Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2004) **24**, 70–106. Printed in the USA.
Copyright © 2004 Cambridge University Press 0267-1905/04 $12.00
DOI: DOI: 10.1017/S0267190504000042

4. RESEARCH IN TEACHING WRITING

Tony Silva and Colleen Brice

On the basis of our examination of L2 writing scholarship published between 2000 and the present, we describe and reflect on developments relating to the teaching of L2 writing. While our primary focus is applied research, we have also addressed basic research that has clear implications for pedagogy. The paper includes an overview of relevant basic research (i.e., research on the phenomenon of second language writing), a discussion of relevant applied research (i.e., research on second language writing instructional principles and practices), an examination of some general issues and concerns that have important implications for second language writing instruction, and an assessment of the current status of the field along with our thoughts on where it might go in the future.

It is an exciting time to be working in the area of second language writing. Due partly to globalization and the subsequent need to communicate via computer, second language writing has become an important if not dominant focus of work in second language studies. Additionally, second language writing scholarship, in responding to the current situation, has increased its breadth and depth and has begun to break free from the constraints imposed on it by its parent disciplines, applied linguistics and composition studies, vis-à-vis theory, research, and instruction. In short, the study of second language writing has become a legitimate area of inquiry in its own right. We have come to these conclusions partly as a result of the review of current research on the teaching of second language writing that was done in preparation for writing this chapter.

In this chapter, we review and reflect on developments in second language writing instruction over the last three to four years—though we sometimes address earlier work to provide contextual information for current studies. The scholarship we report on here focuses primarily on applied research, but we have also included basic research which has clear implications for pedagogy—as any principled discussion of teaching must take into account research and theory. To make our task manageable, we have limited ourselves to looking at published work—specifically, refereed journal articles, book chapters, and books; we have not addressed here

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

scholarship in the form of dissertations, ERIC documents, or in-house publications. We have attempted to be comprehensive, but inevitably things get left out: We apologize in advance for any omissions.[1] We will (1) briefly address relevant basic research (i.e., research on the phenomenon of second language writing); (2) discuss applied research (i.e., research on second language writing instructional principles and practices); (3) examine some general issues and concerns that have important implications for second language writing instruction, but that do not fit in the first two categories; and (4) conclude with an assessment of the current status of the field and our thoughts on where it might go in the future.[2]

Review of Research

Basic Research

Composing processes. Work on composing has intensified and taken on greater depth and breadth. While general composing processes (Fukao & Fujii, 2001; Lally, 2000a; Sasaki, 2002; Zhu, 2001b) and comparisons of first and second language composing (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001; Lally, 2000b; Roca de Larios & Murphy, 2001; Thorson, 2000) are still issues of interest, work on subprocesses has increased and become more sophisticated. These subprocesses include revising (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001; Miller, 2000; Sengupta, 2000; Sze, 2002), formulating (Roca de Larios, Marín, & Murphy, 2001; Zimmerman, 2000), pausing (Miller, 2000; Sasaki, 2000), reviewing and annotation of text (Cresswell, 2000), backtracking (Manchón, Roca de Larios, & Murphy, 2000a), text generation (Armengol-Castells, 2001; Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001), idea generation (Lally, 2000a), task representation (Ruiz-Funes, 2001), noticing (Qi & Lapkin, 2001), and summarizing (Yang & Shi, 2003).

Variables seen to affect composing have also received more attention. These include the use of the L1 in L2 writing (Aidman, 2002; Brooks-Carson & Cohen, 2000; Lally, 2000a; Wang & Wen, 2002; Woodall, 2002); L2 proficiency (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001; Manchón, Roca de Larios, & Murphy, 2000b; Wang & Wen, 2002; Woodall, 2002); writing fluency (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001; Hatasa & Soeda, 2000; Miller, 2000; Sasaki, 2000); the use of learning and writing strategies (Ching, 2002; Khaldieh, 2000; Olivares-Cuhat, 2002; Sasaki, 2000); textual quality and complexity (Sasaki, 2000); text pattern knowledge (Schindler, 2000); linguistic experience (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001); writing experience (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001); writing tasks (Wang & Wen, 2002); task difficulty (Woodall, 2002); writing skill level (e.g., expert vs. novice); (Sasaki, 2000); medium of composing (Y.-J. Lee, 2002); writing anxiety (Cheng, 2002); writer goals (Cumming, Bush, & Zho, 2002); linguistic knowledge, metacognitive knowledge, and retrieval speed (Schoonen et al., 2002); and age of exposure to an L2 (Arrecco & Ransdell, 2002).

Perhaps the most interesting and important trend in work on composing relates to the contexts in which it is done. Work in FL (as opposed to SL) contexts is now clearly dominant. This includes EFL writing in Spain (Armengol-Castells, 2001; Manchón, Roca de Larios, & Murphy, 2000a, 2000b; Roca de Larios, Marín,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

& Murphy, 2001), Japan (Fukao & Fujii, 2001; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001; Sasaki, 2000, 2002), Hong Kong (Sengupta, 2000), Germany (Zimmerman, 2000), China (Wang & Wen, 2002), Italy (Cresswell, 2000), Bulgaria (Rainville, 2000), and Malaysia (Ching, 2002). It also includes FL writing in French (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001; Lally, 2000, 2000b), Spanish (Ruiz-Funes, 2001), German (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001; Thorson, 2000), and Arabic (Khaldieh, 2000) in North America; Japanese as foreign language in Australia (Hatasa & Soeda, 2000); and French as a foreign language in Germany (Schindler, 2000). In addition, an extensive bibliography (Silva, Brice, Kapper, Matsuda, & Reichelt, 2001) and literature reviews (Manchón, 2001b; Roca de Larios, Marin, & Murphy, 2001) on L2 composing processes and an analysis of the oscially mediated nature of L2 comparing processes (Roca de Larios & Murphy, 2001) have been produced.

Written texts. While work on text is still dominant in the literature, within textual studies there is a trend toward greater variety with regard to foci, context, genre, and level. Local foci include cohesive devices (Biesenbach-Lucas, Meloni, & Weasenforth, 2000; Hinkel, 2001, 2002a; Liu, 2000; Zhang, 2000), coherence-creating devices (Lee , 2002a, 2002b), error analysis (Coates, Sturgeon, Bohannan, & Pasini, 2002; Feng, Ogata, & Yano, 2000; Khuwaileh & Shoumali, 2000), syntactic features (Gallagher & McCabe, 2001; Grant & Ginther, 2000; Hinkel, 2002a, 2003; Huie & Yahya, 2003; K. Hyland, 2000a, 2000b, 2002a, 2002b, 2002d, 2002f), and lexical features (Jarvis, 2002; Okamura & Shaw, 2000; Reynolds, 2002). Global foci include obliqueness—reflecting a failure to address the writing task (Chandrasegaran, 2000), communication strategies (Chimbganda, 2000), organizational patterns (L. Flowerdew, 2000b; Hirose, 2003), genre awareness (Ramanathan & Kaplan, 2000), topical structure (Simpson, 2000), textual features related to individualism and collectivism (Wu & Rubin, 2000), the pragmatics of letter writing (Al-Khatib, 2001), genre-based instruction (Cargill, Cadman, & McGowan, 2001; K. Hyland, 2002c, 2003; Weber, 2001), rhetorical strategies (Garcia, 2001), and written discourse analysis (Kaplan & Grabe, 2002).

The contexts for textual work reflect a move from SL to FL and from North America to outside North America. Even though most of the scholarship addresses texts written in English (EFL), this scholarship is being done in a wide variety of places, e.g., Australia (Cargill et al., 2001), Botswana (Chimbganda, 2000), China (Zhang, 2000), Ecuador (Thatcher, 2000), England (Thompson & Tribble, 2001), Finland (Jarvis, 2002), Hong Kong (Bruce, 2002; Candlin, Bhatia, & Jensen, 2002; L. Flowerdew, 2000b; K. Hyland, 2000a, 2000b, 2002a; Lee, 2002a, 2002b), Iran (Kiany & Khezri Nejad, 2001), Japan (Feng et al. 2000; Gallagher & McCabe, 2001; Hirose, 2003), Jordan (Al-Khatib, 2001; Khuwaileh & Shoumali, 2000), Korea (Kim, 2001), Luxembourg, (Weber, 2001), Mexico (Garcia, 2001), Singapore (Chandrasegaran, 2000), Spain (Gallagher & McCabe, 2001), and Taiwan (Wu & Rubin, 2000).

The genres examined in this work also vary greatly and reflect a move from the "general essay" to more particular genres and from school-sponsored writing to that done in "real-world" contexts. While the general essay continues to be focused

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on in classroom, laboratory, and testing situations, more frequently other genres are being used. These include e-mail (Biesenbach-Lucas et al., 2000); nursing notes (Parks, 2000) and care plans (Parks, 2001); personal letters (invitations) (Al-Khatib, 2001) and business letters (cover letters for manuscript submissions) (Okamura & Shaw, 2000); research proposals (Cargill et al., 2001); business manuals and auditing reports (Thatcher, 2000); formal legal essays (Weber, 2001) and legal problem answers (Bruce, 2002); theses, both undergraduate (Hyland, 2002a) and doctoral (Thomson & Tribble, 2001); medical research articles (Coates et al., 2002); narratives (Tickoo, 2000); autobiographies/personal narratives (Dyer & Friederich, 2002); project reports (L. Flowerdew, 2000b); published research articles (K. Hyland, 2002b, 2002e); textbooks (K. Hyland, 2002b, 2002e); and summaries (Kim, 2001; Rivard, 2001).

Assessment. Research on assessment in second language writing has expanded in scope over the past several years, going beyond a focus on results to consider a broad array of methodological, political, and ethical questions related to various stakeholders (testers, test takers, test users, and interpreters) and their roles in the assessment process. The relationships among raters' target language status (native versus nonnative), the ratings they assign, and their reasons for those ratings continue to be issues of interest, particularly in foreign language learning contexts—EFL in Japan (Cornwell & McKay, 2000; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2001), Germany (Reichelt, 2003), and China (Shi, 2001); and foreign languages in the United States (Breiner-Sanders, Sender, & Terry, 2002), including German (Reichelt, 2003), French (Robinson, 2000), and Japanese (Kondo-Brown, 2002). A cross-cultural study (Reichelt, 2003) compared the rating criteria employed by teachers of German in two contexts: Germany and the United States. Similarly, research investigating the relationship between ratings assigned and different assessment modes and task types continues to grow. Modes examined include direct versus indirect assessment (Crusan, 2002), computerized text analysis versus human rating (Li, 2000a), portfolio-based assessment versus direct assessment (Brauer, 2000b; Song & August, 2002), and analytic versus holistic scoring (Bacha, 2001).

However, inquiry on L2 writing assessment has branched out to identify variables other than rater TL status and assessment mode that play salient roles in the assessment process. These variables include raters' prior experiences teaching and rating writing (Cumming, Kantor, & Powers, 2002; Erdosy, 2001; Hamp-Lyons, 2003; Turner & Upshur, 2002), the nature of the writing samples to be rated (Boldt, Valsecchi, & Weigle, 2001; Turner, 2000; Turner & Upshur, 2002; Weigle, Boldt, & Valsecchi, 2003), raters' biases toward particular types of writers and criteria (Kondo-Brown, 2002), topic familiarity (Stapleton, 2001), and even the purposes for L2 writing and L2writing instruction (e.g., general or specific) (Cumming, 2001b). To gain insight into the influence of these variables, researchers have shifted their attention from characteristics of the raters themselves to their rating processes, examining the thinking processes and behaviors they engage in while they actually rate student writing (Cumming, Kantor, & Powers, 2002; Erdosy, 2001) and collaborate with other raters to develop assessment scales for particular contexts (Turner, 2000).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Research in this area has also acknowledged the need for assessment to take into account the specific characteristics of the language learning and educational contexts. Two studies have described the development of assessment schemes for use with learners in specific contexts—Japanese students in EFL classes (Stewart, Rehorick, & Perry, 2001) and international students in intensive English for Academic Purposes courses in the United States (Wilhelm & Rivers, 2001). Cornwell and McKay (2000) describe the development and validation of a Daly Miller Writing Apprehension Test for EFL students in Japan. Another study (Escamilla & Coady, 2001) has argued for the need to develop context-sensitive writing assessment in bilingual Spanish–English courses.

Assessment for the purposes of placing students into and allowing students out of writing courses has also grown as a focus of inquiry. Researchers have studied the extent to which students' ability to perform in courses is predicted by different types or modes of assessment, including direct versus indirect placement testing (Crusan, 2002), direct exit tests (Braine, 2001b; Song & August, 2002), indirect proficiency tests (Kiany & Khezri Nejad, 2001), and portfolio-based exit assessment (Song & August, 2002). The results of these studies indicate that timed, direct essay tests seriously underpredict ESL students' abilities to write under natural conditions, holding them back, in some cases repeatedly. Such findings highlight the inherently political nature of writing assessment and raise important ethical questions for ESL teachers and testers (for additional perspectives on the political nature of assessment and implications for teachers, see Cumming, 2002; Currie, 2001; and Hamp-Lyons, 2001, 2002).

The students' perspective has also surfaced as an area of interest in assessment scholarship. Bacha (2002) and Basturkmen and Lewis (2002) have compared students' perceptions of their own achievement with their teachers' perceptions. Rating scales derived from student samples have been discussed (Turner & Upshur, 2002). In addition, two historical accounts of L2 writing assessment have been published (Hamp-Lyons, 2001, 2002) as well as an essay on the difficulties facing L2 writing assessment vis-à-vis the notion of standards (Cumming, 2001a).

Applied Research

Content-based writing instruction. The development and implementation of content based writing instruction programs has continued and flourished in recent years. Foci for such programs and courses include health—physical, emotional, and mental (Bailey, 2000); intellectual commentary (Bernard, 2000); psychology (Carson, 2000); applied linguistics literature (Casanave, 2003); critical thinking skills in engineering (L. Flowerdew, 2000a), academic and professional work (Pally, 2001); topics from students' fields (Hansen, 2000); material from a variety of disciplines—e.g., linguistics, environmental science, computer science (Kasper, 2000b); art history and film (Kirshner & Wexler, 2002); authentic science writing (Lang & Albertini, 2001); American history (Nelson & Burns, 2000); film and society (Pally, 2000a); and mystery novels (Heyden, 2001). In addition, Katznelson,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Perpignan, and Rubin (2001) and Pally, Katznelson, Perpignan, and Rubin (2002) look at what they call by-products (changes students undergo as they develop writing skills in an academic course) of content based writing approaches. For more details on content-based writing instruction in L2 writing programs cited above, see Pally (2000b).

Voice and identity. Recent years have seen a revival of interest in matters of L2 writer voice and identity. A large part of this revival is a special issue of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* on voice in L2 writing edited by Belcher and Hirvela (2001c). In this issue, Ivanic and Camps (2001) argue that L2 student writers can use lexical, syntactic, organizational, and material aspects of writing to construct identity or voice. Matsuda (2001b) suggests that the notion of voice is not exclusively tied to individualism and shows different ways in which voice is constructed in Japanese and English. Prior (2001) argues for a view in which voice is simultaneously personal and social—this follows from his view of discourse as fundamentally historical, situated, and indexical. Hirvela and Belcher (2001) address a tendency in L2 writing instruction and research to overlook the voices and identities already possessed by L2 writers, especially at the graduate level. The special issue closes with Atkinson's (2001) response to the foregoing papers.

However, this special issue is not the only source of new work on voice and identity. K. Hyland (2002a, 2002d) examines the presence of authorial identity in academic writing via an analysis of L2 writers' personal pronoun use. Kells (2002) looks at ethnolinguistic identities and language attitudes of Mexican-American bilingual college writers. Russell and Yoo (2001) address subjectivity underlying students' investment in L2 writing. Stapleton (2002) critiques the notions of voice, authorial identity, and authorial presence and argues against their use as tools in L2 writing pedagogy. Vollmer (2002) argues for understanding L2 writing as active participation in the construction of discourse identity. Leki (2001b) talks about hearing voices—i.e., those of students enrolled in L2 writing courses.

Reading and writing. The connection between reading and writing also continues to be explored. Matsuda (2001a) chronicles the genesis of reading and writing in L2 studies. Grabe overviews the links between theory and practice (2001) and research and practice (2003) of the reading–writing relationship. Carson (2001) analyzes the tasks involved in reading and writing in undergraduate and graduate courses, and Leki (2001c) examines different approaches to linking reading and writing instruction. Abu Rass (2001) describes the design of an integrated reading and writing course; Chen (2001) calls for continued inclusion of models in L2 writing instruction; and Dobson and Feak (2001) offer a cognitive modeling approach to teaching L2 writers to critique nonliterary text. For more detail on some of the aforementioned texts, see Belcher and Hirvela (2001a, 2001b).

Computers and technology. The use of computers and technology is rapidly expanding in second and foreign language writing pedagogy, and correspondingly, research in this area has seen dramatic growth. In the past four years, more than two dozen publications have addressed issues related to the use of technology in L2

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

composition, and these studies have focused on a wide variety of contexts, including EFL situations—in Sweden (Sullivan & Lindgren, 2002), Hong Kong (Braine, 2001a; Li, 2000b), Korea (Suh, 2002), Taiwan (Liaw & Johnson, 2001), Japan (Fedderholdt, 2001; Feng et al., 2000; Greene, 2000; Stapleton, 2003), and Singapore (Yuan, 2003); ESL situations—in Canada (Li & Cumming, 2001) and in the United States (Biesenbach-Lucas et al., 2000; Bloch, 2002; Kasper, 2002; Lam, 2000)—as well as Spanish (González-Bueno & Pérez, 2000) and German (Abrams, 2001; Thorson, 2000) FL contexts in the United States. In addition, self-initiated writing involving technology has been studied outside the classroom (Lam, 2000).

Computer software has been developed to identify and correct typical collocational errors (Shei & Pain, 2000) and morphological errors (Feng et al., 2000) in L2 writing. In addition, software that is able to tag linguistic features at the discourse, sentence, and word levels has been employed to analyze differences in writing at different proficiency levels (Grant & Ginther, 2000), and software that traces writers' keystrokes has been used to study writers' composing and revision processes (Sullivan & Lindgren, 2002; Thorson, 2000; Warden, 2000). The major focus in the research, however, is the examination of the effects of various technologies on the quality, quantity, and processes of L2 writing. This work has compared the effects of word-processed and e-mail–generated texts on language use (Biesenbach-Lucas et al., 2000); traditional and LAN (local area network) classrooms on writing improvement (Braine, 2001a); different types of e-mail tasks on language complexity and accuracy (Li, 2000b); e-mail journaling on accuracy and fluency (González-Bueno & Pérez, 2000); computer-mediated and traditional pen-and-paper writing on the social roles adopted by writers during group journaling (Abrams, 2001), and on writing improvement and revision behaviors (Li & Cumming, 2001). Noncomparative research addresses the impact of computers on L2 writing (Pennington, 2003), L2 acquisition (Kramsch, A'Ness, & Lam, 2000), student awareness of limitations of Web-based sources (Stapleton, 2003), and student reactions to computer-mediated writing instruction (Suh, 2002).

Several articles describe technology-related assignments and curricula, such as cross-cultural e-mail correspondence units (Fedderholdt, 2001; Liaw & Johnson, 2001); a design model for computer-mediated writing (Greene, 2000); technology-enhanced research writing units (Kasper, 2000b; Moulton & Holmes, 2000); online correction of e-mail assignments (Melby-Mauer, 2003); integration of online communication into academic writing courses (Warschauer, 2002); the implementation of CommonSpace in the composition classroom (Bloch & Brutt-Griffler, 2001); the use of concordances to learn features of genre (Weber, 2001); the use of chat rooms (Yuan, 2003); and the use of computer recordings of one's own composing and revision activities to promote self-assessment (Sullivan & Lindgren, 2002).

Grammar and vocabulary. Research in this category encompasses work that focuses on linguistic accuracy in L2 student writing—a term that is used rather broadly in the literature to refer to sentence level issues and below (grammar, vocabulary, convention use)—and the relationship between accuracy in these areas

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and pedagogical techniques (also referred to as "error feedback" or "error treatment"). Such inquiry has a long history in L2 studies that continues to the present. Since 2000, one book and several articles on error treatment have been published. The book (Ferris, 2002) is aimed at L2 writing instructors and provides them with a concise review of research on error in L2 writing and guidelines for providing instruction and feedback on grammatical error in student writing. Frodesen and Holten (2003) present an overview of the role of grammar in L2 writing.

In the research, the relationship between different error treatments and students' written accuracy continues to be a central concern. Feedback treatments that have been examined vary in terms of focus of attention (on error versus higher order concerns) (Fazio, 2001) and explicitness (error type labeled versus error location identified versus no feedback) (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). Inquiry has broadened, however, to examine the effects of different error treatments on students' editing processes as well as their products, trying to determine whether specific types of markings influence students' attention to error during editing (Fazio, 2001; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; F. Hyland, 2003; Kubota, 2001) or their awareness of correct forms in TL writing/input (Tsang, 2000). Other work advocates increased attention to grammar in the composition classroom (Muncie, 2002a; Myles, 2002).

Innovative approaches to helping students edit for grammatical error have also been presented. Hinkel (2002b) advocates the contextualized teaching of grammar (employing analysis of authentic texts) to heighten learners' awareness of TL use. Yates and Kenkel (2002) advocate and illustrate error feedback practices that are informed by current SLA theory and cognizant of the inherently interrelated nature of discourse types and sentence level grammar choices. In addition, Jabbour (2001) discusses the use of collocation and corpus linguistics to teach grammar and vocabulary.

Finally, work in the area of vocabulary has examined the role of task type (timed writing versus multiple drafting) on the accuracy, range, and sophistication of students' vocabulary use (Muncie, 2002b) and discussed the use of dictionaries to teach vocabulary (Odlin, 2001).

Peer interaction. A handful of publications in the past four years have addressed issues related to peer interaction. They are about evenly divided in focus between second and foreign language contexts and address a range of academic levels, including secondary EFL in Hong Kong (Tsui & Ng, 2000), university EFL in Israel (Levine, Oded, Connor, & Asons, 2002), precollege ESL in the United States (Di Giovanni & Nagaswami, 2001), and university composition, both ESL (de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000; Porto, 2001) and mixed NES/ESL (Zhu, 2001a). Interest has moved from the comparison of students' uses of and attitudes toward peer versus teacher response (F. Hyland, 2000; Muncie, 2000; Tsui & Ng, 2000) to the examination of a number of other variables seen to influence students' uses of peer feedback and the quality and quantity of interaction among peers in writing groups. These include the language status (ESL vs. NES) of the participants (Zhu, 2001a),

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the language learning and cultural context (SL vs. FL) (Levine et al., 2002), the mode of interaction (online versus face-to-face) (Di Giovanni & Nagaswami, 2001), the status of peer participants relative to one another (de Guerrero & Villamil, 2000), written versus oral peer response (Bartels, 2003), comparative effects of working alone or with a peer (Franken & Haslett, 2002), and comparative effects of peer review in electronic and traditional modes (Liu & Sadler, 2003). In addition to these articles, a book on peer response (Liu & Hansen, 2002) provides an overview of the research in the area and guidelines for the integration and implementation of a variety of peer response activities. Ferris (2003b) offers a briefer overview of issues in peer feedback.

Plagiarism. Research continues to delve into the complex issues related to plagiarism in L2 writing. Inquiry remains focused on school-sponsored writing, but several school contexts have been examined, including undergraduate (Bloch, 2001; F. Hyland, 2001; Mounsey, 2001; Pecorari, 2001; Prochaska, 2001); graduate (Barks & Watts, 2001); ESL in the United States (Barks & Watts, 2001; Bloch, 2001; Pecorari, 2001; Prochaska, 2001); ESL in New Zealand (F. Hyland, 2001); ESL/EFL in Mexico (Mounsey, 2001); and EFL in Japan (LoCastro & Masuko, 2002; Yamada, 2000) and China (Sapp, 2002). Studies have examined the processes involved in writing from source material (Barks & Watts, 2001); the role of print versus electronic media (Bloch, 2001); teachers' feedback on plagiarism (F. Hyland, 2001); students' understanding of plagiarism (F. Hyland, 2001; Mounsey, 2001); individual and institutional policies on plagiarism (Pecorari, 2001, Sapp, 2002); the practical and political implications of the lack of a clear definition of the construct (Prochaska, 2001); possible causes of plagiarism (LoCastro & Masuko, 2002; Sapp, 2002); the role of attitudes, cultural expectations, and educational context (Sapp, 2002); how students can be helped to avoid plagiarism (Yamada, 2003); and how teachers can modify their conceptions of and responses to plagiarism (Sapp, 2002).

Teacher response. Perceived as one of the most important and time-consuming aspects of teaching writing, response has been the subject of only a handful of studies over the past several years. This research, however, has made some significant methodological and conceptual advances in understanding this complex, multidimensional activity. Several studies have investigated both what students do with teacher feedback and how this feedback appears to affect the quality of their writing (Ashwell, 2000; DiPuma & Maslekoff, 2001; F. Hyland, 2000; Kasanga, 2001; Storch & Tapper, 2002; Warden, 2000). Ashwell (2000) examined whether the feedback sequence currently recommended in multiple draft writing (providing feedback on content in earlier drafts and form in later drafts) is more effective than other patterns in effecting improvement in students' writing and inspiring revision and editing.

Attention has also been given to authentic (as opposed to manipulated) teacher feedback and its effectiveness in communicating with students. F. Hyland (2000) examined the ways in which students' concerns and revision ideas are overridden by their teachers' feedback. Hyland and Hyland (2001) analyzed teacher feedback according to its functions (praise, criticism, suggestions) and forms.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Sanson-Moorey (2001) discusses student–teacher conferences. In addition, reviews of the research on teacher response have appeared (Ferris, 2003a, 2003b; Goldstein, 2001).

Literature and film. The role of literature in L2 composition pedagogy has been a long-standing topic of debate in the field; however, it has been the focus of only a handful of articles published in the past several years (Belcher & Hirvela, 2000; Hirvela, 2001; Newell, Garriga, & Peterson, 2001; Vandrick, 2003). Belcher and Hirvela (2000) present a comprehensive review of the interrelated but separate histories of the literature–composition debate in L1 and L2 writing. This article also lays out the pros and cons of using literature in the L2 writing classroom. Hirvela (2001) talks about the place of literature in the L2 writing curriculum; and Newell, Garriga, and Peterson (2001) discuss reading to write on literature, in the form of critical responses to literary texts. Recent work has also advocated the use of film in L2 writing instruction as a means of promoting language acquisition (verbal, written, and visual) and motivating students (Fluitt-Dupuy, 2001; Kasper, 2000a; Kasper & Singer, 2001).

General Issues and Concerns

Foreign language writing. Research focusing on foreign (as opposed to second) language contexts has proliferated, evidence both of the growth of L2 writing as a discipline and the changing role of writing in the 21st century. The focus of this research has expanded, both geographically and conceptually. Studies have reported on EFL writing instruction in Bulgaria (Rainville, 2000), Japan (Hirose, 2001; Hirose & Sasaki, 2000), Tunisia (Ghrib-Maamouri, 2001), and the Ukraine (Tarnopolsky, 2000); and on writing instruction in various FLs taught in U.S. university settings, including Spanish (Roebuck, 2001; Ruiz-Funes, 2001), German (Reichelt & Waltner, 2001), and French (Calvez, 2000; Kelley, 2001). In addition, two collections focusing on FL contexts appeared: a special volume of *MEXTESOL Journal* on L2 writing (Hayward, 2001) and an edited collection discussing FL instruction in Switzerland, Italy, Denmark, Germany, and the United States (Brauer, 2000d). The latter collection presents an historical account of foreign language pedagogy research over the past 50 years (Homstad & Thorson, 2000b).

Descriptive work in this area has presented the curriculum of specific writing courses and the theoretical motivation for them (Hirose, 2001; Kelley, 2001; Reichelt & Waltner, 2001; Roebuck, 2001); detailed the changing role of writing in a given context and the authors' experiences as teachers of writing in these contexts (Rainville, 2000; Tarnopolsky, 2000); described the use of particular techniques in the FL classroom, including intensive and extensive writing (Homstad & Thorson, 2000a), portfolios (Brauer, 2000b), brainstorming (Hornung, 2000; M. Schrader, 2000), creative writing (R. Schrader, 2000), workshopping (Svendsen, 2000), the computer (Nelson, 2000), and the Internet (Blatt, 2000); and outlined curricular modifications teachers have made to better respond to students' interests and proficiency levels (Reichelt & Waltner, 2001; Tarnopolsky, 2000). An approximately equal number of FL studies have investigated various aspects of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

FL writing process, including the effects of different instructional treatments on writing quality (Hirose & Sasaki, 2000); the effects on linguistic accuracy of different task types (Calvez, 2000) and different task representations (Ruiz-Funes, 2001); and the major writing difficulties experienced by FL students (Ghrib-Maamouri, 2001).

In addition, fundamental questions that have previously been neglected or considered irrelevant have come to the fore of FL writing research. One such question has been raised by Reichelt (1999, 2001) and Leki (2001e)—namely, what is(are) the purpose(s) of FL writing? In a review of research on the effects of instruction and task type on U.S. students' FL writing, Reichelt (2001) found no unified sense of purpose for writing in the FL curriculum, which, she argues, is the precursor to a coherent research agenda and informed pedagogical decision making. Similarly, Leki (2001e) argues that the greatest ideological challenge facing English teachers working in non-English dominant (FL) contexts is the question of the purpose of FL writing instruction, yet she notes that this question is rarely addressed. Finally Brauer (2000a) argues for the expansion of the function of writing in FL classrooms.

Approach, technique, and curriculum design. Much research published in the past several years describes and/or investigates particular approaches, curricula, and teaching techniques for L2 composition. The curricula that are presented vary widely in terms of foci, reflecting a local, needs-based approach to curriculum development. These foci include the investigation of writing in one's own academic discipline (Lax & Reichelt, 2001; Vann & Myers, 2001); the analysis of language use in media (Hunter & Morgan, 2001); writing for university exams (Weigle & Nelson, 2001); basic writing tasks required in undergraduate (Carson, 2001) and postgraduate study (Cargill, Cadman, & McGowan, 2001; Carson, 2001); writing based on learners' interests (Hall, 2001); a problem posing critical literacy approach (Quintero, 2002); a self-access approach (Nakayama, 2002); a cognitive modeling approach to critique writing (Dobson & Feak, 2001); evaluation in academic writing (Bloch, 2003); and genre approaches to L2 writing instruction (Johns, 2003). In addition, discussions of the issues teachers may need to consider when designing literacy courses (Leki, 2001c; Lunsford, 2001) and advanced EAP curricula were published (Reid, 2001), and an article on the development of models of adult L2 writing instruction appeared (Cumming & Riazi, 2000).

Instructional techniques described in the literature address a wide variety of issues as well, including coherence (Lee, 2002a, 2002b); heuristic devices (Beck, 2002); narrative crisis conventions (Tickoo, 2001); strategy and self-regulation (Ching, 2002); Grice's Maxims (White, 2001); one-on-one tutoring (Shin, 2002); argumentation (Livie, 2000); genre (Badger & White, 2000); dialogue journaling (Hansen-Thomas, 2003; Myers, 2001; Sanders, 2000); scaffolding (Cotterall & Cohen, 2003); working memory strategies (Ransdell, Lavelle, & Levy 2002); explicit linguistic preparation (Ruan, 2001); using the resources of the writing center (Thonus, 2002, 2003; Williams, 2002); oral versus literate strategies of communication (Atari & Triki, 2000) and text patterns (Yamada, 2000). The effects

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of instruction in particular aspects of writing on student improvement in those aspects of writing has also been examined (Archibald, 2001; Olivares-Cuhat, 2002).

L2 writing programs. Recent years have also seen acceleration in the development of innovative programs and courses for L2 academic writing worldwide. These developments include a writing center at Hong Kong Polytechnic (Xiao, 2001); a Spanish writing center at the University of Minnesota (Strong & Fruth, 2001); an ESP writing program at Sultan Kaboos University in Oman (J. Flowerdew, 2001); an introduction to academic writing course at Aichi Prefectural University in Japan (Hirose, 2001); an ESL academic-social learning community program at Kingsborough Community College in New York (Babbit, 2001); an interdisciplinary, interinstitutional learning communities program at San Diego State University (Johns, 2001); cooperative learning, learner-centered, learning and cross-cultural exchange program at Iowa State University (Vann & Myers, 2001); a language-based academic induction program focused on genre used in the university at Adelaide University in Australia (Cargill, Cadman, & MacGowan, 2001); an advanced university course on language and public life at Ryerson Polytechnic University in Canada (Hunter & Morgan, 2001); a task-based composition course for resident ESL writers at the University of Illinois at Chicago (Williams, 2001); a course in advanced writing for university examinations at Georgia State University (Weigle & Nelson, 2001); a course linking ESL writing and the study of Greek and Latin roots in English at Hunter College in New York (Smoke, Green, & Isenstead, 2001); and an EAP professional development course at Macquarie University in Australia. For more details on these programs see Leki (2001a), from which all the foregoing chapters come, and the editor's introduction to the collection (2001d). In addition, Matsuda and Jablonski (2000) discuss the relationship between ESL writing and Writing Across the Curriculum programs.

Ideology. Current explicit commentary on ideological matters has its roots in a cluster of papers in the early- to mid-1990s. Santos (1992) claimed that L1 writing tended toward the ideological; and L2 writing, the pragmatic. Johns (1992), largely in agreement with Santos, warned against the uncritical acceptance of L1 writing ideology. Benesch (1993) responded to Santos, suggesting that all forms of ESL instruction are ideological, that neutrality is a myth, and that Santos's pragmatic position supports the status quo. Severino (1993) also responded to Santos, arguing that L2 writing pedagogy is just as ideologically charged as L1 writing pedagogy, though not as openly articulated and discussed. Allison (1994), in response to Benesch (1993), denied any necessary connection between pragmatism and an accommodationist ideology and challenges what he sees as Benesch's "ideologist" discourse. Benesch (1994) challenged Allison's claim that English for academic purposes has sufficiently addressed ideological issues. In 2001, Benesch and Santos reviewed and refined their earlier discussion. Benesch focused on critical theory and pedagogy and its opponents and argued for a "critical pragmatism." Santos laid out her views on critical theory and pedagogy and offered critiques of critical approaches to EAP and L2 writing.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A smaller cluster of work at the end of the century looked at ideology from a cultural perspective. Ramanathan and Atkinson (1999) claimed that L1 composition's principles and practices reflect an individualist ideology and that applying them to students whose culture may not share this ideology is problematic. Elbow (1999) agrees with what he calls Ramanathan and Atkinson's root claim about cross cultural differences, but argues that the notions of voice, peer review, critical thinking, and textual ownership (the four areas addressed by Ramanathan and Atkinson) are not inherently individualistic. Atkinson (2000a) claims that Elbow's outsider status (outside of L2 writing) causes some misunderstandings with regard to the L2 writing context but also generates insights and synergies vis-à-vis L2 writing. Other examples of papers addressing ideological concerns include Valdés (2000), who addresses language bigotry in mainstream composition classes against speakers of nonprestige varieties of English; Currie (2001), who explores the role of power in the evaluation of L2 students' writing; Belcher (2001), who looks at L2 writing theory in terms of research methodology, discourse style, and gender sensitivity; Ramanathan (2003), who investigates the politics of textual production and consumption; Canagarajah (2002), who explains how pedagogical approaches can help L2 writers position themselves in vernacular and academic communities; Smoke (2001), who discusses strategies to advocate for ESL student support services; and Leki (2003a), who wonders if writing has been overrated.

History and development. The L2 writing area of interest that has seen, perhaps, the most dramatic growth is the history and development of the field. The new millennium brought a discussion of the future of L2 writing that specifically looked at the question of whether increased interest in and importance of L2 writing was matched by increased production of L2 writing specialists (Santos, Atkinson, Erickson, Matsuda, & Silva, 2000). The views expressed in this piece range from pessimistic (Atkinson) to optimistic (Silva) with mixed views from Santos, Erickson, and Matsuda. In a response to this discussion, Kaplan (2000) suggested that the focus of the discussion was limited to the current situation in North America but that L2 writing was neither restricted to North America, nor was it solely a contemporary issue and offered illustrations. There were two published responses to Kaplan's critique. Santos (2000) accepted Kaplan's critique, whereas Atkinson (2000b) took issue with it, suggesting that L2 writing is not, as Kaplan purports, a relatively well-established international research field with a critical mass of committed scholars.

A number of historical overviews were produced. Leki (2000) and Silva and Matsuda (2002) examined developments in L2 writing in the context of applied linguistics. Matsuda (2003) provided an historical review of L2 writing in the 20th century from an interdisciplinary perspective—looking at the influence of composition studies and second language studies. Kroll (2001) addressed developments in L2 writing via a personal reflection of her work in the field, as did several L2 scholars in Blanton and Kroll (2002a). Reichelt (2001) presented an overview of pedagogical issues and approaches in FL writing. Connor (2003) overviewed work in contrastive rhetoric over the past 30 years. Kapper 92002) reviewed the first 10 years of research published in the *Journal of Second Language Writing*. Silva and Matsuda (2001b) traced the evolution of L2 writing over the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

previous 40 years. Kaplan and Grabe (2002) presented a 50-year history of written discourse analysis; Cumming (2001c) surveyed two decades of research on L2 writing acquisition; and Brauer (2000c) traced the history of L2 writing over the past 30 years.

Atkinson (2003a) edited a special issue of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* reviewing contemporary work in L2 writing—post process. In this issue, foci include basic issues (Atkinson, 2003a), genre (K. Hyland, 2003), gender/class/race (R. Kubota, 2003), culture (Atkinson, 2003b), a sociopolitical orientation to research (Casanave, 2003a), and a push for giving more attention to interdisciplinarity, postmodernism, and globalization (Leki, 2003b). In another group effort, Matsuda, Canagarajah, Harklau, K. Hyland, and Warschauer (2003) focused on important currents that have shaped inquiry in L2 writing during the previous decade: generation 1.5 students (Harklau), multiliteracies (Canagarajah), technology (Warschauer), discourse analysis (K. Hyland), and multidisciplinary inquiry (Matsuda, 2003a). Finally, *CCC* (*College Composition and Communication)* acknowledged the growing importance of L2 writing by publishing a (long overdue) position paper on second language writing and writers (2001), describing the L2 writer population and addressing such issues as placement, assessment, class size, credit, and teacher preparation and support.

Early L2 Writing

Research on L2 composition has historically focused on higher education contexts, and as is evident from this review, this is still true today. The dominance of higher education contexts in L2 writing scholarship is the result of a combination of factors related to access, resources, and disciplinarity (see Matsuda & DePew, 2002b, for a discussion of these factors). However, recent years have seen substantial growth in the amount of work focusing on early L2 literacy issues, a response, in large part, to the rapidly growing population of ESL users in pre-K–12 contexts in the United States and abroad. This shift toward nonuniversity contexts was marked by a special edition of the *Journal of Second Language Writing,* edited by Matsuda and DePew (2002a), which presented four research articles on early literacy. In the past four years, a total of about two dozen or so studies have addressed early L2 literacy issues, and these studies have addressed a wide variety of issues (as is evident in the sections above) and been conducted in a wide variety of contexts, including Casablanca, Morocco (Blanton, 2002); Catalonia, Spain (Torras & Celaya, 2001); Montreal (Fazio, 2001; Maguire & Graves, 2001); Bulgaria (Rainville, 2000); the Ukraine (Tarnopolsky, 2000); Japan (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002); Hong Kong (Sengupta, 2000; Tsui & Ng, 2000); and the United States (Buckwalter & Lo, 2002; Harklau, 2001; Huie & Yahya, 2003; Jarvis, 2002; Lang & Albertini, 2001; Malloy, 2001; Reynolds, 2002).

This scholarship has also varied in terms of participants, examining a variety of levels within the pre-K–12 spectrum, including preschool (Buckwalter & Lo, 2002), primary school, (Blanton, 2002; Huie & Yahya, 2003; Maguire & Graves, 2001), middle school (Fazio, 2001; Jarvis (2002), Lang & Albertini, 2001; Malloy,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2001; Reynolds, 2002; Torras & Celaya, 2001), secondary school (Harklau, 2001; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002; Lang & Albertini, 2001; Rainville, 2000; Sengupta, 2000; Tsui & Ng, 2000), and pre-university (Tarnopolsky, 2000). In addition to these studies, a resource book for K–12 teachers was published (Peregoy & Boyle, 2001), and a call for more scholarship on writing in classroom-based research (both on how students learn to write in L2 and on how they learn an L2 through writing) was made (Harklau, 2002).

Conclusion

On the basis of the foregoing, we feel that, with regard to second language writing instruction, "the times they are a-changin"(Dylan, 1964), and that this change is welcome and salutary for the field. We see a transition in process, a transition from the view that second language writing teachers should play the role of passive consumers of imported instructional approaches and methods and their accompanying research programs (e.g., controlled composition, current–traditional rhetoric, process approaches, and English for academic purposes/genre approaches—see Blanton (1995), Raimes (1991), Reid (1993), and Silva (1990) for overviews of approaches to second language writing instruction). This transition resists one-size-fits-all, off-the-shelf approaches promulgated and promoted by self-proclaimed pundits who imply that a particular orientation to writing instruction will prove successful at all times, in all places, and for all students.

We see a transition toward a view of second language writing teachers as experienced and seasoned professionals with an understanding of the nature of the phenomenon of second language writing and a familiarity with relevant theory and research from within and without the field, who, in an informed and principled way, develop curricula and materials that make sense for their students; their teaching styles; and their political, institutional, and classroom contexts; and who are unencumbered by the limitations of L2 writing's parent disciplines (e.g., the applied linguistics belief in the primacy of speech and composition studies' neglect of second language issues).

As for the research related to second language writing instruction, we also see positive developments. We see an increasing amount of published research addressing a greater variety of issues, with more breadth, depth, and sophistication—research that is more innovative and more global in its origin and that maintains a better balance of basic and applied issues, fosters more model and theory building, and encourages a greater recognition of the role of politics and ideology in inquiry. For all these reasons, we feel, as we said earlier, that it is indeed an exciting time to be working in the area of second language writing.

Notes

1. We examined the following sources to locate relevant research: indexes (Current Index to Journals in Education, Education Index, ERIC, Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts, Research in Education, World Cat); published bibliographies

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(selected annotated bibliography of scholarship in L2 writing in the *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(1)–*12*(3) (2000–present); and periodicals (*Academic Writing; ADE Bulletin; ADFL Bulletin; Annual Review of Applied Linguistics; Applied Language Learning; Applied Linguistics; Assessing Writing; Australian Review of Applied Linguistics; Babel; The Canadian Modern Language Review; Cardiovascular Research; College Composition and Communication; College ESL; Composition Studies; Computers & Composition; Computer Assisted Language Learning; ELT Journal; English for Specific Purposes; English Teaching Forum; Foreign Languages and Their Teachers; Foreign Language Annals; The French Review; Glottodidactica; Hermes: Journal of Linguistics; International Journal of English Studies; International Review of Applied Linguistics; Issues in Writing; ITL: Review of Applied Linguistics; JALT Journal; Journal of Adult Migrant Education; Journal of Basic Writing; Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education; Journal of English for Academic Purposes; Journal of Language for International Business; Journal of Literacy Research; Journal of Pragmatics; Journal of Second Language Writing; Journal of Teaching Writing; Language Awareness; Language, Culture, and Curriculum; Language Learning; Language Learning & Technology; Language Research Bulletin; Language Teaching Research; Language Testing; Learning and Instruction; MEXTESOL Journal; The Modern Language Journal; RELC Journal; Research in the Teaching of English; System; Teaching English in the Two-Year College; Technical Communication Quarterly; TESL Canada Journal; TESL-EJ; TESL Reporter; TESOL HEIS News: ESL in Higher Education Newsletter; TESOL Journal; TESOL Quarterly; World Englishes; Writing Instructor; Writing on the Edge; and Written Communication*.

2. In an attempt to make this review of research coherent and useful, we have developed a categorization system, recognizing that this system reflects our biases and that others might organize this material in very different ways.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Belcher, D., & Connor, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Reflections on multiliterate lives*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.

This book is a collection of personal accounts of the literacy experiences of successful academics from a variety of countries and disciplines. These accounts, presented in narratives and interviews, illustrate the contributors' struggles and achievements involved in becoming multiliterate.

Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (2001a). *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading–writing connections*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This collection provides a theoretical overview of the connection between reading and writing in a second language. It looks at how L1 composition studies has influenced L2 reading–writing theory and pedagogy as well as how L2 reading–writing scholarship has created an identity of its own.

Blanton, L. L., & Kroll, B. (Eds.). (2002). *ESL composition tales: Reflections on teaching.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

In this collection, several veteran L2 writing scholars write openly and honestly about their careers, thus creating, in effect, a collective history of the development of contemporary thinking about L2 writing and writing instruction.

Brauer, G. (Ed.). (2000d). *Writing across languages*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

The intention of this volume is to question why so little attention is paid to writing in language education. It considers perspectives from Switzerland, Italy, Denmark, Germany, and the United States at all levels of instruction.

Casanave, C. P. (2002). *Writing games: Multicultural case studies of academic literacy practices in higher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

This monograph uses the metaphor of "games" to explore how writers from different cultural backgrounds write in academic settings and the ways in which their writing affects their developing identities as students and professionals.

Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language writing.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

This book overviews the theory and research on error feedback in L2 writing and provides guidelines and suggestions for teaching editing and responding to error in student writing.

Ferris, D. (2003b). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Aimed at teachers of ESL writers and L2 teacher educators, this book provides an overview of the research on response to first and second language writing and offers practical guidelines for responding to ESL writers' texts.

Hinkel, E. (2002a). *Second language writers' text: Linguistic and rhetorical features.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This book, based on the results of a large-scale empirical study, provides a comprehensive and detailed analysis of L2 writers' texts and how these texts differ from those of L1 writers.

Kroll, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

This collection's 13 original articles provide a series of discussions of basic issues in and multiple aspects of L2 writing that are important to new and experienced teachers at the postsecondary level.

Leki, I. (Ed.). (2001a). *Academic writing programs*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

This volume in the Case studies in TESOL practice series focuses on novel L2 writing courses and programs in a range of academic settings. Each chapter establishes the context of the course and describes its unique features.

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. G. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

This book presents an overview of the research on peer response in second and foreign language writing and offers practical guidelines for implementing peer response in different contexts.

Manchón, R. M. (2001a). *Writing in the L2 classroom: Issues in research and pedagogy*. Murcia, Spain: Universidad de Murcia.

This collection, comprised of 10 original articles, offers theoretical perspectives on L2 writing, research on L2 writers and their texts, a look at issues in L2 pedagogy, and an extensive bibliography of scholarship on L2 composing.

Ransdell, S., & Barbier, M-L. (Eds). (2002). *New directions for research in L2 writing.* Boston: Kluwer.

This 12-chapter volume provides an entrée to current psycholinguistic research on L2 writing in the experimental tradition in the international context and is aimed at describing, predicting, and, ultimately, explaining L2 writing.

Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. K. (Eds.). (2001a). *Landmark essays on ESL writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

This collection of 15 original articles on L2 writing systematically delineates and explores central issues in field with regard to theory, research,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

instruction, assessment, politics, articulation with other disciplines, and standards.

Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. K. (Eds.). (2001b). *On second language writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

This 16-article reprint collection represents the development of the field of ESL writing from a historical perspective with the aim of providing ready access to primary works that have shaped the field and placing them in their historical contexts.

OTHER REFERENCES

Abrams, Z. I. (2001). Computer-mediated communication and group journals: Expanding the repertoire of participant roles. *System, 29*, 489–503.

Abu Rass, R. (2001). Integrating reading and writing for effective language teaching. *English Teaching Forum, 39*(1), 30–33.

Aidman, M. (2002). Early bilingual writing: Some influences of the mother tongue on written genre learning in the majority language. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*(1), 1–18.

Al-Khatib, M. A. (2001). The pragmatics of letter-writing. *World Englishes*, *20*(2), 179–200.

Allison, D. (1994). Comments on Sarah Benesch's "ESL ideology, and the politics of pragmatism." A reader reacts . . . *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(3), 618–623.

Archibald, A. (2001). Targeting L2 writing proficiencies: Instruction and area of change in students' writing over time. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 153–174.

Armengol-Castells, L. (2001). Text-generating strategies of three multilingual writers: A protocol-based study. *Language Awareness, 10*(2/3), 91–106.

Arrecco, M. R., & Ransdell, S. (2002). Early exposure to an L2 predicts good L1 as well as good L2 writing. In S. Ransdell & M.-L. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2 writing* (pp. 123–131). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Ashwell, T. (2000). Pattern of teacher response to student writing in a multiple draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 227–57.

Atari, O. F., & Triki, M. A. (2000). The formal features of oral and literate strategies of communication: Their implications for EFL writing revision. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *38*(2), 95–107.

Atkinson, D. (2000a). On Peter Elbow's response to "Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers," by Vai Ramanathan and Dwight Atkinson. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(1), 71–76.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Atkinson, D. (2000b). On Robert B. Kaplan's response to Terry Santos et al.'s "On the future of second language writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 317–320.
Atkinson, D. (2001). Reflections and refractions on the *JSLW* special issue on voice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1/2), 107–124.
Atkinson, D. (2003a). L2 writing in the post-process era: Introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(1), 3–15.
Atkinson, D. (2003b). Writing and culture in the post-process era. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(1), 49–63.
Babbit, M. (2001). Making writing count in an ESL learning community. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 49–60). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
Bacha, N. (2001). Writing evaluation: What can analytic versus holistic essay scoring tell us? *System, 29*(3), 371–383.
Bacha, N. (2002). Testing writing in the EFL classroom: Student expectations. *English Teaching Forum*, *40*(2), 14–19, 27.
Badger, R., & White. G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal, 54*(2), 153–60.
Bailey, N. (2000). *E. pluribus unum*: Health as content for a community of learners. In M. Pally (Ed.), *Sustained content teaching in academic ESL/EFL* (pp. 179–199). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Barks, D., & Watts, P. (2001). Textual borrowing strategies for graduate-level ESL writers. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 209–228). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Bartels, N. (2003). Written peer response in L2 writing. *English Teaching Forum, 41*(1), 34–37.
Basturkmen, H., & Lewis, M. (2002). Learner perspectives of success in an EAP writing course. *Assessing Writing, 8*(1), 31–46.
Beck, A. (2002). Writing strategies worksheet. *TESOL Journal*, *11*(1), 34–35.
Belcher, D. (2001). Does second language writing have gender? In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 59–71). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (2000). Literature and L2 composition: Revisiting the debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(1), 21–39.
Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (Eds.). (2001b). Introduction. *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 1-14). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Belcher, D., & Hirvela, A. (Eds.). (2001c). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(1/2) [Special issue on voice in L2 writing].
Benesch, S. (1993). ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 705–717.
Benesch, S. (1994). The author responds . . . *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(3), 623–624.
Benesch, S. (2001). Critical pragmatism: A politics of L2 composition. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 161-172). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bernard, R. W. (2000). Reflecting on commentary: Mind, intellect, and a use of language. In M. Pally (Ed.), *Sustained content teaching in academic ESL/EFL* (pp. 200–215). New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S., Meloni, C., & Weasenforth, D. (2000). Use of cohesive features in ESL students' e-mail and word-processed texts: A comparative study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 13*(3), 221–237.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S., & Weasenforth, D. (2001). E-mail and word processing in the ESL classroom: How the medium affects the message. *Language Learning & Technology, 5*(1), 135–165.

Blanton, L. (1995). Elephants and paradigms: Conversations about teaching L2 writing. *College ESL, 5*(1), 1–21.

Blanton, L. (2002). Seeing the invisible: Situating L2 literacy acquisition in child-teacher interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(4), 295–310.

Blatt, I. (2000). Internet writing and language learning. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 89–98). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Bloch, J. (2001). Plagarism and the ESL student: From printed to electronic texts. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 209–228). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bloch, J. (2002). Student/teacher interaction via email: The social context of Internet discourse. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(2), 117–134.

Bloch, J. (2003). Creating materials for teaching evaluation in academic writing: Using letters to the editor in L2 composition courses. *English for Specific Purposes, 22*(4), 347–364.

Bloch, J., & Brutt-Griffler, J. (2001). Implementing CommonSpace in the ESL composition classroom. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 309–334). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Boldt, H., Valsecchi, M. I., & Weigle, S. C. (2001). Evaluation of ESL student writing on text-responsible and non-text responsible writing tasks. *MEXTESOL Journal, 24*(3), 13–33.

Braine, G. (2001a). A study of English as a foreign language (EFL) writers on a local-area network (LAN) and in traditional classes. *Computers and Composition, 18*, 275–292.

Braine, G. (2001b). When an exit test fails. *System, 29*(2), 221–234.

Brauer, G. (2000a). Afterword: Expanding the function of writing in foreign and second language education. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 181–184). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Brauer, G. (2000b). Portfolio learning. *Writing across languages*. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 167–179). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Brauer, G. (2000c). Product, process, and the writer within: History of a paradigm shift. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 15–22). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Breiner-Sanders, K. E., Sender, E., & Terry, R. M. (2002). Preliminary proficiency guidelines—writing (revised 2001). *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(1), 9–15.

Brooks-Carson, A. W., & Cohen, A. D. (2000). Direct vs. translated writing: Strategies for bilingual writers. In B. Swierzbin, B. Morris, M. E. Anderson,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

C. A. Klee, & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Social and cognitive factors in second language acquisition* (pp. 397–423). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.

Bruce, N. (2002). Dovetailing language and content: Teaching balanced argument in legal problem answer writing. *English for Specific Purposes, 21*, 321–345.

Buckwalter, J. K., & Lo, Y. G. (2002). Emergent biliteracy in Chinese and English. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(4), 269–293.

CCCC Committee on Second Language Writing. (2001). Statement on second language writing and writers. *College Composition and Communication, 52*(4), 669–674.

Calvez, D. J. (2000). Advanced undergraduate French composition: Problems and solutions. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(1), 93–102.

Canagarajah, S. (2002). Multilingual writers and the academic community: Towards a critical relationship. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1*(1), 29–44.

Candlin, C. N., Bhatia, V. K., & Jensen, C. H. (2002). Developing legal writing materials for English second language learners: Problems and perspectives. *English for Specific Purposes, 21*(4), 299–320.

Cargill, M., Cadman, K., & McGowan, U. (2001). Postgraduate writing: Using intersecting genres in a collaborative content-based program. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 85–96). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Carson, J. (2000). Reading and writing for academic purposes. In M. Pally (Ed.), *Sustained content teaching in academic ESL/EFL* (pp. 19–34). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Carson, J. (2001). A task analysis of reading and writing in academic contexts. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading–writing connections* (pp. 48–83). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Casanave, C. P. (2003). Multiple uses of applied linguistics literature in a multi-disciplinary graduate EAP class. *ELT Journal, 57*(1), 43–50.

Chandrasegaran, A. (2000). An analysis of obliqueness in student writing. *RELC Journal, 31*(1), 23–44.

Chen, L. (2001). On the function of models in English composition. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching, 4*(144), 28–29, 38.

Cheng, Y. (2002). Factors associated with foreign language writing anxiety. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(5), 647–656.

Chenoweth, N. A., & Hayes, J. R. (2001). Fluency in writing: Generating text in L1 and L2. *Written Communication, 18*(1), 80–98.

Chimbganda, A. B. (2000). Communication strategies used in the writing of answers in biology by ESL first year science students of the University of Botswana. *English for Specific Purposes, 19,* 305–329.

Ching, L. C. (2002). Strategy and self-regulation instruction as contributors to improving students' cognitive model in an ESL program. *English for Specific Purposes, 21*, 261–289.

Coates, R., Sturgeon, B., Bohannan, J., & Pasini, E. (2002). Language and publication in *Cardiovascular Research* articles. *Cardiovascular Research, 53,* 279–285.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Connor, U. (2003). Changing currents in contrastive rhetoric: Implications for teaching and research. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 218–241). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cornwell, S., & McKay, T. (2000). Establishing a valid, reliable measure of writing apprehension for Japanese students. *JALT Journal, 22*(1), 114–139.

Cotterall, S., & Cohen, R. (2003). Scaffolding for second language writers: Producing an academic essay. *ELT Journal, 57*(2), 158–166.

Cresswell, A. (2000). Self-monitoring in student writing: Developing learner responsibility. *ELT Journal*, *54*(3), 235–244.

Crusan, D. (2002). An assessment of ESL writing placement assessment. *Assessing Writing, 8*(1), 17–30.

Cumming, A. (2001a). The difficulty of standards, for example in L2 writing. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 209–229) Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cumming, A. (2001b). ESL/EFL instructors' practices for writing assessment: Specific purposes or general purposes? *Language Testing, 18*(2), 207–224.

Cumming, A. (2001c). Learning to write in a second language: Two decades of research. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 1–24.

Cumming, A. (2002). Assessing L2 writing: Alternative constructs and ethical dilemmas. *Assessing Writing, 8*(2), 73–83.

Cumming, A., Bush, M., & Zho, A. (2002). Investigating learners' goals in the context of adult second-language writing. In S. Ransdell, & M.-L. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions in for research in L2 writing* (pp. 189–208). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Cumming, A., Kantor, R., & Powers, D. E. (2002). Decision making while rating ESL/EFL writing tasks: A descriptive framework. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(1), 67–96.

Cumming, A., & Riazi, G. (2000). Building models of adult second-language instruction. *Learning and Instruction, 10*(1), 55–71.

Currie, P. (2001). On the question of power and control. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 29–38). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

de Guerrero, M. C. M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal, 84*(1), 51–68.

Di Giovanni, E., & Nagaswami, G. (2001). Online peer review: An alternative to face-to-face? *ELT Journal*, *55*(3), 263–272.

Di Puma, L., & Maslekoff, D. (2001). Students' attention to in-text teacher feedback & their rationale for revisions. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *24*(3), 53–70.

Dobson, B., & Feak, C. (2001). A cognitive modeling approach to teaching critique to nonnative speakers. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading–writing connections* (pp. 186–200). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Dyer, B., & Friederich, L. (2002). The personal narrative as cultural artifact: Teaching autobiography in Japan. *Written Communication, 19*(2), 265–296.

Dylan, B. (1964). "The times, they are a changin."

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Elbow, P. (1999). Individualism and the teaching of writing: Response to Vai Ramanathan and Dwight Atkinson. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 327–338.

Erdosy, M. U. (2001). The influence of prior experience on the construction of scoring criteria for ESL composition: A case study. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 175–196.

Escamilla, K., & Coady, M. (2001). Assessing the writing of Spanish-speaking students: Issues and suggestions. In S. R. Hurley & J. V. Tinajero (Eds.), *Literacy assessment of second language learners* (pp. 43–63). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Fazio, L. L. (2001). The effect of corrections and commentaries on the journal writing accuracy of minority- and majority-language students. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(4), 235–249.

Fedderholdt, K. (2001). An email exchange project between non-native speakers of English. *ELT Journal*, *55*(3), 273–280.

Feng, C., Ogata, H., & Yano, Y. (2000). Mark-up-based writing error analysis model in an on-line classroom. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 13*(1), 79–97.

Ferris, D. (2003a). Responding to writing. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 119–140). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 161–184.

Flowerdew, J. (2001). Toward authentic, scientific-purpose writing at the lower levels of proficiency. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 21–33). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Flowerdew, L. (2000a). Critical thinking development and academic writing for engineering students. In M. Pally (Ed.), *Sustained content teaching in academic ESL/EFL* (pp. 96–116). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Flowerdew, L. (2000b). Using a genre-based framework to teach organizational structure in academic writing. *ELT Journal, 54*(3), 369–378.

Fluitt-Dupuy, J. (2001). Teaching argumentative writing through film. *TESOL Journal, 10*(4), 10–15.

Franken, M., & Haslett, S. (2002). When and why talking can make writing harder. In S. Ransdell, & M.-L.Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2 writing* (pp. 209–229). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Frodesen, J., & Holten, C. (2003). Grammar and the ESL writing class. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 141–161). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fukao, A., & Fujii, T. (2001). Investigating difficulties in the academic writing process: Interview as a research tool. *Language Research Bulletin, 16*, 29–40.

Gallagher, C., & McCabe, A. (2001). Academic register and the nominal group. *Language Research Bulletin, 16*, 53–67.

Garcia, S. S. (2001). Diferencias en las convenciones retóricas del Inglés y del Español y su escritura en Inglés como idioma extrajero por Hispanohablantes Mexicanos [Differences in the rhetorical conventions of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

English and Spanish and the writing in English as a foreign language of Spanish speaking Mexicans]. *MEXTESOL Journal, 24*(3), 35–51.

Ghrib-Maamouri, E. (2001). Thinking and writing in EFL: Cutting off Medusa's head. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics, 133/134*, 243–269.

Goldstein, L. (2001). For Kyla: What does the research say about responding to ESL writers? In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 73–89). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

González-Bueno, M., & Pérez, L. C. (2000). Electronic mail in foreign language writing: A study of grammatical and lexical accuracy, and quantity of language. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(2), 189–198.

Grabe, W. (2001). Reading-writing relations: Theoretical perspectives and instructional practices. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 15–47). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242–262). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grant, L., & Ginther, A. (2000). Using computer-tagged linguistic features to describe L2 writing differences. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(2), 123–145.

Greene, D. (2000). A design model for beginner-level computer-mediated EFL writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 13*(3), 239–252.

Hall, D. (2001). Relinquishing teacher control: Learners as generators of course content. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 147–157). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (2001). Fourth generation writing assessment. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 117–127). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (2002). The scope of writing assessment. *Assessing Writing, 8,* 5–16.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (2003). Writing teachers as assessors of writing. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 162–189). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hansen, J. G. (2000). Interactional conflicts among audience, purpose, and content knowledge in the acquisition of academic literacy in an EAP course. *Written Communication, 17*(1), 27–52.

Hansen-Thomas, H. (2003). A case study of reflective journals in a university-level EFL writing course in Hungary. *English Teaching Forum, 41*(1), 22–28.

Harklau, L. (2001). From high school to college: Student perspectives on literacy practices. *Journal of Literacy Research, 33*(1), 33–70.

Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(4), 329–350.

Hatasa, Y. A., & Soeda, E. (2000). Writing strategies revisited: A case of non-cognate L2 writers. In B. Swierzbin, B. Morris, M. E. Anderson, C. A. Klee, & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Social and cognitive factors in second language acquisition* (pp. 375–396). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hayward, N. (Ed.). (2001). *MEXTESOL Journal: Special Issue, Topics in ESL/EFL Writing, 24*(3).

Heyden, T. (2001). Using sustained content-based learning to promote advanced ESL writing. *TESOL Journal 10*(4), 16–20.

Hinkel, E. (2001). Matters of cohesion in L2 academic texts. *Applied Language Learning, 12*(2), 111–132.

Hinkel, E. (2002b). Teaching grammar in writing classes: Tenses and cohesion. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 181–198). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hinkel, E. (2003). Simplicity without elegance: Features of sentences in L1 and L2 academic texts. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(2), 275–301.

Hirose, K. (2001). Realizing a giant first step toward improved English writing: A case in a Japanese University. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 35–46). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Hirose, K. (2003). Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(2), 181–209.

Hirose, K., & Sasaki, M. (2000). Effects of teaching metaknowledge and journal writing on Japanese university students' EFL writing. *JALT Journal, 22*(1), 94–113.

Hirvela, A. (2001). Connecting reading and writing through literature. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading–writing connections* (pp. 109–134). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2001). Coming back to voice: The multiple voices and identities of mature multilingual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1/2), 83–106.

Homstad, T., & Thorson, H. (2000a). Quantity vs. quality: Using intensive and extensive reading in the FL classroom. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 141–152). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Homstad, T., & Thorson, H. (2000b). Writing and foreign language pedagogy: Theories and implications. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 3–14). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Hornung, A. (2000). Method awareness and the teaching of writing. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 131–140). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Huie, K., & Yahya, N. (2003). Learning to write in the primary grades: Experiences of English language learners and mainstream students. *TESOL Journal, 12*(1), 25–38.

Hunter, J., & Morgan, B. (2001). Language and public life: Teaching multiliteracies in ESL. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 99–109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(1), 33–54.

Hyland, F. (2001). Dealing with plagiarism when giving feedback. *ELT Journal, 55*(4), 375–381.

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31*(2), 217–230.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 185–212.
Hyland, K. (2000a). Hedges, boosters and lexical invisibility: Noticing modifiers in academic texts. *Language Awareness, 9*(4), 179–197.
Hyland, K. (2000b). "It might be suggested that…": Academic hedging and student writing. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 16*, 83–97.
Hyland, K. (2002a). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*(8), 1091–1112.
Hyland, K. (2002b). Directives: Argument and engagement in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics, 23*(2), 215–239.
Hyland, K. (2002c). Genre: Language, context, and literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 113–135.
Hyland, K. (2002d). Options of identity in academic writing. *ELT Journal, 56*(4), 351–358.
Hyland, K. (2002e). What do they mean? Questions in academic writing. *Text, 22*(4), 529–557.
Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 12(1), 17–29.
Ivanic, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1/2), 3–33.
Jabbour, G. (2001). Lexis and grammar in second language reading and writing. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 291–308). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
Jarvis, S. (2002). Short texts, best-fitting curves and new measures of lexical diversity. *Language Testing, 19*(1), 57–84.
Johns, A. (1992). Too much on our plates: A response to Terry Santos' "Ideology in composition: L1 and ESL." *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*(1), 83–88.
Johns, A. (2001). An interdisciplinary, interinstitutional, learning communities program: Student involvement and student success. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 61–72). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
Johns, A. (2003). Genre and ESL/EFL composition instruction. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 195–217). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Kaplan, R. (2000). Response to "On the future of second language writing." Terry Santos, et al. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 311–314.
Kaplan, R. B., & Grabe, W. (2002). A modern history of written discourse analysis. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(3), 191–223.
Kapper, J. L. (2002). The first 10 years of the *Journal of Second Language Writing:* An updated retrospective. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(2), 87–89.
Kasanga, L. A. (2001). Responding to feedback in revision in multiple-draft writing. *TESL Reporter, 34*(2), 1–14.
Kasper, L. F. (2000a). The imagery of rhetoric: Film and academic writing in the discipline-based ESL course. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 28*(1), 52–59.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Kasper, L. F. (2000b). Sustained content study and the Internet: Developing functional and academic literacies. In M. Pally (Ed.), *Sustained content teaching in academic ESL/EFL* (pp. 54–73). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kasper, L. F. (2002). Technology as a tool for literacy in the age of information: Implications for the ESL classroom. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 30*(2), 129–144.

Kasper, L. F., & Singer, R. (2001). Unspoken content: Silent film in the ESL classroom. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 29*(1), 16–33.

Katznelson, H., Perpignan, H., & Rubin, B. (2001). What develops along *with* the developments of second language writing? Exploring the "by-products." *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 141–159.

Kelley, A. K. (2001). Some suggestions for teaching intermediate composition. *French Review, 75*(1), 128–140.

Kells, M. H. (2002). Linguistic contact zones in the college writing classroom: An examination of ethnolinguistic identity and language attitudes. *Written Communication, 19*(1), 5–43.

Khaldieh, S. D. (2000). Learning strategies and writing processes of proficient versus less proficient learners of Arabic. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(5), 522–534.

Khuwaileh, A. A., & Shoumali, A. A. (2000). Writing errors: A study of the writing ability of Arab learners of academic English and Arabic at university. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 13*(2), 174–183.

Kiany, G. R., & Khezri Nejad, M. (2001). On the relationship between English proficiency, writing ability, and the use of conjunctions in Iranian EFL learners' compositions. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics, 133/134*, 227–241.

Kim, S.-A. (2001). Characteristics of EFL readers' summary writing: A study with Korean university students. *Foreign Language Annals, 34*(6), 569–581.

Kirschner, M., & Wexler, C. (2002). Caravaggio: A design for an interdisciplinary content-based EAP/ESP unit. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1*(2), 163–183.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2001). Factors relating to EFL writers' discourse level revision skills. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 71–101.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2002). High school student perceptions of first language literacy instruction: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(2), 91–116.

Kondo-Brown, K. (2002). A FACETS analysis of rater bias in measuring Japanese second language writing performance. *Language Testing, 19*(1), 3–31.

Kramsch, C., A'Ness, F., & Lam, W.S.E. (2000). Authenticity and authorship in the computer-mediated acquisition of L2 literacy. *Language Learning and Technology, 4*(2), 78–104.

Kroll, B. (2001). The composition of a life in composition. In T. Silva, & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp.1–16). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kubota, M. (2001). Error correction strategies used by learners of Japanese when revising a writing task. *System, 29*, 467–480.

Kubota, R. (2003). New approaches to gender, class, and race in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*(1), 31–47.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lally, C. G. (2000a). First language influences in second language composition: The effect of pre-writing. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(4), 428–432.

Lally, C. G. (2000b). Writing across English and French: An examination of strategy use. *The French Review, 73*(3), 525–538.

Lam, S. E. L. (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.

Lang, H. G., & Albertini, J. A. (2001). Construction of meaning in the authentic science writing of deaf students. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 6*(4), 258–284.

Lax, J., & Reichelt, M. (2001). Writing about writing: An innovative first-year composition curriculum. *Issues in Writing, 11*(1), 64–82.

Lee, I. (2002a). Helping students develop coherence in writing. *English Teaching Forum, 40*(3), 32–39.

Lee, I. (2002b). Teaching coherence to ESL students: A classroom inquiry. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(2), 135–159.

Lee, Y.-J. (2002). A comparison of composing processes and written products in timed-essay tests across paper-and-pencil and computer modes. *Assessing Writing, 8*(2), 135–157.

Leki, I. (2000). Writing, literacy, and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 20*, 99–115.

Leki, I. (2001b). Hearing voices: L2 students' experiences in L2 writing courses. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 17–28). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Leki, I. (2001c). Interlude: Developing meaningful literacy courses. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading–writing connections* (pp. 201–208). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Leki, I. (2001d). Introduction: Accessing communities and disciplines through L2 writing programs. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 1–4). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Leki, I. (2001e). Material, educational, and ideological challenges of teaching EFL writing at the turn of the century. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 197–209.

Leki, I. (2003a). A challenge to second language writing professionals: Is writing overrated? In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 315–331). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I. (2003b). Coda: Pushing L2 writing research. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(1), 103–105.

Levine, A., Oded, B., Connor, U., & Asons, I. (2002). Variation in EFL-ESL peer response. *TESL-EJ, 6*(3), A-1.

Li, Y. (2000a). Assessing second language writing: The relationship between computerized analysis and rater evaluation. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics, 127/128*, 37–51.

Li, Y. (2000b). Linguistic characteristics of ESL writing in task-based e-mail activities. *System, 28*, 229–245.

Li, J., & Cumming, A. (2001). Word processing and second language writing: A longitudinal case study. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 127–152.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Liaw, M.-L., & Johnson, R. J. (2001). E-mail writing as a cross-cultural learning experience. *System, 29*(2), 235–251.

Liu, D. (2000). Writing cohesion: Using content lexical ties in ESOL. *English Teaching Forum*, *38*(1), 28–33.

Liu, J., & Sadler, R. W. (2003). The effect and affect of peer review in electronic versus traditional modes of L2 writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*(3), 193–227.

Livie, K. (2000). Teaching argumentative writing strategies with popular culture. *TESOL HEIS News: ESL in Higher Education Newsletter, 19*(2), 11.

LoCastro, V., & Masuko, M. (2002). Plagiarism and academic writing of learners of English. *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics, 28*, 11–38.

Lunsford, A. A. (2001). Afterword: Lessons on linking literacies for L1 teachers. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 335–338). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Maguire, M. H., & Graves, B. (2001). Speaking personalities in primary school children's L2 writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(4), 561–593.

Malloy, M. E. (2001). The foreign language literacy classroom "translating event" as reading and composing: Eighth graders read cross-cultural children's literature. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 135–163). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Manchón, R. M. (2001b). Trends in the conceptualization of second language composing strategies: A critical analysis. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 47–70.

Manchón, R. M., Roca de Larios, J., & Murphy, L. (2000a). An approximation to the study of backtracking in L2 writing. *Learning and Instruction, 10*(1), 13–35.

Manchón, R. M., Roca de Larios, J., & Murphy, L. (2000b). La influencia de la variable "grado de domino de la L2" en los procesos de composición en lengua extranjera: Hallazgos recientes de la investigación [The influence of L2 proficiency on composing processes in a foreign language: Insights from recent research]. In C. Munoz (Ed.), *Segundas lenguas: Adquisición en el aula* (pp. 277–297). Barcelona, Spain: Editorial Ariel.

Matsuda, P. K. (2001a). Reexamining audiolingualism: On the genesis of reading and writing in L2 Studies. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 84–108). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Matsuda, P. K. (2001b). Voice in Japanese written discourse: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1/2), 35–53.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 15–34). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Matsuda, P. K., Canagarajah, S., Harklau, L., Hyland, K., & Warschauer, M. (2003). Changing currents in second language writing research: A colloquium. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(2), 151–179.

Matsuda, P. K., & DePew, K. E. (Guest Eds.) (2002a). Special Issue: Early second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(4).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Matsuda, P. K., & DePew, K. E. (2002b). Early second language writing: An introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(4), 261–268.

Matsuda, P. K., & Jablonski, J. (2000). Beyond the L2 metaphor: Towards a mutually transformative model of ESL/WAC collaboration. *Academic Writing, 1*. Retrieved July, 2003, from http:///aw.colostate.edu/aw/articles/matsuda_jablonski2000.htm.

Melby-Mauer, J. (2003). Using e-mail assignments and online correction in ESL instruction. *TESOL Journal, 12*(2), 37–38.

Miller, K. S. (2000). Academic writers on-line: Investigating pausing in the production of text. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(2), 123–148.

Moulton, M. R., & Holmes, V. A. (2000). An ESL capstone course: Integrating research tools, techniques, and technology. *TESOL Journal, 9*(2), 23–29.

Mounsey, J. M. (2001). Our students have the right to know: Teaching about plagiarism in the ESL/EFL classroom. *MEXTESOL Journal, 24*(3), 95–102.

Muncie, J. (2000). Using written teacher feedback in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal*, *54*(1), 47–53.

Muncie, J. (2002a). Finding a place for grammar in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal, 56*(2), 180–186.

Muncie, J. (2002b). Process writing and vocabulary development: Comparing lexical frequency profiles across drafts. *System*, *30*, 225–235.

Myers, J. L. (2001). Self-evaluations of the "stream of thought" in journal writing. *System, 29*, 481–488.

Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESL-EJ, 6*(2), A1.

Nakayama, T. (2002). Learning to write in Japanese: Writing contexts, student performance, and instructional approach. *Babel, 37*(1), 27–36, 38.

Nelson, G., & Burns, J. (2000). Managing information for writing university exams in American history. In M. Pally (Ed.), *Sustained content teaching in academic ESL/EFL* (pp. 132–157). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Nelson, T. (2000). Using computers to teach writing in the FL classroom. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 99–115). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Newell, G., Garriga, M. C., & Peterson, S. S. (2001). Learning to assume the role of author: A study of reading to write one's own ideas in an undergraduate ESL composition course. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading–writing connections* (pp. 164–185). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Odlin, T. (2001). With the dictionary and beyond. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 271–290). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Okamura, A., & Shaw, P. (2000). Lexical phrases, culture, and subculture in transactional letter writing. *English for Specific Purposes, 19*, 1–15.

Olivares-Cuhat, G. (2002). Learning strategies and achievement in the Spanish writing classroom: A case study. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(5), 561–570.

Pally, M. (2000a). Film and society: A course for analyzing readings, writings, and critical thinking. In M. Pally (Ed.), *Sustained content teaching in academic ESL/EFL* (pp. 158–178). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Pally, M. (Ed.). (2000b). *Sustained content teaching in academic ESL/EFL*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Pally, M. (2001). Skills development in "sustained" content-based curricula: Case studies in analytic/critical thinking and academic writing. *Language and Education, 15*(4), 279–305.

Pally, M., Katznelson, H., Perpignan, H., & Rubin, B. (2002). What is learned in sustained-content writing classes along with writing? *Journal of Basic Writing, 21*(1), 90–115.

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. (2001). Moving from school to the workplace: Disciplinary innovation, border crossing, and the reshaping of a written genre. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(4), 405–438.

Pecorari, D. (2001). Plagiarism and international students: How the English-speaking university responds. In D. Belcher & A. Hirvela (Eds.), *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections* (pp. 229–245). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Pennington, M. C. (2003). The impact of the computer in second language writing. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 287–310). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2001). *Reading, writing, & learning in ESL: A resource book for K–12 teachers* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Porto, M. (2001). Cooperative writing response groups and self-evaluation. *ELT Journal*, *55*(1), 38–46.

Prior, P. (2001). Voices in text, mind, and society: Sociohistoric accounts of discourse acquisition and use. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1/2), 55–81.

Prochaska, E. (2001). Western rhetoric and plagiarism: Gatekeeping for an English-only international academia. *Writing on the Edge, 12*(2), 65–79.

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*(4), 277–303.

Quintero, E. (2002). A problem-posing approach to using native language writing in English literacy instruction. In S. Ransdell, & M.-L. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2 writing* (pp. 231–244). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(3), 407–430.

Rainville, A. (2000). EFL and the writing process in Bulgaria. *TESOL Matters, 10*(1), 10.

Ramanathan, V. (2003). Written textual production and consumption (WTPC) in vernacular and English-medium settings in Gujarat, India. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(2), 125–150.

Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 45–75.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ramanathan, V., & Kaplan, R. B. (2000). Genres, authors, discourse communities: Theory and application for (L1 and) L2 writing instructors. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(2), 171–191.

Ransdell, S., Lavelle, B., & Levy, C.M. (2002). The effects of training a good working memory strategy on L1 and L2 writing. In S. Ransdell & M.-L. Barbier (Eds.). *New directions in for research in L2 writing* (pp. 133–144). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Reichelt, M. (1999). Toward a more comprehensive view of L2 writing: Foreign language writing in the U.S. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(2), 181–204.

Reichelt, M. (2001). A critical review of foreign language writing research on pedagogical approaches. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*, 578–598.

Reichelt, M. (2003). Defining "Good writing": A cross-cultural perspective. *Composition Studies, 31*(1), 99–126.

Reichelt, M., & Waltner, K. B. (2001). Writing in a second-year German class. *Foreign Language Annals*, *34*(2), 235–245.

Reid, J. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Reid, J. (2001). Advanced EAP writing and curriculum design: What do we need to know? In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 143–160). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Reynolds, D. W. (2002). Learning to make things happen in different ways: Causality in the writing of middle-grade English language learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(4), 311–328.

Rinnert, C, & Kobayashi, H. (2001). Differing perceptions of EFL writing among readers in Japan. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(2), 189–209.

Rivard, L. P. (2001). Summary writing: A multi-grade study of French-immersion and Francophone secondary students. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 14*(2), 171–186.

Robinson, D. W. (2000). Building consensus on the scoring of students' writing: A comparison of teacher scores versus native informants' scores. *The French Review, 73*(4), 667–688.

Roca de Larios, J., Marín, J., & Murphy, L. (2001). A temporal analysis of formulation processes in L1 and L2 writing. *Language Learning, 51*(3), 497–538.

Roca de Larios, J., & Murphy, L. (2001). Some steps toward a socio-cognitive interpretation of second language composition processes. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 25–45.

Roebuck, R. F. (2001). Teaching composition in the college level foreign language class: Insights and activities from sociocultural theory. *Foreign Language Annals, 34*(3), 206–213.

Ruan, Z. (2001). The effects of linguistic preparation on an EFL writing task. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching, 4*, 24–27.

Ruiz-Funes, M. (2001). Task representation in foreign language reading-to-write. *Foreign Language Annals*, *34*(2), 226–234.

Russell, P. D., & Yoo, J. (2001). Learner investment in second language writing. In X. Bonch-Bruevich, W. J. Crawford, J. Hellermann, C. Higgins, & H. Nguyen (Eds.), *The past, present, and future of second language research:*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Selected proceedings of the 2000 Second Language Research Forum (pp. 181–196). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.

Sanders, K. (2000). Dialogue journals in the adult ESL classroom. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 41–52). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Sanson-Moorey, B. (2001). Reading and writing in an advanced ESP class: Student conferences and teacher observations. *MEXTESOL Journal, 24*(3), 71–94.

Santos, T. (1992). Ideology in composition: L1 and ESL. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*(1), 1–15.

Santos, T. (2000). Response to Kaplan. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 315.

Santos, T. (2001). The place of politics in second language writing. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 173–90). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Santos, T., Atkinson, D., Erickson, M., Matsuda, P. K., & Silva, T. (2000). On the future of second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(1), 1–20.

Sapp, D. A. (2002). Towards an international and intercultural understanding of plagiarism and academic dishonesty in composition: Reflections from the People's Republic of China. *Issues in Writing, 13*(1), 58–79.

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. (2002). Building an empirically-based model of EFL learners' writing processes. In S. Ransdell, & M.-L. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2 writing* (pp. 49–80). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Schindler, K. (2000). Gemeinsames Schreiben in der Fremdsprache: Muster, kreativität und das Glück des Autors. [General writing in a foreign language: Pattern, creativity, and author's luck.]. *Glottodidactica, 28*, 161–184.

Schoonen, R., van Gelderen, A., de Glopper, K., Hulstijn, J., Snellings, P., Simis, A., & Stevenson, M. (2002). In S. Ransdell, & M.-L. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2 writing* (pp. 101–122). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Schrader, M. (2000). Automatic writing in the preparation of immigrants for work that is indeed beautiful. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 53–67). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Schrader, R. (2000). Creative writing with young immigrants. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 25–40). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Sengupta, S. (2000). An investigation into the effects of revision strategy instruction on L2 secondary school learners. *System, 28*(1), 97–113.

Severino, C. (1993). The sociopolitical implications of response to second language and second dialect writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*(3), 181–201.

Shei, C. C., & Pain, H. (2000). An ESL writer's collocational aid. *Computer Assisted Language Learning 13*(2), 167–182.

Shi, L. (2001). Native- and nonnative-speaking EFL teachers' evaluation of Chinese students' English writing. *Language Testing, 18*(3), 303–325.

Shin, S. J. (2002). Ten techniques for successful writing tutorials. *TESOL Journal, 11*(1), 25–31.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Silva, T., Brice, C., Kapper, J., Matsuda, P. K., & Reichelt, M. (2001). Twenty-five years of scholarship on second language composing processes: 1976–2000. *International Journal of English Studies. 1*(2), 211–240.

Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. K. (2002). Writing. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 251–266). London: Arnold.

Simpson, J. (2000). Topical structure analysis of academic paragraphs in English and Spanish. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 293–309.

Smoke, T. (2001). Instructional strategies for making ESL students integral to the university. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 129–441). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Smoke, T., Green, T. M., & Isenstead, E. (2001). "This course is giving me cephalgia . . . :" Linking ESL writing and the Greek and Latin roots of English. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 137–149). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Song, B., & August, B. (2002). Using portfolios to assess the writing of ESL students: A powerful alternative? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(1), 49–72.

Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing critical thinking in the writing of Japanese university students: Insights about assumptions and content familiarity. *Written Communication, 18*(4), 506–548.

Stapleton, P. (2002). Critiquing voice as a viable pedagogical tool in L2 writing: Returning the spotlight to ideas. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(3), 177–190.

Stapleton, P. (2003). Assessing the quality and bias of Web-based sources: Implications for academic writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*(3), 229–245.

Stewart, T., Rehorick, S., & Perry, B. (2001). Adapting the Canadian language benchmarks for writing assessment. *TESL Canada Journal*, *18*(2), 48–64.

Storch, N., & Tapper, J. (2002). A useful kind of interaction? Evaluations by university students of feedback on written assignments. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*(1), 147–167.

Strong, R. M., & Fruth, J. K. (2001). The Spanish writing center at the University of Minnesota. *ADFL Bulletin, 32*(2), 33–36.

Suh, J.-S. (2002). Effectiveness of CALL writing instruction: The voices of Korean EFL learners. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(6), 669–679.

Sullivan, K., & Lindgren, E. (2002). Self-assessment in autonomous computer-aided second language writing. *ELT Journal, 56*(3), 258–266.

Svendsen, L. P. (2000). The use of workshops and seminars in the ESL classroom. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Writing across languages* (pp. 153–165). Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Sze, C. (2002). A case study of the revision process of a reluctant ESL student writer. *TESL Canada Journal, 19*(2), 21–36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tarnopolsky, O. (2000). Writing English as a foreign language: A report from Ukraine. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 209–226.
Thatcher, B. L. (2000). L2 professional writing in a US and South American context. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(1), 41–69.
Thompson, P., & Tribble, C. (2001). Looking at citations: Using corpora in English for academic purposes. *Language Learning & Technology, 5*(3), 91–105.
Thonus, T. (2002). Tutor and student assessments of academic writing tutorials: What is "success"? *Assessing Writing, 8*(2), 110–134.
Thonus, T. (2003). Serving generation 1.5 learners in the university writing center. *TESOL Journal, 12*(1), 17–24.
Thorson, H. (2000). Using the computer to compare foreign and native language writing process: A statistical and case study approach. *The Modern Language Journal, 84*, 155–169.
Tickoo, A. (2000). How to create a crisis: A study of ESL narrative prose. *ITL: Review of Applied Linguistics, 129/130*, 169–190.
Tickoo, A. (2001). How to create a crisis: Empowering the ESL writer with lessons from narrative art. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(1), 21–36.
Torras, M. R., & Celaya, M. L. (2001). Age-related differences in the development of written production: An empirical study of EFL school learners. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 103–126.
Tsang, W. K. (2000). Giving grammar the place it deserves in process writing. *Journal of the Adult Migrant Education Program, 15*(1), 34–45.
Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(2), 147–170.
Turner, C. E. (2000). Listening to the voices of rating scale developers: Identifying salient features for second language performance assessment. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *56*(4), 555–584.
Turner, C. E., & Upshur, J. A. (2002). Rating scales derived from student samples: Effects of the scale maker and the student sample on scale content and student scores. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(1), 49–70.
Valdés, G. (2000). Nonnative English speakers: Language bigotry in English mainstream classrooms. *ADE Bulletin, 124,* 12–17.
Vandrick, S. (2003). Literature in the teaching of second language composition. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 263–283). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Vann, R. J., & Myers, C. (2001). Capitalizing on contacts, collaboration, and disciplinary communities: Academic ESL options in a large research university. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 73–84). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
Vollmer, G. (2002). Sociocultural perspectives on second language writing. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin, 25*(2), 1–2.
Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: An exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(3), 225–246.
Warden, C. A. (2000). EFL business writing behaviors in differing feedback environments. *Language Learning, 50*(4), 573–616.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Warschauer, M. (2002). Networking into academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 1*(1), 45–58.
Weber, J. J. (2001). A concordance- and genre-informed approach to ESP essay writing. *ELT Journal, 55*(1), 14–20.
Weigle, S. C., Boldt, H., & Valsecchi, M. I. (2003). Effects of task and rater background on the evaluation of ESL student writing: A pilot study. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(2), 345–354.
Weigle, S. C., & Nelson, G. (2001). Academic writing for university examinations. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 121–135). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
White, R. (2001). Adapting Grice's maxims in the teaching of writing. *ELT Journal, 55*(1), 62–69.
Wilhelm, K. H., & Rivers, M. (2001). An audience approach to EAP writing assessment: Learners, teachers, outsiders. *Applied Language Learning, 12*(2), 177–190.
Williams, J. (2001). A task-based composition course for resident L2 writers. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 111–120). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
Williams, J. (2002). Undergraduate second language writers in the writing center. *Journal of Basic Writing, 21*(2), 73–91.
Woodall, B. R. (2002). Language-switching: Using the first language while writing in a second language. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(1), 7–28.
Wu, S.-Y., & Rubin, D. L. (2000). Evaluating the impact of collectivism and individualism on argumentative writing by Chinese and North American college students. *Research in the Teaching of English, 35*(2), 148–178.
Xiao, M. K. (2001). The writing assistance programme: A writing center with Hong Kong characteristics. In I. Leki (Ed.), *Academic writing programs* (pp. 7–19). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
Yamada, K. (2000). Helping novice EFL/ESL academic writers appreciate English textual patterns through summary writing. *JALT Journal, 22*(1), 196–208.
Yamada, K. (2003). What prevents ESL/EFL writers from avoiding plagiarism?: Analyses of 10 North-American college Web sitessites. *System, 31*(2), 247–258.
Yang, L., & Shi, L. (2003). Exploring six MBA students' summary writing by introspection. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 2*(3), 165–192.
Yates, R., & Kenkel, J. (2002). Responding to sentence-level errors in writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *11*(1), 29–47.
Yuan, Y. (2003). The use of chat rooms in an ESL setting. *Computers and Composition, 20*(2), 194–206.
Zhang, M. (2000). Cohesive features in the expository writing of undergraduates in two Chinese universities. *RELC Journal, 31*(1), 61–95.
Zhu, W. (2001a). Interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(4), 251–276.
Zhu, W. (2001b). Performing argumentative writing in English: Difficulties, processes, and strategies. *TESL Canada Journal, 19*(1), 34–50.
Zimmerman, R. (2000). L2 writing: Subprocesses, a model of formulating, and empirical findings. *Learning and Instruction 10*(1), 73–99.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000042 Published online by Cambridge University Press