* or *holding* instead of *holdin*. For English blocks, we use AE. Wir benutzen *contractions* im Englischen.

ABWEICHUNGEN in der AUSPRACHE, die Sprachwechsel beinhalten, werden ausgeschrieben, z. B. *intuitiv* (in which case the participant used the German pronunciation for *intuitive*), ODER, wenn die Buchstabierung nicht sprachspezifisch ist, durch ein (E) bzw. (D), z. B. bei *mobile.E*. Wir machen also Sprachwechsel auf zweierlei Arten kenntlich. Erster Fall: aus dem gesprochenen Wörtern geht klar hervor, aus welcher Sprache Sie stammen. Beispiel "you know what Ich hab kein bock mehr", Letzteres ist eindeutig Deutsch. Falls man es aber nicht erkennen kann (Beispiel: "Is that kindergarten"), dann setzen wir an der Stelle ein (E) bzw. (D).

UNVERSTÄNDLICHE Passagen werden als *unclear* transkribiert und mit ihrer Dauer in Sekunden in Klammern angegeben, z. B. (5: *unclear*).

AUFFÄLLIGE Abweichungen von der in der deutschen (oder englischen) Standardsprache üblichen Aussprache werden notiert, z. B. *para[grave]* (in which case the last syllable was mispronounced) or *[CORR]ect* (in which case the stress was on the first instead of the second syllable).

When participants use the highlighting function provided in the word processor or the Adobe reader in their reading process, we indicate ((note taking)) in the transcript.

WRITING/READING-RELATED NON-VERBAL activities, such as scrolling, web-searches, app-changes, are indicated in double parentheses like so ((app change)) or ((web search: wikipedia.de)). During these activities, especially during web searches, pauses may occur when people read more than just individual lexemes. These pauses are indicated in single parentheses like so ((web search: wikipedia.de)) (8). ((scrolls)), ((clicks)), ((types)), ((app change)), ((web search: URL)). If you feel that you need to add an activity to the list, ask the researcher first. Activities such as 'copy&paste' or 'mouse movements' or 'selecting the text' need not be indicated. Before indicating the activity ((scrolls)), we need to assess: are they only scrolling to continue reading (so: they make more of the text visible to continue their reading process) or do they scroll with an aim that we cannot really identify? In the FRIST case, we just ignore the scrolling, they are merely reading. In the LATTER case, we indicate ((scrolls)).

ZIFFERN und ZAHLEN werden ausgeschrieben.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

DAS ORTHOGRAPHISCHE Apostroph im Englischen wird benutzt (z. B. *this guy's idea*).

REZEPTIONSSIGNALE werden ausgeschrieben (z. B. *mhmh* oder *aha*).

DER HEADER ist mit vollständigen Angaben jedem Transkript voranzustellen.

CODIERT werden nach der Transkription die Passagen, in denen die Probanden lediglich vorlesen, z. B. die Aufgabenstellung, den Ausgangstext, ihren eigenen Text, etc.

ÄUßERUNGEN anderer Personen und NICHT der Probanden (z. B. Äußerungen der Versuchsleitung) werden mit Hinweis in Klammern transkribiert, z. B. (*researcher: no that's okay*).

NICHTVERBALE Handlungen so wie Trinken, Lachen, Gähnen, Seufzen, etc. werden in doppelten Klammern ohne Zeitangabe notiert, z. B. ((*laughs*)).

Bei Fragen oder Unsicherheiten bitte Zeitmarke im Transkriptionsdokument setzen und Leiter kontaktieren.

JEGLICHE DATEIEN sind absolut vertraulich zu behandeln und dürfen nicht kopiert oder weitergegeben werden.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

16 Schedule with multilingual practices

BA UNGRADED	BA GRADED	L (GRADED)
<p>Complete out-of-class recording assignment I by Sunday, 23 April, 02 pm.</p> <p>Complete out-of-class recording assignment II by Sunday, 30 April, 02 pm.</p> <p>Participate in writing session I.</p> <p>Send out-of-class experiment results by Sunday, 04 June, 02 pm.</p> <p>Send out-of-class writing assignment by Sunday, 25 June, 02 pm</p> <p>Participate in writing session II.</p>	<p>Complete out-of-class recording assignment I by Sunday, 23 April, 02 pm.</p> <p>Complete out-of-class recording assignment II by Sunday, 30 April, 02 pm.</p> <p>Participate in writing session I.</p> <p>Send out-of-class experiment results by Sunday, 04 June, 02 pm.</p> <p>Send out-of-class writing assignment by Sunday, 25 June, 02 pm</p> <p>Participate in writing session II.</p> <p>Revise writing assignments I, II and III, and hand the revised versions in as a portfolio by Sunday, 24 September, 02 pm.</p> <p>Portfolio: 20% + 80%</p>	<p>Complete out-of-class recording assignment I by Sunday, 23 April, 02 pm.</p> <p>Complete out-of-class recording assignment II by Sunday, 30 April, 02 pm.</p> <p>Participate in writing session I.</p> <p>Send out-of-class experiment results by Sunday, 04 June, 02 pm.</p> <p>Send out-of-class writing assignment by Sunday, 25 June, 02 pm</p> <p>Participate in writing session II.</p> <p>Take the written exam on Tuesday, 18 July.</p> <p>Writing 20% + exam 80%</p>

BA UNGR.	Recording 01 Graded	Recording 02 Graded	Writing session 01 Graded	Online experiments Ungraded	Out-of-class writing Graded	Writing session 02 Graded	No grade
BA GR.	Recording 01 Graded Portfolio: no	Recording 02 Graded Portfolio: no	Writing session 01 Graded Portfolio: yes	Online experiments Ungraded	Out-of-class writing Graded Portfolio: yes	Writing session 02 Graded Portfolio: yes	Portfolio First texts: 20% Revised texts: 80% ²
L	Recording 01 Graded Final grade: no	Recording 02 Graded Final grade: no	Writing session 01 Graded Final grade: yes	Online experiments Ungraded	Out-of-class writing Graded Final grade: yes	Writing session 02 Graded Final grade: yes	Exam First texts: 20% ³ Exam: 80%

	Topic	Assignments
Psychowhat ?	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formalities Comparison to Neurolinguistics <p>Psycholinguistic research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surveys TAPs 	<p>Practical assignments</p> <p>Complete out-of-class recording assignment based on Zorzi et al. (2012)</p> <p>Sign up for writing sessions I&II.</p>
Is there an innate language faculty?	<p>Human and animal communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Project Nim</i> (2011) or <i>The Grammar of Happiness</i> (2012) 	<p>Practical assignments</p> <p>Complete out-of-class recording assignment based on introduction to Keysar et al. (2012)</p> <p>Print Keysar et al. (2012)</p>
Can I only think what I can say? I	<p>Language, morality, and truth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Testing the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis <p>Psycholinguistic research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Choice scenarios Reading p-values 	<p>Practical assignment</p> <p>Participate in writing session I (either this week or the following week, NOT both).</p>

² You may send in your texts for feedback more than once. Only the first and the last version are relevant for the portfolio.

³ I strongly recommend that you hand in revised versions of your text for further feedback.



	DIY week I	No in-class session	Practical assignment Participate in writing session I (either this week or the preceding week, NOT both).
Can I only think what I can say? II		Language and perception <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sapir-Whorf hypothesis continued Psycholinguistic research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reaction time measurements • Gaze pattern analysis 	COMPREHENSION
DIY week II		No in-class session	Practical assignment Complete online experiments.
Can I only think what I can say? III		Language, sex, time, and advertising <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sapir-Whorf hypothesis continued Psycholinguistic research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Memory tests • Accuracy tests • Subjective judgments 	COMPREHENSION APPLICATION
Can I choose to process language?		Basic language processing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The McGurk effect • The Stroop effect • Modern Myths about reading • CAPTCHAs 	COMPREHENSION APPLICATION ANALYSIS
Does my mind contain a dictionary? What is the mental shotgun?		Higher-order language processing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple access • Spreading activation • Top-down processing • Cross-modal activation Psycholinguistic research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priming 	COMPREHENSION APPLICATION ANALYSIS
Do I have separated language corners in my mind?		The multilingual mind I <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cognate facilitation • Homograph inhibition Psycholinguistic research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness in studies 	SYNTHESIS
Should the parents of bilinguals be sued for neglect?		The multilingual mind II <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different types of multilingualism • Multicompetence Psycholinguistic research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ANT tasks • Task switching 	COMPREHENSION APPLICATION ANALYSIS
DIY week III		No in-class session	Practical assignment Participate in writing session II (either this week or the preceding week, NOT both).
Can kids be cured from dyslexia?		Literacy development and disorders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dyslexia Speech disorders and therapies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aphasia Psycholinguistic research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys revisited • TAPs revisited 	None.
		Written exam for L	None.



17 Language distribution per sub-process

App-Table 9: FL per sub-process of writing (pre), group comparison (n = 28)

Monitoring processes		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	54.4% 388 (485.64) [19.63]	45.6% 325 (227.36) [41.93]
Monolingual course	89.2% 413 (315.36) [30.23]	10.8% 50 (147.64) [64.57]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 1,176) = 156.367, p = .000$		
Planning processes		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	47.0% 94 (124.69) [7.55]	53.0% 106 (75.31) [12.51]
Monolingual course	87.1% 108 (77.31) [12.18]	12.9% 16 (46.69) [20.17]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 324) = 52.420, p = .000$		
Selecting		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	66.5% 135 (158.24) [3.41]	33.5% 68 (44.76) [12.07]
Monolingual course	91.0% 162 (138.76) [3.89]	9.0% 16 (39.24) [13.77]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 381) = 33.147, p = .000$		
Formulating		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	87.6% 694 (701.67) [0.08]	12.4% 98 (90.33) [0.65]
Monolingual course	92.6% 176 (168.33) [0.35]	7.4% 14 (21.67) [2.71]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 982) = 3.799, p = .051$		
Self-dictating		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	94.3% 1967 (1987.07) [0.2]	5.6% 118 (97.93) [4.12]
Monolingual course	97.3% 955 (934.93) [0.43]	2.7% 26 (46.07) [8.75]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 3,066) = 13.495, p = .000$		
Source text (total)		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	52.6% 721 (882.18) [29.45]	47.4% 649 (487.82) [53.25]
Monolingual course	89.7% 572 (410.82) [63.23]	10.3% 66 (227.18) [114.35]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 2,008) = 260.284, p = .000$		
Target text (total)		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	54.7% 468 (570.24) [18.33]	45.3% 388 (285.76) [36.58]
Monolingual course	87.5% 428 (325.76) [32.09]	12.5% 61 (163.24) [64.04]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 1,345) = 151.04, p = .000$		
Translating		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	13.8% 15	86.2% 94
Monolingual course	23.1% 3	76.9% 10

Assumptions violated.



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

General comments		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	62.6%	37.4%
	134 (146.67) [1.09]	80 (67.33) [2.38]
Monolingual course	80.4%	10.6%
	86 (73.33) [2.19]	21 (33.67) [4.77]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 321) = 10.430, p = .001$		
Addressing the researcher		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	58.8%	41.2%
	20	14
Monolingual course	100.0%	0.0%
	15	0
Search processes		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	39.9%	60.1%
	124 (148.35) [4]	187 (162.65) [3.65]
Monolingual course	59.2%	40.8%
	125 (100.65) [5.89]	86 (110.35) [5.37]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 522) = 18.907, p = .000$		
Unclear		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	31.5%	68.5%
	334 (349.54) [0.69]	726 (710.46) [0.34]
Monolingual course	35.9%	64.1%
	188 (172.46) [1.4]	335 (350.54) [0.69]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 1,583) = 3.12, p = .07$		

App-Table 10: FL per sub-process of writing (post), group comparison (n = 28)

Monitoring processes		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	45.5%	54.5%
	350 (460.7) [26.6]	419 (308.3) [39.75]
Monolingual course	80.3%	19.7%
	436 (325.3) [37.67]	107 (217.7) [56.29]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 1,312) = 160.300, p = .000$		
Planning processes		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	33.7%	66.3%
	67 (103.58) [12.92]	132 (95.42) [14.02]
Monolingual course	83.1%	16.9%
	98 (61.42) [21.79]	20 (56.58) [23.65]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 317) = 72.379, p = .000$		
Selecting		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	45.7%	54.3%
	139 (172.74) [6.59]	165 (131.26) [8.67]
Monolingual course	80.4%	19.6%
	115 (81.26) [14.01]	28 (61.74) [18.44]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 447) = 47.718, p = .000$		
Formulating		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	90.3%	9.7%
	524 (524.41) [0]	56 (55.59) [0]
Monolingual course	90.6%	9.4%
	193 (192.59) [0]	20 (20.41) [0.01]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 793) = 0.012, p = .910$		



This work is licensed under Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Self-dictating		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	94.4%	5.6%
	2023 (2044.2) [0.22]	119 (97.8) [4.59]
Monolingual course	97.6%	2.4%
	945 (923.8) [0.49]	23 (44.2) [10.17]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 3,110) = 15.468, p = .000$		
Source text (total)		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	50.1%	49.9%
	710 (876.77) [31.72]	708 (541.23) [51.39]
Monolingual course	89.5%	10.5%
	539 (372.23) [74.72]	63 (229.77) [121.05]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 2,020) = 278.88, p = .000$		
Target text (total)		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	37.6%	62.4%
	357 (501.95) [41.86]	593 (448.05) [46.89]
Monolingual course	81.1%	18.9%
	416 (271.05) [77.51]	97 (241.95) [86.84]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 1,463) = 253.098, p = .000$		
Translating		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	11.0%	89.0%
	10	81
Monolingual course	20.0%	80.0%
	1	4
assumption for expected values violated		
General comments		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	55.0%	45.0%
	93 (110.74) [2.84]	76 (58.26) [5.4]
Monolingual course	77.1%	22.9%
	118 (100.26) [3.14]	35 (52.74) [5.97]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 322) = 17.354, p = .000$		
Addressing the researcher		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	53.8%	46.2%
	6	7
Monolingual course	96.9%	3.1%
	31	1
assumption for expected values violated		
Search processes		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	41.7%	58.3%
	78 (99) [4.45]	109 (88) [5.01]
Monolingual course	68.4%	31.6%
	93 (72) [6.12]	43 (64) [6.89]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 323) = 22.482, p = .000$		
Unclear		
Course	FL	Non-FL
Multilingual course	25.4%	74.6%
	264 (332.29) [14.04]	776 (707.71) [6.59]
Monolingual course	43.3%	56.7%
	260 (191.71) [24.33]	340 (408.29) [11.42]
$\chi^2 (1, n = 1,640) = 56.377, p = .000$		

