

11

LANGUAGE AND L2 WRITING

Learning to write and writing to learn in academic contexts

Rosa M. Manchón

This chapter provides a survey of work on two dimensions of L2 writing in academic contexts seldom analyzed in combination thus far (but see Manchón, 2011a): the dimensions of learning to write (LW) and of writing to learn language (WLL). The former corresponds to theory and research concerned with advancing understandings of the various facets (personal, social, educational, sociopolitical, ideological, cognitive, and linguistic) of writing in an additional language. LW preoccupations constitute the backbone of most L2 writing studies, as evidenced in the list of contents of this volume.

In contrast, when L2 writing is viewed from the WLL perspective, the key issue of concern is the examination of the role that writing may play in developing competencies in an L2, hence prioritizing the “L2” part of L2 writing. This is a much more recent strand at the intersection between L2 writing studies and second language acquisition (SLA), and one that still needs to carve its own disciplinary space given that L2 writing research has been chiefly concerned with the “writing” part of L2 writing, while SLA scholars have made a priority of “oral” language acquisition and use in their theorizing and empirical endeavors (see Ortega, 2012).

The common thread of the joint analysis of the LW and WLL dimensions of L2 academic writing undertaken here is the *connection between language and L2 writing*. This will be approached through the dual lens of the role of language in the acquisition of L2 written literacy in academic settings (LW), on the one hand, and of the role of writing in the acquisition of L2 competences in academic settings (WLL), on the other. To accomplish this task, I will synthesize past and current research in terms of the theoretical frameworks informing it and the main issues of debate. This review of past and present achievements (which is not intended to be exhaustive and which will put heavier emphasis on the LW dimension) will be supplemented with a brief forward-looking account of key questions on the connection between language and L2 writing in need of further theoretical and empirical attention.

Learning to write in an additional language

The importance of language in the development of academic writing skills is undisputed. From a pedagogical angle, in the recent edition of their successful manual on teaching L2

composition, Ferris and Hedgcock (2014) assert that “skillful language use is an indispensable and inextricable part of what it means to be a successful writer” (p. 311). Based on this premise, their book includes a new chapter on “Developing language skills in the writing class: Why, what and how”. Their proposal is a welcome addition to many previous texts aimed at elucidating the most pedagogically valid approach to cater for the language needs of L2 writers in academic settings.

The importance of language in the acquisition of academic writing abilities has similarly long been acknowledged in the area of writing assessment, a domain in which Weigle (2013) has recently proposed to disentangle the “writing” and “language” dimensions. Accepting that “second language writing ability requires both writing skills, which may or may not have been learned in the writer’s first language, and proficiency in the second language”, and accepting also that writing ability and writing skills “can be considered a separate construct in its own right, and thus a complete picture of second language writing needs to consider both language and writing ability” (p. 87), Weigle presents a proposal for using automated scoring to assess either writing ability (assessing writing: AW) or second language proficiency (assessing language through writing: ALW), a distinction intended as an expansion of Manchón’s (2011a) LW/WLL distinction to the area of assessment.

The study of language in the construct of L2 writing also enjoys a long tradition in areas other than L2 teaching and assessment. Thus, studies of writing processes have provided ample empirical evidence of the intense linguistic processing activity that characterizes writing in an additional language (see reviews in Manchón, 2013; Roca de Larios, Murphy, & Marín, 2002). Empirical evidence shows that, although the process of text generation (or “transcription”) is prioritized by both L1 and L2 writers, L1 writers consume around 50 percent of their composing time in the transcription process, whereas this allocation can go up to 80 percent in L2 writing. This greater time spent in finding ways to express one’s intended meaning has been interpreted as an indication of the predominance of language concerns in L2 writing and of the more labor intense nature of composition writing in an L2. Interestingly, in contrast to earlier models of L1 writing in which the planning and revision processes were the central components and the ones that attracted most of the empirical attention, recent developments in L1 writing research emphasize the centrality of the process of text generation (Fayol, Alamargot, & Berninger, 2012) because this “is the goal for planning and provides the product on which the review and revision processes operate” (p. 12). Accordingly, transcription has been added as a central element in Hayes’ (2012) latest attempt at model building.

Other strands of research have applied diverse lenses to their inquiries into the role of language in the learning and teaching of L2 writing in academic contexts by both international students (mostly in university contexts) and publishing multilingual scholars from a wide range of disciplines. Key issues of concern in this body of research are the characteristics and development of L2 writers’ textual production (see Hinkel, 2002; see Polio & Park, 2016; Silva, 1993, for comprehensive overviews), their identity construction and multilingual literacy practices as multi-competent language users (cf. Gentil & Sêror, 2014; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2012; Marshall, Hayashi, & Yeung, 2012; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016), their writing processes and strategies as multilingual writers (as reviewed in Manchón, Roca de Larios, & Murphy, 2007; Roca de Larios, Murphy, & Marín, 2002) who can shuttle between languages and discourses (cf. Canagarajah, 2006, 2011a, b), their goals for writing in an additional language (cf. Cumming, 2006, 2012), and the challenges and dilemmas that international students and publishing scholars face in their attempts to succeed in their academic writing endeavors (cf. Flowerdew, 2013; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Kuteeva & Mauranten, 2014). This

array of research preoccupations explains the variety of theoretical perspectives that have informed scholarly work in the field. These include cognitive theories of L1 and L2 writing, theories of multilingualism and multi-competence, identity theories, goal theories, and several linguistic theories and approaches.

The research base on the role of language in the literacy practices, outcomes, and struggles of L2 writers in academic settings is too large to be thoroughly reviewed in the space available. This survey of major preoccupations is necessarily selective, but I will point the reader to further elaborations through citations of representative studies and reviews.

Characterizing the linguistic component of L2 writing abilities

We can start by isolating three dimensions of the nature of the linguistic component of L2 writing academic abilities that have attracted considerable attention: (i) the linguistic characteristics of L2 academic texts; (ii) the connection between the development of language capacities and writing expertise; and (iii) the challenges and dilemmas faced by international students and publishing academics as users of additional languages.

Characteristics of L2 texts and the development of L2 writing capacities

As mentioned above, an important linguistically-oriented line of inquiry has looked into the *characteristics of L2 texts and the development of L2 writing capacities*, or, put another way, into “what develops in L2 writing” from a linguistic perspective (see Norris & Manchón, 2012). Narrative accounts by bi/multilingual writers (mainly academics) have provided rich insights of various facets of the linguistic component of their biliteracy acquisition and development (for example, contributions to Belcher & Connor, 2001; Gentil & Séror, 2014; Tang, 2012c). Descriptive studies of the features of the texts produced by L2 writers have also produced important advances in this domain. The studies include analyses of (i) language use in a given domain (for instance, syntactic complexity (Ortega, 2003), or the development of use of lexical phases (Li & Schmitt, 2009); (ii) how L2 texts differ from those written by their L1 counterparts (i.e., Crossley & McNamara, 2011; see Silva, 1993, for a review of early research); or (iii) how L2 texts change over time (as thoroughly reviewed in Polio & Park, 2016). Over the years, these linguistic analyses have been framed in several theoretical perspectives, including systemic functional linguistics (cf. Achugar & Carpenter, 2014; Byrnes, 2009, 2013; Yasuda, 2014), theories of multicompetence (cf. Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2012, 2013), or complex dynamics systems (cf. Verspoor, Schmid, & Xu, 2012; Verspoor & Smiskova, 2012).

These diverse empirical efforts have been coupled with methodological reflections and proposals on how to best measure linguistic performance and progress in writing, a research preoccupation that witnessed a turning point with the publication of Wolfe-Quintero, Ingaki, and Kim’s (1998) seminal book, and one that continues to raise continued interest (see, for instance, Biber, Gray, & Kornwipa Poonpon, 2011; Byrnes, 2014a; Connor-Linton & Polio, 2014; Evans et al., 2014; Norris & Ortega, 2009).

The interplay between writing expertise and L2 abilities

Another research preoccupation has been the analysis of the potential interplay between writing expertise and linguistic ability, the main concern being the elucidation of whether or not L2 abilities constrain the development of L2 writing skills (see review in Roca de Larios,

Murphy, & Marín, 2002). Following Cumming's (1989) pioneering study, the field generally accepted that writing expertise and language proficiency are independent constructs, with L2 proficiency being an additive factor in multiliterate writing. Explorations of the interplay between language proficiency and writing abilities have more recently been framed in theories of multi-competence (cf. Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2012; Ortega & Carson, 2010; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016), which see multilingual language users' competence as distinct from the sum of their separate linguistic competencies, one in which their various languages and their writing knowledge, abilities, and practices interact in complex ways. Accordingly, relevant theoretical and empirical questions are no longer related to what writers can or cannot do in their L2 as a function of their L2 proficiency, but, rather, to how multi-competent language users make use of their various knowledge resources when approaching the writing of texts in the various languages at their disposal (see Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2013, for an exemplar study).

Two key contributions in this domain are Gentil's (2011) socially-situated proposal of the transfer of genre knowledge across languages, and Kobayashi and Rinnert's (2012, Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016) model of the "evolving configuration of writing knowledge" (Kobayashi & Rinnert's 2012, p. 125) that tries to "explicate L1/L2/L3 text construction of multilingual writers" (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016). These two seminal contributions to the field have greatly advanced our vision of the phenomenon of transfer in L2 writing, making evident the need to recognize its cognitively- and socially-mediated nature and its multidirectionality (see Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2013).

Language abilities and academic success

As advanced above, another important area in the study of the linguistic dimension of academic writing centers on how language plays out in the literacy practices of multilingual writers. The field has witnessed a proliferation of debates and empirical studies on the challenges and dilemmas faced by L2 writers in their attempts to become part of given communities of practice, and how and why their status as users of an additional language influences their academic and/or professional success (cf. Flowerdew, 2013; Lillis & Curry, 2010; Tang, 2012a, b). Part of the debate has centered on the consideration of the so-called "linguistic inequality" that affects L2 writers in academic settings (Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014; Tang, 2012a, for two recent treatments) and on whether or not linguistic challenges are a barrier to publication.

In addition to a wealth of empirical findings, several ideological positions have been adopted with respect to (i) the teaching of academic writing (see, for instance, Canagarajah, 2011a, b); (ii) how to best cater for the challenges faced by those who need to be part of academic communities of practice, and may or may not have access to professional networks (as discussed, for instance, in Lillis & Curry, 2010); (iii) questions related to positions of acceptance of and/or resistance to hegemonic, predominant discourses (see, for instance, Canagarajah, 2011a, b; Salager-Mayer, 2014); or (iv) potential ways of facilitating and increasing the presence and influence of peripheral multilingual scholars in academic communities (for instance, Salager-Mayer, 2014). Importantly, conversations have expanded to add a welcome consideration of the linguistic and cultural capital that L2 writers bring with them to their literacy experiences in an additional language (see Chang & Kanno, 2010; Tang, 2012c), thereby counteracting the "deficit" view of L2 writers that has dominated much of past discourses. Equally welcome are recent proposals that emphasize "expertise" rather than "nativeness" (Flowerdew, 2013) when considering multilingual writers' literacy

acquisition and practices. This is because, as acutely expressed by Tang (2012b, p. 12), “academic discourse’ is not the natural first language of any writer”.

The bilingual nature of multilingual practices

Two additional streams of research (each one framed in different theoretical perspectives) together serve to shed light on another key dimension of the language component of L2 academic writing, namely the intriguing “bilingual” nature of multilingual literacy acquisition and practices. One has delved into aspects of multilinguals’ identity construction, whereas the second set of studies has looked into multilinguals’ strategic use and interaction of their various languages while composing in an L2. A brief analysis of developments in these two important areas follows.

Identity construction

Two recent studies (Gentil & Séror, 2014; Marshall, Hayashi, & Yeung, 2012), coincidentally conducted in Canadian settings, have illuminated the way in which multilingual students and multilingual scholars exert their agency when balancing demands for using and/or publishing in the various languages that form their linguistic repertoire. Marshall, Hayashi, and Yeung (2012) report the agency and creativity exerted by eight multilingual graduate students, strategically enacting “different identities through their formal and less formal language and literacy practices” (p. 33), namely, “the identity of an accepted member of the academic community in their formal writing and broader and freer identities as writers in digital environments” (p. 33). The authors conclude that this purposeful agency on the part of these multiliterate writers and the richness of their “multilingual and multiliterate practices serves to challenge institutional discourses around multilingual learners that solely focus on deficit and the need for remediation” (p. 51).

An equally illuminating account of identity issues is provided in Gentil and Seror’s (2014) “dialogical self-case study” (p. 18), which offers a personal reflection of the authors’ “biliteracy development” and “bilingual publication practices”. Particularly relevant are their observations on their “individual language choices as scholars” (p. 19), their “commitment to academic biliteracy” (p. 22), and to the dissemination of knowledge in their various languages – as well as how and why this has changed over the years as they advanced in their careers – as a question of “identity and linguistic loyalty” (p. 26).

L1 use in L2 writing

Another key dimension of the bilingual nature of academic writing is how and why L2 writers make use of their L1 as a strategic resource when writing academic texts in an L2 (see Manchón, 2013; Manchón, Roca de Larios, & Murphy, 2007, for reviews). L2 writers have been found to resort to the L1 for a variety of purposes related to the four macro writing processes, namely, planning, text generation, revision, and monitoring. Important here is use of the L1 as a heuristics in the linguistic problem-solving activity inherent to the process of text generation (Murphy & Roca de Larios, 2010, for a study of L1-based lexical searches, and Manchón, Roca de Larios, & Murphy, 2007, for a review of L1-based L2 writing strategies).

This research also shows that L1 use in L2 writing is a function of individual and social factors. As for the former, the analysis of the L2 proficiency-mediated nature of L1 use has been widely reported in the literature. In Manchón, Roca de Larios, and Murphy (2007) we

interpreted the research as a continuum in L1 use, one that starts with a heavy reliance on the L1 at lower-proficiency levels for a whole set of purposes, including generating ideas in the L1 that are then translated into the L2, searching for the language needed to express one's intended meaning via the L1, or evaluating the appropriateness of linguistic choices through back translation. As proficiency increases, a lesser use of the L1 is observed, although the L1 nevertheless still continues to represent a useful strategic device. Thus, more proficient L2 writers resort to their L1 in order to solve linguistic problems (thus deploying a whole range of L1-based lexical retrieval strategies), to overcome task demands, or to facilitate the kind of engagement in deeper levels of processing that higher levels of L2 proficiency allow (see Manchón, Roca de Larios, & Murphy, 2009; van Weijen et al., 2009, for two representative studies).

Despite these general tendencies, notable individual differences in L1 use have also been reported, even in the case of writers at the same proficiency level: highly proficient L2 academic writers may or may not make use of their L1 use (see Beare & Bourdages, 2007; Matsumoto, 1995, for studies of the latter), and the same variation has been observed in the case of less experienced writers. For instance, Gosden (1996) found four different patterns in the way in which a group of Japanese novice researchers writing their first scientific research article for publication wrote their first L2 draft. Thus, whereas some participants wrote the full draft in Japanese and then translated it into English, others opted for writing an outline in Japanese and subsequent translation into English; still others wrote notes in English, expanded them into full sentences, and then completed their first draft, and yet other writers did write their first draft completely in English.

In addition to L2 proficiency, L1 use in L2 writing is also a function of cognitive and social variables (Manchón, 2013). Two cases in point are Hu's (2003) study of the writing processes of 15 international science and engineering Chinese students at a Canadian university, and Ferenz's (2005) language of planning used by advanced MA and PhD English students of Russian and Hebrew origin residing in Israel. Hu (2003) found that the manner in which the Chinese participants in the study resorted to their L1 resulted from the interplay of a range of factors, including "the language of knowledge input, the language of knowledge acquisition, the development of L2 proficiency, the level of knowledge demands, and specific task conditions" (p. 39). In his analysis of language choice while planning, Ferenz (2005) concluded that recourse to the L1 in L2 writing is a function of both cognitive-affective factors (including motivation, the need to overcome cognitive load, or the language in which knowledge is stored), and social factors given L2 writers' linguistic choices are socially mediated by what they perceive is valued in their writing social networks.

Writing to learn an additional language

This part of the chapter will look into the WLL dimension, which is a vibrant SLA-oriented strand of L2 writing research that has so far provided (i) rationales for the language learning potential (LLP) of L2 writing, and (ii) a growing body of empirical evidence on the manner in which writing itself and the processing of feedback can contribute to L2 development.

The origin of the interest into the LLP of L2 writing can be traced back to Cumming's (1990) pioneering study in which he argued that "composition writing might function broadly as a psycholinguistic output condition wherein learners analyze and consolidate second language knowledge that they have previously (but not yet fully) acquired" (Cumming 1990, p. 483). Importantly, Cumming also claimed that challenging L2 writing "elicits attention to form-meaning relations that may prompt learners to refine their linguistic expression – and hence

their control over their linguistic knowledge”, a process claimed to be “facilitated by the natural disjuncture between written text and the mental processes of generating and assessing it” (p. 483). Cumming’s study was followed by Qi and Lapkin’s (2001) partial replication. Together, these studies served to draw attention to the important linguistic processing that takes place while writing, pointing at the same time to potential learning outcomes that may derive in terms of expansion and/or consolidation of L2 linguistic knowledge. They also speculated that such potential learning outcomes may more likely be the result of complex, problem-solving types of writing tasks that entail a real challenge for students at ideational and linguistic levels. Yet, this agenda was not immediately taken up in the field of English for academic purposes.

This situation has ostensibly changed in the last few years as we have witnessed a proliferation of theoretical accounts of the rationale of the LLP of L2 writing (based on cognitive theories of L1 and L2 writing as well as cognitive and sociocultural theories of SLA; see Manchón, 2011b, c; Manchón & Williams, 2016), as well as an emergent line of empirical research, although one that has paid only limited attention to academic writing contexts (but see Byrnes, 2014b; Manchón & Roca de Larios, 2011). Collectively, these theoretical and empirical efforts have revolved around two main questions: what is unique about writing that can potentially lead to advancing language competences, and what learning outcomes can be expected to derive from engaging in academic writing tasks?

As mentioned above, several theoretical frameworks provide the theoretical underpinnings for the purported language learning potential of L2 writing, a potential that is associated with the act of writing itself as well as to the processing of feedback. Of special relevance are those recent developments in L1 writing research mentioned in an earlier section that emphasize the centrality of the process of text generation, theories of problem-solving (see Manchón & Roca de Larios, 2007), as well as several SLA theoretical approaches, including those of a cognitive nature (mainly Skill Learning Theory, the Focus on Form research, the Noticing Hypothesis, and the Output Hypothesis), and sociocultural approaches to language learning and use (as recently reviewed in Bitchener, 2012; Manchón, 2011b; Ortega, 2012; Polio, 2012; Williams, 2012).

The general consensus in the field is that L2 writing (in both individual and collaborative conditions; see Storch, 2013) can potentially lead to language learning as a result of (i) the availability of time that characterizes writing (which is even more the case in academic settings); (ii) the visibility and permanence of both the written text and the feedback on it; (iii) the challenging, problem-solving nature of academic writing tasks; and (iv) the languaging, metalinguistic reflection, and noticing processes that may result from the scaffolding provided in collaborative writing conditions. As noted in a previous review of these issues (Manchón, 2014, p.99):

The pace and permanence of writing make it possible for L2 writers to be more in control of their attentional resources, more prone to prioritize linguistic concerns (in contrast to oral production) and, accordingly, more likely to attend to focus on language during both their composing activity and their processing of the feedback received. Similarly, the problem-solving activity engaged in during writing requires decision-making (at various levels) and deep linguistic processing with potential beneficial effects on learning.

It has been posited that these conditions may be conducive to learning. Thus, engaging in challenging academic writing tasks is thought to foster crucial learning processes that

can indirectly lead to advancing language competences, such as attentional focus-on-form processes, the formulation and testing of hypotheses about the L2, and the production and self-assessment of one's own linguistic options and metalinguistic reflection. Writing is also posited to have a more direct potential contribution to language learning by helping learners develop fluency and automaticity as a result of the conditions for communicative practice that writing academic texts favors. In addition, writing itself, provided it entails problem-solving, can play a role in developing explicit knowledge about the L2.

Regarding the language learning potential of feedback processing, Bitchener (2012; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012) claims that this processing can contribute to learning by helping learners to expand their explicit knowledge and to increase the accuracy of their use of the L2. These learning outcomes are purported to be mediated by a number of variables that include feedback factors (which type of feedback is provided and how), task factors (types of writing tasks), and linguistic factors (which linguistic elements are targeted in the feedback provided). In addition, a whole set of individual factors have also been found to play a role: cognitive factors (analytic ability), linguistic factors (L2 proficiency), and affective factors (beliefs, goals, and attitudes). Finally, a crucial variable in bringing about language learning is the depth of the L2 writer's own engagement with and reflection on the feedback received.

Some of these tenets have been put to the empirical test, and the field has seen a proliferation of studies intended to shed light on the LLP of feedback and of collaborative writing. However, few of these studies have focused on individual academic writing or on issues relevant to the learning and teaching of writing in academic settings. Three recent studies are exceptions to this trend. In Manchón and Roca de Larios (2011) we followed a group of university students enrolled in an EAP course for the duration of the course (9 months) and traced their writing development as well as their perceptions of the LLP of their academic writing activity. We concluded that our results were relevant in shedding light on a range of factors interpreted as instrumental in bringing about L2 learning, namely (p. 181):

the role played by self-initiated and teacher-led noticing processes and associated learning actions, extensive and challenging output practice, and the availability of tailor-made form-focused instruction in bringing about learning through writing. The participants' own perceptions of the language learning potential of writing was also found to be both a powerful motivating factor in their literacy experience and one of the goals that guided their writing activity.

In another study within the same research program (Nicolás-Conesa, Roca de Larios, & Coyle, 2014), a close connection between goals for and approaches to writing, on the one hand, and the kind of linguistic processing and linguistic problem-solving behavior engaged in, on the other, was uncovered. Importantly, such problem-solving activity is considered to be crucial in bringing about language learning through writing (see Manchón & Roca de Larios, 2007; Ortega, 2012). In addition to these more cognitively-oriented studies, systemic functional linguistics has also illuminated the potential connection between the engagement with complex and challenging, meaning-making academic writing tasks and L2 development (cf. Byrnes, 2014b).

Empirical research on the WLL dimension of L2 writing research is nevertheless still in its infancy, and hence much further research efforts are needed before we can come to more robust conclusions on the role of writing in developing language competences in academic settings. Some fruitful avenues to explore in future research agendas are suggested in the next section.

Suggestions for future research.

As far as the LW dimension of L2 writing is concerned, further research efforts should go to the study of the linguistic dimension of writing development. Norris and Manchón (2012) offer detailed theoretical and methodological suggestions for a future research agenda in which writing development is approached in theoretically sound, methodologically appropriate, and pedagogically valid ways (see also Polio and Park, 2016). The way in which the “multi” in multilingual writing is negotiated at process and product levels also deserves further theoretical and empirical attention. For instance, in relation to how academics exert their agency in their multilingual practices, an important issue for future research agendas is to disentangle in what way such agency is mediated by ideological commitments/positions and/or the stage in one’s professional career. In other words, a question with important ethical implications worth asking is who is in a position to choose whether or not to publish in languages other than English (which necessarily entails opting for not publishing in top, high-impact factor journals, for instance), or in a position to choose to resist what has come to be known as “hegemonic discourses”.

Future research agendas on the role of language in the acquisition of academic literacies would also benefit from expanding the range of contexts and academic writers investigated. For instance, Gentil (2011, p. 20) recommends adding “populations representing other configurations of writing expertise and language proficiency” such as “highly literate writers in their L1 with only incipient oral proficiency in their L2, who may be found among visiting scholars in foreign-language environments”, or “writing professionals who encounter a new language”.

Regarding the WLL dimension of L2 writing in academic settings, future research efforts should go in the direction of exploiting the LLP of the act of engaging in individual, challenging academic tasks. The questions awaiting an answer are the ones that have already been uncovered, questions that include (i) whether writing in academic settings leads to expansion or consolidation of L2 resources, or (ii) whether feedback processing on one’s own writing simply leads to immediate “uptake” or rather to long-term “retention”. In this respect, I have previously suggested that a crucial issue to be teased out empirically is the difference between “feedback for accuracy” and “feedback for acquisition”, a distinction that in my view is at the basis of the disciplinary debate on the effectiveness of error correction. Similarly, Ortega (2012) has claimed that:

progress will remain slow unless researchers committed to investigating these L2 writing–SLA interfaces are able to develop a positive program tasked with the challenge of explaining the various and complex roles that explicit and implicit knowledge might play in L2 writing.

(p. 410)

It is hoped that traveling these research avenues can result in tangible advancements in theory and research on the role that language plays in the acquisition of L2 written literacy in academic settings, as well as on the role that L2 writing can play in the acquisition of L2 competences in academic settings.

Acknowledgements

The synthesis presented in this chapter is part of a long-term program of research on L2 writing supported by two research grants from the Fundación Séneca, Murcia Regional Government Agency for Science and Technology (Research Grant 11942/PHCS/09 and 19463/PI/14), and a grant by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (Research Grant FFI2012–35839). I would like to thank Ken Hyland for his most useful suggestions on an earlier version of the chapter.

Further reading

Gentil (2011); Kuteeva & Mauranen (2014); Manchón (2011a); Tang (2012a)

Related chapters

- 4 English as the academic lingua franca
- 10 Academic reading into writing
- 22 Critical perspectives
- 38 English for professional academic purposes

References

- Achugar, M. & Carpenter, B.D. (2014). Tracking movement toward academic language in multilingual classrooms. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 14, 60–71.
- Beare, S. & Bourdages, J.S. (2007). Skilled writers' generating strategies in L1 and L2: An exploratory study. In Torrance, M., Van Waes, L. & Galbraith, D. (eds), *Writing and Cognition. Research and Applications* (pp. 151–161). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Belcher, D. & Connor, U. (2001). *Reflections on Multiliterate Lives*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Biber, D., Gray, B., & Kornwipa Poonpon, K. (2011). Should we use characteristics of conversation to measure grammatical complexity in L2 writing development? *TESOL Quarterly*, 45, 5–35.
- Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on 'the language learning potential' of written CF. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 348–363.
- Bitchener, J. & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Byrnes, H. (2009). Emergent L2 German writing ability in a curricular context: a longitudinal study of grammatical metaphor. *Linguistics and Education*, 20, 50–66.
- Byrnes, H. (ed.) (2013). Writing as meaning-making – Teaching to mean. Special of the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22.
- Byrnes, H. (2014a). Theorizing language development at the intersection of 'task' and L2 writing: Reconsidering complexity. In Byrnes, H. & Manchón, R.M. (eds), *Task-Based Language Learning – Insights from and for L2 writing* (pp. 59–103). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Byrnes, H. (2014b). Linking task and writing for language development: Evidence from a genre-based curricular approach. In Byrnes, H. & Manchón, R.M. (eds), *Task-Based Language Learning – Insights from and for L2 writing* (pp. 237–263). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). The place of world Englishes in composition: Pluralization continued. *College Composition and Communication*, 57, 586–619.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011a). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies in translanguaging. *Modern Language Journal*, 95, 401–417.
- Canagarajah, S. (2011b). Writing to learn and learning to write by shuttling between languages. In Manchón, R.M. (ed.), *Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language* (pp. 111–132). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chang, Y.-J. & Kanno, Y. (2010). NNES doctoral students in English-speaking academe: The nexus between language and discipline. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 671–692.

- Connor-Linton, J. & Polio, C. (2014) (eds). Comparing perspectives on assessing ESL writing: Multiple analyses of a common corpus. Special issue of the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 25.
- Crossley, S.A. & McNamara, D.S. (2011). Shared features of L2 writing: Intergroup homogeneity and text classification. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20, 271–285.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 39, 81–141.
- Cumming, A. (1990). Metalinguistic and ideational thinking in second language composing. *Written Communication*, 7, 482–511.
- Cumming, A. (ed.) (2006). *Goals for Academic Writing. ESL Students and their Instructors*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cumming, A. (2012). Goal theory and second-language writing development, two ways. In Manchón, R.M. (ed.), *L2 Writing Development: Multiple Perspectives* (pp.165–190). Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Evans, N.W., Hartshorn, K.J., Cox, T.L., & Martin de Jel, T. (2014). Measuring written linguistic accuracy with weighted clause ratios: A question of validity. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 24, 33–50.
- Fayol, M., Alamargot, D., & Berninger, V.W. (2012). From cave writers to elite scribes to professional writers to universal writers, translation is fundamental to writing. In Fayol, M., Alamargot, D., & Berninger, V.W. (eds), *Translation of Thought to Written Text While Composing: Advancing Theory, Knowledge, Research, Methods, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 3–14). London: Psychology Press.
- Ferenz, O. (2005). First and second language use during planning processes. In Kostouli, T. (ed.), *Writing in Context(s): Textual Practices and Learning Processes in Sociocultural Settings* (pp. 185–205). New York: Springer.
- Ferris, D. & Hedgcock, J. (2014). *Teaching L2 Composition: Purpose, Process, and Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Flowerdew, J. (2013). English for research publication purposes. In Paltridge, B. & Starfield, S. (eds), *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes* (pp. 301–321). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gentil, G. (2011). A biliteracy agenda for genre research. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20, 6–23.
- Gentil, G. & Séror, J. (2014). Canada has two official languages – Or does it? Case studies of Canadian scholars' language choices and practices in disseminating knowledge. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13, 17–30.
- Gosden, H. (1996). Verbal reports of Japanese novices' research writing practices in English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5, 109–128.
- Hayes, J.R. (2012). Modelling and remodeling writing. *Written Communication*, 29, 369–388.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second Language Writers' Text: Linguistic and Rhetorical Features*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hu, J. (2003). Thinking languages in L2 writing: Research findings and pedagogical implications. *TESL Canada Journal*, 21, 39–63.
- Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (2012). Understanding L2 writing development from a multicompetence perspective: Dynamic repertoires of knowledge and text construction. In Manchón, R.M. (ed.), *L2 Writing Development: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 101–134). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (2013). L1/L2/L3 writing development: Longitudinal case study of a Japanese multicompetent writer. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 4–33.
- Kuteeva, M. & Mauranen, A. (eds) (2014). Writing for publication in multilingual contexts. Special issue of *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13.
- Li, J. & Schmitt, N. (2009). The acquisition of lexical phrases in academic writing: A longitudinal case study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 85–102.
- Lillis, T. & Curry, M.J. (2010). *Academic Writing in a Global Context. The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English*. New York: Routledge.
- Manchón, R.M. (2011a). *Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Manchón, R.M. (2011b). Writing to learn the language: Issues in theory and research. In Manchón, R.M. (ed.), *Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language* (pp. 61–82). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Manchón, R.M. (2011c). The language learning potential of writing in foreign language contexts. Lessons from research. In Reichelt, M. & Cimasko, T. (eds), *Foreign Language Writing. Research Insights* (pp. 44–64). West Lafayette, IN: Parlour Press.
- Manchón, R.M. (2013). Writing. In Grosjean, F. & Ping, P. (eds), *The Psycholinguistics of Bilingualism* (pp. 100–115). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Manchón, R.M. (2014). Learning and teaching writing in the FL classroom: Fostering writing-to-learn approaches. In Driscoll, P., Macaro, E., & Swarbrick, A. (eds), *Debates in Modern Language Education* (pp. 96–107). London: Routledge.
- Manchón, R.M. & Roca de Larios, J. (2007). Writing-to-learn in instructed language contexts. In Alcón, E. & Safont, P. (eds), *The Intercultural Speaker. Using and Acquiring English in Instructed Language Contexts* (pp. 101–121). Dordrecht: Springer-Verlag.
- Manchón, R.M. & Roca de Larios, J. (2011). Writing to learn in foreign language contexts: Exploring learners' perceptions of the language learning potential of L2 writing. In Manchón, R.M. (ed.), *Learning-to-Write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language* (pp. 181–207). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Manchón, R.M. & Williams, J. (2016). Second language writing and second language acquisition. In Manchón, R.M. and Matsuda, P. (eds), *The Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing*. New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Manchón, R.M., Roca de Larios, J., & Murphy, L. (2007). A review of writing strategies: Focus on conceptualizations and impact of first language. In Cohen, A. & Macaro, E. (eds), *Language Learner Strategies: 30 Years of Research and Practice* (pp. 229–250). Oxford: OUP.
- Manchón, R.M., Roca de Larios, J., & Murphy, L. (2009). The temporal dimension and problem-solving nature of foreign language composing. Implications for theory. In Manchón, R.M. (ed.), *Writing in Foreign Language Contexts: Learning, Teaching and Research* (pp. 102–129). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Marshall, S., Hayashi, H., & Yeung, P. (2012). Negotiating the multi in multilingualism and multiliteracies. Undergraduate students in Vancouver, Canada. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 68, 28–53.
- Matsumoto, K. (1995). Research paper writing strategies of professional Japanese EFL writers. *TESL Canada Journal*, 13 (1), 17–27.
- Murphy, L. & Roca de Larios, J. (2010). Searching for words: One strategic use of the mother tongue by advanced Spanish EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19, 61–81.
- Nicolás-Conesa, F., Roca de Larios, J., & Coyle, Y. (2014). Development of EFL students' mental models of writing and their effects on performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 24, 1–19.
- Norris, J. & Manchón, R. (2012). Investigating L2 writing development from multiple perspectives: Issues in theory and research. In Manchón, R.M. (ed.) *L2 Writing Development: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 221–244). Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Norris, J.M. & Ortega, L. (2009). Towards an organic approach to investigating CAF in instructed SLA: The case of complexity. *Applied Linguistics*, 30, 555–578.
- Ortega, L. (2003). Syntactic complexity measures and their relationship to L2 proficiency: A research synthesis of college-level L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 24 (4), 492–518.
- Ortega, L. (2012). Epilogue: Exploring L2 writing–SLA interfaces. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 404–415.
- Ortega, L. & Carson, J. (2010). Multicompetence, social context, and L2 writing research praxis. In Matsuda, P.K. & Silva, T. (eds), *Practicing Theory in Second Language Writing* (pp. 48–71). West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction controversy. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 375–389.
- Polio, C. & Park, J.-H. (2016). Language development in second language writing. In Manchón, R.M. & Matsuda, P.K. (eds), *The Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Qi, D.S. & Lapkin, S. (2001). Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 277–303.
- Rinnert, C. & Kobayashi, H. (2016). Multicompetence and multilingual writing. In Manchón, R.M. & Matsuda, P.K. (eds), *The Handbook of Second and Foreign Language Writing*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Roca de Larios, J., Murphy, L., & Marín, J. (2002). A critical examination of L2 writing process research. In Ransdell, S. & Barbier, M.-L. (eds), *New Directions for Research in L2 Writing* (pp. 11–47). Dordrecht: Kluwer academic Publishers.
- Salager-Mayer, F. (2014). Writing and publishing in peripheral scholarly journals: How to enhance the global influence of multilingual scholars? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13, 78–82.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27 (4), 657–675.
- Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative Writing in L2 Classrooms*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

- Tang, R. (2012a). *Academic Writing in a Second or Foreign Language. Issues and Challenges Facing ESL/EFL Academic Writers in Higher Education Contexts*. London: Continuum.
- Tang, R. (2012b). The issues and challenges facing academic writers from ESL/EFL contexts: An overview. In Tang, R. (ed.), *Academic Writing in a Second or Foreign Language. Issues and Challenges Facing ESL/EFL Academic Writers in Higher Education Contexts* (pp. 1–18). London: Continuum.
- Tang, R. (2012c). Two sides of the same coin: Challenges and opportunities for scholars from EFL backgrounds. In Tang, R. (ed.), *Academic Writing in a Second or Foreign Language. Issues and Challenges Facing ESL/EFL Academic Writers in Higher Education Contexts* (pp. 204–232). London: Continuum.
- van Weijen, D., Van den Bergh, H., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Sanders, T. (2009). L1 use during L2 writing: An empirical study of a complex phenomenon. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 235–250.
- Verspoor, M. & Smiskova, H. (2012). Foreign language writing development from a dynamic usage based perspective. In Manchón, R.M. (ed.), *L2 Writing Development: Multiple Perspective* (pp.17–46). Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Verspoor, M., Schmid, M.S., & Xu, X. (2012). A dynamic usage based perspective on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21 (3), 239–263.
- Weigle, S. (2013). English language learners ad automated scoring essays: Critical considerations. *Assessing Writing*, 18, 85–99.
- Williams, J. (2012). The potential role(s) of writing in second language development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 321–331.
- Wolfe-Quintero, K., Inagaki, S., & Kim, H.-Y. (1998). *Second Language Development in Writing: Measures of Fluency, Accuracy, and Complexity*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Yasuda, S. (2014). Exploring changes in FL writers' meaning-making choices in summary writing: A systemic functional approach. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.09.008>