



Learning to Write in a Second Language: Two Decades of Research

ALISTER CUMMING*

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto

ABSTRACT

The empirical studies reviewed in this article show that over the past two decades research on learning to write in second languages has expanded and refined conceptualizations of (a) the qualities of texts that learners produce, (b) the processes of students' composing, and, increasingly, (c) the specific sociocultural contexts in which this learning occurs. Research has tended to treat each of these dimensions separately, though they are integrally interrelated. Certain recommendations for instruction follow from this inquiry, but the conclusiveness and comprehensiveness of such recommendations are constrained by the multi-faceted nature of second-language writing and the extensive variability associated both with literacy and with languages internationally.

KEYWORDS: writing, second and foreign languages, learning, instruction, research, theories.

* Address for correspondence: Alister Cumming, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Modern Language Centre, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1V6, tel.: 1-416-923-6641, ext. 2538, fax: 1-416-926-4769, e-mail: acumming@oise.utoronto.ca

I. INTRODUCTION

Sufficient research on writing in second languages has accumulated over the past two decades to permit assessments of what this research can collectively tell us. Many publications have recently done so, highlighting trends in theories (e.g., Cumming, 1998; Grabe, 2001; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Silva, 1990; Silva, Leki & Carson, 1997), empirical findings (e.g., Cumming, 1994; Krapels, 1990; Reichelt, 1999; Silva, 1993), implications for instruction (e.g., Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998; Leki, 1992; Raimes, 1991, 1998), new technologies for writing (e.g., Cummins & Sayers, 1995; Pennington, 1996; Warschauer, 1999), and assessment practices (e.g., Cumming, 1997; Hamp-Lyons, 1991; Kroll, 1998). The present article focuses specifically on learning to write in second or foreign languages. I review three dimensions of writing that have featured in published research on this topic over the past two decades. Then I consider how analyses of these three dimensions each produces an alternative view of instruction in second-language writing. In reviewing publications for this article I have selected published empirical studies that illuminate these themes. I have cited research on various second or foreign languages, though the vast majority of these publications concern writing among adults acquiring English in formal educational contexts.

II. LEARNING TO WRITE IN A SECOND LANGUAGE

What does learning to write in a second language involve? Most relevant research has investigated one of three fundamental dimensions of second-language writing: (a) features of the texts that people produce; (b) the composing processes that people use while they write; and (c) the sociocultural contexts in which people write. Each dimension has a micro- and a macro-perspective, viewing second-language writing either from a relatively local, episodic, or individual basis or from a more global, sequential, or holistic viewpoint, as shown in Figure 1.

	<i>Micro</i>	<i>Macro</i>
<i>Text</i>	Syntax & morphology	Cohesive devices
	Lexis	Text structure
<i>Composing</i>	Searches for words & syntax	Planning
	Attention to ideas & language concurrently	Revising
<i>Context</i>	Individual development	Participate in a discourse community
	Self-image or identity	Social change

Figure 1: What does a person learn when writing in a second language?

1.1. Text Features

Considerable research has viewed writing improvement in terms of features of the texts that second-language learners produce. At a micro-level of discourse, diverse studies have shown second-language learners to improve the complexity and accuracy of the syntax and morphology in their written texts (Archibald, 1994; Bardovi-Harlig, 1995, 1997; Bardovi-Harlig & Bofman, 1989; Cumming & Mellow, 1996; Dickson, Boyce, Lee, Portal, Smith & Kendall, 1987; Harley & King, 1989; Ishikawa, 1995; Mellow & Cumming, 1994; Perkins, 1980; Reid, 1992; Sweedler-Brown, 1993; Weissberg, 2000). A related aspect is learners' abilities to use a greater range of vocabulary in their writing as their second-language proficiency increases (Engber, 1995; Grant & Ginther, 2000; Laufer & Nation, 1995, 1999; Reid, 1986; Sweedler-Brown, 1993; but see Cumming & Mellow, 1996). At a macro-level of text structure, people also learn to become more adept at signaling a hierarchy of related ideas at the beginning, end, or throughout a text (Connor, 1996; Kaldor, Herriman & Rochecouste, 1998; Tedick & Mathison, 1995), specifically by using cohesive, functional-semantic, or various stylistic devices in their second-language texts (Allison, 1995; Jacobs, 1982; Grant & Ginther, 2000; Hyland & Milton, 1997; Intaraprawat & Steffenson, 1995; Reid, 1992; Reynolds, 1995; Schleppegrel, 1996). Such developmental patterns have been documented in respect to discourse features unique to particular text-types, such as argumentative (Connor & Farmer, 1990; Grant & Ginther, 2000; Varghese & Abraham, 1998; Vedder, 1999;

Yeh, 1998), autobiographical (Henry, 1996), or narrative (Albrechtsen, 1997a; Bardovi-Harlig, 1995) modes of writing, or impressionistically (with rating scales) across various kinds of writing tasks (Cumming, 1989; Cumming & Riazi, 2000; Kaldor, Herriman & Rochecouste, 1998; Kern & Schultz, 1992; Tarone, Downing, Cohen, Gillette, Murie & Dailey, 1993). Similarly, in tasks where reading and writing are closely integrated (e.g., summarizing or translating), learners tend to **become** better able (as they develop individually, or in comparison to less skilled counterparts) to use ideas, phrases, and conventions of referencing from **source** documents appropriately in their written texts (Braine, 1995; Connor & Kramer, 1995; Cumming, Rebuffot & Ledwell, 1989; Deckert, 1993; Dong, 1996; Hood & Knightley, 1991; Johns, 1985; Ruiz-Funes, 1999; Sarig, 1993; Tsang, 1996).

Collectively, this inquiry suggests that as people learn to write in a second language their written texts display more sophisticated, complex syntax and morphology, a greater range and specificity of vocabulary, and improved command over conventional rhetorical forms and over ways of signaling the relations of their texts to other texts when performing tasks that involve reading and writing. The conceptual orientations guiding such inquiry are text linguistics, **diverse** theories of grammar (ranging from conventional descriptions to functional concepts), and **principles** of rhetoric or stylistics. Researchers **have** typically categorized specific text **features**—using measures such as tallies of occurrences, ratings against hierarchical maps or networks of normative text structures, or type-token ratios (of text **features** or types of words or other linguistic items to the total words in each **text**)—to compare groups of compositions **judged** to differ in quality or to represent different stages of learning or writing ability (i.e., in cross-sectional research designs, e.g., Cumming & Mellow, 1996; Grant & Ginther, 2000; Laufer & Nation, 1995; Tarone et al., 1993). More rarely, researchers **have** studied the texts of particular learners as they progress in their writing over time (i.e., in longitudinal research designs, e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, 1997; Hood & Knightley, 1991; Kern & Schultz, 1992). Computer programs that tag specific text **features** **have** recently helped to facilitate such inquiry (e.g., Cumming & Mellow, 1996; Ferris, 1993; Grant & Ginther, 2000; Reid, 1986, 1992). A limitation on these conclusions, however, is that research on the development of second-language written texts has tended to use differing methods of analyses and theoretical frameworks in **diverse** contexts, among differing **learner** groups writing different types of texts. Consequently, the findings from this research point toward possible tendencies **rather than firm**, predictable generalizations. Moreover, **evidence** from text analyses is inherently restricted in its capacity to explain why people learn. To understand why and how people may change their writing **behaviors**, researchers **have** had, in addition to text analyses, to examine the processes of composing and of social interaction that influence people's textual choices.

11.2. Composing Processes

Investigating how second-language learners compose their written texts is a second major dimension investigated in recent research. In addition to simply describing what these composing processes are, numerous studies have made inferences about learned abilities by contrasting performance among two groups of learners who have greater and lesser proficiency, skill, or experience in second-language writing (i.e., novice-expert studies, aiming to determine what may constitute more skilled processes of second-language composing) or by contrasting the same learners writing comparable tasks in their first and second languages (i.e., within-subjects designs, aiming to determine what is unique about writing in the second language, compared to the first language). Cognitively-oriented studies have examined learners' ongoing thinking episodes or decision-making while composing, finding salient composing behaviors among skilled second-language learners to be frequent or fluent searches for appropriate words or phrases (Butler-Nalin, 1984; Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001; Cumming, 1989, 1990; Silva, 1992; Qi, 1998; Uzawa, 1996) and attention to ideas and to language forms concurrently while making decisions (Bell, 1995; Cumming, 1989, 1990; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Vignola, 1995; Whalen & Menard, 1995). Such micro-level, heuristic decision-making about writing tends to occur in brief, sporadic episodes while composing, so it contrasts with more extended, macro-level strategies for composing that people use to prepare for, draft, revise, and complete their writing tasks. At this macro-level, as with mother-tongue composing, more skilled second-language writers tend to do more effective and extensive planning (either prior to or while composing, Akyel, 1994; Cumming, 1989; Roca de Larios, Murphy & Manchón, 1999; Sasaki, 2000; Zimmerman, 2000), revising (Hall, 1990; Manchón, Roca de Larios & Murphy, 2000; Urzua, 1987; Zamel, 1983), and/or editing (Polio, Fleck & Leder, 1998; Walters & Wolf, 1996) of their texts than do their less skilled counterparts. Like unskilled writers in their mother tongues, people who do not write well in the second language are often unable to (or unsure of how to) plan, manipulate, monitor, or revise their ideas or texts effectively (Bosher, 1998; Clachar, 1999; Cumming, 1989, 1995; Hall, 1990; Porte, 1996; Raimes, 1987; Sasaki, 2000; Victori, 1999; Uzawa, 1996; Zimmerman, 2000).

That individuals compose in their second languages in fundamentally the same way as they do in their mother tongues has been demonstrated in numerous studies and diverse contexts (Akyel & Kamisli, 1997; Albrechtsen, 1997b; Amdt, 1987; Berman, 1994; Cumming, Rebuffot & Ledwell, 1989; Edelsky, 1986; Hall, 1990; Pennington & So, 1993; Skibniewski & Skibniewska, 1986; Uzawa, 1996; Vedder, 1999, cf. Krapels, 1990). But in the second-language, learners seem to devote much attention while they write to decisions about the form of the second language or to finding resources such as appropriate words, which may constrain their attention to formulating complex ideas, their capacity to function in situations of high knowledge demands, and the extent of their planning of their writing (Fagan & Hayden, 1988; Jacobs, 1982;

Jones & Tetroe, 1987; Qi, 1998; Roca de Larios et al., 1999; Uzawa & Cumming, 1989; Whalen & Ménard, 1995). An intriguing behavior documented in various studies is that of using the resources of both first and second languages together for various strategic purposes while composing (Akyel, 1994; Clachar, 1999; Cumming, 1989, 1990; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1992; Lay, 1982; Manchón et al., 2000; Qi, 1998; Smith, 1994; Uzawa, 1996; Uzawa & Cumming, 1989). An upshot of this kind of inquiry has been the argument, encapsulated in Swain's (1995) "output hypothesis", that the context of writing (particularly the time available for reflection and revision, the goal of instantiating ideas or communication into formal text, and the necessity of assessing hypotheses about the language before putting them down as text) presents an optimal context to learn to use the forms of the second language, offering practice that may prompt people to convert their acquired competence in a second language into controlled, skillful performance (Cumming, 1990; Ringbom, 1987; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Weissberg, 2000).

In sum, the research on composing processes suggests that as people learn to write in a second language they gain greater control over their abilities to plan, revise and edit their texts, to search for appropriate words and phrases (drawing on their first and second languages as resources in the process), and to attend more often or intently to their ideas in respect to the forms of the second language. In the process of doing so, people may consolidate or refine their abilities in the second language. Because these processes are primarily mental and self-directed, researchers have relied on methods of investigation like concurrent verbal reports, stimulated recalls, personal journals, or interviews to elicit verbal data from people about their thinking while they compose or recently composed. (But computer programs that monitor writers' key strokes have started to document some of these composing and revising behaviors online, e.g., Li & Cumming, this volume; New, 1999; Pennington, 1993; Thorson, 2000.) These introspective research techniques, supported by theories of cognitive problem-solving in complex tasks (e.g., Ericsson & Simon, 1984), have been applied with many insights into the study of mother-tongue writing processes by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), among others. But their limitations are neatly summarized in Smagorinsky (1994, i.e., learners' "reactivity" to researchers' purposes, restrictions and variability in people's capacities to report on their thinking, and distortions of natural contexts for composing). In addition to the limitations inherent in verbal reports, such inquiry has mostly: (a) required tightly-controlled, experimental conditions for writing; (b) found it challenging to explain exactly how specific composing processes lead to particular qualities of written products; and (c) involved relatively small numbers and select groups of learners (see article by Manchón, this volume). For these reasons, and in efforts to understand how learning to write in a second language naturally occurs and develops, considerable research in the past decade has sought to investigate the social contexts of composing.

11.3. Contexts of Writing

A third dimension investigated in recent research concerns the social contexts of second-language writing. At a micro-level, learning from this viewpoint is a process of individual development in particular social contexts. Accordingly, research has **taken** the form of case studies focused on the situations and personal challenges a person, or small, related group of people, experiences writing in the second language. Research in naturally-occurring contexts for second-language writing has produced vivid accounts of people studying at universities, colleges, or schools (Angelova & Riazantseva, 1999; Casanave, 1995; Currie, 1993; Johns, 1992; Leki, 1995; Leki & Carson, 1997; Losey, 1997; Maguire, 1997; Prior, 1998; Riazi, 1997; Spack, 1997; Zamel, 1995); in their home and community settings (Cumming & Gill, 1991; Long, 1998; Losey, 1997); or working at specific job functions (Parks, 2000; Parks & Maguire, 1999; Pogner, 1997; Thatcher, 2000), including scholars trying to publish in their second language (Casanave, 1998; J. Flowerdew, 1999, 2000; Gosden, 1996; Matsumoto, 1995). Learning to write in a second language from this perspective highlights concepts such as acculturation into particular discourse communities (cf. Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995) through processes of legitimate peripheral participation (e.g., J. Flowerdew, 2000; Parks, 2000, cf. Lave & Wenger, 1991), individual coping and learning strategies (e.g., Leki, 1995; Riazi, 1997), and the long-term, shifting formation of individual identities (e.g., Casanave, 1992; Lam, 2000; Maguire, 1997; Spack, 1997). In other words, writing in a second language forms a focus for individuals to learn ways of cooperating with and seeking assistance from diverse people and resources; to adapt to and reflect on new situations, knowledge and abilities; to negotiate relations of work and power; and to gain and modify new senses of self.

Most of these studies have adopted an ethnographic orientation and research methods, involving long-term engagement and emergent inquiry using observations, interviews, and discourse analysis. But few of these studies have—as Ramanathan and Atkinson (1999) argued—actually attempted to present a full-scale ethnography of second-language writing. Nonetheless, Edelsky (1986) and Losey (1997) do aspire to comprehensive, critically conscious accounts of biliteracy learning and education among specific Hispanic populations in the U.S., and Prior (1998) and Spack (1997) provide thorough, long-term accounts of learning to write in particular university settings. In turn, certain studies have started to depict the administrative policies, structures and practices of second-language writing, providing a macro-perspective on the social contexts of second-language writing through comparative surveys and analyses (Atkinson & Ramanathan, 1995; Pennington, Costa, So, Shing, Hirose & Niedzielski, 1997; Powers & Nelson, 1995; Williams, 1995). Macro-perspectives on social contexts have featured explicitly in literacy research directed at social change, following ideas of Freire (e.g., 1970), to improve learning opportunities for specific minority groups otherwise not well served by education. Projects such as Auerbach (1992), Cumming and Gill (1991), and Moll (1989) have devised unique

educational programs to build on the cultural knowledge of disadvantaged groups, and then the researchers have documented how these programs promoted participants' long-term literacy achievement. These projects demonstrate that transforming conventional structures of education to suit minority cultural values can improve diverse people's writing and other dimensions of educational opportunity, definitions of self-worth, and societal participation. However, few such ethnographies or participatory research projects have been conducted, seemingly because of the intense, sustained research effort they require. Although they have provided profound insights into the societal dimensions of second-language literacy, these contextually-oriented studies are inherently local and limited, the evidence they present is often highly interpretive and selective (given the complexity of factors related to second-language writing in any one context), and much necessarily relies on learners' self-analysis of their own circumstances and abilities.

III. IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTRUCTION

What do these studies of learning tell us for teaching? Most importantly, they help to conceptualize what learning to write in a second language entails. But they do so in three relatively distinctive, though necessarily interdependent, ways (as summarized in Figure 1). Instructional modeling of second-language writing probably should include not just modeling of text forms but also modeling of composing processes and of the socio-cultural purposes and functions that writing in the second language serves (Cumming, 1995).

Analyses of text features have guided many recommendations for teaching second-language writing in respect to genre form and function (e.g., Connor & Farmer, 1990; Feez, 1998; L. Flowerdew, 2000; Hammond, 1987; Hyon, 1996; Johns, 1997; Paltridge, 1997; Swales, 1990). A micro-perspective on language forms also informs conventional methods of grammatical instruction and pedagogical practices for responding to students' writing. But determining exactly how teachers' feedback on students' writing may influence their learning has proved difficult to evaluate. Teachers' feedback is so personalized, subtle, task-specific, and even inconsistent that it is difficult to document, categorize, and interpret (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ferris, 1995, 1997; Ferris, Pezone, Tade & Tinti, 1997; Hyland, 1998; Truscott, 1996; Warden, 2000; Zamel, 1985, and see Goldstein, 2001, for a review). Students have diverse preferences for feedback, based on their prior education, tasks, and future intentions, so they act on such feedback in diverse ways (Cumming & Riazi, 2000; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994, 1996; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Saito, 1994). Because such feedback typically occurs after initial drafting it may have limited impact on students' online composing processes (Cumming & So, 1996; Polio, Fleck & Leder, 1998).

Many assessment practices, curricula and educational policies have taken for granted that the text features of second-language writers develop significantly and systematically as students

progress, but it is worrying that no theories and few large-scale research projects have accounted comprehensively for grammatical or rhetorical development in second-language writing, nor have explicit models appeared to explain exactly how instruction might influence such developments (Archibald, 1994; Cumming, 1997, 2001; Cumming & Riazi, 2000; Cummins & Swain, 1986; Grabe, 2001; Polio, 1997; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Silva, 1993; Valdés, Haro & Echevarriarza, 1992). At the same time, research on composing processes has promoted a widespread consensus that instruction should emphasize students' planning, information-gathering, revision, and editing of drafts of writing (Pennington et al., 1997; Raimes, 1991, 1998). Because many unskilled second-language writers lack or fail to implement certain composing strategies (as demonstrated in research on their composing processes), a promising area of inquiry has been to provide instruction that prompts learners to set long-term goals for themselves to improve their writing. In these circumstances, many second-language learners have been able to define, monitor, and accomplish their personal goals successfully while they compose (Cumming, 1986, 1995; Donato & McCormick, 1994; Hoffman, 1998; Sasaki, 2000).

Research that extends the focus of learning (beyond the text and individual composing) to social contexts has helped to analyze the range of classroom situations and variables that may foster learning to write in a second language. These include the spoken discourse of teaching (Cumming, 1992; Losey, 1997; Shi, 1998; Weissberg, 1994), teachers' beliefs about writing (Clachar, 2000; Li, 1996; Shi & Cumming, 1995); the dynamics of peer or group responses to writing (Berg, 1999; Carson & Nelson, 1996; Connor & Asenavage, 1994; de Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Lockhart & Ng, 1995; Mangelsdorf & Schlumberger, 1992; McGroarty & Zhu, 1997; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Nelson & Murphy, 1992; Paulus, 1999; Shi, 1998; Stanley, 1992; Tang & Titchcott, 1999; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996; Zhang, 1995), written interactions between teachers and students through dialogue journals (Nassaji & Cumming, 2000; Peyton & Staton, 1993), one-on-one tutoring (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; Cumming & So, 1996), and teacher-student conferences (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Patthey-Chavez & Clare, 1996; Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997). Although only a few of these studies have adopted a specifically Vygotskian perspective (e.g., Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994; de Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Nassaji & Cumming, 2000), their collective findings can be summarized in Vygotskian terms: These various types of situated interactions, if pitched appropriately and meaningfully at learners' zones of proximal development, can help in diverse ways to scaffold people's acquisition of text forms, composing processes, and purposeful social interactions through writing in the second language.

Obviously writing and second languages are multi-faceted phenomena. Their variability is perhaps the greatest constraint on obtaining a comprehensive view of learning them that might unequivocally inform teaching. As Hornberger (1989) and Hornberger and Skilton-Sylvester (2000) have demonstrated, biliteracy varies along several continua — personally, interpersonally, culturally, and geographically — in terms of the characteristics and development of individuals,

contexts of language use, relations of status and power, and facets of communication media. It is little wonder then that diverse cultural values inform even the measures used to assess achievement in second-language writing (Connor-Linton, 1995; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1996; Song & Caruso, 1996) and variability is inherent across different types of conventional assessment tasks for second-language writing (Koda, 1993; Reid, 1992; Way, Joiner & Seaman, 2000). In view of this complexity and variability, it is perhaps to be expected that over the past two decades of research a multi-faceted, rather than unified, perspective has emerged on learning to write in second languages.

REFERENCES

- Albrechtsen, D. (1997a). A discourse analysis of narrative essays written in English by Danish students. In K. Pogner (Ed.), *Writing: Text and interaction. Odense Working Papers in Language and Communication*, 14, 1-40.
- Albrechtsen, D. (1997b). One writer, two languages: A case study of a 15-year-old student's writing processes in Danish and English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7 (2), 223-250.
- Aljaafreh, A. & Lantolf, J. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78 (4), 465-483.
- Allison, D. (1995). Assertions and alternatives: Helping ESL undergraduates extend their choices in academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4 (1), 1-15.
- Akyel, A. (1994). First language use in EFL writing: Planning in Turkish vs. planning in English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4 (2), 169-196.
- Akyel, A. & Karnisli, S. (1997). Composing in first and second languages: Possible effects of EFL writing instruction. In K. Pogner (Ed.), *Writing: Text and interaction. Odense Working Papers in Language and Communication*, 14, 69-105.
- Archibald, A. (1994). *The acquisition of discourse proficiency: A study of the ability of German school students to produce written texts in English as a foreign language*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Angelova, M. & Kiazantseva, A. (1999). "If you don't tell me, how can I know?" A case study of four international students learning to write the U.S. way. *Written Communication*, 16 (4), 491-525.
- Arndt, V. (1987). Six writers in search of texts: A protocol-based study of L1 and L2 writing. *ELT Journal*, 41 (4), 257-267.
- Atkinson, D. & Rarnanathan, V. (1995). Cultures of writing: An ethnographic comparison of L1 and L2 university writing/language programs. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29 (3), 539-568.
- Auerbach, E. (1992). *Making meaning, making change: Participatory curriculum development for adult ESL literacy*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.

- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1995). A narrative perspective on the development of the tense/aspect system in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17 (2), 263-291.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1997). Another piece of the puzzle: The emergence of the present perfect. *Language Learning*, 47 (3), 375-422.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Bofman, T. (1989). Attainment of syntactic and morphological accuracy by advanced language learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11 (1), 17-34.
- Bell, J. (1995). The relationship between L1 and L2 literacy: Some complicating factors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29 (4), 687-704.
- Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berg, E. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8 (3), 215-241.
- Berkenkotter, C. & Huckin, T. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication: Cognition/culture/power*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berman, R. (1994). Learners' transfer of writing skills between languages. *TESL Canada Journal*, 12 (1), 29-46.
- Bosher, S. (1998). The composing processes of three southeast Asian writers at the post-secondary level: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7 (2), 205-241.
- Braine, G. (1995). Writing in the natural sciences and engineering. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 113-134). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Butler-Nalin, K. (1984). Revising patterns in students' writing. In A. Applebee (Ed.), *Contexts for learning to write* (pp. 121-133). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Carson, J. & Nelson, G. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5 (1), 1-19.
- Casanave, C. (1992). Cultural diversity and socialization: A case study of a Hispanic woman in a doctoral program in sociology. In D. Murray (Ed.), *Diversity as resource: Redefining cultural literacy* (pp. 148-180). Alexandria, VI: TESOL.
- Casanave, C. (1995). Local interactions: Constructing contexts for composing in a graduate sociology program. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 83-110). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Casanave, C. (1998). Transitions: The balancing act of bilingual academics. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7 (2), 175-203.
- Chenoweth, N. & Hayes, J.R. (2001). Fluency in writing: Generating text in L1 and L2. *Written Communication*, 18, (1), 80-98.

- Clachar, A. (1999). It's not just cognition: The effect of emotion on multiple-level discourse processing in second-language writing. *Language Sciences*, 21 (1), 31-60.
- Clachar, A. (2000). Opposition and accommodation: An examination of Turkish teachers' attitudes toward Western approaches to the teaching of writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 35 (1), 66-100.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U. & Asenavage, K. (1994). Peer response groups in ESL writing classes: How much impact on revision? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3 (2), 257-276.
- Connor, U. & Farmer, M. (1990). The teaching of topical structure analysis as a revision strategy for ESL writers. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 126-139). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U. & Kramer, M. (1995). Writing from sources: Case studies of graduate students in business management. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 155-182). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Connor-Linton, J. (1995). Cross-cultural comparison of writing standards: American ESL and Japanese EFL. *World Englishes*, 14 (1), 99-115.
- Conrad, S. & Goldstein, L. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher-written comments: Text, contexts, and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8 (2), 147-179.
- Cumming, A. (1986). Intentional learning as a principle for ESL writing instruction: A case study. In P. Lightbown & S. Firth (Eds.), *TESL Canada Journal*, Special Issue 1, 69-83.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 39 (1), 81-141.
- Cumming, A. (1990). Metalinguistic and ideational thinking in second language composing. *Written Communication*, 7 (4), 482-511.
- Cumming, A. (1992). Instructional routines in ESL composition teaching. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (1), 17-35.
- Cumming, A. (Ed.) (1994). *Bilingual performance in reading and writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins/Language Learning.
- Cumming, A. (1995). Fostering writing expertise in ESL composition instruction: Modeling and evaluation. In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essay on research and pedagogy* (pp. 375-397). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Cumming, A. (1997). The testing of second-language writing. In C. Clapham (volume Ed.) & D. Corson (series Ed.), *Language assessment*, Vol. 7 of *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 51-63). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.

- Cumming, A. (1998). Theoretical perspectives on writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 61-78.
- Cumming, A. (2001). The difficulty of standards, for example in L2 writing. In T. Silva & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *On secondlanguage writing* (pp. 209-229). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cumming, A. & Gill, J. (1991). Learning ESL literacy among Indo-Canadian women. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 4 (3), 181-2000.
- Cumming, A. & Mellow, J. D. (1996). An investigation into the validity of written indicators of second language proficiency. In A. Cumming & R. Berwick (Eds.), *Validation in language testing* (pp. 72-93). Clevedon, Avon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Cumming, A., Rebuffot, J. & Ledwell, M. (1989). Reading and summarizing challenging texts in first and second languages. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 2 (2), 201-219.
- Cumming, A. & Riazi, A. (2000). Building models of adult second-language writing instruction. *Learning and Instruction*, 10 (1), 55-71.
- Cumming, A. & So, S. (1996). Tutoring second language text revision: Does the approach to instruction or the language of communication make a difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5 (3), 197-226.
- Cummins, J. & Sayers, D. (1995). *Brave new schools: Challenging cultural illiteracy*. Toronto: OISE Press/University of Toronto Press.
- Cummins, J. & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education*. London: Longman.
- Currie, P. (1993). Entering a disciplinary community: Conceptual activities required to write for one introductory university course. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (2), 101-117.
- Deckert, G. (1993). Perspectives on plagiarism from ESL students in Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (2), 131-148.
- de Guerrero, M. & Villamil, O. (1994). Social-cognitive dimensions of interaction in L2 peer revision. *Modern Language Journal*, 78 (4), 484-496.
- Dickson, P., Boyce, C., Lee, B., Portal, M., Smith, M. & Kendall, L. (1987). Assessment of performance unit: *Foreign language performance in schools, Report of the 1985 survey of French*. Slough, UK: National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales.
- Dong, Y. (1996). Learning how to use citations for knowledge transfonnations: Non-native doctoral students' dissertation writing in science. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 30 (4), 428-457.
- Donato, R. & McCormick, D. (1994). A sociocultural perspective on language learning strategies: The role of mediation. *Modern Language Journal*, 78 (4), 453-464.
- Edelsky, C. (1986). *Writing in a bilingual program*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Engber, C. (1995). The relationship of lexical proficiency to the quality of ESL compositions. *Journal*
- O Servicio de Publicaciones. Universidad de Murcia. All rights reserved. *IJES*, vol. 1 (2), 2001, pp. 1-23

- of Second Language Writing*, 4 (2), 139-155.
- Ericsson, A. & Simon, H. (1984). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fagan, W. & Hayden, H. (1988). Writing processes in French and English of fifth grade French immersion students. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 44 (4), 653-668.
- Feez, S. (1998). *Text-based syllabus design*. Sydney, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- Ferris, D. (1993). The design of an automatic analysis program for L2 text research: Necessity and feasibility. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (2), 119-129.
- Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29 (1), 33-53.
- Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31 (3), 315-339.
- Ferris, D. & Hedgcock, J. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D., Pezone, S., Tade, C., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6 (2), 155-182.
- Flowerdew, J. (1999). Problems in writing for scholarly publication in English: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8 (3), 243-264.
- Flowerdew, J. (2000). Discourse community, legitimate peripheral participation, and the nonnative-English-speaking scholar. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34 (1), 127-150.
- Flowerdew, L. (2000). Using a genre-based framework to teach organizational structure in academic writing. *ELT Journal*, 54 (4), 369-378.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (M. Ramos, trans.). New York: Seabury.
- Goldstein, L. & Conrad, S. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24 (4), 443-460.
- Goldstein, L. (2001). For Kyla: What does the research say about responding to ESL writers. In T. Silva & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 73-89). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gosden, H. (1996). Verbal reports of Japanese novices' research writing practices in English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5 (2), 109-128.
- Grabe, W. (2001). Notes toward a theory of second language writing. In T. Silva & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 39-57). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Grant, L. & Ginther, L. (2000). Using computer-tagged linguistic features to describe L2 writing differences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9 (2), 123-145.
- Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24 (1), 43-60.
- Hammond, J. (1987). An overview of the genre-based approach to the teaching of writing in Australia. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10 (2), 163-181.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (Ed.) (1991). *Assessing second language writing in academic contexts*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Harley, B. & King, M. (1989). Verb lexis in the written compositions of L2 learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11 (4), 415-439.
- Hedgcock, J. & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (3), 255-276.
- Hedgcock, J. & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3 (2), 141-163.
- Hedgcock, J. & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback on L2 writing. *Modern Language Journal*, 80 (3), 287-308.
- Henry, K. (1996). Early L2 writing development: A study of autobiographical essays by university-level students of Russian. *Modern Language Journal*, 80 (3), 309-326.
- Hoffman, A. (1998). An exploratory study of goal setting and the nature of articulated goals in second language writing development. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 4, 33-48.
- Hood, S. & Knightley, S. (1991). *Literacy development: A longitudinal study*. Sydney, Australia: New South Wales Adult Migrant English Service.
- Hornberger, N. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, 59 (2), 271-296.
- Hornberger, N. & Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2000). Revisiting the continua of biliteracy: International and critical perspectives. *Language and Education*, 14 (2), 96-122.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher-written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7 (3), 255-286.
- Hyland, K. & Milton, J. (1997). Qualification and certainty in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6 (2), 183-205.
- Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (4), 693-722.
- Intaraprawat, P & Steffenson, M. (1995). The use of metadiscourse in good and poor ESL essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4 (2), 253-272.

- Ishikawa, S. (1995). Objective measurement of low-proficiency ESL narrative writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4 (1), 51-69.
- Jacobs, S. (1982). *Composing and coherence: The writing of eleven pre-medical students*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Johns, A. (1985). Summary protocols of "underprepared" and "adept" university students" Replications and distortions of the original. *Language Learning*, 35 (4), 495-517.
- Johns, A. (1992). Toward developing a cultural repertoire: A case study of a Lao college freshman. In D. Murray (Ed.), *Diversity as resource: Redefining cultural literacy* (pp. 183-198). Alexandria, VI: TESOL.
- Johns, A. (1997). *Text, role, and context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, S. & Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), *Writing in real time: Modeling the production processes* (pp. 34-57). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Kaldor, S., Herriman, M. & Rochecouste, J. (1998). *Framing student literacy: Cross-cultural aspects of communication skills in Australian university settings. Tertiary student writing*. Perth: University of Western Australia.
- Kem, R. & Schultz, J. (1992). The effects of composition instruction on intermediate level French students' writing performance: Some preliminary findings. *Modern Language Journal*, 76 (1), 1-13.
- Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (1992). Effects of first language on second language writing: Translation versus direct composition. *Language Learning*, 42 (2), 183-215.
- Kobayashi, H. & C. Rinnert. (1996). Factors affecting composition evaluation in an EFL context: Cultural rhetorical pattern and readers' background. *Language Learning*, 46 (3), 397-437.
- Koda, K. (1993). Task-induced variability in FL composing: Language-specific perspectives. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26 (3), 332-346.
- Krapels, A. (1990). An overview of second language writing process research. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 37-56). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kroll, B. (1998). Assessing writing abilities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 219-240.
- Lam, W. (2000). L2 literacy and the design of the self: A case study of a teenager writing on the Internet. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34 (3), 457-482.
- Laufer, B. & Nation, P. (1995). Vocabulary size and use: Lexical richness in L2 written production. *Applied Linguistics*, 16 (3), 307-322.
- Laufer, B. & Nation, P. (1999). A vocabulary-size test of controlled productive ability. *Language Testing*, 16 (1), 33-51.

- Lave, J. & Wegner, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lay, N. (1982). Composing processes of adult ESL learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16 (3), 406.
- Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, Heineman.
- Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29 (2), 235-260.
- Leki, I. & Carson, J. (1997). "Completely different worlds": EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31 (1), 39-69.
- Li, X. (1996). *"Good writing" in cross-cultural context*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lockhart, C. & Ng, P. (1995). Analyzing talk in ESL peer response groups: Stances, functions, and content. *Language Learning*, 45 (4), 605-655.
- Long, S. (1998). Learning to get along: Language acquisition and literacy development in a new cultural setting. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 33 (1), 8-48.
- Losey, K. (1997). *Listen to the silences: Mexican American interaction in the composition classroom and the community*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Maguire, M. (1997). Shared and negotiated territories: The socio-cultural embeddedness of children's acts of meaning. In A. Pollard, D. Thiessen, & A. Filer (Eds.), *Children and their curriculum* (pp. 51-80). London: Falmer.
- Manchón, R. M., Roca de Larios, J. & Murphy, L. (2000). An approximation to the study of backtracking in L2 writing. *Learning and Instruction*, 10 (1), 13-35.
- Mangelsdorf, K. & Schlumberger, A. (1992). ESL student response stances in a peer-review task. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (3), 235-254.
- Matsumoto, K. (1995). Research paper writing strategies of professional Japanese ESL writers. *TESL Canada Journal*, 13 (1), 17-27.
- McGroarty, M. & Zhu, W. (1997). Triangulation in classroom research: A study of peer revision. *Language Learning*, 47 (1), 1-43.
- Mellow, J. D. & Cumming, A. (1994). Concord in interlanguage: Efficiency or priming? *Applied Linguistics*, 15 (4), 442-473.
- Moll, L. (1989). Teaching second language students: A Vygotskian perspective. In D. Johnson & S. Roen (Eds.), *Richness in writing* (pp. 55-69). New York: Longman.
- Nassaji, H. & Cumming, A. (2000). What's in a ZPD? A case study of a young ESL student and teacher interacting through dialogue journals. *Language Teaching Research*, 4 (2), 95-121.

- Nelson, G. & Carson, J. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7 (2), 113-131.
- Nelson, G. & Murphy, J. (1992). An L2 writing group: Task and social dimensions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (3), 171-193.
- New, E. (1999). Computer-aided writing in French as a foreign language: A qualitative and quantitative look at the process of revision. *Modern Language Journal*, 83 (1), 80-97.
- Paltridge, B. (1997). *Genres, frames, and writing in research settings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Parks, S. (2000). Professional writing and the role of incidental collaboration: Evidence from a medical setting. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9 (2), 101-122.
- Parks, S. & Maguire, M. (1999). Coping with on-the-job writing in ESL: A constructivist-hermeneutic perspective. *Language Learning*, 49 (1), 143-175.
- Patthey-Chavez, G. & Clare, L. (1996). Task, talk, and text: The influence of instructional conversation on transitional bilingual writers. *Written Communication*, 13 (4), 515-563.
- Patthey-Chavez, G. & Ferris, D. (1997). Writing conferences and the weaving of multi-voiced texts in college composition. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 31 (1), 51-90.
- Paulus, T. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8 (3), 265-289.
- Pennington, M. (1993). A critical examination of word processing effects in relation to L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (2), 227-255.
- Pennington, M. (1996). *The computer and the non-native writer: A natural partnership*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Pennington, M., Costa, V., So, S., Shing, J., Hirose, K., & Niedzielski, K. (1997). The teaching of English-as-a-Second-Language writing in the Asia-Pacific region: A cross-country comparison. *RELJ Journal*, 28 (2), 120-143.
- Pennington, M. & So, S. (1993). Comparing writing processes and products across two languages: A study of 6 Singaporean university student writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (1), 41-63.
- Perkins, K. (1980). Using objective methods of attained writing proficiency to discriminate among holistic evaluations. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14 (1), 61-69.
- Peyton, J. & Staton, J. (Eds.) (1993). *Dialogue journals in the multilingual classroom: Building fluency and writing skills through written interaction*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Polio, C. (1997). Measures of linguistic accuracy in second language writing research. *Language Learning*, 47 (1), 101-143.
- Polio, C., Fleck, C. & Leder, N. (1998). "If I only had more time:" ESL learners' changes in linguistic

- accuracy on essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7 (1), 43-68.
- Pogner, K. (1997). Text and dynamics: Observations on text production at a technical workplace. *Odense Working Papers in Language and Communication*, 14, 119-145.
- Porte, G. (1996). When writing fails: How academic context and past learning experiences shape revision. *System*, 24 (1), 107-116.
- Powers, J. & Nelson, J. (1995). L2 writers and the writing center: A national survey of writing center conferencing at graduate institutions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4 (2), 113-138.
- Prior, P. (1998). *Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Qi, D. (1998). An inquiry into language-switching in second language composing processes. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54 (3), 413-435.
- Radecki, P. & Swales, J. (1988). ESL students' reactions to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16 (3), 355-365.
- Raimes, A. (1987). Language proficiency, writing ability, and composing strategies: A study of ESL college student writers. *Language Learning*, 37 (3), 357-385.
- Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (3), 407-430.
- Raimes, A. (1998). Teaching writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 142-167.
- Ramanathan, V. & Atkinson, D. (1999). Ethnographic approaches and methods in L2 writing research: A critical guide and review. *Applied Linguistics*, 20 (1), 44-70.
- Reichelt, M. (1999). Toward a comprehensive view of L2 writing: Foreign language writing in the U.S. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8 (2), 181-204.
- Reid, J. (1986). Using the Writer's Workbench in composition teaching and testing. In C. Stansfield (Ed.), *Technology and language testing* (pp. 167-188). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Reid, J. (1992). A computer text analysis of four cohesion devices in English discourse by native and nonnative writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (2), 79-107.
- Reynolds, D. (1995). Repetition in nonnative speaker writing: More than quantity. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17 (2), 195-209.
- Riazi, A., (1997). Acquiring disciplinary literacy: A social-cognitive analysis of text production and learning among Iranian graduate students of education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6 (2), 105-137.
- Ringbom, H. (1987). *The role of the first language in foreign language learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Ruiz-Funes, M. (1999). The process of reading-to-write used by a skilled Spanish-as-a-foreign language student: A case study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 32 (1), 45-62.
- Roca de Larios, J., Murphy, L. & Manchón, R.M. (1999). The use of restructuring strategies in ESL writing: A study of Spanish learners of English as a foreign language. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8 (1), 13-44.
- Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Carzada Journal*, 11 (1), 46-70.
- Sarig, G. (1993). Composing a study-summary: A reading/writing encounter. In J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp. 161-182). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Sasaki, M. (2000). Toward an empirical model of EFL writing processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9 (3), 259-291.
- Sasaki, M. & K. Hirose. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning*, 46 (1), 137-174.
- Schleppegrell, M. (1996). Conjunction in spoken English and ESL writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 17 (3), 271-285.
- Shi, L. (1998). Effects of prewriting discussions on adult ESL students' compositions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7 (3), 319-345.
- Shi, L. & Cumming, A. (1995). Teachers' conceptions of second language writing instruction: Five case studies. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4 (1), 87-111.
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silva, T. (1992). L1 vs. L2 writing: ESL graduate students' perceptions. *TESL Carzada Journal*, 10 (1), 27-47.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27 (4), 657-677.
- Silva, T., Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). Broadening the perspective of mainstream composition studies: Some thoughts from the disciplinary margins. *Written Communication*, 14 (3), 398-428.
- Skibniewski, L. & Skibniewska, M. (1986). Experimental study: The writing processes of intermediate/advanced foreign language learners in their foreign and native languages. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 19, 143-163.
- Snagorinsky, P. (Ed.) (1994). *Speaking about writing: Reflections on research methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smith, V. (1994). Thinking in a foreign language: An investigation into essay writing and translation

by L2 learners. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

- Song, B. & Caruso, I. (1996). Do English and ESL faculty differ in evaluating the essays of native English-speaking and ESL students? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5 (2), 163-182.
- Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study. *Written Communication*, 14 (1), 3-62.
- Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (3), 217-233.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Sidelhofer (Eds.), *Principal and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16 (3), 371-391.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sweedler-Brown, C. (1993). ESL essay evaluation: The influence of sentence-level and rhetorical features. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (1), 3-17.
- Tang, G. & Tithecott, J. (1999). Peer response in ESL writing. *TESL Canada Journal*, 16 (2), 20-38.
- Tarone, E., Downing, B., Cohen, A., Gillette, S., Murie, R. & Dailey, B. (1993). The writing of Southeast Asian-American students in secondary school and university. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (2), 149-172.
- Tedick, D. & Mathison, M. (1995). Holistic scoring in ESL writing assessment: What does an analysis of rhetorical features reveal? In D. Belcher & G. Braine (Eds.), *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy* (pp. 205-230). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Thatcher, B. (2000). L2 professional writing in a U.S. and South American context. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9 (1), 41-69.
- Thorson, H. (2000). Using the computer to compare foreign and native language writing processes: A statistical and case study approach. *Modern Language Journal*, 84 (2), 155-170.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46 (2), 327-369.
- Tsang, W. (1996). Comparing the effects of reading and writing on writing performance. *Applied Linguistics*, 17 (2), 210-233.
- Urzua, C. (1987). "You stopped too soon": Second language children composing and revising. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21 (2), 279-304.
- Uzawa, K. (1996). Second language learners' processes of L1 writing, L2 writing, and translation from
- O Servicio de Publicaciones. Universidad de Murcia. All rights reserved. **IJES**, vol. 1 (2), 2001, pp. 1-23

- L1 into L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5 (3), 271-294.
- Uzawa, K. & Cumming, A. (1989). Writing strategies in Japanese as a foreign language: Lowering or keeping up the standards. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 46 (1), 119-134.
- Valdes, G., Haro, P. & Echevarriarza, M. (1992). The development of writing abilities in a foreign language: Contributions toward a general theory of L2 writing. *Modern Language Journal*, 76 (3), 333-352.
- Varghese, S. & Abraham, S. (1998). Undergraduates arguing a case. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7 (3), 287-306.
- Vedder, I. (1999). Linguistic and pragma-rhetorical characteristics of argumentative discourse in L2 and L1. In R. van Eemeren, R. Grootendorst & J. Blair (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference of the International Study of Argumentation* (pp. 813-819). Amsterdam: Society for the Study of Argumentation.
- Victori, M. (1999). An analysis of writing knowledge in EFL composing: A case study of two effective and two less effective writers. *System*, 27 (4), 537-555.
- Vignola, M. (1995). *Les prises de décision lors du processus d'écriture en langue maternelle et en langue seconde chez les diplômés d'immersion française*. [Decision making during the processes of writing in mother tongue and second language among graduates of French Immersion.] Quebec: International Center for Research on Language Planning.
- Villamil, O. & de Guerrero, M. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5 (1), 51-75.
- Walters, J. & Wolf, Y. (1996). Language awareness in non-native writers: Metalinguistic judgments of need for revision. *Language Awareness*, 5 (1), 3-25.
- Warden, C. (2000). EFL business writing behaviors in differing feedback environments. *Language Learning*, 50 (4), 573-616.
- Warschauer, M. (1999). *Electronic literacies: Language, culture, and power in online education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Way, D., Joiner, E. & Seaman, M. (2000). Writing in the secondary foreign language classroom: The effects of prompts and tasks on novice learners of French. *Modern Language Journal* 84 (2), 171-184.
- Weissberg, B. (1994). Speaking of writing: Some functions of talk in the ESL composition class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3 (2), 121-139.
- Weissberg, B. (2000). Developmental relationships in the acquisition of English syntax: Writing vs. speech. *Learning and Instruction*, 10 (1), 37-53.
- Whalen, K. & Ménard, N. (1995). L1 and L2 writers' strategic and linguistic knowledge: A model of multiple-level discourse processing. *Language Learning*, 45 (3), 381-418.

- Williams, J. (1995). ESL composition program administration in the United States. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4 (2), 157-179.
- Yeh, S. (1998). Empowering education: Teaching argumentative writing to cultural minority middle-school students. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 33 (1), 49-83.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17 (2), 165-187.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19 (1), 79-101.
- Zamel, V. (1995). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. *College Composition and Communication*, 46 (4), 506-521.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Re-examining the affective advantages of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4 (2), 209-222.
- Zirnerman, R. (2000). L2 writing: Subprocesses, a model of formulating and empirical findings. *Learning and Instruction*, 10 (1), 73-99.