Instructional Expertise for Assessing Digital Multimodal Composing in a Second Language

Conceptual Frameworks and Teachers' Perspectives

Christoph A. Hafner and Wing Yee Jenifer Ho

Introduction

In recent years, there has been considerable interest in L2 writing circles in incorporating digital multimodal composing (DMC) into L2 writing courses. DMC can be defined as an approach to language teaching and learning that engages with digital forms of expression, including the use of "visual images and their relationship to the written word" (New London Group, 1996), i.e., an approach that engages with multimodal communicative competence. DMC can involve designing multimodal texts like websites or videos, similar to the kinds of texts that students engage with outside of class and also may have to engage with as future professional members of society. Engaging students with DMC is thought to have numerous benefits. However, it also poses challenges to teachers, and these are challenges that directly implicate teachers' instructional expertise. Teachers who have been trained as L2 writing instructors in the traditional sense may feel that they lack some essential qualities: knowledge and understanding of the principles of multimodal design; skill and familiarity in using the tools for design. In addition, it may be that particular attitudes are called for when approaching multimodal composing tasks. The main goal of this chapter is to identify core elements of expertise that are required of teachers "doing" DMC with their students. We examine perceptions of teachers engaged in DMC tasks with their students, with a view to determining how they feel about their own expertise in supporting their students and, in particular, facilitating and assessing the multimodal L2 writing. We begin by examining the key concept of expertise as it applies to second language writing instruction. We then describe a case study of the DMC assessment practices of seven teachers in order to understand the kinds of expertise implicated in this relatively novel practice.

Expertise in Second Language Writing Instruction

In a recent "Disciplinary Dialogues" section of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* focusing on expertise in L2 writing instruction, Hirvela and Belcher (2022) make a strong case for the need for more research on second language writing instruction (SLWI) that explicitly employs the concept of expertise. As they point out, SLW research has focused heavily on learners (their writing processes and products) and far less on teachers of writing. As a result, they suggest that "we have no operative descriptions of SLWI expertise to work with" (p. 3). Such descriptions would be of benefit to teacher training programs, providing useful models in that context. In addition, there appears to be growing interest in the concept of expertise in SLWI contexts, with some recent research addressing teacher expertise in feedback practices (Lee & Yuan, 2021) and teacher expertise in genre instruction (Tardy et al., 2022).

The contributors to Hirvela and Belcher's "Disciplinary Dialogues" section all agree that the concept of expertise can be difficult to define. For one thing, there is a danger with this concept that it may introduce an overly simplistic and essentialist binary between the so-called expert and the so-called novice (Seloni, 2022). Cumming (2022) cautions that any model of expertise developed "cannot be a single, monolithic prescription of basic competences" but instead must address the "variable, multi-faceted, and culturally embedded dimensions of the phenomena" (p. 1). Similarly, Burns (2022) cautions against attempting to create a monolithic definition of writing instruction expertise, instead emphasizing its "emergent and evolving nature" (p. 1). In the context that we address in this chapter—that of DMC—it is easy to see how teachers continuously need to develop new kinds of expertise, defined here as the ability to work with new kinds of writing that involves multimodal forms of expression. As such, it is perhaps better to think of teacher expertise in terms of a continuous journey that teachers are on rather than as a destination that they can reach once and for all.

With these important caveats in mind, we can nevertheless identify some of the characteristics that are typically associated with expertise. A useful starting point is the definition provided by Hirvela (2020, p. 17, cited in Hirvela & Belcher, 2022), who maintains that expertise involves "the instructional beliefs, knowledge, and skills that may be considered essential at a certain level of proficiency in order for teachers to guide students toward the acquisition of beneficial L2 writing ability." In this definition, it is interesting to note the inclusion of not only instructional *knowledge and skills* but also of *beliefs*. We would add to this that, related to beliefs, teachers' attitudes may be an important affective dimension of expertise. Tsui (2022) calls attention to the way that developing expertise involves developing a kind of "disposition" to "engage in emergent innovations" (p. 3). According to this view, experts possess a capacity to "break out of…

standard routines" (Johnson, 2010, p. 41, cited in Tsui, 2022), or, in other words, expertise also involves creativity and innovation in the face of the novel professional situations that experts find themselves in. This notion has been captured by the concept of "adaptive expertise" highlighted by Hirvela (2020, 2021, cited in Hirvela & Belcher, 2022) and which draws a distinction between routine and adaptive experts, with adaptive experts capable of engaging "in an ongoing exploration and expansion of what they know and thus mak[ing] adjustments in how they teach" (Hirvela & Belcher, 2022, p. 4).

In summary, the concept of expertise in second language writing is a complex and emergent one that implicates dimensions of knowledge, skill, belief, attitude, creativity, and innovation. In this chapter, we examine the "what" of expertise in the context of DMC instruction. That is, what knowledge and skills do teachers feel that they need in order to implement DMC pedagogy? What role do beliefs, attitudes, and dispositions play in this? Our data have relatively less to say about the "how," that is, how teachers develop this expertise over time. Consistent with this emphasis on "what" rather than "how," our data present a snapshot of teacher expertise in action, similar to the approach taken by Wineburg (1998): we report teachers' descriptions of and reflections on the way that they have responded to an example of a digital multimodal composition in order to evaluate it for grading purposes as part of their teaching. We also examine their comments about the challenges that this relatively innovative task posed to them in terms of expertise, i.e., how their own professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes were implicated in the DMC grading process. In research on DMC, the area of assessment is one that is consistently defined as in need of further attention (see, e.g., Zhang, Akoto, & Li, 2021). In this chapter, we build on our previous work in this area (Hafner & Ho, 2020), extending it to specifically engage with the role played by instructional expertise in assessing DMC.

The Study

Background and Context

The data that informs this study was collected on an English for Science course at a university in Hong Kong, a course that has been documented in various other publications (Hafner, 2014; Hafner & Ho, 2020; Hafner & Miller, 2019). The course is designed to equip students enrolled in various Bachelor of Science programs with the necessary communication skills to engage with experts from science disciplines broadly conceived and with the general public. The course has an annual enrollment of 350 students, and a vast majority of students are L2 writers with Cantonese as their L1.

The course is a 13-week course that adopts a project-based learning approach (Hafner, 2020). Throughout the semester, students worked collaboratively

on an "English for science project," which involves students completing a simulated scientific study and presenting its findings in the form of a five-to-seven minute scientific documentary video aimed at a non-specialist, public audience (teamwork, worth 30% of the final grade), followed by a 1,500-word written scientific report aimed at a specialist audience (individual work, 40%). According to the rubric, the scientific documentary is expected to follow a generic structure involving an "attention-grabbing opening, an effectively organized body that clearly follows scientific conventions, and a memorable conclusion/ending." The report is expected to follow an Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion (IMRD) structure in order to report the findings of the study and, being written for a different audience using different media, will require students to employ a different register in a genre that has different conventional forms of expression. Some example topics include measuring noise pollution in different environments, measuring the effect of light pollution, and examining the "blind spot" in human vision. These prompts were provided by the course co-ordinator, with input from disciplinary specialists. This chapter focuses on the teacher's expertise in relation to the assessment of the scientific documentary video task. The scientific documentary was designed to be uploaded to YouTube and made accessible to the public.

On this DMC project, students' activity was scaffolded with in-class input at each stage of the project: (1) reading/data collection; (2) scripting/storyboarding; (3) performing/recording; (4) editing; and (5) sharing. When it came to structuring assessment processes and assessing students' output, a process-based assessment model informed by a genre-based pedagogy (see Hafner & Ho, 2020 and Hafner & Miller, 2019) was adopted for assessing students' scientific documentaries. Teachers were provided with a rubric broken into three equally weighted categories, each judged in a holistic way rather than addressing separate generic elements: (1) organization and content, (2) multimedia and visual effects, and (3) language and delivery.

Participants

The participants were seven teachers who had taught the English for Science course over the two years prior to data collection. An email invitation was sent to these teachers, and all of them agreed to be interviewed. Five participants were men, and two were women. As for the age range, one participant was between 20 and 30 years old, four participants were between 31 and 40 years old, and two participants were 60 years old or above. One participant held a PhD, four held Master's degrees, and two held Bachelor's degrees. One participant had taught the course 18 times, while one participant had just taught the course once at the time of the interview. Hence, the group of participants represents a sample of teachers with a range of experiences. Table 9.1 summarizes the background of the participants.

Table 9.1 Background of the participants

Pseudonym	*Gender*	*Age group*	*Major at university*	*Qualification*	*Teaching experience*	*Experience on the course*	*Self-rated confidence in using technology for educational purposes (out of 10, 1 = not confident at all; 10 = extremely confident)*
Justin	M	31–40	Chemistry	PhD	2 years	2 times	8
Ken	M	60 or above	Humanities	Master's degree	20 years	2 times	7
Elaine	F	31–40	Biology (with MA in Linguistics)	Bachelor's degree	5 years	3 times	9
Joyce	F	20–30	English	Bachelor's degree	4 years	4 times	8
Calvin	M	31–40	Education and Linguistics	Master's degree	10 years	7 times	9
Alex	M	31–40	Language Studies	Master's degree	10 years	18 times	9
Chris	M	60 or above	English	Master's degree	>30 years	2 times	7

Interview Procedure

With respect to data sources, this was an interview-based study. The interviews were conducted face to face by the two authors of this chapter. Each interview lasted 45–60 minutes and was video-recorded with the consent of the participants. Each of the semi-structured interviews was conducted with a similar format: (1) a general question about what teachers were looking for when they evaluated a digital video scientific documentary, with a copy of the rubric available for teachers to comment on; (2) questions on two specific videos selected by the teachers for comment prior to the interview; and (3) questions about the video grading process in general. This chapter focuses on the responses in the third part: the grading process. The full list of questions used in the interview process is included in Appendix A. These questions allowed us to gain insight into the knowledge and skills that teachers brought to bear on the teaching and assessing of DMC, as well as relevant beliefs, attitudes, and dispositions. The data was collected as part of a larger project aimed at understanding how teachers assess DMC (Hafner & Ho, 2020). The current study re-analyzed the interviews to unpack what kind of instructional expertise teachers indicated that they needed.

Data Analysis

The interviews were transcribed and imported into MaxQDA (Verbi Software, 2018) for inductive coding. A thematic analysis procedure was used to identify themes emerging from the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). We first immersed ourselves in the data by repeatedly reading the transcripts and taking notes on observations made. Afterward, we compared our notes and identified potential codes in order to come up with a tentative coding scheme in an inductive fashion. After the coding scheme was agreed on, we individually coded a single interview and met again to compare and refine the coding scheme. The second author then coded the remaining interviews while making adjustments to the coding scheme where necessary. Trustworthiness of the analysis was ensured by a process of constant comparison (Richards, 2003).

Findings

This section reports the findings generated from the semi-structured interviews conducted with seven teachers. After the process of thematic coding, the following themes emerged: (1) knowledge to grade videos and its source; (2) attitudes toward grading videos; and (3) struggles with assessing DMC. We now present findings relative to each theme.

Knowledge Necessary to Grade Videos and Its Source

Teachers indicated that assessing DMC required them to draw on sources of knowledge that they had both accumulated as language teachers (either generally or on this course in particular) as well as sometimes from their personal experience of media consumption and production. When asked to compare the video grading task with other kinds of grading, teachers' responses suggested that they were often able to "transfer" knowledge gained from grading presentations and essays experienced on other courses to the DMC assessment task:

> We're looking at very similar elements here: organisation and content, and how they're using language. The only difference here would be multimedia and visual effects. That could be a little bit more challenging to some students.
>
> (Calvin)

> I find it quite similar because we are looking at language, organisation, content. The only difference is the kind of the mode that we are looking at.
>
> (Elaine)

Here, Calvin and Elaine commented that, in grading videos, they are "looking at very similar elements" when compared to other kinds of grading, and "the only difference here would be multimedia and visual effects." In this sense, teachers arrived at the DMC assessment task with similar experiences of grading (and thus, relevant knowledge) that they could draw upon but specifically identified the focus on multimodality as different. A similar view to that expressed here was also articulated by all the other teachers in the interview. This common agreement on the positive transfer from other kinds of grading shed valuable light on instructional expertise in the DMC context. The ability to transfer from prior assessment experiences was not the only point that stood out in the interviews. There was also a "within-course" component that appeared consistently. One teacher, Alex, expanded on the kind of knowledge of multimodality and design principles that he felt teachers and students needed to complete the video creation task:

> I think the, I believe, *in the course material there's a session on multimodality*. Not only just students but teachers who teach the course, they also need to be generally *familiar* with what would be considered as different camera angles. You have the distance, the close-up. When you interview someone, do you have a close-up, do you have a portrait, do you have kind of like a *variety* of that? […] I would ask my students to try to have different angles. Try. I think that would actually help the

> production in terms of, as an audience, in terms of an individual who's watching it. When you watch professional documentaries, they actually have various angles. You don't just have one scene for 2 minutes or 30 seconds. That could be shown based on some of the examples that are in the course materials. So this is it.
>
> (Alex)

Here, it is interesting to note the way that Alex commented that such a knowledge of multimodality can be derived from teaching on the course and making use of the course materials. In particular, he singled out the "session on multimodality" as contributing to an understanding of the use of a "variety" of camera angles, also seen in "professional documentaries". Calvin also highlighted the notion that teaching on the course provides a source of knowledge about visual design when he commented on his feelings about grading videos:

> I think at this stage it's fine. I remember when it's the first time that I was teaching the course that it could have been more challenging for me because *I, as well, were learning about videos*.
>
> (Calvin)

Thus, according to Calvin, teaching on the course was also a way of "learning about videos," something that he now feels comfortable with. As well as course materials, assessment procedures like standardization, where teachers and the course co-ordinator discussed example student videos and expected grades, also supported teacher knowledge about multimodality, as Justin pointed out. Ken also identified the experience of teaching on the course as a source of knowledge:

> Knowledge… I maybe need a bit of *experience* probably more than knowledge. I've not taught this course many times and I think it comes with *doing it over and over again*.
>
> (Ken)

Finally, some teachers reported on another useful assessment resource: deriving relevant knowledge about multimodality from personal experience of media consumption and production. For example, Chris characterized himself as a "consumer of video… as everybody in today's world is" and noted that this played a role in his grading (see also below). Alex recounted his personal experience of media production and how that was helpful in his grading:

> I am pretty familiar after teaching this course for 5 years […] I mean it also help because in high school I took photography […] and that helped

> because one of the videos in the course material, it also talked about distance, the power dynamic, things like that. So that sort of came full circle in some ways *from what I learned in high school*.
>
> (Alex)

It appears that Alex's experience of taking a photography course in high school became a significant source of knowledge that provided him with elements of expertise useful for teaching the course. This confidence is reinforced by the course material, which provided him with the metalanguage necessary to explain how to use camera distance as a resource.

In summary, these findings show that the teachers drew from a variety of resources when assessing the video. Evaluating some aspects of videos, like organization, content, and language, came through their prior experiences in grading presentations and essays. However, such experiences did not appear to prepare them fully to assess multimodal design elements of the DMC project. They also utilized knowledge developed through experience teaching on the course, including their use of course materials and participation in standardization meetings. In addition, some teachers also relied on their own experience of multimodal design, both as producers and consumers of multimedia content, as a source of knowledge and expertise. Nevertheless, as we demonstrate in the next section, while all teachers in the study were well positioned and qualified as language teachers, they appeared to hold mixed attitudes toward grading videos.

Attitudes toward Grading Videos

Teachers showed a generally positive attitude toward grading videos, though this was nuanced by mixed attitudes with respect to specific practice (see below). Teachers' overall comments reflected the feeling that grading videos is *new*, *interesting*, and *fun*:

> It's something *new* I would say. When we are grading videos we are looking at very *different* things and normally we are grading essays and reports. So I find it pretty *fun*, pretty *interesting*. We are looking at *different* things besides language, organisation and content. We are also look at multimedia and visual effects which is *something that we don't normally do as teachers, as English teachers*. I enjoyed the process and I liked it very much.
>
> (Elaine)

> In terms of grading, this is kind of more *interesting* to grade, because you watch the product students are producing, quite *interesting* to see what they've come up with, whereas reading reports, which I'm doing

> just now, computer science, it's kind of the same, same information keeps coming up, the same problems keep coming up. So it's nice to have this little, *breaks slightly different [from what we do?]*.
>
> (Chris)

These teachers reported that grading videos is a source of enjoyment, with a greater variety of products created by students compared to other tasks. The novelty of the grading task is also a result of engaging in something that "we don't normally do as teachers, as English teachers."

However, while most teachers expressed a general feeling of *comfort* with the video grading task viewed globally, they did also express some *uncertainty* when discussing the topic in more detail, as reflected in the following comment from Joyce:

> For some groups they have a better video as I can see they have really good quality media effect but *I am not sure* is it because maybe one of the group mates, they have editing skills they are really good at this. That's why they can make a very effective video but sometimes students may have good language and they have good organisation and content but because they lack those skills of editing then the final product does not seem to reflect their actual English ability because of this, so that's why *I am not sure*… I feel a little bit *uncomfortable* in judging them based on this.
>
> (Joyce)

Here, Joyce felt "uncomfortable" making a judgment between grading students on "language criteria," including language, organization, and content, and the "skills of editing," which is a criterion unique to videos. Joyce placed strong emphasis on students' "actual English ability" as a consideration in grading but lamented the possibility that the evaluation of this ability may be affected by students' editing skills. This feeling came from a struggle between teachers' perception of the course as a "language course" and the relative importance that they accorded to "language," a struggle that we elaborate on in the next section.

One particular feeling of uncertainty that teachers faced could be characterized as a "conflict" between subjectivity and objectivity in grading processes. For example, Justin, the only teacher in the team with a science background, noted his challenge relative to not knowing how to deal with his subjective preference when grading videos:

Justin: Any other challenges… Still very subjective. How can you present this as an objective assessment? It's very hard.

Christoph: Why?

Justin: Some, some… It's very personal like when you look at visual effect, whether you prefer a more clear object in the video clips or you, you prefer not to have a clear object, so this rely on your preference on visual thing. Yeah.

Similarly, when assessing the scientific documentaries, Chris expressed the uneasy feeling of having to put aside his subjectivity and ignore his personal preferences:

> We're consumers so, I think I based part of my marking based on personal preferences. I tried *not to let that get in the way*, for example in the first one [video], I don't really - as I mentioned I don't really like those cartoon-y animations but *I try not to let that influence the marking*. Yeah, so I don't know.
>
> (Chris)

Chris had been teaching for over 30 years, making him the most experienced teacher among the seven participants. When asked to comment on his general feeling of grading videos, Chris at first expressed confidence by saying, "I didn't find it [grading videos] any better or worse than grading written report or anything." Nevertheless, when discussing what knowledge he still needed to grade videos, Chris perceived his personal preferences (based on his personal experience of these popular genres) as something that "[gets] in the way" and explicitly expressed his uncertainty as to whether his personal preference would be an issue ("Yeah, so I don't know"). It is interesting to note that he characterized his understanding of what makes an appropriate visual design in terms of personal preferences rather than in terms of professional knowledge that could be derived from understandings of genres and how they are multimodally expressed.

These findings suggest a complex picture regarding the teachers' attitudes toward such grading. On the one hand, when discussing the issue of grading videos in a global sense, the teachers generally held positive attitudes. However, when it comes to the actual practice of assigning marks to each criterion in the assessment scheme, some teachers appeared to express uncertainty and feeling uncomfortable in the actual grading, worrying that the grades arrived at do not reflect the students' "actual English ability" or that they are influenced by "personal," rather than professional, considerations. In a similar vein, it became apparent that teachers' feelings of uncertainty led to an internal struggle for some of them, which is addressed next.

Struggles with Assessing DMC

As touched upon earlier, in spite of their experience with the course, most of the teachers expressed a kind of ideological struggle with the goals of the course and the goals of the assessment. The course had explicitly adopted an approach that sought to "rethink" writing as multimodal design in an effort to meet emerging needs of multimodal expression among students. The grading criteria reflect this to some extent, with equal marks awarded to: (1) content and organization, (2) language, and (3) multimedia and visual effects.

However, this orientation provided a major source of struggle for some teachers, who understood the course as a "language course" in a traditional sense. This view is most pronounced in Joyce, who described the course as a "language course" multiple times throughout the interview, problematizing the use of multimedia and visual effects as an assessment criterion. Her source of struggle also came from an implicit assumption that writing in a "language course" needs to focus on a narrow conception of language that excludes elements of the multimodal ensemble presented:

> But this is an English course, so I tried to make my judgement, make my focus shift on the language.
>
> (Joyce)

> So I think this is a language course so I am not sure if we should focus more on the language part.
>
> (Joyce)

> So if I mark an essay, I can focus more on the language part, but for videos I think I get distracted easily by other components.
>
> (Joyce)

Related to this, other teachers expressed difficulty in reconciling language-related criteria with multimodal design criteria. Even experienced teachers expressed a sense of struggle and regret when deciding on the distribution of marks across the language criteria and multimodal design criteria:

> So you really have to make a judgement here, you know, how much lower should you be, you know, grading do you have. But I guess, you know, with the rubrics here, we have ten percent, ten percent, ten percent right here, *that should have settled it*. But in your mind, you still would be *struggling*, "Do they really deserve this grade?"
>
> (Calvin)

> Some students they have a short introduction, they may have a weak research background or maybe another video has really great elements, very very clear introduction, wonderful organisation and clear conclusion, but production wasn't really good, so you have to sort of bring them down in terms of multimedia visual effects. Perhaps, some might have a group who, again, this is all predicating on the fact that they all work really hard. Perhaps there is a group which is good at the the language but multimedia effects just weren't as good.
>
> (Alex)

Here Calvin reports "struggling" with the idea that students with a "perfect script," as he put it, could nevertheless fail to achieve a correspondingly high score as a result of perceived issues of visual design. He wondered about the relative contribution of the three criteria (organization and content, language, multimedia/visual effects), even though the rubric states that they are awarded equal marks, and, as he himself remarked, "that should have settled it." Nevertheless, Calvin appeared to have difficulty accepting this weighting. Even the teacher with the most experience of the English for Science course, Alex, expressed similar regrets when discussing the balance between overall organization and content, on the one hand, and production quality, on the other. Here the teachers experienced difficulties in making professional judgments, which hindered their ability to grade students' DMC as a *multimodal ensemble*. We can see this struggle as resulting from a challenge to their identity as a language teacher, that is, how it is that they perceived themselves and conceived of what they do.

Discussion and Conclusions

This chapter set out to examine what knowledge and skills teachers feel that they need in order to implement DMC pedagogy in a second language writing context, as well as the role of their beliefs, attitudes, and dispositions in that enterprise. With respect to knowledge and skills, the teachers reported some similarities between the assessment of DMC tasks and other, more traditional tasks like essays and presentations, as all of these tasks required them to attend to features of the assessed text, such as organization, content, and language. At the same time, assessing DMC as a multimodal ensemble was something that was new to them, thus engaging them in new professional "ways of doing" relevant to the assessment challenge they faced. Here an important finding was that they reported that they were able to derive necessary knowledge in this area from a range of available sources, including both course materials and relevant prior personal experience of media. Thus, reflecting on the kind of professional knowledge and skills required for instructional expertise in DMC, the findings suggest

that the teachers already possessed a strong foundation to work from but that they perceived a lack of professional expertise in multimodal design. In other words, there was a gap between what they already knew and what they needed to know to assess DMC performance. Consequently, in training teachers for DMC assessment, it would make sense to clearly acknowledge this strong foundation to draw from, one which resides in their expertise in evaluating texts as expressed for particular audiences and purposes privileging the linguistic form. Building on this finding, pre-service or in-service teacher development could focus on the way that multiple semiotic resources are orchestrated in DMC in ways that are appropriate to specific genres. Within this context, Chris's comment that he had to prevent his "personal preferences" from "getting in the way" suggests that there is room to improve teachers' understanding of the way that the use of multimodal resources connects with their existing professional knowledge of use of language and appropriate construction of genre.

While holding generally positive attitudes and feelings of competence toward the DMC assessment task, the teachers nevertheless expressed some doubts and discomfort as well. At the far end of the scale, this expressed itself as a struggle with the underlying assumptions of the assessment; specifically, the teachers questioned the weighting of criteria and expressed regret that a student group with an excellent score on "use of language" might be held back by their score on "multimedia and visual effects." We see here a kind of ideological disconnect between what the course is trying to do—i.e., provide a form of writing instruction that takes account of developments in digital media—and what the teachers are trying to do—i.e., promote a narrow conception of language proficiency in discipline-specific writing. We see this divide as "ideological" because, at its root, it is about ideas of what writing *is* and *should be*. As Stewart (2023) puts it, it is about "what counts" as writing and whether that includes new literacy practices such as multimodal design. Here, in spite of the fact that the course and assessment criteria explicitly valued multimodal design, the teachers struggled to value such forms of expression, a finding that echoes numerous other studies (e.g., Jiang & Ren, 2020; Jiang, Yu, & Zhao, 2021; Mills & Exley, 2014). In fact, recent research (Kim, Belcher, & Peyton, 2023) suggests that DMC activities can benefit second language writers' linguistic performance and writing development *more* than traditional approaches on some measures. Such findings suggest that teachers' instinctive desire to privilege text-based forms of writing in order to "make my focus shift on the language" may be out of place. Consequently, engaging teachers with the findings of research on DMC could be a useful step toward developing a closer ideological alignment and bridging the kind of divide observed.

It is also interesting to note that the struggle observed in teachers played out on the level of beliefs, attitudes, and dispositions. Other scholars have

pointed out that competences associated with digital literacies involve particular dispositions (Kern, 2021) and mindsets (Lankshear & Knobel, 2008; Tour, 2015). Interestingly, the responses that we elicited also had an emotional dimension to them, although this was sometimes quite subtle, with the video project activity evaluated in positive terms as "interesting" and "fun" on the one hand and frustration and regret expressed with respect to grading criteria on the other. The subtle emotional response appears to index the cognitive dissonance that teachers experience as a result of the ideological disconnect identified above. Golombek and Doran (2014) suggest that it is helpful for teacher trainers to pay attention to such emotional cues, as they can signal potential "growth points" for teacher development, viewing emotion, cognition, and activity as closely interrelated. In view of recent interest in emotions in English language teaching (Richards, 2022), further research on expertise in SLWI could examine this element in more detail.

When it comes to developing assessment expertise in the DMC context, it is significant that the participants consistently noted that the DMC assessment task was novel, "something that we don't normally do." From an expertise framework perspective, this finding illustrates the need for adaptive expertise as well as how such adaptive expertise must include the full range of dimensions: not only knowledge and skills but also beliefs, attitudes, and dispositions. A number of the teachers expressed the notion that they were able to learn and adapt in response to the course materials, as well as standardization of assessment, in essence "learning about videos," as Calvin put it, when the need arose. In other words, there was evidence of them operating as adaptive experts within this new instructional environment. The course in its current form therefore appears to provide teachers with opportunities to develop the knowledge and skills that they need in order to teach DMC, i.e., to develop adaptive expertise. However, this instructional setting on its own may not be sufficient for teachers to develop full expertise. A teacher could teach the course many times and, while developing the technical skills and knowledge needed to do so, still fail to develop beliefs, attitudes, and dispositions supportive of effective teaching practice in this context. The data indicate that in the context of this course, more attention could be given to this dimension. For example, it would be useful to provide more opportunities for teachers and course designers to examine the values that they bring to SLWI and have conversations about what exactly it is that they mean by things like "writing" and "language," as well as to question the kind of writing and the kind of language that ought to be privileged in a setting like the academy. In the new instructional domain of DMC, from both a teaching and assessment perspective, such conversations are essential to the development of teachers' expertise.

Ultimately, these reflections point to the *negotiated* nature of the development of expertise, particularly as changes in beliefs, attitudes, and

dispositions likely occur in a gradual way over time and in conversation with others. Our data point to a range of human and nonhuman participants that teachers interact with as they develop expertise, negotiating new knowledge, skills, values, and beliefs. The interviews highlighted artifacts like course materials and the grading rubric as influential artifacts that mediate teachers' expertise. Standardization meetings where teachers and course co-ordinators interact around grading criteria appear to play a similar mediating role. In fact, the interview experience itself provided a further opportunity for interaction between course co-ordinators and teachers, with the potential to negotiate expertise by allowing space for teacher reflection. One can imagine a range of other mediating artifacts and activities: teachers might keep reflective journals, for example (Golombek & Doran, 2014) and could also be exposed to recent research on DMC, like the work of Kim, Belcher, and Peyton (2023), referred to earlier, which highlights the relative effectiveness of DMC tasks in terms of promoting writing development, as compared to traditional writing tasks. When it comes to developing expertise in response to the kind of pedagogical innovation described in this chapter, it is important for course designers and co-ordinators to remember that expertise is something that is continuously negotiated. To support this process, they should ensure that the full range of mediating artifacts and activities are available.

References

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Burns, A. (2022). Emergence in teacher writing expertise: Teachers be(com) ing expert. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 58*, 100938. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100938

Cumming, A. (2022). Modeling expertise as variable options. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 58*, 100937. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100937

Golombek, P. R., & Doran, M. (2014). Unifying cognition, emotion, and activity in language teacher professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 39*, 102–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.01.002

Hafner, C. A. (2014). Embedding digital literacies in English language teaching: Students' digital video projects as multimodal ensembles. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(4), 655–685. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.138

Hafner, C. A. (2020). *Doing project-based learning in language education*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Hafner, C. A., & Ho, W. Y. J. (2020). Assessing digital multimodal composing in second language writing: Towards a process-based model. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 47*, 100710. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100710

Hafner, C. A., & Miller, L. (2019). *English in the disciplines: A multidimensional model for ESP course design*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429452437

Hirvela, A. (2020). Exploring second language writing teacher education: The role of adaptive expertise. In L. Seloni & S. H. Lee (Eds.), *Second language writing instruction in global contexts: English language teacher preparation and development* (pp. 13–30). Multilingual Matters.

Hirvela, A. (2021). Expertise and the teaching of argumentative writing. In A. Hirvela & D. Belcher (Eds.), *Argumentative writing in a second language: Perspectives on research and pedagogy* (pp. 99–114). University of Michigan Press.

Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2022). Expertise in L2 writing instruction: The road less travelled. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 58*, 100936. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100936

Jiang, L., & Ren, W. (2020). Digital multimodal composing in L2 learning: Ideologies and impact. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 20*(3), 167–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2020.1753192

Jiang, L., Yu, S., & Zhao, Y. (2021). Teacher engagement with digital multimodal composing in a Chinese tertiary EFL curriculum. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(4), 613–632. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819864975

Johnson, S. (2010). *Where good ideas come from: The natural history of innovation*. Penguin Publishing.

Kern, R. (2021). Twenty-five years of digital literacies in CALL. *Language Learning & Technology, 25*(3), 132–150. https://hdl.handle.net/10125/73453

Kim, Y., Belcher, D., & Peyton, C. (2023). Comparing monomodal traditional writing and digital multimodal composing in EAP classrooms: Linguistic performance and writing development. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 64*, 101247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2023.101247

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Digital literacies: Concepts, policies and practices*. Peter Lang.

Lee, I., & Yuan, R. (Eric). (2021). Understanding L2 writing teacher expertise. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 52*, 100755. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100755

Mills, K. A., & Exley, B. (2014). Time, space, and text in the elementary school digital writing classroom. *Written Communication*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088314542757

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60–92.

Richards, J. C. (2022). Exploring emotions in language teaching. *RELC Journal, 53*(1), 225–239. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220927531

Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative inquiry in TESOL*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Seloni, L. (2022). Activity theory as an analytical framework to understand expertise in L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 58*, 100940. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100940

Stewart, O. G. (2023). Negotiating "what counts" in multimodal writing in the classroom: A high school English teacher's perspective. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2023.2264237

Tardy, C. M., Buck, R. H., Jacobson, B., LaMance, R., Pawlowski, M., Slinkard, J. R., & Vogel, S. M. (2022). "It's complicated and nuanced": Teaching genre awareness in English for general academic purposes. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 57*, 101117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2022.101117

Tour, E. (2015). Digital mindsets: Teachers' technology use in personal life and teaching. *Language Learning & Technology*, *19*(3), 124–139.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2022). The gold standard for the teaching of profession: A rejoinder. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 58*, 100941. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100941

VERBI Software. (2018). *MaxQDA, software for qualitative data analysis*. VERBI Software. maxqda.com

Wineburg, S. (1998). Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert/expert study in the interpretation of historical texts. *Cognitive Science, 22*(3), 319–346. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog2202_3

Zhang, M., Akoto, M., & Li, M. (2021). Digital multimodal composing in post-secondary L2 settings: A review of the empirical landscape. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 36*(4), 694–721. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1942068

Appendix A

Interview Questions

1 What do you look for in a digital video when you are grading it?
2 While watching select videos (one highly rated, one less highly rated)

   a What do you evaluate positively/negatively in this video?
   b What do you think about the visual effects?
   c What do you think about the accompanying soundtrack?
   d What do you think about the language used?
   e What do you think about the organization and content?
   f What do you think about the use of multimedia as a whole?

1 Now that we have watched the two documentaries, let's talk about grading videos in general.

   a How do you feel about grading videos?
   b What are the challenges of grading videos?
   c What are the similarities and differences between grading videos and other assignments?
   d What knowledge do you still need to grade videos?
   e How easy/difficult is it to apply the criteria?
   f Do you have any suggestions on how we can improve the criteria?