Approaches to Writing Instruction for Adolescent English Language Learners



A DISCUSSION OF RECENT RESEARCH AND PRACTICE LITERATURE
IN RELATION TO NATIONWIDE STANDARDS ON WRITING

THE EDUCATION ALLIANCE at Brown University

Approaches to Writing Instruction for Adolescent English Language Learners



A DISCUSSION OF RECENT RESEARCH AND PRACTICE LITERATURE IN RELATION TO NATIONWIDE STANDARDS ON WRITING

THE EDUCATION ALLIANCE at Brown University

Since 1975, The Education Alliance, a department at Brown University, has helped the education community improve schooling for our children. We conduct applied research and evaluation, and provide technical assistance and informational resources to connect research and practice, build knowledge and skills, and meet critical needs in the field.

With offices in Rhode Island, New York, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and a dedicated team of over 100 skilled professionals, we provide services and resources to K-16 institutions across the country and beyond. As we work with educators, we customize our programs to the specific needs of our clients.

NORTHEAST AND ISLANDS REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY (LAB)

The Education Alliance at Brown University is home to the Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory (LAB), one of ten educational laboratories funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences. Our goals are to improve teaching and learning, advance school improvement, build capacity for reform, and develop strategic alliances with key members of the region's education and policymaking community. The LAB develops educational products and services for school administrators, policymakers, teachers, and parents in New England, New York, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Central to our efforts is a commitment to equity and excellence. Information about all Alliance programs and services is available by contacting:

The Education Alliance at Brown University
222 Richmond Street, Suite 300
Providence, RI 02903-4226

Phone: 800.521.9550
Fax: 401.421.7650
E-mail: info@alliance.brown.edu
Web: www.alliance.brown.edu

Authors: Carolyn Panofsky, Maria Pacheco, Sara Smith, Janet Santos, Chad Fogelman, Margaret Harrington, Erica Kenney
Editor: Elizabeth Devaney
Designers: Shraddha Aryal and Patricia McGee

Copyright ©2005 Brown University. All rights reserved.

This publication is based on work supported by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), U.S. Department of Education, under Contract Number ED-01-CO-0010. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IES, the U.S. Department of Education, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Education Alliance at Brown University's Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory (LAB) and the authors thank the many individuals who offered their review and guidance throughout the development of this research paper, including Adie Becker, Francine Collignon, Tom Crochunis, and Mary-Beth Fafard at The Education Alliance; Paul Matsuda at the University of New Hampshire; and Lorrie Verplaetse at Southern Connecticut State University.

This paper is also available from The Education Alliance's online publications catalog at:
http://www.alliance.brown.edu/db/ea_catalog.php

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii
INTRODUCTION 1
A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY 4

PART I: Taking Stock of the Literature:
Methodology and Findings 5

A. COMPILING THE NATIONWIDE STANDARDS 5
1. SURVEYING WRITING STANDARDS ACROSS THE NATION 5
2. CREATING A MATRIX OF WRITING STANDARDS 5
3. DEVELOPING A PROTOCOL 6

B. COMPILING THE RESEARCH STUDIES, SECONDARY RESEARCH REVIEWS, AND PRACTICE LITERATURE 9
1. SURVEYING THE LITERATURE 9
2. FINDINGS OF THE LITERATURE SURVEY 9

C. SELECTING THE CORE TEXTS 10

PART II: Reviewing the Knowledge Base for Teaching Writing to
Adolescent ELLs in the U.S. 13

A. MAKING SENSE OF ABSENCE IN THE FINDINGS 13
B. OVERVIEW OF EXISTING RESEARCH 16
1. THEORY FOR RESEARCH IN SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING 17
2. THEORY FOR INSTRUCTION 17

C. KEY ISSUES IN WRITING INSTRUCTION FOR ADOLESCENT ELLS IN THE U.S. 19
1. LEARNER ISSUES 19
2. PEDAGOGICAL ISSUES 20
3. ASSESSMENT ISSUES 26
4. STRUCTURAL ISSUES 27

D. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS IN PART II 31

PART III: Connecting the Knowledge Base to the Standards 33

A. THE STANDARDS CATEGORIES:
CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE LITERATURE 33
1. GENRE 33
2. WRITING PROCESS AND STRATEGY 35
3. INTERNAL LOGIC AND COHERENCE 39
4. KNOWLEDGE OF AUDIENCE, LANGUAGE, CULTURE, AND POLITICS 42
5. STYLISTICS 44
6. ERROR, USAGE, AND SYNTACTIC CORRECTNESS 45

B. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS IN PART III 48

PART IV: Recommendations for Research 51

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Matrix of State Writing Standards 53
APPENDIX B: Review Protocol for Research Studies and Practice Literature 59
APPENDIX C: Annotated List of Core Texts 65
APPENDIX D: Additional Resources 69

REFERENCES 77

TABLES

TABLE 1: CATEGORIES AND DESCRIPTORS FOR STANDARDS FROM ACROSS THE NATION 7
TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF WORKS REVIEWED 10
TABLE 3: LIST OF CORE TEXTS 11

ABSTRACT

English language learners (ELLs) in today's U.S. middle schools and high schools face significant challenges from state writing assessments, and data suggest that they do not fare well. This paper seeks to uncover some of the reasons by posing the question: What is the available research base and practice literature to help teachers prepare ELLs to meet the standards? To answer this question, we began by collecting the writing standards from each state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; identified major topics and themes in the standards; and reduced the total number of standards to a set of six categories that could be used to assess the research and practice literature. We then conducted an extensive search of the research and practice literature published between 1995 and 2005 that addresses adolescents, second language learning, and writing. Although the literature is extensive, only a small portion addresses U.S. resident and immigrant ELLs in grades 7 through 13. We found several historical factors that have resulted in these gaps: research has focused largely on post secondary and international student populations, with little focus on U.S. resident and immigrant middle and high school students; ESL teacher preparation programs focus largely on oral language development; and secondary school English teacher preparation programs rarely address working with second language learners. In addition to limiting the field of research available for review, the factors above may account for the wide gap between ELL students' writing skills and those of their English-speaking peers This report explores these issues further by reviewing the research and practice literature relevant to the six categories of standards and offering recommendations for further research.

INTRODUCTION

Many contemporary trends in both schooling and society highlight the increasing importance of high quality literacy education for adolescent English language learners (ELLs). To meet today's increasingly challenging high school graduation requirements, all students are now required to write competently in several genres. For example, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) measures students' abilities to produce narrative, informative, and persuasive writing. In addition, the current implementation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requires that all students, regardless of English language proficiency, be held to the same standards of literacy assessment throughout their years of public schooling. After high school, literary skills are required in most workplaces, as even minimum wage jobs often require the ability to keep records and report on workplace activities. Likewise, post secondary opportunities for technical training and higher education are restricted to those who can demonstrate their abilities using the written word. Against the backdrop of these pressures on ELLs to perform, research by Scarcella (2003) and Rumberger and Gándara (2000) reveals that alarming numbers of nonnative English-speaking college freshmen fail entry-level writing assessments despite their years of schooling in the mainland U.S. The recent change in the SAT writing assessment and the related raising of the writing performance standard in 2005 lend greater urgency to those findings. Given the existing writing standards and accountability systems in public education and the measures governing admissions to post secondary education and employment, it is important to identify the available research on teaching writing to adolescent ELLs, to organize that research, and to assess how current practice literature relates to the research.

The Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory at Brown University has prepared this review of the research and practice literature addressing approaches to writing instruction for adolescent ELLs in order to take stock of the information available from major publishers and in peer-reviewed journals for educational stakeholders. It gives specific attention to studies focused on students in grades 7 through 13, and includes the first year of college because of the

critical role of writing in students' college success and because of the importance of students' pre college preparation for writing. The review, conducted in the context of an overview of the writing standards from each state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, describes the key issues, strengths, and limitations of the existing literature on this topic. It is intended as a resource for policymakers, professional development and curriculum specialists, educational researchers, practitioners, and funders of writing and literacy research.

In the coming years a growing number of nonnative English speakers will enroll in public schools in the U.S. Recent demographic analyses of the 2000 U.S. census reveal that the proportion of children who speak languages other than English at home continues to grow and spread into new geographic locations. These analyses suggest that the population of adolescent nonnative English speakers in schools will expand for the foreseeable future and challenge increasing numbers of education systems and teacher preparation institutions (Pew Hispanic Center, 2005). However, quantitative reports of demographic change reveal only part of the story. According to Harklau, Losey, and Siegal (1999):

> Almost 15% of the limited English proficient (LEP) students in U.S. public schools are at the secondary level. More than 75,000 were high school seniors in 1993....Because LEP classification represents only the most elementary level of English language proficiency, and because learning an L2 for academic purposes is a protracted process that requires up to 7 years by some accounts... the population of English learners *graduating* [italics added] from U.S. high schools yearly is likely to be at least double to triple that figure [that is, 225,000 or more]. (pp. 2-3)

In short, several significant factors make writing instruction for ELLs a potent and pressing issue for policy makers, teacher educators, professional development specialists, researchers, funders of writing and literacy research, and practitioners. To recap, these factors include:

- The challenge of writing standards and accountability systems in public education;
- Real-world accountability measures governing access to post secondary education and employment opportunities;
- A growing and underserved population of ELLs; and
- The need for increasing numbers of educators prepared to educate ELLs.

Given these factors, it is crucial to identify and understand the knowledge base for teaching writing to adolescent ELLs. For this report, we investigated the structure and substance of that knowledge base, the nationwide standards, and the connection of the knowledge base to the standards. In examining the knowledge base, we asked the following questions:

- What is the quality and quantity of the research base?
- How does it contribute to efforts to improve pedagogy, curricula, and programming?

As state (hereafter, our use of *state* includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands) standards affect the orientation of curricula and programs, the instructional decisions that teachers make, and the assessment challenges faced by ELLs, we then asked the following questions:

- Is there a common set of standards for writing across the nation, and if so, what is it?
- Does the research and practice literature connect to the standards? If so, how?
- Where are the gaps, if any, between the research and the standards?

This report contains four parts. Part I describes the methodology and associated activities. The review team gathered the writing standards for each state, compiled them in a matrix, and clustered them into categories. We then determined criteria for selecting research and practice literature on writing instruction for adolescent ELLs in U.S. schools to review and developed a protocol to use as a template for surveying documents. Using the protocol, we identified literature that met our criteria; coded, tabulated, and analyzed the literature; and used the findings of this analysis to take stock of the field. From this analysis, the team selected a set of core texts for review in Parts II and III of this report.

Part II uses the core texts, their studies, and their findings to review the current state of the field of second language writing instruction. It includes a brief overview of existing research and an extended discussion of the key issues in writing instruction for adolescent ELLs, organized into learner issues, pedagogical issues, assessment issues, and structural issues.

Part III connects the knowledge base outlined in Part II to state writing standards. It explains the substance of each standards category, reports the frequency of particular standards across states, and connects this frequency and the degree to which the standard category is addressed in the research and practice literature, specifically the core texts. Salient research findings and issues from the core texts are presented, and implications for the classroom are explored. Part III concludes with a summary of key findings from the review. Finally, Part IV offers recommendations for future research.

A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY

There are a number of terminological ambiguities in the area of second language education. One area of confusion involves the varied acronyms for identifying people or populations, languages, and programmatic approaches, as the following list suggests:

People:

NS	Native speaker/speaking
NES	Native English speaker/speaking
NNS	Nonnative speaker/speaking
NNES	Nonnative English speaker/speaking
NELB	Non-English language background
LEP	Limited English proficient/proficiency
ELL	English language learner

Languages:

L1	First language
L2	Second language
TL	Target language
FL	Foreign language

Programs:

ESL	English as a second language
EFL	English as a foreign language
ESOL	English for speakers of other languages
TESOL	Teaching English to speakers of other languages
TESL	Teaching English as a second language
ESP	English for specific purposes
EAP	English for academic purposes

Many of the terms in this list overlap in the ways they are used in the literature, especially as different authors and sources use different terms to refer to the same population. Language minority students may be referred to as NNS, NNES, or NELB by different authors. Sometimes terms are used across categories, as when a learner is referred to as "an ESL student," or colloquially, as in "he's ESL." In the best case, the choice of different terms in the literature reflects differing contexts of discussion, but it may also be merely idiosyncratic. New terms may be created when an existing term is understood as pejorative by those to whom it is applied, such as the currently preferred use of ELL instead of LEP. In addition, there are terms that have no acronym, such as *language minority*. Harklau, Siegal, & Losey (1999) refer to U.S. resident ELL students as "immigrants" and "refugees" in order to distinguish them from international students because the needs, orientations, and circumstances of the two populations diverge significantly. Harklau et al. also borrow the term *Generation 1.5* from Rumbaut and Ima (1988) to refer to students who were born in other countries and are now permanently relocated and educated in the U.S. These individuals are:

> immigrants who arrive in the United States as school-age children or adolescents, and share characteristics of both first and second generation. But a generational definition fails us in considering the case of students from Puerto Rico and other parts of the United States where English is not the community language. Students from such areas may still very well be English learners at the college level. (p. 4)

As we will discuss at more length below, great variation exists within the target population of adolescent ELLs in the U.S., as well as among this group and the many other groups studied by researchers under the general heading of second language—or L2—writing. ELLs also differ from NS or L1 learners in significant ways, and thus the literature raises important questions about the applicability of L1 pedagogy for L2 learners. In this paper, we attempt to identify those questions, to give an account of related controversies, and to explain proposed resolutions or share cautions offered by experts.

In the following report, we have tried to limit our use of acronyms to *ELL* and *L2*. When we have used additional acronyms, the choice reflects their use in the particular work under discussion.

PART I: Taking Stock of the Literature

Methodology and Findings

A. COMPILING THE NATIONWIDE STANDARDS

1. SURVEYING WRITING STANDARDS ACROSS THE NATION

In order to understand the assessment expectations for ELLs nationwide, we examined writing standards in each state during the first phase of the project. By comparing state-level assessment expectations, we were able to compile an exhaustive list that covered all writing standards in all states. Using this complete list, we then identified six major categories into which all standards could be grouped. This process was cross-checked at several points to establish the validity and reliability of the final matrix and categories. The methodology for developing this matrix is described in detail below.

2. CREATING A MATRIX OF WRITING STANDARDS

We retrieved current writing standards from each state's department of education Web site. Although many states are currently revising their content-area standards to comply with No Child Left Behind, we address only writing standards that were current in spring 2005. In some states the writing standards are included in a single document, while in other states writing is one strand in a multi strand set of English language arts standards; this variation complicated the task of extracting all writing standards from all states.

With the goal of creating a matrix of all writing standards, we initially reviewed writing standards or frameworks for 13 states (Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois and the District of Columbia) to generate an exhaustive list of common writing elements. These 13 states, representing approximately one quarter of all state-level entities, were selected using alphabetical order to avoid regional bias. During this phase of our review we noted the frequency of certain writing elements and began the reiterative process that eventually resulted in the six categories mentioned above.

Because Idaho has comprehensive and thoroughly detailed state writing standards, we decided to use it as a framework for the creation of the matrix. Throughout the development process, descriptors not found in Idaho's standards were added to the matrix as they were identified. Hawaii's writing standards, for example, contain a component specifying that students should "understand diversity in language, perspective, and/or culture in order to craft texts that represent diverse thinking and expression" (Hawaii Dept. of Education, 1999, p.4). To capture this in a way that corresponded with elements found in other states, we added, "students will understand the nature of language and the way language has shaped perceptions" to the matrix.

After a draft of the matrix was created from the sample of states, data for all 53 state-level entities were entered into the matrix. The development team then used a recursive process to identify a valid set of six broad categories: (1) Genre; (2) Writing Process and Strategy; (3) Internal Logic and Coherence; (4) Knowledge of Audience, Language, Culture, and Politics; (5) Stylistics; and (6) Error, Usage, and Syntactic Correctness. The categorization of the individual elements resulted in the collapsing of some. For instance, phrases, clauses, verb forms and tenses, and comma usage were combined into "Students will possess general knowledge of grammar and punctuation."

To establish reliability, the development team decided to have a subcommittee cross-check the writing standards for five states with large ELL populations (California, New York, Florida, Texas, and Illinois); for the six states in New England; and for four states selected at random (Kansas, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Tennessee). The development team met twice to discuss the subcommittee's findings and any discrepancies that emerged. With reliability confirmed, corresponding adjustments were made for the remaining states in the matrix. Table 1 lists the six categories and their corresponding standards as well as tabulations showing frequency of the descriptors for each state, based on numbers and percentages of states that incorporate each descriptor. The final matrix displaying the data from all states can be found in Appendix A.

3. DEVELOPING A PROTOCOL

After identifying the categories of writing standards, the development team devised a standard protocol to use as a template to facilitate uniformity across texts and reviewers during the upcoming literature review process. Our process of identifying and collecting materials was guided by a search for intersections among literature on the teaching of writing, the learning of adolescents (grades 7 through 13), and ELLs; in this way, we searched in the broad area of L2 writing, even though it encompasses a far greater research base than is relevant to our topic. To characterize the materials collected, we constructed typologies of types and sources of publications, of research methodologies, samples and settings, and of practice-literature functions.

In the process of generating and pilot testing the protocol, a key category was refined. Initially, the project proposed to review the research and practice literature. As work progressed, it became evident that we would need to limit the meaning of *practice literature* since it encompasses an extremely wide range of publications, from discussions focused primarily on research with implications for practice, to discussions of practice with only a peripheral discussion of research, to how-to texts that omit any mention of research. Although the latter two forms may be thoroughly based in research, only discussions that foreground research are clearly related to the goals of this review, so we restricted our collection of references to those sources. In addition, we defined *research* to include both primary reports of research studies and secondary reports that review and analyze many studies by disparate authors, analyze the origins or structure of a research domain, or construct theory based on analysis of other works.

TABLE 1: CATEGORIES AND DESCRIPTORS FOR STANDARDS FROM ACROSS THE NATION

	DESCRIPTORS	Number of States with Requirement	Percentage of States with Requirement
Genre	General requirements (referring to the writing of the following five types of writing as well as resumes, cover letters, personal essays, journal responses, memos, business letters, other writing done in occupational settings, etc.).	36	68
	Students will write narrative texts.	43	81
	Students will engage in expository writing.	45	85
	Students will engage in persuasive writing.	45	85
	Students will write literature critiques, short stories, essays, and/or poems.	45	85
	Students will write extensive research papers.	39	74
Writing Process & Strategy	Students will engage in the writing process (prewriting, brainstorming, outlining, and/or mapping, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing/finalizing draft).	51	96
	Students will obtain and gather knowledge from multiple sources of information (primary and secondary, including electronic sources) to support an argument.	50	94
	Students will evaluate, synthesize, contrast and compare ideas and information from multiple sources of information.	48	91
	Students will critique writing in peer editing workshops.	39	74
Internal Logic & Coherence	Students will produce a text with a strong thesis, focus, or controlling idea.	48	91
	Students will provide relevant information to support the main focus of text.	51	96
	Students will demonstrate a command of the structure of paragraphs and sentences.	37	70
	Student will develop a logical and appropriate coherent organization of text that includes an introduction, transitions, and conclusions/closure.	48	91

	DESCRIPTORS	Number of States With Requirement	Percentage of States With Requirement
Knowledge of Audience, Language, Culture & Politics	Students will write for a variety of purposes and audiences.	50	94
	Students will learn about the inclusionary and exclusionary nature of language.	11	21
	Students will develop fluency in the English language arts by using and building upon the strengths of their language, culture, and life experiences.	15	28
	Students will demonstrate a distinctive voice and individuality in their work.	32	60
	Students will understand the nature of language and the way language has shaped perceptions.	26	49
Stylistics	Students will use appropriate format to cite sources (MLA, APA, Chicago Manual of Style, etc.).	41	77
	Students will use words that adequately convey meaning (diction).	44	83
	Students will employ different techniques in their writing (figurative, literary, dramatic, poetic elements, rhetorical devices, cause and effect, display knowledge of stream of consciousness, multiple perspectives, and experimentation with time).	41	77
	Students will use a variety of sentences (simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex) in their written texts.	43	81
	Students will supplement organized statements, reports and essays by using visuals (chart, tables, graphs, etc.) and media (PowerPoint, video, etc.), as appropriate.	30	57
Error, Usage, & Syntactic Correctness	Students will possess general knowledge of grammar and punctuation (parts of speech, verb forms and tenses, subject/verb agreement, pronoun/antecedent agreement, parallel structure, comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives, apostrophes, commas, etc.).	52	98
	Students will have knowledge of capitalization.	42	79
	Students will have knowledge of spelling.	46	87

The final protocol delineated a seven-level review process. Each document, identified by author, title, and year of publication, was reviewed to collect: (1) type of source, (2) target population and level, (3) type of document, (4) type of literature, (5) methodology, (6) topic, and (7) connections to the Standards Categories. The final protocol is included here as Appendix B.

B. COMPILING THE RESEARCH STUDIES, SECONDARY RESEARCH REVIEWS, AND PRACTICE LITERATURE

1. SURVEYING THE LITERATURE

For our literature review, we identified and collected a variety of studies in the key areas of writing research, second language writing, English as a second language, bilingual students, and applied linguistics. To ensure that we reviewed studies in keeping with current theories and knowledge about best practices, we limited our survey to peer-reviewed journals, annual edited volumes from major academic publishers, and handbooks on research that were published in the last decade. Work published before 1995 was omitted (unless republished at a later date or considered a landmark work). In the process of identifying and reviewing the literature, we were able to eliminate seemingly relevant literature as we found that many primary research studies had been conducted with populations or levels not relevant to our central question. For example, although the title of a journal article may indicate that it is a study of ESL writing, the study may have been conducted with international students at the graduate level learning English in the U.S., or by students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in another country. We omitted those research studies that exclusively targeted a population outside the U.S., a population outside the age range of grades 7 through 13, or a language other than English. In addition, we found that article and book titles were often specific enough to help us eliminate works, (e.g., when *elementary*, *primary*, *graduate students*, or *EFL* appeared in the title). If no population identifiers appeared in the title, the article or book was collected and reviewed—those that subsequently proved irrelevant were deleted from the collection. Review articles and practice literature almost always incorporated research beyond our target area. To delete such articles would have severely limited our survey, so any review article or practice literature that included some research relevant to our target population or that broadly addressed L2 writing was retained.

Although our search was extensive, we did exclude some areas of research that could be considered relevant. For example, since reading and writing are related in many complex ways, research on reading of adolescent ELLs might be considered relevant for this review. However, given our emphasis on work related to writing standards and the assessment challenges faced by high school and college ELLs, we decided to restrict our focus in order to concentrate on our central question rather than risking the diversion of a vastly expanded research base. Additional reviews are needed to address the knowledge base on reading standards for ELLs, as well as that on reading-writing connections for adolescent ELLs.

2. FINDINGS OF THE LITERATURE SURVEY

The results of our survey show that the research literature that specifically addresses adolescent ELLs in the U.S. is limited. Originally, we sought to narrow our literature review to include only late adolescent ELLs, that is, students in grades 9 through 13, high school, and the first year of college. The lack of research on late adolescents, however, led us to expand the category to include middle school students. A few additional studies of early adolescents are included in the survey as a result. Similarly, review articles and monographs that include research on U.S. ELL adolescents were judged to meet the population criteria, even though they primarily draw from research on a wider sampling of L2 English writing students.

We originally selected 183 journal articles, book chapters, and monographs (books on a single topic, not collections by various authors). All works were analyzed using the template protocol. From that number, we identified 80 primary research studies; the remaining 103 included the practice literature and secondary research reviews. From the 80 primary research studies, we found that only 25 actually focused on ELLs in the U.S. in grades 7 through 13. All of these studies were published in peer reviewed journals or in books published by prominent and highly respected academic publishers. (Note: We included only works that would be readily available to most professionals in the field, including readers of this document. We did not review dissertations, conference papers, ERIC documents, or little-known institutional publications.)

We tabulated the results from the protocols to look for relationships between the 183 works and the six standards categories. Of the 25 research studies focused on adolescent ELLs in the U.S., 20 addressed standards-related topics. For the sake of the tabulations, we separated primary research studies into a distinct group to identify the research focus. Recall that our selection of practice literature was limited to works emphasizing the research literature knowledge base. Thus, both the secondary research reviews and the practice literature used in this review are based on the wider research literature. For this reason, they are combined in the tabulations. Secondary reviews of research and practice literature that foreground research both draw widely from studies on varied ages and populations. None of the reviews or practice pieces focused exclusively on adolescent populations (either as immigrant or foreign language learners). In some cases, a text rarely or never referred to the age of research populations in the studies discussed, though inspection of some cited sources suggests that most research used in the review and practice works is based on undergraduate and graduate student populations, often learning English as a foreign language for academic purposes. This is not surprising given the scarcity of research on immigrant adolescent ELLs in the U.S. The lack of specificity precluded a tabulation of sources that focus on our target population.

Within this systematically chosen body of works published in the past decade, we found qualitative, quasi-experimental, and correlational studies, but none that implemented truly experimental treatment and control conditions. Of the 103 titles in the combined category of practice literature and secondary research reviews, 67 address standards-related topics. All tabulations are presented in Table 2 below.

TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF WORKS REVIEWED

Total number of books, chapters, and articles selected for consideration	183
Total research studies	80
Total practice literature and secondary research reviews	103
RESEARCH STUDIES	
Research studies that focus on ELLs in the US, Grades 7–13	25
Research studies that address one or more state writing standards categories	20

C. SELECTING THE CORE TEXTS

Our next tasks were to construct a review of the research and practice literature and to analyze the literature for each of the six standards categories. To accomplish those tasks we identified a set of core texts to focus on for the review. To choose these texts, we first selected several articles that reviewed either the

research or the field of L2 writing from recent and highly respected sources: a chapter from a just-published comprehensive handbook of research (Hedgcock, 2005); two recent articles from the *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* (Leki, 2000; Silva & Brice, 2004); an analytic discussion of the field from the *Journal of Second Language Writing* (Harklau, 2002); and an historical discussion of the field published in a prominent edited collection (Matsuda, 2003b).

On the basis of the five review articles, we identified key themes for our discussion and key authors and their writings on those themes. From among the themes, authors, and writings, we identified the set of primary studies, secondary reviews, and practice literature, including journal articles, book chapters, and monographs, that best addressed the teaching of writing to adolescent ELLs grades 7 through 13 in the U.S. Notably, many of the works identified during this process reviewed numerous studies but did not specifically address our target population. Some did not even include any studies of or references to adolescent ELLs in the U.S. except college-level learners (who often are international students rather than U.S. residents). In order to address the relative absence of our target population in our search, we looked specifically for peer-reviewed journal articles, books, or chapters in edited volumes that addressed ELLs in middle and high school. On this basis, we selected additional journal articles and a number of chapters from two edited volumes focused on adolescents in U.S. middle and high schools or immigrant first-year college ELLs.

We used these core texts to produce the review and discussion of the field in Part II of this paper and the discussion of standards in Part III. The complete list of core texts is presented in Table 3 below. Additional sources used in our discussion but not included in the list of core texts are those used for a single point or referred to in the secondary sources in ways that required specific mention.

TABLE 3: LIST OF CORE TEXTS

Review Articles
Harklau, 2002
Hedgcock, 2005
Leki, 2000
Matsuda, 2003
Silva & Brice, 2004

Primary Research
Adger & Peyton, 1999
Blanton, 1999
Ferris, 1999b
Frodesen, 2001
Harklau, 1999
Hartman & Tarone, 1999
Hudelson, 2005
Johns, 1999
Muchisky & Tangren, 1999
Reynolds, 2005
Rodby, 1999
Valdes, 1999

Secondary Research and Practice
(including edited volumes)
Faltis, 1999
Faltis & Wolfe, 1999
Ferris, 2002
Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005
Grabe, 2003
Harklau, Losey, & Siegal, 1999
Hinkel, 2004
Hyland, 2004
Kroll, 2003
Pennington, 2003

In Appendix C, we annotate each core text.

A final note on sources:

We have relied heavily on secondary sources in this review. In secondary sources, each reviewer has a particular perspective that influences how a range of material is represented. As a result, reliance on secondary sources can be a constraint on understanding or create confusion in reporting about the original source of a finding. We have tried to communicate clearly when a secondary source is reporting the work of others and to clarify the perspective of each secondary source.

PART II: Reviewing the Knowledge Base for Teaching Writing to Adolescent ELLs in the U.S.

A. MAKING SENSE OF ABSENCE IN THE FINDINGS

Our survey of the field found a striking absence of research on the writing of adolescent ELLs in the U.S., prompting a series of questions: Why is there so little research? Is it possible to account for this absence? Is the absence real or just apparent—an artifact of our methodology? Comments by a number of scholars indicate that this absence is not an illusion and offer important insights to help us frame our overview of the research and practice literature. For example, in a chapter surveying the broad topic of second language writing, Hedgcock (2005) describes second language writing as an "embryonic" field and an "emergent discipline," noting, "writing research has a comparatively short biography" (pp. 597-598). Scholars have accounted for this "short biography" in different ways.

Unlike Hedgcock (2005), Matsuda (2003b) finds considerable growth in the field of L2 writing; however, he sees a need for change. He has written extensively about a "disciplinary division of labor" between ESL and composition teaching, and argues that, although an interdisciplinary field has developed, both ESL and mainstream English teachers need to do more to share knowledge and perspectives.

Similarly, Leki (2000) shows that research in second language writing has had a complicated and disjointed history and has struggled to find both disciplinary and organizational affiliations. Many ESL teachers, for example, have been educated primarily in an oral language orientation, based in research on applied linguistics and the grammar of oral second language acquisition. In contrast, many writing teachers (at both high school and college levels) have been educated in composition pedagogy and the study of literary texts, with no preparation in second language acquisition or pedagogy. Students in an ESL writing course, then, may find instruction primarily focused on grammar and correctness in written language. In contrast, students in an English composition course may find instruction that assumes native competence and incorporates no strategies for the English language learner.

In the 1970s, according to Leki (2000), L2 writing instruction began to change as some dissatisfied L2 writing instructors turned to the new L1 composition pedagogy and its emerging research base. This change led to a shift toward a focus on communication and appropriation of process-oriented pedagogy in place of the earlier product focus on correctness. Yet Casanave (2003) cautions that it would be misleading to suggest that the traditional paradigm of writing instruction based on grammar and correctness has been swept away in ESL instruction. She points, for example, to the absence of process approaches in non-Western contexts. Others note that a product-oriented focus on grammar and correctness continues to dominate the experience of writing instruction for many ELLs in the U.S. Further, Silva and Brice (2004) note that some scholars have suggested that "Western" and "individualistic" themes in process pedagogy may be culturally inappropriate for some learners. Nevertheless, they claim that interesting and important research into the composing processes of L2 writers has developed in recent years; of particular significance to this review, they contend that work in foreign language contexts "is now clearly dominant" (p. 71). Although such findings are suggestive, ESL experts stress the need for caution when considering the applicability of findings across populations as different as foreign language learners and ELLs in the U.S. We explore the cautions presented by experts later in this paper.

Harklau (2002) identifies another issue: in both research and pedagogy, the dominant orientation has been oral language, and most research has emphasized the importance of face-to-face interaction in language learning. This emphasis reflects the central finding that native language acquisition occurs through social interaction (rather than primarily through imitation or explicit direction). Harklau adds that most studies of face-to-face interaction in classrooms have examined adult learning. These studies, she points out, reflect considerable amounts of dialogue in the classroom learning of adult ELLs. In contrast, Harklau's observational research in high school classrooms revealed that learners rarely had more than a single monosyllabic exchange with a teacher in a whole day and "interactions with native speaker peers were seldom more plentiful" (p. 331). Nevertheless, she discovered that the adolescent ELLs she observed in U.S. classrooms were learning English. In trying to understand how this learning was facilitated, she found written rather than spoken language to be the modality of their learning. Harklau goes on to document the "pervasive invisibility" (p. 335) in the ESL research and practice literature of the role that literacy plays in language learning. An implicit assumption appears to be that "literacy is parasitic on spoken language and that *texts serve only to represent and encode spoken language* [italics added]" (p. 332), suggesting that writing has tacitly been ignored as mere transcription. If so, its neglect seems less surprising. There is widespread agreement among literacy experts, however, that writing is vastly more complex.

In keeping with the strong oral-language orientation of applied linguistics and of second language acquisition research and the attendant inattention to writing, the curricula of ESL teacher preparation programs have neglected the teaching of writing theory and pedagogy. As recently as 1997, Grabe & Kaplan asserted that it is necessary and beneficial for teachers-in-training to take a course on theories of writing development and instructional techniques; such a course would improve their teaching and curriculum design while strengthening their own writing skills and awareness. Although many ESL teachers have little or no preparation for teaching composition, many secondary school English teachers have taken a full course in the teaching of writing. Thus, it may be that nonnative speaking students are taught to write in English by teachers with little or no training in research-based pedagogy while still being held to the same writing standards and assessed by the same tests as their L1 peers. Additional research is needed to assess the equivalence of the knowledge base for writing instruction in the preparation programs for ESL and mainstream English teachers.

Matsuda (2003b) notes that L2 writing researchers are beginning to study new populations:

> Thus far, the field has focused mostly on issues that are specific to the needs of international ESL students in U.S. higher education because of the historical circumstances surrounding the origin of second language writing; more recently, however, there has been an increasing attention to immigrant and refugee students in North America... (p. 27)

The historical circumstances Matsuda alludes to are the post-World War II policies of recruiting international students to higher education institutions in the U.S. Because of these policies, U.S. ESL instruction and research have long focused on the growing numbers of international students in U.S. higher education institutions. Matsuda's reference to a new focus on immigrant and refugee students points to the work of Harklau, Losey, and Siegal (1999), an edited volume of original essays by scholars in the field addressing the fact that:

> although nonnative language college writers educated in the United States are becoming a major constituency in college writing programs…there has been a dearth of research or writing about the instructional issues presented by this student population. Long-term U.S. resident English learners pose a significant challenge to the conventional categories and practices governing composition instruction at the postsecondary level. With backgrounds in U.S. culture and schooling, they are distinct from international students or other newcomers who have been the subject of most ESL writing literature, while at the same time *these students' status as ELLs is often treated as incidental or even misconstrued as underpreparation* [italics added] in writings on mainstream college composition and basic writing. (p. vii)

This volume on high school and college "generation 1.5" students may be, as Harklau, Siegal, and Losey (1999) speculate, "the first devoted explicitly to articulating the issues involved in teaching college writing to English learners who reside in the United States and graduate from U.S. high schools" (p. 3). Another collection of original works, co-edited by Faltis and Wolfe (1999), is aimed at increasing awareness of and understanding about the significant and growing numbers of adolescent language minority students in U.S. high schools. The editors argue that "there is nowhere near enough understanding of how [U.S. resident and immigrant ELLs] experience school and how schools and teachers respond to their presence" and suggest that "secondary education in the United States is in need of far-reaching structural change if it is to adequately meet its mandate to educate these students, and all students, on an equal basis" (p. vii).

Faltis (1999) offers additional insights into the dearth of research on this topic, referring to the early history of federal funding for bilingual education in the late 1960s. This money was typically set aside for elementary school students because it was assumed that the majority of second language learners were young children in the primary grades. Since "native language instruction was considered a bridge to English, few schools saw any need to continue the primary language into the middle or high school grades. The assumption was that by the time bilingually educated children reached middle or high school, they should have acquired enough English to participate effectively in an all-English classroom environment" (p. 4). This assumption ignores the ongoing arrival of new immigrants of all ages—adolescents as well as the very young—and the amount of time that can be required to master a second language for learning academic content.

Finally, Faltis (1999) suggests that "all of the legal battles over the need for some form of bilingual or ESL teaching have involved class action suits brought

by concerned parents in which the plaintiffs were elementary school children…no significant legal cases concerning the civil or educational rights of middle or high school immigrant or bilingual students have been litigated" (p. 4). To further support his interpretation, Faltis reports that a content analysis of the five leading journals in ESL and bilingual research published "fewer than ten articles dealing directly with concerns of secondary-level immigrant and bilingual students" (p. 4) in the 16-year period between 1980 and 1996.

B. OVERVIEW OF EXISTING RESEARCH

In the absence of a significant research base on adolescent ELL literacy in the U.S., we draw extensively on the wider research base of L2 writing. Two recent review articles (Hedgcock, 2005 and Silva & Brice, 2004) offer a way to organize this knowledge base by identifying similar themes in theory and research findings. In this overview, we first provide background for the current work and then organize material from the reviews as follows: (1) theory for research; (2) theory for instruction.

Language and literacy theory has gone through several significant changes over the last four decades. Beginning in the 1960s, Noam Chomsky's research on language ignited the cognitive revolution in linguistics and helped to fuel a similar upheaval in psychology, initiating the decline of then-prominent behaviorist theories of language learning. Chomsky (1965) argued that children's language reflects structures they have never heard in the speech of others such as overgeneralization of grammar rules, e.g., "foots" instead of "feet," thus demonstrating that their language use reflects rule-governed understanding and contradicts the imitation-and-reinforcement model of behaviorism.

In the wake of the Chomskian revolution, whole language and process writing theorists developed a new approach to the teaching of writing, drawing on language acquisition research and several forms of constructivist research. Language acquisition research shows that children learn to speak through social interaction (see Lindfors, 1980) and provides a basis for the new theorists' promotion of the use of oral and written language development in schooling in the context of meaningful social interaction and learning. The terms whole and process highlight the importance of learning language in a relevant context rather than in decontextualized parts, as in traditional skills-based and product-oriented approaches. In addition, Piagetian research on cognitive development shows that children construct understandings of the physical world through interaction with the world. Socially oriented research, often framed in Vygotskian terms, points to the construction of understandings in the process of social interaction. These constructivist notions of cognitive learning and development are also joined with cognitive processing research on thinking and problem-solving and give further support to process models of composing.

Beginning in the late 1980s, some scholars began to pay increased attention to critical theories in education and to question aspects of the whole language and process writing approaches. In a recent discussion, Sarah Hudelson (2005) revisits some of her own research, framed in constructivist terms, and reframes it in light of critical insights. She writes:

> Even with our use of the literature on bilingualism, language maintenance, language shift, and marked versus unmarked languages (Hudelson, 1993), the underlying framework for our interpretations was constructivism. The focus was on the children and their decisions to use English and on the strategies the children used to construct written English. We interpreted what the children were doing as *individual decisions based on individual interests and individual language proficiencies* [italics added]. We foregrounded the children as *unique individuals, some of whom chose to make forays into English and some of whom did not, some of whom chose to use more*

> *English more than others* [italics added]. Even when we used the concept of marked/unmarked languages, we did not frame this construct in terms of political realities or the hegemony of English…Rather, *we used the construct in a neutral way* [italics added]. (p. 211)

In her discussion, Hudelson articulates concerns that have now coalesced into the contemporary framework for research and instruction for L2 writing.

1. THEORY FOR RESEARCH IN SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING

This contemporary framework for second language writing builds on the earlier linguistic and cognitive traditions sketched above but goes significantly beyond them. Scholars have labeled this framework both "social constructionist" and "sociopolitical." The difference between the social constructionist and the sociopolitical theory is power. Some within the L2 writing community critique the social constructionist perspective for failing to address the sociopolitical issues affecting L2 research and pedagogy and for treating academic literacy instruction as "neutral, value-free, and non-exclusionary" (Hedgcock, 2005, p. 602, quoting Belcher & Braine, 1995). These critics argue that literacy must be understood in terms of power and larger societal forces of race, class, and gender inequality. In either case, the many complex dimensions of L2 writing—writer, text, and audience—are seen as socially and culturally situated. Hedgcock (2005, citing Connor, 1996) writes, "'texts are socially constructed'…written discourse [is] embedded in culture and inextricably linked with conceptions of literacy" (p. 599). That is, texts have purposes, and the community determines their functions.

These theoretical frameworks are not simply matters of academic debate but are seen by many as of particular importance for pedagogy: moving beyond an earlier cognitive-linguistic framework, they assert that a learner's cultural practices and social situation profoundly affect the learning process. Therefore, findings from a study of EFL learners in China, for example, are unlikely to have clear or direct application to adolescent ELLs in the U.S. This perspective, as Hudelson (2005) notes, is able to "balance the constructivist focus on individual agency with social, cultural, and political complexities and realities" (p. 218).

2. THEORY FOR INSTRUCTION

The theory for instruction in L2 writing is also changing, influenced in part by L1 writing pedagogy and in part by L2 research insights. Current practice reflects a range of approaches, from traditional to process-oriented to socioliterate. As Hedgcock (2005) notes, however, there has been a significant shift in L2 writing toward process-oriented instruction, a term he uses to signify the multiplicity of process approaches.

Traditional approaches to L2 writing "served mainly to reinforce oral patterns and test grammatical knowledge" (Hedgcock, 2005, p. 604). These product-focused approaches eschewed open-ended writing activity, instead favoring "controlled compositions designed to give writers practice with selected morphosyntactic patterns…and the arrangement of sentences into paragraphs based on prescribed templates" (Hedgcock, p. 604). Matsuda (2003b, quoting Pincas, 1982) describes controlled composition as "an approach that focused on sentence-level structure…Informed by a behavioral, habit-formation theory of learning, controlled composition consisted of combining and substitution exercises that were designed to facilitate the learning of sentence structures by providing students with 'no freedom to make mistakes'" (Matsuda, pp. 19-20). Controlled composition was soon seen to have serious limitations and was largely replaced by the less rigid approach of guided composition, in which students were given models to follow, outlines to expand, or partially written texts to complete (Matsuda, p. 20). Still, the guided approach imposed a kind of control that most would find incompatible with a process-oriented approach.

Although many note that a process orientation has never been dominant in the field, most suggest that it has come to characterize many L2 writing contexts, especially ESL contexts in North America. Hedgcock (2005) states that "it has become almost axiomatic that L2 writing instruction should be solidly grounded in what 'writers actually do as they write'" (p. 605)—that is, it should reflect the composing process of a writer rather than seek to control that process by artificial means and should emphasize form-based rather than meaning-based activity. While cautioning that there are multiple variations of process-oriented pedagogy, Hedgcock notes that all versions see the writer's role in learning as an active one. In addition, Hedgcock argues that a premise of all process-oriented pedagogies is "that composing involves the management of numerous structural and rhetorical systems, with expository and argumentative prose requiring the greatest complexity" (p. 604; citing Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Developing as a writer means learning to manage those many interacting systems.

A dilemma of process-oriented pedagogies for L2 writing, however, is that "the principles and practices of process writing are not always compatible with the cultural, philosophical, and educational orientations of all educational settings or institutions" (Hedgcock, 2005, p. 605). Thus, process-oriented pedagogy is not adopted in some cultural contexts. In other contexts in which it is adopted, such as U.S. classrooms, teachers may find a process orientation to be culturally incompatible with some learners. When process pedagogy is used for L2 learners, it is necessary to understand them as a "distinct population from monolingual writers" and to recognize that "L1-based methods should not be applied uncritically to L2 writing research and pedagogy" (p. 598). Hedgcock argues that "L2 writers' implicit and explicit linguistic knowledge, educational backgrounds, multilingual literacy skills, and strategic abilities may necessitate instructional practices geared sensitively to the needs of L2 populations" (p. 598). For example, unlike L1 writers, L2 learners do not have "native intuitions" about grammar and syntax, so they may need to be given explicit instruction that would be deemed superfluous for native speakers.

The insights offered by the increasingly influential socioliterate approach may be particularly useful in meeting the needs of L2 learners because of its emphasis on the "situatedness" of all communication, oral and written. In the socioliterate approach, learners are "constantly involved in research into texts, roles, and contexts and into the strategies that they employ in completing literacy tasks in specific situations" (Johns, 1997, p. 15). Commenting on this approach, Hedgcock (2005) writes,

> By acknowledging this socially-informed, discursively-based perspective on writing instruction, L2 professionals have realized that effective writing instruction must enable students to become readers and writers of the genres and text types associated with the Discourses (Gee, 1996, 1999), communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), and literacy clubs (Smith, 1988) that they aspire to join. These Discourses include educational, professional, and vocational communities comprising all manner of expert and novice practitioners. (p. 600)

The socioliterate approach to instruction also draws on research in contrastive rhetoric, which highlights differences in the ways texts and language users construct meanings in different cultural contexts. Since "written communication is embedded in communities of readers and writers," L2 instruction must guide L2 writers to structure their texts "to meet the expectations of L2 readers" (Hedgcock, 2005, p. 599). Like process-oriented approaches, socioliterate approaches see an active role for the learner and value the writer's immersion in writing as a process. The socioliterate approach differs, however, in that it also emphasizes the exploration of genres of writing, not for the sake of genre, but "as a vehicle for engaging with core content" (Hedgcock,

p. 601) and for producing a thorough understanding of texts and content. Critical and Freirean approaches go further, to assert "the ethical and political dimensions of L2 writing instruction" (Hedgcock, p. 602), and to challenge the genres of academic discourse and the power relations embedded within them. According to Hedgcock, whereas "socioliterate approaches maintain that writing instruction always has social purposes, critical pedagogy challenges the precept that those purposes are necessarily beneficial to novice writers" (p. 602).

C. KEY ISSUES IN WRITING INSTRUCTION FOR ADOLESCENT ELLS IN THE U.S.

Above we touched on a number of key issues and controversies in writing instruction for adolescent ELLs in the U.S. Here, we elaborate on several of those issues as they relate to four major areas: (1) learner issues, (2) pedagogical issues, (3) assessment issues, and (4) structural issues.

1. LEARNER ISSUES

In the section on terminology at the beginning of this report, we identified several terms that could serve the same purpose. That is, a language minority student might be referred to (sometimes inappropriately) by any of several acronyms: ELL, ESL, NNS, NNES, NELB, and LEP. The meaning implied by these terms is significant, for there is tremendous variation among the individuals to whom these labels are applied. Harklau, Siegal, & Losey (1999) illustrate this point: "Immigrants may begin U.S. schooling in sixth grade or as a high school junior…Students may be highly privileged and highly educated on arrival and make the transition to U.S. schooling effortlessly. On the other hand, they may have interrupted schooling histories in their home countries" (p. 4). Despite their differences, all of these students could be placed in the same college writing course as first-year students. These wide discrepancies within the population of resident U.S. adolescent ELLs pose significant educational challenges that have not been adequately addressed by research, pedagogical approaches, or assessment practices.

Valdes (1999) suggests distinguishing between "incipient bilinguals" and "functional bilinguals" as a way to assess and develop different approaches to instruction. *Incipient bilingual* denotes students who are still learning English and whose language contains many and varied grammatical errors. In contrast, *functional bilingual* students have developed fairly advanced proficiency but still produce frequent errors; however, their errors are systematic and repetitive, reflecting "fossilized elements" in their speech. It is difficult for untrained evaluators to distinguish speakers of these two types, but failure to do so results in inappropriate instruction for both. Such challenges point to the need for composition teachers as well as ESL teachers to have in-depth knowledge of ESL issues.

Significant differences can also arise between resident ELLs and international ELLs as a result of the ways in which they have learned English. They differ in:

- The ways in which they acquired their current levels of English proficiency—largely through lived experience and oral instruction vs. academic study and written exercises
- The primary uses for English that motivate their study—for lifelong experience vs. for academic purposes
- Their identity as learners—as stigmatized students who have been "put back" in ESL vs. as exchange students who have achieved a highly prized college placement

For many resident ELLs, English instruction has focused on developing oral communication skills, not academic English. These students are likely to have developed considerable fluency in oral expression. In contrast, newly arrived international students, who

may be placed in the same college writing course with resident ELLs, are more likely to have studied English as a foreign language with a primary focus on written language, structure, and vocabulary. Learning English in academic contexts tends to foster general linguistic awareness and written language skill, but little oral proficiency. Students with such a wide range of prior experience in learning English are unlikely to be at the same level or be responsive to the same instructional approaches, yet they are often placed together in composition courses for "ESL students." In many ways, this type of placement is alienating for the U.S. resident students who, as Blanton (1999) points out, often have long since exited the ESL program in high school. Now they are reassigned that label and may be treated as "foreign" by course instructors (e.g., be given assignments to "compare your experiences here with your home country" when the U.S. is the only "home country" they remember). Thus, such differences point to the many reasons that research cannot be generalized across differing ELLs, especially immigrants versus international students.

It is also important to acknowledge differences between L2 and L1 learners, because pedagogy developed in an L1 context may not be appropriate for ELLs. Reynolds (2005) has compared the development of linguistic fluency in the writing of middle school students enrolled in ESL and those in regular language arts classes. His detailed analysis of differences in fluency and grammatical competency shows that the RLA students are developmentally more advanced in terms of grammar and vocabulary as well as in rhetorical sophistication. Reynolds suggests that to promote the linguistic fluency of ELLs, different pedagogical approaches are needed, with less emphasis on process-oriented instruction, and more opportunity "for students to gain experience writing for different purposes and audiences" (p. 41). The issue of pedagogical variation will be addressed more fully in the next section.

2. PEDAGOGICAL ISSUES

In order to impose some structure on the very large terrain of pedagogy for teaching writing to ELLs, we divide this section into four subsections: theories of writing pedagogy; grammar and vocabulary; responding to students' writing; and the role of computers.

Theories of Writing Pedagogy

Process-Oriented Approach

As suggested in the introductory section, recent decades have seen significant changes in writing pedagogy, with a shift away from the strictly product-focused concerns of correctness in grammar, usage, and mechanics (sometimes using either controlled composition or guided composition approaches in ESL teaching) and toward more process-focused concerns where writing is a meaningful activity for thinking and problem-solving. Although a number of L2 scholars believe that the process-oriented writing instruction used with L1 students is not appropriate for ELLs, they view its emphasis on substance, particularly in terms of selecting a narrow focus during the early phases of generating, developing, and drafting ideas, as important. This debate in the L2 writing community involves several elements of process pedagogy. Many scholars argue that ELLs are not best served by curricula focused primarily on "expressivist" writing and the development of individual identity. Ferris and Hedgcock, for example, note that certain hallmarks of the process-oriented approach—unstructured prewriting tasks such as freewriting, brainstorming, and listing—are not comfortable activities for many nonnative speakers. Despite the popularity of these strategies in the L1 composition community, Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) indicate that some research, though sparse, suggests "that freewriting and related pre-writing techniques favorably influence writing performance and proficiency only marginally, if

at all" (p. 148). They recommend a cautious approach: teachers of ELLs might consider implementing such techniques in variously structured formats and using multiple approaches to find ways of meeting the needs of all learners. However, in suggesting the use of some structure in planning techniques, they do not mean to suggest a return to traditional methods and they "discourage teachers from imposing the formal outlining processes that once characterized L1 and L2 composition teaching" (p. 155).

Post-Process Approach

Grabe (2003) argues for what some have begun calling a *post-process* approach (see, for example, Matsuda, 2003a). The label *post-process* suggests not that process approaches are being abandoned but that contemporary approaches are adding new elements to the original elements of process pedagogy. Grabe cites research indicating the need for teaching to integrate reading and writing with strategies for understanding academic discourse. Johns (1999) is a particularly outspoken advocate of an approach beyond process. She writes, in reference to college writing, "Expressivist and personal identity approaches to teaching…still predominate in many classrooms. In these approaches, the focus is almost exclusively on developing individual voice and identity, personal interests, and personal meaning making, generally through a limited number of pedagogical and literacy genres, such as the personal essay or works of literature" (p. 159). Johns cites the critiques of several Australian genre theorists who describe expressivist approaches variously as "damaging" and even "cruelly unfair" to language minority students. Although not issuing as strong a critique herself, Johns agrees that language minority students need "to examine the unfamiliar social and rhetorical contexts in which they will be attempting to succeed while working within their second or third languages and cultures" (p. 160).

Socioliterate Approach

Johns (1999) proposes the socioliterate approach (which she says resembles but does not duplicate Australian curricula). Referring to the socioliterate approach as SA, she writes:

> SA is based on the contention that texts are social; important written and spoken discourses are situated within specific contexts and produced and read by individuals whose values reflect those of the communities to which they belong. The principal focus in an SA is not on the individual and his or her identity or meaning making as separate from culture, language, and context, but on understanding how all of us are shaped by the social nature of language and texts. Certainly students understand, at some level, texts' social nature, and the purposes of SA classes are to bring this understanding to the forefront and to encourage student flexibility and creativity in negotiating and processing texts in new social settings. (p. 160)

Johns' (1999) socioliterate approach is an elaboration of genre approaches, but it also incorporates many elements of a process orientation. Key elements of the approach are analysis and critique across a variety of genres as well as multiple examples of the same genre, all drawn from a wide range of sources, including the student's life both inside and outside school. Part of course time is spent discussing and reflecting on strategies for approaching the reading and writing of the various genres so that students develop a metalanguage about texts and textual experiences. As in process approaches, students use a process of drafting and revising, including peer response and peer editing, but the writing tasks focus "outward," in Johns' terminology, preparing the student for a wide range of reading and writing challenges in academic courses, institutional communications, and the world of work, rather than "inward" on personal themes.

Research by Reynolds (2005) supports the value of a socioliterate approach. Reynolds found that the middle school ESL students he studied "Clearly...have the grammatical competency necessary to use features [that were examined in his study] because they use them in some cases. What they lack, however, is a sense of rhetorical appropriateness" (p. 41). Rather than promoting instruction in the use of surface features that the ESL students misapplied, he writes "we need to include more ways in our writing curricula for students to gain experience writing for different purposes and audiences." Reynolds supports "using a process approach for developing students' awareness of invention, revision, and clarity," but he also notes that there can be "limitations placed on the number of writing topics [and therefore limited purposes and audiences]...when too many assignments go through a multi-draft writing process." Further, he argues that "we need to consider the functional uses of language when we analyze texts, not just decontextualized paradigms for form and meaning" (p. 41). In this way, he suggests, the goals of literacy development can be broadened beyond accuracy and complexity to encompass linguistic fluency.

There is evidence of a growing consensus in the L2 writing community, from Reynolds' middle school research to Johns' ESL composition research with immigrant college students, that students will be most likely to develop the writing practices necessary for success in content courses if given the kind of literacy experiences these scholars are advocating. Blanton (1999) refers to this approach as "critical literacy":

> Critical literacy is more than learning to read and write, and more than know-how in using language conventions. Readers and writers achieve it through textual interaction because that, in fact, is what *it* is: ways of interacting with texts. Although literacy skills undoubtedly transfer to students' future coursework—especially in enabling them to offer up acceptable-looking assignments—critical literacy practices, and not skills, make the crucial difference in academic success. (p. 131)

Teaching strategies are only part of the picture. What about issues of error correction and teacher feedback, peer response, and peer interaction? These elements of writing pedagogy continue to be used in the updated model in much the same ways as in process-oriented pedagogy. We address them in more detail following a discussion of grammar and vocabulary.

Grammar and Vocabulary

Researchers and authors of practice literature agree that L2 learning requires specific instruction in formal aspects of language, although less agreement exists on the merits of varied approaches. This consensus is based on a growing body of research findings showing the positive effects of formal grammar and vocabulary instruction across many populations of ESL students. In contrast, L1 researchers have consistently challenged the practice of teaching grammar, because L1 writers are assumed to have an intuitive sense of language rules. Some L2 scholars, too, have questioned the efficacy of grammar instruction. The value of error correction, in particular, has been a topic of considerable debate (see Ferris, 1999a and Truscott, 1996, 1999 for the great debate on error correction). However, there is general agreement that L2 learners do not have an intuitive sense of the rules of English and therefore that there is a "positive role for supplemental grammar instruction in L2 writing instruction, which can work in tandem with error correction to facilitate increased accuracy over time" (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, p. 272).

Drawing from an extensive review of research on grammar and vocabulary, Hinkel (2004) concurs that mere exposure to L2 grammar and vocabulary is not an effective means of learning (p. 5) and asserts that writing pedagogy for native speakers is not readily applicable to L2 writing. She argues that intensive and consistent instruction is needed (p. 13) for L2 writers to achieve the linguistic proficiency that L2 writing

requires. Norris and Ortega (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of over 40 studies, showing that explicitly taught grammar-focused instruction is more effective than implicit instruction of any sort (p. 26).

So if we establish that the teaching of grammar is essential, the natural question that follows is where to begin. Hinkel suggests focusing on the most "blatant grammar errors," those that are seen as having the most negative or "stigmatizing" effect on the perceived quality of text by native speaking readers. Research on "error gravity" has identified errors in word order, verb tense, word morphology, and subject-verb agreement as among the most important to perception of quality. Of less impact on perceived quality are mistakes with articles, prepositions, comma splices, and spelling (Hinkel, 2004, p. 48). Although most of the research in Hinkel's review is based on international students in higher education, her work can offer many suggestions for teaching and researching the resident adolescent ELL population in the U.S. In particular, her discussion of how errors in grammar and syntax influence the perceptions of native speaker readers, primarily students' instructors, provides a useful orientation for instruction. Hinkel also outlines steps in teaching error awareness and self-editing skills, noting "the goal of the error awareness practice and self-editing training is to enable students to minimize the number and extent of the most egregious types of errors in their texts" (p. 51).

The issue of error correction raises many questions for practice and has been the subject of much research and debate: how should errors be corrected—directly or indirectly? Which errors should be corrected—some or all? If some, which ones? Although these questions refer to formal aspects of language, they are so interwoven with teacher's response to the content of students' writing that we address them in the next section under the more general category of response to student writing.

Responding to Students' Writing

Teacher Feedback/Expert Response

Regardless of pedagogical approach (e.g., traditional, process-oriented, or socioliterate), the response of teachers to student writing has been examined in a variety of ways. Researchers have analyzed the functions and forms of feedback as well as its effect on student writing. Depending on the type of teacher response, research results have been mixed: teacher feedback has been found sometimes to help, other times to hinder, and occasionally to have no effect on students' learning and revising (Hedgcock, 2005; Silva & Brice, 2004).

Hedgcock (2005) discusses the considerable controversy that has been generated over time about teacher feedback. He notes, "The common wisdom that teachers' marks and corrections are noticed and processed by student writers has come under careful scrutiny among experts on both sides of the error feedback/correction debate" (p. 606). Some have boldly asserted that correction is at best ineffective and at worst harmful, and should be abandoned. Others, however, have argued that carefully constructed teacher response can have instructional benefit. Hedgcock (2005) offers a measured summary:

> A global insight offered by this research is that the effects of expert feedback depend on writers' proficiency levels, their educational needs and expectations, curricular and institutional constraints, the nature of writing tasks, the focus of teacher commentary, and learner training.... Given the state of the error treatment controversy, conclusions regarding the impact of form-focused feedback in L2 writing may be a long way off. (p. 606)

Ferris (1999b) examined the data on teacher feedback from the perspective of one particular population, immigrant students, and found more consistency,

suggesting that differences between varied student populations may account for the ambiguities in the research. Many studies, for example, have been conducted with native-English-speaking (NES) students studying a foreign language at the college level. On the one hand, NES and ESL writers may well have different "affective responses" to feedback from their teachers. More important, "[foreign language] FL students and instructors have different attitudes toward composition in the FL class than do ESL instructors and students, with the former group seeing writing primarily as language practice and the latter seeing it as a necessary survival skill for L2 academic settings" (p. 144). Given such differences, it is not surprising that students might respond differently to teacher feedback.

In her review of existing research on immigrant writers, Ferris (1999b) addresses several questions: how immigrant ESL writers react to teacher feedback; the kind of revisions they make in response to it; and the kind of grammar feedback that is most helpful to them. She reports the following findings:

- "[I]mmigrant students are comfortable with feedback-and-revision cycles…they perceive the value of improving their writing and of teacher feedback in achieving that goal, [but] they may experience some confusion with regard to specific teacher response strategies." (p. 147)
- Students were "able to effectively address questions that asked for specific information from their own experience or from assigned course readings, feedback that suggested micro level (word or sentence) revisions as opposed to global changes, and verbal summary feedback about specific patterns of grammatical error, combined with underlined in-text examples of these patterns." (p. 149)
- The limited research available suggests that "indirect error correction methods" may work best for immigrant students: this approach "simply locates errors…without offering labels or corrections" (p. 150) and then asks the students to revise the marked locations. This approach may be effective because immigrant students have learned English primarily through oral experience rather than explicit instruction in the structures of the language. To explore this hypothesis, Ferris conducted a training study with impressive results: in a 10-week grammar and editing tutorial program, she found that "college-level immigrants lack specific types of formal grammatical knowledge and that they can benefit from focused instruction on grammar terms and rules and editing strategy training that addresses the gaps in their knowledge while building on their acquired competence in the L2." (p. 151)

Peer Response/Peer Interaction

A key component of the process-oriented approach is peer review. Students form a community of writers who read each other's writing, partly to be a tutor and editor for others and partly to build insight for self-evaluation. Researchers have examined the practice of peer response in L2 classrooms and found mixed results: some studies have found that "student writers (particularly novices for whom L2 writing essentially constitutes a form of language practice) resist peer review, strongly preferring 'expert' teacher feedback" (Hedgcock, 2005, p. 605). Ferris and Hedgcock (2005), however, report that "studies of L2 writers' reactions to PR have yielded almost uniformly positive results" (p. 232) and that participants find collaboration helpful and enjoyable.

According to Silva and Brice (2004), peer review is neither uniformly positive nor negative. They cite a variety of factors influencing the effectiveness of peer interaction and response, including "language status (ESL vs. NES) of the participants," the "status of peer participants relative to one another," and modality factors such as "written versus oral peer response"

or "online versus face to face" (pp. 77-78). Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) also refer to research demonstrating how cultural issues can complicate peer response: collectivist and individualist cultures use collaborative learning for different purposes—collectivists to maintain group relationships, individualists to accomplish personal work. Hedgcock concludes, "Empirical findings now strongly suggest that, to produce pedagogically valuable results, peer response processes 'must be modeled, taught, and controlled if [the use of peer response] is to be valuable'" (p. 605; quoting from Kroll, 2001, p. 228). Similarly, Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) argue that there is "a great deal of positive evidence for incorporating [peer review] as a regular component of L2 literacy education" (p. 232), but that many ESL teachers resist using peer review, possibly because they do not know how to use it effectively.

A study by Rodby (1999) provides a very different perspective of peer response. She conducted case studies of several immigrant students during their freshman year in college writing courses "to study the relation of classroom context to writing development" (p. 46). She writes, "Because revision was such a salient feature of the curriculum, it was not a surprise that when students passed the course, they had repeatedly revised their essays based on feedback....Those who did not pass generally did not persist in revising more than once" (p. 47). She extended her research question to discover "What motivated some students to revise so that they could successfully approximate academic argument?"

Rodby's (1999) findings are important for what they suggest about both students and the instructional context. She reports that "motivation was located in the context rather than inside students' heads. Students were motivated by elements of the environment in which they were studying. As their environs changed so did their writing, their persistence in revising, and hence their writing skill" (p. 47). This research led Rodby to adopt Bronfenbrenner's social ecological framework, which makes visible the varied contexts of an individual's life and the way those contexts create interwoven and multilayered systems of people, ideas, activities, roles, and beliefs. "Bronfenbrenner hypothesized that a densely interconnected [system] would motivate student learning" (p. 52). Conversely, a set of tenuous connections may create insurmountable challenges to necessary motivational lines of force. In some cases,

> motivation resulted from ties that accumulated among [a student's] nested social systems....This sense of motivation is drawn from Lewin (1931) who wrote that motivational forces "[emanate] not from within the person but from the environment itself. Objects, activities, and especially other people send out lines of force, valences, and vectors that attract and repel, thereby steering behavior and development." (p. 51)

Findings such as Rodby's (1999) suggest that curriculum and pedagogy may not be sufficient for fostering the success of all students. Considerations of the social organization of classrooms and schools are of significance as well. These include peer interaction and the use of peer review and response techniques. We will discuss the social organization of classrooms further in the section on structural issues.

The Role of Computers

Any contemporary discussion of the teaching of writing is not complete without a discussion of the role computers play in the processes of composing, revision, and editing. Although early studies found mixed results, more recent work reveals the positive impact of computer use on writing. We raise the issue here to highlight it as one of the important pedagogical issues facing teachers of second language learners. A full discussion of the research on and implications of computers and word processing is included in Part III of this paper under a discussion of standards related to writing process and strategy.

3. ASSESSMENT ISSUES

Assessment of second language writing is fraught with difficulties. In summarizing research on entrance and exit testing of second language learners, Silva and Brice (2004) write that 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" (p. 74). Similarly, Rodby's (1999) research, reported above, initially looked at an assessment conundrum: there appeared "to be no statistically significant correlation between students' entering test scores and their pass-fail rates" (p. 46) in the freshman composition course. These results raise the question: if a placement test has no predictive capability, what is its utility, let alone its validity? Hedgcock (2005), too, finds many assessment dilemmas: "Linguistic accuracy serves as an influential, and therefore problematic, formal dimension known to influence raters' perceptions of writing quality.... Further complicating the task of appraising student writing is the variation seen across tasks and texts... as well as reader expectations and raters' complex (and often biased) decision-making processes" (p. 607).

Hedgcock (2005) concludes that "commonsense insights and criticisms, coupled with scrupulous empirical studies of numerous assessment variables, have led practitioners and researchers to raise serious concerns about both reliability and validity—particularly construct validity—in measuring L2 writing performance" (p. 607). If assessment of L2 writers is as problematic as the research suggests, then assessments in which L2 and L1 writers are evaluated by a single process, such as the standards-based assessments in which late-adolescent ELLs currently participate, are even more problematic. It is difficult to know whether a test score reflects a student's performance or the raters' response to surface features at the expense of the substance and coherence of an essay.

Specific studies of adolescent immigrant ELLs raise additional issues. As noted earlier, Valdes (1999) highlights the difficulties that many evaluators, especially those not specialized in ESL, have in distinguishing the written language of incipient bilinguals from that of functional bilinguals. Yet as her work shows, these groups are in fact very different in their language competence.

Finally, Muchisky and Tangren (1999) raise questions about the validity and reliability of placement measures. At their college, all entering nonnative English-speaking students must take a placement test, whether they are international or resident immigrant students. The English placement exam is a battery of three tests consisting of two standardized tests—on English language proficiency and aural comprehension—as well as a 30-minute composition test that is holistically scored. Students are placed in courses and programs based on the composite score of the three tests. Composite scores, however, turn out to be inconsistent predictors for placement. Careful examination of the subtest scores suggests a pattern: if a student has scores on the two standardized tests that are similar, the placement appears fairly successful. For students with significantly discrepant scores on the two tests, the placement is often problematic. In particular, immigrant students often have a high composite score because of a very high aural score that compensates for a low language proficiency score. Despite exceptional effort, determination and hard work, these students are often frustrated in their goals and are unable to achieve passing marks in regular college courses.

In analyzing their assessment data, Muchisky and Tangren (1999) accounted for their findings by Cummins' language proficiency framework. The framework distinguishes between "context-embedded versus context-reduced communication and cognitively undemanding versus cognitively demanding tasks" (p. 219). Their interpretation of the data is that the aural comprehension test is a context-embedded and cognitively undemanding task, whereas the language proficiency test is a context-reduced and cognitively demanding task. Thus, although the two tests were given equal

weight in the battery, they measured dimensions of very different significance for academic success. This analysis highlights the critical role of construct validity in the measurement of language and communication. In addition, it points out that when choosing a test, it is important to consider the original design and the population who pilot-tested the instrument. Although the authors do not discuss this point, the standardized tests they used were created at the nation's first intensive language institute (Matsuda, 2003b, p. 17), which focused on international students. We know from research mentioned earlier in this paper that international students and immigrant U.S. ELLs differ in significant ways that must be taken into account in both teaching and research. In their study, Muchisky and Tangren reflect on the significance of an inappropriate placement: when an international student failed and was unable to advance to the next level of ESL or to academic study, it "was often just a temporary setback. For our immigrant students, it was frequently a terminal setback" (p. 220). Thus, the unintended consequences of an inappropriate assessment can be a high-stakes life change, even when the assessment is not itself a high-stakes test.

4. STRUCTURAL ISSUES

Although the research and practice literature we have reviewed does not define certain issues in L2 writing as "structural," some sources (e.g., Harklau, 1999; Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Matsuda, 2003b; Valdes, 1998, 1999) and our own work for this review suggest that ESL instruction for adolescent ELLs in the United States is profoundly affected by several structural issues of concern to educational leaders—researchers as well as policymakers, teacher educators as well as district administrators.

Divisions in the Teaching Profession

As Matsuda (2003b) has clearly documented, there is a "disciplinary division of labor" in the provision of English language instruction to non-English-speaking students in U.S. schools. Matsuda traces the division back more than forty years and finds it well established by the mid-1960s. As increasing numbers of international students arrived on U.S. campuses, English departments struggled with the problem of teaching composition to students who were not fluent speakers of English. In response, teacher preparation programs began to provide teachers with specialized training in second language acquisition. Over time, teachers of ELLs were successful in arguing that L2 students should be taught by specialists. Specialists increasingly took over the instruction of ESL students, causing composition and ESL teachers who had been meeting at the annual Conference on College Composition and Communication to drift apart. This separation was solidified with the founding of the TESOL organization in 1966. Matsuda (2003b) writes:

> Consequently, writing issues were divided into L1 and L2 components, and L2 writing issues came to be situated almost exclusively in second language studies—or more specifically, in the area of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL). Thus, the disciplinary division of labor between composition studies and second language studies was firmly established. (p. 18)

As a result of the division, the two fields developed along different lines, each with a unique scholarly lineage. As discussed earlier, the study of second language acquisition and the preparation of ESL teachers were embedded in the field of applied linguistics and focused on the development of oral language. The focus on oral language was so complete that, as Matsuda (2003b) notes, "until fairly recently, few post-baccalaureate professional preparation programs in TESL or related fields offered a course in second language writing" (pp. 22-23). As suggested earlier, the need for a course on the teaching of writing in ESL preparation programs is not a settled issue (Grabe & Kaplan, 1997).

In the meantime, while TESOL generally ignored writing, composition studies situated in English depart-

ments underwent a period of significant change that brought increasing sophistication, specialization, and professionalization to the field. In Matsuda's (2003b) view, these divisions are in the process of being ameliorated as second language writing evolves "into an interdisciplinary field of inquiry situated in both composition studies and second language studies simultaneously" (p. 25).

Even if an interdisciplinary field is evolving, the division of labor continues to have widespread effects on the experiences of ELLs in public schools. ESL teachers have been prepared to teach oral language, but not writing. When ESL students are exited from ESL instruction after one or two years, they are placed with English teachers who have been prepared to teach writing but do not have knowledge of second language learning. When a student is moved from an ESL placement to the regular classroom, she or he is unlikely to be a fluent speaker and will have had little, if any, instruction in writing. Yet it is likely that this student will receive little instructional support for the development of oral language and will be expected to demonstrate the same level of writing proficiency as her or his mainstream peers.

Hartman and Tarone (1999) document these kinds of differences in a teacher interview study. In interviews with ESL and mainstream English teachers in the same urban high school, they found that *writing* in the ESL classes and English classes had very different meanings. To teachers of lower level ESL, writing meant "drilling, doing it over and over again until I am sure myself that they are getting the structure....Fill in the blanks, fill in the gaps, substitution and drills, those are the main activities that I like to concentrate (on)" (p. 104). Other level 1 teachers described similar approaches. In higher level ESL courses, teachers gave more control to students but suggested that time constraints limited their instructional tasks and goals.

When mainstream English teachers described their writing instruction, they spoke about process approaches at all levels of instruction. Teachers reported they looked "more for organization, clarity of thought, and critical thinking skills than grammar" (Hartman & Tarone, 1999, p. 108). When asked to comment on the ELLs in their classes, all the teachers commented on students' "inability to get ideas across," "lack of logical process," and "lack of critical thinking" (p. 109). Several of the teachers attributed these characteristics to "cultural differences," thus locating the issue with the students rather than with students' prior instruction. Given the small size of this study, the findings need to be viewed with caution; nonetheless, they suggest that Matsuda's vision of an interdisciplinary field is not yet fully realized.

The division of labor described above can be credited with the stunning gap in the continuity of professional service. This gap exists in part because of limitations in structures that are separate from the individuals involved. For example, the limited time that students are allowed to remain in ESL programs may reflect the need for a transition between ESL and mainstream instruction. In addition, because the gap is reflected in the preparation curricula of ESL and English teachers, one step would be to change those curricula to prepare teachers for transitional instruction. Such a change might begin with a discussion about teacher preparation guidelines between the various professional organizations, including NCTE (the National Council of Teachers of English), CCCC (the Conference on College Composition and Communication), and TESOL (the Teachers of Speakers of Other Languages). These organizations not only address their publications to teachers divided across the gap but also set standards for preparing those teachers. Recognition by the three organizations of these issues and coordination among these groups could have a profound impact on eliminating the gap.

Divisions in Secondary School Curricula and Programs

A number of authors have written about structural issues in schooling that override the best efforts of ESL teachers and ELLs, as well as English composition teachers. A gap exist between the level of preparation that ESL programs can provide and the level of preparation that mainstream programs assume (given that native speakers are their target population). Valdes (1999) argues that "in many schools there are currently two separate worlds: the world of ESL and the mainstream world in which 'real' American schooling takes place" (p. 139). In these schools, ELLs are often placed in ESL for three periods each day and in "accessible" subjects such as PE, art, and cooking the remainder of the time. Schools with "expanded opportunities" for ESL students offer sheltered instruction programs in which:

> teachers—who may or may not speak the non-English language(s) spoken by their students—present subject-matter instruction using special strategies. They modify their use of English, and they provide many illustrations of the concepts they are presenting. (p. 174)

The goal of this sheltered instruction is to make content instruction accessible to ELLs while they are still developing basic competence in L2 rather than to delay content instruction until they are L2 proficient, an approach that could make it impossible for them to catch up. As noted above, the writing instruction in ESL classes cannot provide the level of preparation found in mainstream classrooms. Valdes (1999) offers a particularly critical view, based on her research, of the results of the gaps between ESL and mainstream curricula:

> Many students who wish to enter mainstream courses and who have been exited from both limited and extensive [including sheltered content courses] ESL programs often have had little exposure to writing. Because ESL instruction frequently focuses primarily on language structure, they know little about key aspects of mechanics (e.g., punctuation) and have little experience in text organization. Not only is their English still 'faulty,' but their [written] texts appear infantile compared to the writing produced by English-speaking students at the same age and grade level. (p. 147)

The transition that students need between ESL and mainstream instruction is not offered in secondary schooling. Most students are exited from ESL programs after two or three years, even though some research suggests more time is needed to develop cognitive academic language proficiency (Thomas & Collier, 1997). What happens when students are exited from the ESL program or when they move from middle school to high school? Harklau (1999) studied the experience of adolescent language learners in high schools. She suggests that "high schools can best be understood as a series of instructional niches," each carrying "certain assumptions and expectations for student performance," and each providing "a unique linguistic and academic environment in which to learn language and content-area concepts" (p. 42). She notes that because most educators work in only one of these environments, they "have little opportunity to see how what they do in their classroom compares with the other instructional experiences students have over the course of a school day" (pp. 42-43).

Harklau (1999) followed ESL students from class to class in their high schools and observed distinctly different experiences in their ESL and mainstream classes. In ESL, teachers tuned their instruction to the needs of the ELLs, giving explicit guidance for making sense of texts, helping students learn to use context to infer meanings when they did not know a word, requiring students to give explanations in their own words rather than allowing them to merely copy from a book or the blackboard. In contrast, explicit instruction and feedback were rare in mainstream classrooms. For

example, in an English class, the purpose of grammar instruction was "to formalize and label intuitions that students were already expected to possess as native speakers of English. As such, it did not provide the sorts of grammatical rules and principles that nonnative speakers might rely on in lieu of those intuitions" (p. 49). Teachers' feedback on students' written work assumed knowledge of conventions and other forms of prior knowledge that ELLs did not have.

Despite the "folk belief" that ESL students "will learn English simply by surrounding them with native English-speaking peers" (p. 50), Harklau (1999) found that very little interaction between ELLs and native speakers occurred. When interaction did occur, it was during class, focused on course topics, and lasted only a few turns. The ELLs "perceived a social wall between themselves and American-born peers," believing their language and life experiences prevented communication and connection (p. 50).

Harklau (1999) saw ESL students as living in two very different worlds within schools. The ESL classroom was a haven where they could connect with peers and where teachers not only met their academic needs, but also offered guidance on a variety of challenging situations. The ESL classroom was "a retreat from the overwhelming monolingual environment of the mainstream, a place where…[students] were understood and appreciated" (p. 51). Harklau sums up the differences between ESL and mainstream English classrooms as providing many or few opportunities for language development, as providing many or few connections to students' needs, and as offering many or few opportunities for student participation and language use.

Harklau (1999) also found that tracking creates instructional niches in addition to the niches of ESL and mainstream English classes. She writes, "Tracking is a major force in the differentiation of linguistic and academic environments encountered by language learners in American high schools....Language-minority students are adversely affected by ability grouping practices" (p. 51) and are significantly overrepresented in the lowest levels of the system. In her study, Harklau documented the different workload and expectations for achievement between tracks as well as the quality and quantity of spoken and written language interaction. She found that students in the low-track classes developed ambivalence toward schooling in response to their experience and were more likely to be resistant to classroom activity. As was found by numerous other researchers, students' ambivalence "can be understood as the product of the mutually constitutive forces of the school's successive negative evaluations of their ability, and their simultaneous internalization and rejection of those evaluations and the schooling system" (p. 53). Teacher response to student ambivalence and resistance is often focused on maintaining control, creating a downward spiral in which the quality and quantity of opportunities for learning academic content and language are significantly diminished. The resulting gap between what is learned in high and low tracks makes it difficult for low-track students to move to higher levels. Harklau's study, while small in scale, was focused on structural factors that characterize many U.S. high schools. Her conclusions are compelling and may reflect the reality of many ELLs in high school: "Thus, low-track placements, at first a pragmatic and ostensibly temporary solution to students' limited English proficiency and ability to compete, easily lead to low-track placement throughout their high school careers" (p. 55).

The work of Valdes (1998), Harklau (1999), and others suggests that the very structures put in place to help language minority learners enter and succeed in mainstream schooling have had the opposite effect, isolating ELLs in academic niches that "ghettoize" them within their schools (Valdes).

How might the structurally produced marginalization of immigrant students in the schools be addressed? Adger and Peyton (1999) write that "making secondary schools broadly responsive to immigrant students'

needs is likely to require fundamental changes that reach beyond instruction, recruitment, and training of faculty and that challenge well-established practices, patterns, and beliefs. This task has significant implications for the modification of school and district infrastructure." (p. 206)

It is not the place of this report to explore the various projects attempting to make the fundamental changes that are needed. We hope, however, that our review and discussion of the literature on writing instruction for adolescent ELLs in the U.S. has highlighted the current issues and challenges that must be faced before all ELLs will fully have the opportunity to reach their educational goals—and the standards we have set for them. After a discussion of the standards in Part III of this report, we present recommendations based on the literature in Part IV.

D. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS IN PART II

There is a significant absence of research specifically focused on writing instruction for adolescent ELLs in U.S. schools. A number of factors account for this absence:

- The field of ESL is based on applied linguistics, which has historically focused on oral language and language structure.
- The field of composition has focused on native speakers and assumes native competence of writing students.
- Even when L2 research began to focus on writing, it was in foreign language contexts (EFL and FL teaching) and at the college level.
- The assumption that oral language precedes and leads to written language ignores the possibility that written language can be a source for oral language development.
- Second language learning research has focused on young or elementary age learners or on higher education and international students but rarely on adolescents, especially U.S. resident and immigrant ELLs.

There are several key issues that relate to learners, pedagogy, and structures of schooling:

- There are several different groups of ELLs and their differences need to be considered in designing instruction.
- Teacher feedback varies in effectiveness and is most successful for immigrant and U.S. resident adolescent students when it is specific (rather than global), when it identifies examples from the student's writing, when it asks for specific information from personal experience or texts, and when it uses indirect error correction (identifying error but requiring student to correct it).
- Peer response needs to be modeled, taught, and controlled to be effective.
- Motivations for revision and peer interaction are based on context rather than individual learner characteristics.
- The use of computers can facilitate production and revision of written texts.
- Assessment of second language writing is complex and problematic—timed writing often results in significant underperformance of ELLs, and raters are overly influenced by surface level of L2 writing.
- A disciplinary division of labor exists between the fields of ESL and composition that significantly affects research, curricula, and teacher preparation.
- ELLs in U.S. high schools receive insufficient writing instruction in ESL, insufficient oral and structural language support in mainstream English, and insufficient support in bridging the gaps.
- ELLs in U.S. high schools receive insufficient content instruction prior to mainstreaming.

PART III: Connecting the Knowledge Base to the Standards

As discussed earlier, we began this review by compiling the standards on writing from each of the 50 states, Washington DC, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. We then systematically reviewed the standards to group them into six meaningful categories that were used to code the research and practice literature presented in Part II. In the following section, we present that material reorganized according to the six meaningful standards categories for two reasons: (1) to facilitate the usefulness of this knowledge base for policy, practice, and research at a variety of levels; and (2) to focus on research questions that address the relationship between the knowledge base and the standards. We review those questions here:

- Does the knowledge base (that is, the research and practice literature) connect to the standards?
- If yes, how?
- If there are missing connections between the knowledge base and the standards, where are the gaps?

We first present the six standards categories with a list of key elements from the state writing standards and the assembled knowledge base for each. We then discuss the three questions above. At the end of Part III, we present a summary of key findings.

A. THE STANDARDS CATEGORIES—CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE RESEARCH AND PRACTICE LITERATURE

1. GENRE

Elements of the standards category Genre:

- General requirements (referring to the writing of the following five types of writing as well as resumes, cover letters, personal essays, journal responses, memos, business letters, and other writing done in occupational settings).
- Students will write narrative texts.
- Students will engage in expository writing.

- Students will engage in persuasive writing.
- Students will write literature critiques, short stories, essays, and poems.
- Students will write extensive research papers.

In the matrix of state writing standards, the Genre category refers to writing that accomplishes a particular task, such as persuading, critiquing, telling a story, presenting research, or explaining something. The general requirements characteristic was included to encompass other types of writing that display competence, including occupational writing such as resumes, cover letters, business letters, and memos, as well as more personal work such as journal responses, personal essays, and poetry.

The majority of states require students to display competence in one or more of the genres in this standards category. Specifically, 68% of the states require students to display writing competence in the genres listed under general requirements; 81% require competence at writing narrative texts; 85% at expository writing; 85% at persuasive writing; 85% at literature critiques, short stories, essays, and/or poems; and 74% at writing extensive research papers. Over all, genre is represented fairly consistently across state standards, although it is represented somewhat less frequently than the standards for writing process and internal logic.

Despite its prevalence in state standards, genre is not often addressed in the literature. Typically the only mention of genre occurs in discussions of the need for second language writers to learn about genres in English in order to succeed. Specific aspects of genre, such as effective ways to teach ELL writers about research papers, are not mentioned directly and little research appears to have been done specifically on the topic. Of the literature reviewed for this paper, four of the 25 (16%) primary research studies related specifically to the U.S. adolescent ELL population and twenty-five of the 103 (21.4%) secondary research reviews or practice literature pieces address genre. Although these numbers seem small in light of apparent agreement across states about the necessity of learning different genres, it is important to note that most pieces that do address genre focus on it exclusively. In other words, the quantity of literature on genre is small, but the studies themselves tend to be extensive. Still, more research in the area of genre and L2 writers is needed, especially research about how specific genres are learned by and can be effectively taught to adolescent ELLs.

Research and theory on Genre

Although writing standards throughout the U.S. place greater emphasis on classroom genres (narrative texts, expository writing, persuasive writing, and literature critiques) and less emphasis on writing for occupational settings, most of the authors in the field focus equally on both. Literature in this area reflects a concern for helping second language students develop competence in the specific genres that will empower them in school, the workplace, and their lives in general.

Ferris & Hedgcock (2005), Grabe (2003), Hinkel (2004), Hyland (2004), and Johns (1999) address the need for L2 students to know a variety of genres. Hyland states, "The ability to function competently in a range of written genres is often a central concern for ESL learners as it can determine their access to career opportunities, positive identities, and life choices" (p.43). Although both L1 and L2 students need to learn how to navigate within different genres to attain academic and professional success, L2 students may need more assistance developing awareness of the various genres, many of which have distinctive cultural features. For example, the expected style and content for a research paper or cover letter in the L2 student's native culture may differ from expectations in English. Because L2 writers generally lack this genre knowledge, Hyland recommends that the academic language, conventions, and constructs of genres be taught directly and explicitly.

Johns (1999) emphasizes the need for teaching genre even more urgently. She points out that many L2 writing instructors assign personal essays and reflections to help language minority students develop their voice and become confident in expressing their opinions in the second language. She cautions, however, that limiting students to personal narrative can be harmful because it restricts their opportunities to become literate in the different genres they will need to succeed in school and society. Instead, she urges teachers to help students build a repertoire of genre knowledge using a "socioliterate approach" (p.160). This approach allows students to explore texts from their first languages and cultures as well as from a range of English-language genres, and to engage in assignments designed to engender understanding of the construction of multiple types of text.

Hyland (2004) suggests that teaching genres is the best way for students to learn the rules of English grammar, enabling them to examine grammatical structures in context rather than in isolated classroom exercises. Hyland further suggests that in examining genre prototypes, students can identify and compare structures and apply that knowledge in organizing their own writing logically. Ferris & Hedgcock (2005) concur, maintaining that to comprehend and produce texts from the genres specific to a discipline, learners must know the formal characteristics and text types of each of these genres (rhetorical structure, stylistic features, and preferred syntax); audience expectations pertaining to content, structure, and form within the discipline; and the boundaries of the discipline's core knowledge.

Much of the literature on genre presented here is drawn from secondary research reviews rather than research studies. Most of the research that has been done is not specific to adolescent secondary and first-year ELL college students in the U.S. Rather, it is more general and based on reviewing patterns in texts or comparing genres cross-culturally, or drawn from studies of native speakers.

Implications for the classroom

Because learning about genres provides natural opportunities to learn about many other aspects of writing, most of the authors reviewed for this paper support teaching genre directly to students. Hyland (2004) offers recommendations to practitioners on how to structure units on genre, how to scaffold students' development of genre awareness, and how to perform genre analysis with younger students.

In teaching second language writers, experts suggest identifying the specific genres students will need for academic or occupational purposes. By focusing on these, students will become competent in both the analysis and composition of these specific genres. Johns (1999) and Hyland (2004) also suggest the importance of scaffolding based on students' previous knowledge of genre. The most consistent recommendation from the literature is that teachers explicitly instruct their students in writing in different genres to ensure their success in the classroom and in the workplace.

2. WRITING PROCESS AND STRATEGY

Elements of the standards category Writing Process and Strategy:

- Students will engage in the writing process (prewriting, brainstorming, outlining, mapping, drafting, revision, editing, and publishing final drafts).
- Students will obtain and gather knowledge from multiple sources of information (primary and secondary, including electronic sources) to support an argument.
- Students will evaluate, synthesize, contrast, and compare ideas and information from multiple sources.
- Students will critique writing in peer-editing workshops.

The Writing Process and Strategy category contains four elements that appear prominently in standards across all states. Of the six most popular elements among all writing standards categories, three are from Writing Process and Strategy. First, 96% of states expect students to engage in writing as a process. The writing process involves the tasks associated with producing written work, beginning with prewriting activities such as brainstorming and outlining, moving on to drafting and revising, and finally editing and publishing the work. Second, 94% of states expect students to use information to support an argument, an expectation that includes retrieving primary and secondary sources and discerning their reliability and biases. Third, 91% of states require students to evaluate, synthesize, contrast, and compare ideas and information. The fourth element in the writing process category, which is not one of the six most popular elements across all standards but is nevertheless important, involves students' participation in peer-editing workshops, and 74% of states include standards of this type.

Compared to elements in other standards categories, the writing process elements are among those appearing most frequently. Only one other element (in the Error, Usage, and Syntactic Correctness category: "Students will have knowledge of grammar and punctuation") appears more frequently (98%) than the most popular process element; and one (in the Internal Logic and Coherence category: "Students will provide relevant information to support the main focus of the text") appears as often (96%) as the most popular process element.

Just as writing process elements are frequently addressed in state writing standards, these issues are also a major focus of second language writing scholarship. Writing process is the standards category most often addressed in the research and practice literature assembled for this review. Of the 87 items that addressed one or more standards categories, more than half (45) had implications for writing process instruction. The evident interest in this topic reflects in part the continued power of the process movement that emerged in the 1970s and had a deep influence on L2 writing pedagogy, despite its primary focus on L1 writing pedagogy.

Much of the research and practice literature addressing writing process and strategy focuses on prewriting and revision. Both of these areas are informed by recent inquiry into the impact of technology on second language writing. Second language scholars address to a lesser degree the strategy elements of this category, including the ways in which writers retrieve and synthesize information from multiple sources.

Research and theory on Writing Process and Strategy

Despite the influence of process writing theory and pedagogy on second language writing scholarship, scholars continue to debate the effectiveness of various prewriting and planning techniques that are favored as part of the writing process. According to Ferris and Hedgcock (2005), many nonnative English speakers "are uncomfortable with freewriting." They go on to say that, although it is popular, "reliable research on the usefulness of pre-writing is surprisingly sparse." In fact, some studies suggest that "freewriting and related prewriting techniques favorably influence writing performance and proficiency only marginally, if at all" (p. 148). The scholars maintain, however, that "planning clearly promotes the fluid production of meaningful text" (p. 157).

Feedback and associated revisions are another key aspect of the writing process. Researchers have looked at how and when second language writers should receive feedback, which types are best (content vs. form), where this feedback may come from (teacher, peer, self), and what influence (if any) this feedback has on the quality of written products. Although teacher feedback is traditionally regarded as an essential element of writing instruction, "studies that explicitly link teacher commentary to student revision have been

scarce…and longitudinal research on student improvement as a result of feedback has been virtually nonexistent" (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, p.187). Investigation in this area is complicated by the difficulties of tracing the effects of specific comments on revision, measuring improvement, and isolating the effects of teacher feedback from those of other instructional factors. Several studies do clearly find "that L2 student writers are very likely to incorporate teacher commentary into their subsequent revisions" (p. 187). However, more research exists on the related but separate issue of student beliefs concerning teacher feedback. Ferris and Hedgcock report consistent findings from these studies: students believe teacher feedback is important and helpful; they value feedback on various issues concerning both form and content; and they prefer receiving feedback at early, intermediate, and final stages of the writing process rather than at only a few points.

The literature also confronts the concern that teacher feedback will "appropriate" student writers' texts, so that students lose motivation to revise a piece that no longer seems their own. Reid (2001) argues that text appropriation is a myth teachers need not worry about. She cites several studies illustrating the more relevant concern that ESL students "either slavishly responded to teacher comments" or "misunderstood teacher response." Instead of worrying about appropriation, Reid suggests "teachers should accept their responsibility as cultural informants and as facilitators for creating the social discourse community in the ESL writing classroom" (p. 210). She notes that teachers do not empower students by relinquishing authority but by offering students feedback that meets their needs and improves their writing. She encourages teachers to demystify the writing process as they teach writing.

Like teacher feedback, "peer response has forceful, vocal proponents and detractors as well as a rapidly increasing number of detailed studies on its nature and influence" (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, p. 225). Advocates point to the way in which peer response activities can be used throughout the writing process and are in accord with the Vygotskian theory that cognitive development results from social interaction, and that interaction is important for second language development. Peer response can help student writers understand reader expectations and the clarity of their own writing as well as build error analysis and editing skills. Critics, on the other hand, argue that peer response is not as effective in practice as it may appear to be in theory; they believe that peer response often results in an overemphasis on surface errors. Further, the reader's lack of second language rhetorical schemata can lead to inappropriate expectations that produce feedback counter to U.S. academic expectations. Student readers may make vague, unhelpful, hostile, sarcastic, or unkind comments, leaving student writers with little confidence in their readers' reactions. Finally, students from collectivist cultures may view peer response as a means to build group cohesion and harmony, whereas those from individualist cultures may have the improvement of their own work as the goal (Ferris & Hedgcock). Overall, however, research suggests that peer response generally has positive effects on writers and products, and that writers find peer collaboration both helpful and enjoyable.

As noted in our earlier section on pedagogical issues, an emerging debate in the literature concerns the impact of technology, particularly word processors and electronic networks, on the writing process of second language writers. Though Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) warn that "empirical research investigating the effects of technology on ESL writers' processes, texts, and attitudes is scarce indeed" (p. 346), technology, in the view of some, can change how writers plan, compose, and revise, and how students collaborate and respond to each others' work. Pennington (1996), for example, characterizes hypermedia as a resource for creating an environment that supports communicative second language composition. Gonglewski (2001) writes that in her work in L2 classrooms, she has found that the World Wide Web "can afford a learner-centered, context-rich setting to support meaningful communication with an authentic audience—factors linked

to successful L2 writing" (p. 110). Akyel and Kamisli (1997) report that student attitudes toward writing and planning for writing improved as a result of their use of computers.

Significant attention has been devoted to the ways the use of word processors may affect the process and products of L2 writers. The increasingly widespread use of word processors counts among its advantages "facilitat[ing] the mechanical process of putting words on paper; revising text by substitutions, deletions, additions, and block moves; and producing attractive and readable finished copy" (Pennington, 2003, p. 288). Computers are particularly useful for surface-level editing of spelling and mechanics. Though these physical tasks are critical to the writing process, research also suggests that word processors have an impact on second language writers in other, deeper ways.

First, word processors may change the planning or prewriting stage dramatically. As Pennington (2003) points out, "instead of writing to fit a plan, computer writers plan as they write, an effect also documented for L2 writers" (p. 291). Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) describe this kind of writing as a "seamless, recursive planning-drafting-revising process" that is "likely inevitable" with computers (p. 348).

Second, word processors positively impact revision. Pennington (2003) cites studies that have found second language writers "revise more when writing with a computer than when writing by traditional means,...revise more dynamically and continuously, and...spend more time revising" (p. 290). Research also suggests the use of computers helps students increase their "awareness of and ability to apply revision strategies in their own writing" (p. 290). Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) note, "Studies have found students exhibit improved or superior revision behaviors when using a computer" (p. 348). This finding may be due in part to the small amount of text visible on the screen at one time, which may help students focus in revising their writing (Pennington, 2003, p. 290).

Clearly, word processors affect the prewriting and revision stages, and most recent research suggests that this impact is beneficial. Studies have consistently indicated that second language writers spend more time and produce more writing with a computer (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005, p. 289) than without. Moreover, second language writers may "lack confidence in their writing abilities," according to Pennington (2003, p. 289), and word processing can relieve some of this anxiety.

Technology has also been applied to peer response activities. Both Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) and Pennington (2003) note that researchers do not agree on whether or not computers improve peer collaboration and interaction. Some studies found networked feedback to be more effective, while others found that writing revised through traditional face-to-face feedback received better scores.

Although the literature on the writing process is extensive, literature on writing strategy is more limited, mostly consisting of the debate on reading/writing relations and in research on English for Academic Purposes. According to Ferris and Hedgcock (2005), research suggests the "ESL composition curriculum should systematically integrate reading activities that engage learners in purposeful interaction with authentic texts" since these texts can be both models and sources (p. 40). Grabe (2003) discusses writing from multiple texts in the context of English for Academic Purposes, an area of study primarily informed by college-level second-language writers and their need to incorporate information from sources. Grabe calls for more exploration of strategy topics, such as writing from multiple sources, summarizing information, and reading-writing relations, as a supplement to literature on writing process (p. 251).

Implications for the Classroom

The debate over the effectiveness of various prewriting techniques does not imply that teachers should impose traditional, formal outlining requirements on

writers. In fact, successful planning for writing can take many forms and is dependent on the individual writer. Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) note "as a preliminary scaffold for a developing text, [prewriting] is all that the writer may need to begin the composing process" (p. 157). Other scholars suggest that some writers even develop internal planning processes that allow them to begin drafting without a written plan. Regardless of the form planning takes, scholars agree that planning generally results in better writing.

Scholars also agree that teacher feedback is most effective and most likely to be incorporated into subsequent revisions if it is received on preliminary drafts. Debate continues, however, on whether and when teachers should comment on content and ideas or errors and linguistic form. According to Ferris (2002), some scholars have criticized the practice of providing feedback on errors only in the later, editing stage of writing as harmful to student writers, whereas proponents of the process approach warn that attention to errors too early can disrupt a writer's thinking. In fact, L2 student writers have generally produced more accurate revisions in response to error feedback. Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) argue that teachers should provide feedback on a range of writing issues, citing evidence that students who receive feedback on both content and errors improve in both areas. In particular, teachers are encouraged to use "personalized feedback" (p. 192) appropriate to an individual student's preferences, development, and types and stages of writing.

Despite good intentions, L2 writers may misunderstand and misapply teacher feedback. Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) suggest some practices to help ameliorate these problems, including allowing students time to review teacher feedback and ask questions during class and giving students permission to ignore comments with which they disagree. Ultimately, for teacher feedback to improve student writing effectively, teachers must hold students accountable for reviewing and considering, if not incorporating, feedback.

Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) conclude that the research provides "a great deal of positive evidence for incorporating [peer response] as a regular component of second language literacy education" (p. 232). They suggest that some teachers resist this approach because implementation can be problematic. Implementation activities, which include modeling the peer response process and providing adequate training, are essential to successful peer response; studies show students' performance and attitude improve if they are well prepared for collaborative activities. As with teacher feedback, student writers should be held accountable for addressing peer feedback in their revisions.

Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) also encourage teachers to utilize technology because, "it seems clear that technology offers great potential for enhancing many aspects of the writing process" (p. 350). However, the authors note that teachers must plan activities carefully if students are to enjoy the full benefits of computer-assisted writing.

3. INTERNAL LOGIC AND COHERENCE

Elements of the standards category Internal Logic and Coherence:

- Students will produce a text with a strong thesis, focus, or controlling idea.
- Students will provide relevant information to support the main focus of text.
- Students will demonstrate a command of the structure of paragraphs and sentences.
- Students will develop a logical and appropriate coherent organization of text that includes an introduction, transitions, and conclusions or closure.

The Internal Logic and Coherence category of state writing standards refers to the structure and organization of students' written work. This category appears

in state writing standards with high frequency; of the 53 state-level units, all but one include at least one element of this category in their writing standards. In 48 states (91%), students are expected to be able to produce a text with a strong thesis, focus, or controlling idea. Fifty-one states (96%) require that students provide relevant information to support the main focus of text. In presenting arguments, students in 48 states (91%) are required to produce an organized text that includes an introduction, appropriate transitions, and conclusion or closure. With 3 of 4 composite elements used by at least 90% of states, this standards category has significant prominence in the writing standards.

Despite the high emphasis placed on internal logic and coherence in state writing standards, there is relatively little research and practice literature on the topic. Of the 87 items in this review that addressed one or more of the writing standards categories, fewer than 25% or 21 items addressed internal logic and coherence, and only 8 of these were research studies focused on adolescent ELLs in the U.S. The focus of second language writing scholars in this area does not match the weight this category is given in the states' writing standards.

Research and theory on Internal Logic and Coherence

One of the dilemmas inherent in addressing the needs of ELL writers and their teachers is the variety of ways writing is defined by ESL teachers. Hartman and Tarone (1999) refer to a study in which teachers' definitions of writing ranged from one-word answers to sentence practice to full compositions (p. 104). These divergent views on the nature of writing have implications for the degree to which ESL classes, which purport to address the language domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, actually prepare students for the writing demands of the mainstream classes they will one day attend.

Several scholars stress the importance of explicitly teaching organization and cohesion to L2 student writers. Hyland (2004) recommends the use of genre prototypes to help students develop awareness of a variety of structural features in different types of writing, highlighting the overlap with the genre standards category mentioned earlier. Yet in many ESL classes the development of writing is seen as a controlled process in which students gradually learn how to write grammatical sentences (Valdes, 1999, p. 149). Many teachers reject a process approach for teaching writing to ELL writers because these students often produce texts that are difficult for teachers to understand.

Given the issues raised above, where is the topic of internal logic and cohesion best situated in the writing curriculum for ELLs—in ESL classes or in mainstream English classes? In their study of teachers of Southeast Asian students in grades 8 through 12, Hartman and Tarone (1999) interviewed both ESL instructors and mainstream teachers about the nature of writing instruction in their classes. ESL instructors described writing instruction as substitution drills and pattern practice at the sentence level for beginning students. Intermediate level students moved from sentence construction to paragraph writing, carefully guided to match model texts provided by the teacher. Writing activities included dictation, changing the form of sentences, and writing answers to questions. Teachers avoided assigning lengthier text because most of their ELL writers lacked organization in their written texts.

In contrast, mainstream teachers in the study reported that their classes involved process writing in a number of genres—narrative, exposition, argument, persuasion, and research papers. Book reports were required; students were expected not only to summarize the books they read but to critique them as well. In evaluating student writing, mainstream teachers looked for organization, clarity of thought, and critical thinking, in addition to correct grammar. The main concern mainstream teachers had about their ELL students in this study was that the students could not get ideas across because their writing lacked a logical structure.

Clearly, a gap existed in the preparation of ELL writers between the ESL classroom's focus on sentence formation and the mainstream classroom's demand for longer, organized, complex written texts.

A possible model for the transition between ESL and mainstream classes is suggested by Valdes (1999) through a descriptive study of one mainstream teacher who effectively bridged these challenges. The teacher worked voluntarily with newly arrived immigrants, using a combination of strategies to teach ELL students to meet the challenge of writing well-organized papers. She used a combination of process writing and direct instruction in her eighth-grade classroom. For example, after giving students a general scaffold for a paper and spending considerable time on direct teaching about organization, she prompted students to think and write spontaneously. She then showed students how to use initial clustering techniques and note taking to move from brainstorming ideas to writing a first draft. Working through the steps of the writing process, she incorporated both peer editing and writing conferences. She encouraged students to "use their English proficiencies to write about real experiences and to express genuine thoughts. She adapted a process approach to writing so that students who were not totally familiar with the conventions of English writing might learn how to organize their writing in ways in which they would be expected to do so in mainstream classes" (Valdes, p. 152). Although there is a debate on the effectiveness of a process approach in L2 writing, this teacher, whose ELL students' writing developed logic and coherence over time, provides anecdotal evidence that it is an effective strategy.

Implications for the Classroom

Hartman and Tarone (1999) make several recommendations for teaching writing to nonnative speakers of English, particularly Southeast Asian students, among which are two that may affect internal logic and coherence in writing for all secondary school ELLs:

1. "Allow and encourage LEP students to spend more time in ESL classes to develop their literacy skills to higher levels before being mainstreamed…At the advanced level, as LEP students are ready to move to mainstream classes, provide a bridge for the transition by offering very advanced adjunct ESL courses designed in cooperation with content area teachers" (p. 115).
2. "Spend more time on the problems these students have with organization and content in their writing. These are areas with which mainstream teachers are most concerned. If possible, the teaching of grammar should be integrated into all areas of the student's learning" (pp. 115-116).

Along with a commitment to target the organizational needs of ELL writers, teachers and their students would benefit from a realistic understanding of the time it takes to acquire the organizational skills of writing in a new language. According to Valdes (1999), many teachers believe that when an ELL has exited the ESL program, the student enters the mainstream equipped with all the knowledge and skills of a native English speaker. Professional development in second language acquisition is important for all teachers of ELLs, including mainstream teachers. Awareness of the process, stages, and issues surrounding language acquisition will equip teachers with valuable information for designing instruction that meets the needs of students new to writing in English.

In addition, teachers of ELLs could benefit from professional development in cross-cultural awareness. For ELLs, being held immediately to mainstream standards with no accommodations is tantamount, Valdes (1999) says, to "being penalized for not being native speakers. If the instructor is not tolerant…or if she has no knowledge about the nature of bilingualism, students are likely to receive low grades or to be sent back to the ESL compartment, to classes and instruc-

tion that in terms of the development of their English language proficiency can no longer do anything for them" (p. 171).

Although little research directly addresses logic and coherence for our population, the teacher studied by Valdes (1999) shows that ELLs can do far more than previous models have assumed. More research is needed to further document successful approaches to instruction for this key domain of standards and assessment.

4. KNOWLEDGE OF AUDIENCE, LANGUAGE, CULTURE, AND POLITICS

Elements of the standards category Knowledge of Audience, Language, Culture, and Politics:

- Students will write for a variety of purposes and audiences.
- Students will learn about the inclusionary and exclusionary nature of language.
- Students will develop fluency in the English language arts by using and building upon the strengths of their language, culture, and life experiences.
- Students will demonstrate a distinctive voice and individuality in their work.
- Students will understand the nature of language and the way language has shaped perceptions.

In the matrix of state writing standards for general education, Knowledge of Audience, Language, Culture, and Politics encompasses the sociopolitical dimensions of language. All but three states (94%) currently require students to be able to write for a variety of purposes and audiences. However, other elements are not nearly so well represented: 60% (32) of states demand that students demonstrate a distinctive voice and individuality in their work; 49% (26) call for students to understand the way language shapes perceptions; 28% (15) ask students to develop fluency in the English language arts through exposure to pedagogies that build upon the strengths of students' language, culture, and life experiences; and 21% (11) require students to learn about the inclusionary and exclusionary nature of language.

This review located little research concerning the social, cultural, political, or linguistic dimensions of L2 writing. Of the literature reviewed, four primary research studies and 21 pieces of practice literature made reference to one of the five subtopics under Knowledge of Audience, Language, Culture, and Politics. The majority of the texts referenced in this section actually emerge from the field of genre-based teaching.

Research and theory on Knowledge of Audience, Language, Culture, and Politics

The research reviewed here supports the consensus of the majority of state departments of education that there is an inextricable link between genre and audience. The different theoretical schools of thought regarding genre pedagogies, while differing in their definitions of genre, attest to this link between genre and audience (Hyland, 2004).

An example of how notions of genre and audience are constantly evolving is evident in the realm of technology and its impact on communication. In a secondary research review on the influence of technology on second language writing, Pennington (2003) notes that the emergence of new technologies has contributed to the field's understanding of genres. "Email communication appears to be evolving as a new genre, which [one author] describes as a 'creole' that merges some properties of both speech and writing" (p. 300). Although Pennington describes hypertext and its possible implications for writing, she offers no research on the connection between e-mail communication and its impact on writing in general.

In defining genre as a social construction, various theories and researchers (e.g., Hyland, 2004; Johns,

1999) stress the notion that genres emerge from specific sociocultural contexts. A person's ability to discern appropriateness when employing language is a result of possessing sufficient cultural knowledge. Accordingly, since genres are embedded within the individual and cultural experiences of learners, Hyland (2004) and Johns (1999) propose that L2 learners may possess an understanding of genres different from those valued in the educational system of the United States. Hence, it is the responsibility of teachers to provide their students with the appropriate cultural, social, and linguistic knowledge to convey their thoughts and ideas effectively to a U.S. audience.

In spite of the high demand placed on second language writers nationwide to master knowledge of audience and purpose in their writings, only 14 states require that students build on their cultural and linguistic skills and life experiences. Many other states require only that students build on their prior knowledge of writing to fulfill this requirement.

Writing programs' disregard for students' life experiences is acknowledged in the research. Blanton (1999) found that most writing programs targeted to L2 writers failed to teach students about audience and how it shapes their writing: "having no real purpose, students write for no reason to no one" (p. 132). Blanton (1999) and Johns (1999) support building upon ELLs' cultural, linguistic, and/or life experiences to instruct them on audience. According to Hyland (2004), this type of instructional approach can be instituted when teachers know about the cultural contexts in which different genres are situated. This knowledge combined with a genre-based approach facilitates a teacher's ability to utilize students' prior knowledge in learning about a new genre (Hyland, pp. 55-56). Similarly, a genre-based approach may serve as a tool for nonnative English writers to acquire a comprehensive understanding of the writing required in academic and professional contexts (Hyland, p. 43). However, some oppose the teaching of genre in the classroom, in the belief that the rigidity of a genre-based approach may harm the development of L2 writers.

Both Hyland (2004) and Pennington (2003) touch on the need for L2 writers to develop a distinctive voice in their writing. Voice is yet another aspect of drawing from one's cultural background and past experiences. Hyland considers voice a long-term goal in helping students to master writing in genres in order to be able to manipulate a particular discourse creatively. Pennington extols the potential of technology for developing individual voices. She cites research that "writers can use online space to create alternative selves and to experiment with roles that they might not assume in face-to-face interaction" (p. 295). Little research has been done, however, on the efficacy of new technologies in the teaching of writing, especially in relation to this standards category.

Implications for the classroom

Although researchers differ on the types of writing programs they would like to see employed by teachers, they appear to agree on the importance of adopting a comprehensive approach to teaching L2 students about knowledge of audience, language, culture, and politics and how they relate to writing. According to researchers in this area of writing, a comprehensive writing program for L2 writers incorporates knowledge of discourse, context, and structure in its curriculum.

Authors of the reviewed works agree that building upon students' cultural and linguistic assets and their prior life experiences is crucial to increasing their understanding of the concepts of audience and purpose in the context of genres. Each student brings his or her own culturally embedded notions of various genres to the classroom, and teachers should tap into those notions in order to expand students' knowledge of audience and the interconnections between audience, culture, language, and politics in writing for diverse purposes and audiences.

5. STYLISTICS

Elements of the standards category Stylistics:

- Students will use appropriate format to cite sources (e.g., MLA, APA, Chicago Manual of Style).
- Students will use words that adequately convey meaning (diction).
- Students will employ different techniques in their writing (figurative, literary, dramatic, poetic elements, rhetorical devices, cause and effect, stream of consciousness, multiple perspectives, and experimentation with time).
- Students will use a variety of sentences (simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex) in their written texts.
- Students will supplement organized statements, reports, and essays by using visuals (charts, tables, graphs, etc.) and media (PowerPoint, video, etc.), as appropriate.

As evidenced by the low representation of stylistics in state writing standards, no nationwide consensus exists about the importance of student mastery in this area. The stylistics element found most frequently in state standards concerns word choice and diction: 83% of states expect students to display appropriate diction or word choice. After that, 81% of states require sentence variety in the form of simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex sentences; 77% expect students to use appropriate formats (MLA, APA, etc.) when citing sources; 77% require students to demonstrate knowledge and use of rhetorical techniques, styles, and structures; and (57%) expect the incorporation of visuals and multimedia in composition.

The elements in the Stylistics category are seldom addressed in the literature on second language writing. Of the 87 items in our survey with implications for one or more standards categories, only 17 displayed a connection to stylistics, including only 4 primary research studies—however, in this category, too, the use of genre can play a key role, as discussed below.

Research and theory on Stylistics

Given the low numbers of studies that connect to the stylistics standards category, there is little mention of the constituent elements in the core texts selected for this review. However, issues of stylistics are of particular concern for college and graduate-level international students, and the practice literature addressed to the needs of that population is useful here.

Discussions of stylistics in the literature focus primarily on the challenges of English for Academic Purposes for second language writers. Hyland (2004) notes that the oral proficiency of many university level L2 writers may not translate to comfort with academic writing, which he characterizes as formal and marked by "high lexical density, high nominal style, and impersonal constructions" (p. 142). According to Hyland, L2 writers have trouble achieving the tone appropriate for an academic writing style, which demands the use of "more reflective, spatially and temporally distant language than usually occurs in casual conversation" (p. 75). Hyland asserts that L2 writers "tend to overuse features that are more typical of spoken face-to-face conversational English" (p. 75).

Through a discussion of hedging techniques—in which writers allow for the possibility that what they have written can be disputed or considered naïve or incomplete—Hyland (2004) and Hinkel (2004) highlight the challenges faced by L2 students learning to write in academic English. Hinkel suggests ELLs need to learn hedging because the technique has numerous social and rhetorical purposes in academic texts (pp. 313-314). Hyland notes that L2 writers are often told to make strong claims in their academic writing, and thus are confused when faced with the uncertainty implied in hedging (p. 147). Both scholars assert that more attention should be given to teaching hedging in ESL writing classes.

Implications for the classroom

Ferris (2002) discusses the importance of reading in developing writers' understanding of stylistics: "Writing style more likely comes from exposure to the target language (especially written language) than from correction or classroom instruction" (p. 51), so teachers should use models from written language to foster awareness of and attention to style. Similarly, Hinkel (2004) suggests that students analyze authentic texts to gain an understanding of various genres in the target language and to explore word choice and grammatical and syntactic options. It is not sufficient, however, for students to simply read these texts; teachers have to show them the relevant features of the texts. Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) note that reading texts can help second language writers understand and appropriate various elements of writing, including rhetorical structure and stylistic features (p. 53). Scholars seem to agree that reading and learning to analyze the style of authentic texts can help students internalize aspects of academic English writing style.

6. ERROR, USAGE, AND SYNTACTIC CORRECTNESS

Elements of the standards category Error, Usage, and Syntactic Correctness:

- Students will posses general knowledge of grammar and punctuation (parts of speech, verb forms and tenses, subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, parallel structure, comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives, apostrophes, commas, etc.).
- Students will have knowledge of capitalization.
- Students will have knowledge of spelling.

This category is composed of those state writing standards that encompass knowledge of general grammar and punctuation as well as spelling and capitalization. Of the 53 sets of state-level writing standards examined, 98% (52) require students to demonstrate knowledge of grammar and punctuation, 87% (46) require knowledge of spelling, and 79% (42) call for skill in the use of capitalization.

Reflecting the high emphasis on error, usage, and syntactic correctness in state writing standards, a substantial amount of research and practice literature exists on this topic. Of the 20 studies focused on our target population and relevant to the standards, 12 addressed this category (second only to the Writing Process and Strategy standards category). The work of writing scholars provides considerable support to educators in addressing this category.

Research and theory on Error, Usage, and Syntactic Correctness

As noted in earlier sections of this paper, research on the effects of error correction and grammar instruction on L2 writing is not conclusive. Some scholars claim that there is no convincing research-based evidence that shows error correction to improve L2 student writing (Truscott, 1996, 1999; see review in Ferris, 2002). Others, however, claim the research supports error correction (Ferris, 1999b; see also Ferris 2002). In addition, some scholars support explicit grammar instruction for ELLs, stating that knowledge of the regularities of sentences and how they break down into their major components (nouns, noun phrases, pronouns, verb tenses, voice, lexical classes, functions of verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and adjective and adverbial phrases) can help improve writing (Hinkel, 2004). Ferris (2002) cites studies that have demonstrated that error correction leads to improved accuracy in writing in the short term, i.e., in revision of the same piece of writing or in focused writing over the course of a school term. She claims, however, that the small research base on this question has yielded little evidence to date of long-term improvement resulting from error correction.

A substantial body of research exists on student views of teacher feedback on writing assignments. Ferris & Hedgcock (2005) report that, despite variations in methodology, studies consistently find L2 students value teacher feedback and see it as helpful to improving their writing on a variety of issues, including language errors (p. 188). In student surveys, "students typically respond that they feel they have serious grammar problems that impede the effectiveness of their writing and that they urgently need assistance from their teachers to produce accurate texts and to improve their linguistic control" (Ferris, 2002, p. 79). Ferris posits that because students value teacher feedback on errors and believe it contributes to their writing improvement, feedback may serve to reinforce student motivation.

The errors L2 writers make in their writing are different from the errors of native English speakers. Second language acquisition research has shown that these errors may result from the inappropriate transfer of native language (L1) patterns or from incomplete knowledge of the second language (L2). "Because L2 students, in addition to being developing writers, are still in the process of acquiring the L2 lexicon and morphological and syntactic systems, they need distinct and additional interventions from their writing teachers to make up these deficits and develop strategies for finding, correcting, and avoiding errors" (Ferris, 2002, p. 4). Mere exposure to L2 grammar is not the most effective means of learning. Explicit grammar-focused instruction is more effective than implicit instruction of any sort (Norris & Ortega, 2000).

The question remains as to whether grammar instruction and error correction help students improve their knowledge of correct language forms and their self-editing strategies. Studies that assess the writing progress of L2 students over time generally demonstrate that error feedback results in measurable improvement. However, only six studies to date have compared students who have received error feedback with students who did not. Of these studies, only one was a longitudinal study that found an advantage in accuracy for the students who received error correction (Ferris, 2002, p. 16). More research is needed before a causal relationship can be established between instruction in grammar and error correction and improved accuracy in L2 writing.

As we indicated in the section on pedagogical issues in Part II of this document, many studies have examined the relative effects of direct and indirect feedback on student writing improvement. Direct feedback from the instructor involves identifying an error in a student's writing and correcting it. In contrast, indirect feedback involves identifying the error but calling upon the student to make the correction and, in some cases, to identify the type of error. Overall, error correction research indicates that indirect feedback is superior to direct feedback because it "leads to greater cognitive engagement, reflection and problem-solving" on the part of students. However, some studies have shown no significant difference between direct and indirect feedback (Ferris, 2002, p. 19).

Studies surveying students have indicated their preference for direct and explicit teacher feedback and their frustration over illegible, cryptic, or confusing feedback. Confusion is often caused by teacher shorthand—abbreviated text markings and marginal notes intended to direct student attention to particular errors. Students tend to value a mix of encouragement and criticism and not be hurt or offended by suggestions for improvement (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). Students have been found hostile to error-correction approaches in which teachers give no indication of errors but leave it to the student to locate and address errors. Instead, students prefer that teachers clearly mark errors and either offer strategies for correction or give direct correction.

Research suggests that teacher feedback is most effective when it is given at multiple stages of the writing process rather than only during the editing stage; when it addresses not only grammatical errors but a range of writing issues; and when it addresses

strengths, weaknesses, and target areas for improvement in each piece of L2 writing rather than responding to every error (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005).

Implications for the Classroom

The literature offers much in the way of recommendations for how and when teachers of writing can best provide error correction feedback to L2 students. As stated above, the types of errors that are most common to L2 writers are different from those common to native English speakers. Types of errors vary among L2 writers as well, influenced by their English language learning background, their first language and its comparability to English, and their proficiency level in English, including their ability to recognize and correct certain types of errors. Students at a presystematic stage of error recognition in the second language may make several different errors with the same word and not be able to recognize or correct the problem (Ferris, 2002).

Frodesen (2001) offers guidelines for teachers on delivering feedback that meets the needs of each student: limit error correction to certain types of errors, such as those known to stigmatize learners; provide indirect correction through methods like underlining or coding errors; and consider the student's proficiency level, learning style and metalinguistic knowledge in deciding how to provide feedback.

Understanding student proficiency levels and background are part of a larger strategy for teachers of L2 writers—equipping themselves with new knowledge about and instructional strategies for second language learners. Because the more serious language structure issues L2 writers face are rarely the same as those faced by native speakers, teachers of ELL writers would benefit from substantial knowledge of verb tense, active and passive voice, basic verb types (transitive, intransitive, linking), auxiliary verb forms and functions, basic types and functions of nouns, rules of subject-verb agreement, definite and indefinite article usage, clause and sentence patterns and their combination, and the correct selection of noun, verb, adjective, and adverb forms. Practice in identifying, classifying and correcting L2 writing errors as well as in developing in-class minilessons on grammar would strengthen instructor capacity to teach ELL writers effectively. An understanding of the principles of second language acquisition and composition and of how to differentiate error feedback and grammatical instruction for individual students would also contribute to more effective instruction.

Additionally, teachers of ELL writers need awareness of when and how to provide feedback. Ferris (2002) has introduced the distinction between treatable and untreatable errors. Treatable errors, such as errors in verb tense or subject-verb agreement, are related to linguistic structures and can be considered rule governed. Untreatable errors are peculiar to the learner or to a particular group and might include things like word choice or missing words. Teachers are advised to consider limiting the use of direct feedback when errors are untreatable, as well as when students are at the beginning levels of English language proficiency or when the teacher wishes to focus student attention on certain types of errors. Marking is best placed at the point of error with a verbal summary at the end of the paper for advanced writers who are developing self-editing skills (Ferris, p. 70). Since students need to be taught to identify their own errors and make use of teacher feedback, teachers should devote some instructional time to training students in error correction strategies (Ferris, p. 73). In addition, a rubric or checklist outlining qualities of exemplary writing and tied to grade-level writing standards for the specific content area can help L2 writers meet teacher expectations. Teachers should adhere to a clear, consistent assessment and feedback policy and should communicate that policy to students (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005).

The importance of improving grammar in student writing is of indisputable value to L2 writers. Hinkel (2004) maintains that errors in syntactic, lexical, and discourse features have a negative effect on perceived

quality of student text. Anecdotal and research evidence show that such errors, particularly those in verb inflection, tense, and agreement with subject, can be distracting and even stigmatizing when professors and workplace supervisors come across them. Such errors may not only interfere with reader comprehension of L2 writing but may signal an overall lack of competence in using English, which may be misread as an indication of low intelligence, lack of interest in the subject, or laziness. Writing instructors have the responsibility to equip their students with "knowledge, strategies, and resources they will need to function effectively outside of the ESL writing classroom" in secondary schools, higher education, and the broader social and occupational spheres in which they choose to participate (Ferris, 2002, p. 9).

B. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS IN PART III

GENRE

More than 80% of states expect students to master the most prominent genres of narrative, expository, and persuasive writing, and to write essays, stories, or poems. The L2 writing literature strongly supports explicit teaching of genre through both analysis of and practice composing in a variety of genres, as well as building on students' prior knowledge of genre. Little specific empirical research exists, however, on how ELLs learn and acquire the various genres or on the effectiveness of different instructional approaches. Research is needed to address these issues.

WRITING PROCESS AND STRATEGY

The majority of states place strong emphasis on students' engagement with writing as a process—96% of states explicitly expect all students to engage in the writing process, and over 90% use three of the four composite elements. Some elements of writing process have a strong research basis, while others do not.

Planning appears to promote success in writing, but research on specific prewriting strategies is inconclusive. Although sparsely researched, teacher feedback is generally regarded as essential. Studies have found that L2 writers do incorporate teachers' comments when they revise and that they value teacher feedback at multiple points in the writing process. Findings on peer response are generally positive, with the proviso that successful use requires carefully preparing students to respond to peers. Though more research is needed, use of technology for writing generally appears positive, especially for increasing writers' productivity, for improving and enhancing revision, and for improving attitudes toward writing. Relatively little research exists on students' use of multiple sources to support arguments, evaluate, synthesize, or compare and contrast. Research suggests that students benefit from integrating reading activities into writing instruction, but more research is needed to understand how students use texts in their writing and how to most effectively support the use of texts.

INTERNAL LOGIC AND COHERENCE

At least 90% of states include most elements of this category in their writing standards and all but one state includes at least one element. However, research suggests that the teaching of logic and coherence is a neglected area in ESL classrooms and that mainstream instruction is unlikely to address this gap. However, it has been shown that newly arrived ESL students can progress in the development of logical and coherent writing when they are encouraged to write about real experiences and to express genuine thoughts. A combination of process pedagogy and direct instruction with extensive focus on organization in writing is most effective. More research is needed in this area, and ESL teachers need more knowledge about successful instructional strategies to improve the chance of ELLs to meet the standards in this virtually universal category.

KNOWLEDGE OF AUDIENCE, LANGUAGE, CULTURE, AND POLITICS

Writing for a variety of audiences and purposes is recognized in the standards of 94% of states, though other elements of this category vary widely in their use. Despite its frequent appearance in the standards, little research has been done in this area. The practice literature maintains that an understanding of audience and appropriateness is dependent on cultural knowledge, suggesting that teachers must address these issues explicitly for L2 writers. In addition, since these understandings are related to genre, the elements of this standards category need to be combined with explicit genre instruction. Scholars recommend contextualizing students' writing by building on their life experiences and finding real purposes and audiences for their writing. In addition, they suggest that such writing facilitates the development of the writer's voice, one of the composite elements of this category.

STYLISTICS

The elements in this category are consistently emphasized by a high percentage of states: four of the five composite elements of this category are used by at least 75% of states. Yet as with Knowledge of Audience, Language, Culture, and Politics, this category is addressed in the research only sparsely. Most of the literature relevant to stylistics derives from instruction at the postsecondary level and relates to the challenges of academic writing that requires the use of dense and impersonal language. The practice literature here suggests using models of written language to foster awareness and understanding of academic and other styles from a variety of genres, with particular attention to varied possibilities of word choice, grammar, and syntactic constructions.

ERROR, USAGE, AND SYNTACTIC CORRECTNESS

At least three quarters of state entities require all of the elements comprising this category, and 98% require general knowledge of grammar and punctuation. This area of the standards has almost as much research support as the Writing Process and Strategy category. Research shows that L2 writers make different kinds of errors from those of native speakers and that both groups value and require explicit instruction and error correction for improvement, rather than mere exposure to appropriate use. Despite L2 students' preference for direct feedback, however, research shows that indirect feedback is most productive. More is known about methods for achieving short-term improvement than long-term improvement and self-editing. We do know that feedback is most effective when given at multiple stages of the writing process, with varied foci and specificity at different stages. It is more effective to limit feedback to identified kinds of errors than to give feedback on all errors. Since teachers cannot address all matters of error and usage, it is best to focus on the most stigmatizing errors, to group students based on patterns of error, and to use minilessons to target specific issues.

Clearly, gaps in the research exist for certain standards categories—much more is needed on questions related to genre, audience, stylistics, and logic and coherence. Interestingly, many interrelationships occur between those categories, and the current push in the scholarly L2 writing community toward genre-oriented teaching may encourage this research. If the strong tendency toward process-oriented research was initially led by the paradigm shift in the L1 writing community, a corresponding paradigm shift toward genre-oriented pedagogy in the L2 writing community may lead to a more balanced research base across the standards categories. Genre appears to be a core notion upon which writing instruction can be developed to address all standards categories. That is, reading and analysis of genres can be used to foster understanding

of differences between genres; strategies for logic and coherence; varieties of usage, grammar, and syntax; audience, purpose, and the politics of language in texts; and varieties of stylistic resources and their effects. Writing instruction based on merging writing process research and genre theory may offer increased opportunity for ELLs to meet the writing standards.

Finally, our review found no studies focused specifically on standards-based assessment. Elsewhere, we have discussed findings about the complexities of assessing L2 writing, but no studies reviewed for this paper address the assessment of adolescent ELL writing in the U.S. using current standards-based assessments. Research is needed to address this gap. We offer specific recommendations for such research in the final section, Part IV, of this report.

PART IV
Recommendations for Research

As our exploration of the research and practice literature illustrates, the educational experiences of ELLs in middle and high school ESL and mainstream classrooms may not enable them to meet state writing standards. The writing of many ELLs in mainstream secondary or first-year college classes is characterized by teachers as disorganized; lacking in logic; and problematic in terms of grammar, syntax, and mechanics. If not addressed, such writing difficulties may consign ELLs to low-level ability groups in mainstream placements, limit their success in mainstream content classes, frustrate their mainstream teachers in English language arts and other subjects, and restrict their postsecondary opportunities. We conclude our discussion with a number of recommendations for further research suggested by the issues outlined above.

Our overview of the field and our specific discussion of each standards category indicate a variety of areas for additional research under the broad topic of writing instruction for adolescent ELLs. Out of this review, we determined that research on middle and high school students was most important for our purposes. At least two significant differences between school-age and postsecondary learners suggest the need for studies that can provide a solid knowledge base on middle and high school ELLs: (1) learners between the ages of 12 and 18 are very different from young adult college learners, and (2) motivational differences exist between compulsory schooling for minors and voluntary schooling for the post-secondary population.

We suggest that three types of research be conducted:

1. First, because so little research has been conducted with school-age adolescent ELLs, substantial research should be conducted within an exploratory and qualitative framework for generating hypotheses. A good starting point for hypothesis-generating studies would be to identify several highly successful ESL programs to study. Such programs would be characterized by students who score well on standards-based assessments; who do well after exiting from ESL programs; who have high school graduation rates similar to mainstream students; and who have high rates of college appli-

cation, college acceptance, and writing proficiency. Newcomer programs and those that include an emphasis on developing first language literacy along with English literacy, such as dual language programs, could provide fertile ground for generating new hypotheses. Studies of such programs might examine classroom activity, including instruction, interaction, and reading and writing; examine the program in relation to the pattern of school structures; examine the knowledge base of the ESL teachers and the curriculum of the program; examine the knowledge base of mainstream teachers; assess students' oral and written proficiency; and assess students' and parents' attitudes toward and satisfaction with the program.

2 Another kind of qualitative and exploratory research could be conducted with forms of writing instruction that have been successful at the college level but are mostly untried in middle and high schools. For example, the use of an approach that combines writing process and genre study (as in the socioliterate approach) in the writing demands of both English and other content-area instruction could be studied qualitatively as a means of generating hypotheses about different strategies of implementation or collaboration between content and ESL specialists.

3 Finally, we recommend cautious use of hypothesis-testing studies in areas of narrow range where a substantial body of research exists, albeit one based on postsecondary learners. For example, one might conduct studies of a socioliterate approach with multiple conditions for teaching error correction: perhaps one condition of sequenced explicit and direct instruction and a second condition of minilessons targeted to identified subgroups in response to errors at early and middle points in revision process. Assignments, readings, and other elements would have to be held constant as much as possible to facilitate valid interpretation of dependent variables. Another kind of study could track longitudinal changes related to various kinds of teacher feedback for students in matched sections as well as at different levels of ESL instruction, again with common outcome assessments. Lastly, one might design a follow-up study based on Reynolds' suggestion: an experimental study of a process vs. socioliterate approach. ESL students could be randomly assigned to one of two conditions—one that would involve fewer multidraft assignments (the process approach) and one that would involve many shorter assignments for different purposes and audiences (the socioliterate approach) with dependent variables along the lines of Reynolds' fine-grained analyses of writings on the same topics.

Clearly, much work remains to be done before researchers will be able to offer a solid knowledge base for achieving equal rates of success on writing assessments of ELLs and mainstream students in public secondary schools. We hope this review of research and practice literature will contribute to that fundamental goal of schooling in a democratic society.

APPENDIX A

Matrix of State Writing Standards

Broader Category	Descriptors	States																																	
		Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana
Knowledge of Audience, Language, Culture & Politics	Students will write for a variety of purposes and audiences.	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×		×	×	×		×	×
	Students will learn about the inclusionary and exclusionary nature of language.			×				×					×								×			×	×	×		
	Students will develop fluency in the English language arts by using and building upon the strengths of their language, culture, and life experiences.	×	×					×		×						×				×				×		×		
	Students will demonstrate a distinctive voice and individuality in their work.	×	×	×	×	×	×		×		×		×		×	×		×			×	×	×	×			×	×
	Students will understand the nature of language and the way language has shaped perceptions.	×	×				×	×		×			×	×		×				×	×	×		×	×	×		
Stylistics	Students will use appropriate format to cite sources (MLA, APA, Chicago Manual of Style, etc).	×	×	×		×	×			×		×	×	×		×		×	×	×	×	×	×		×		×	
	Students will use words that adequately convey meaning (diction).	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×		×	×	×		×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×
	Students will employ different techniques in their writing (figurative, literary, dramatic, poetic elements, rhetorical devices, cause and effect, display knowledge of stream of consciousness, multiple perspectives, and experimentation with time).			×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	
	Students will use a variety of sentences (simple, compound, complex, and compound-complex) in their written texts.	×	×	×	×	×	×		×		×	×		×		×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×
	Students will supplement organized statements, reports and essays by using visuals (chart, tables, graphs, etc.) and media (powerpoint, video, etc.), as appropriate.	×	×	×	×				×			×				×			×	×	×			×				
Error Usage, Syntactic Correctness	Students will possess knowledge of general grammar and punctuation (parts of speech, verb forms and tenses, subject/verb agreement, pronoun/antecedent agreement, parallel structure, comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives, apostrophes, commas, etc.).	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
	Students will have knowledge of capitalization.	×	×	×	×		×	×	×		×			×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×			×		×	×
	Students will have knowledge of spelling.	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×		×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×

© 2005 The Education Alliance at Brown University

Broader Category	Descriptors	States																																	
		Alabama	Alaska	Arizona	Arkansas	California	Colorado	Connecticut	Delaware	District of Columbia	Florida	Georgia	Hawaii	Idaho	Illinois	Indiana	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Louisiana	Maine	Maryland	Massachusetts	Michigan	Minnesota	Mississippi	Missouri	Montana
Genre	General requirements (referring to the writing of the following five types of writing as well as resumes, cover letters, personal essays, journal responses, memos, business letters, other writing done in occupational settings, etc.).			×	×		×		×	×		×	×			×		×	×				×			×	×	×
	Students will write narrative texts.	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×				×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×			×
	Students will engage in expository writing.	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×		×		×	×	×		×	×	×	×		×	×	×		×	×
	Students will engage in persuasive writing.	×	×		×	×		×	×	×			×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×
	Students will write literature critiques, short stories, essays, and/or poems.	×	×	×	×	×		×		×				×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	
	Students will write extensive research papers.				×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×		×			×		×	×	×		×	
Writing Process & Strategy	Students will engage in the writing process (Prewriting, brainstorming, outlining, and/or mapping, Drafting, Revising, Editing, and Publish/Final Draft).	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
	Students will obtain and gather knowledge from multiple sources of information (primary and secondary, including electronic sources) to support an argument.	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
	Students will evaluate, synthesize, contrast and compare ideas and information from multiple sources of information.	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
	Students will critique writing in peer editing workshops.	×	×	×	×		×	×		×		×	×	×	×	×		×	×		×	×	×	×		×		×
Internal Logic & Coherence	Students will produce a text with a strong thesis, focus, or controlling idea.	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×		×		×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
	Students will provide relevant information to support the main focus of text.	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
	Students will demonstrate a command of the structure of paragraphs and sentences.	×	×	×		×	×		×	×		×	×	×	×	×		×	×			×	×		×		×	
	Student will develop a logical and appropriate coherent organization of text that includes an introduction, transitions, and conclusions/closure.	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×			×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×

© 2005 The Education Alliance at Brown University

| Broader Category | Descriptors | States | | |

Approaches to Writing Instruction for Adolescent English Language Learners

| Broader Category | Descriptors | States | | |

APPENDIX B

Review Protocol for Research Studies and Practice Literature

OMIT

REVIEW PROTOCOL FOR RESEARCH STUDIES AND PRACTICE LITERATURE PUBLICATIONS
APPROACHES TO WRITING INSTRUCTION FOR LATE-ADOLESCENT ELLS

1/15
POS

Author(s) _____ Year _____
Document Title _____

SOURCE OF STUDY/DOCUMENT

☐ Peer reviewed journal ☐ Journal ☐ Chapter in edited book ☐ Book

TARGET LEVEL & POPULATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

☐ High School Students
☐ Middle School Students
☐ Internat'l Foreign Students
☐ Higher Education
☐ ELLs in US / Canada (circle one)
☐ Other:_____

☐ **PRIMARY RES. STUDY** ☐ **SECONDARY RES. REVIEW** ☐ **PRACTICE LIT.**

RESEARCH STUDY DESCRIPTORS

Methodology

☐ Ethnography
☐ Case study
☐ Qualitative study (survey, interview, focus group)
☐ Action research
☐ Experimental study
☐ Quasi-experimental study
☐ Correlational study

Setting

☐ Classroom/other natural setting
☐ Laboratory/clinical setting
☐ Field setting

PRACTICE LITERATURE DESCRIPTORS

☐ Has theoretical/research foundation
☐ Includes teacher perspective
☐ Explicitly connects to practice
☐ Includes student perspective

TOPIC _____

CONNECTION TO STANDARDS CATEGORIES

☐ Genre
☐ Internal logic, coherence
☐ Knowledge of audience, language, culture, and politics
☐ Usage and syntactic correctness
☐ Writing process and strategy
☐ Stylistics

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX C
Annotated List of Core Texts

Adger, C. T., & Peyton, J. K. (1999). Enhancing the education of immigrant students in secondary school: Structural challenges and directions. In C. J. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 205-224). New York: Teachers College Press.

This chapter reports on various strategies employed by schools and districts participating in the Program in Immigrant Education, an effort aimed at improving immigrant students' academic achievement and access to postsecondary opportunities. The authors review the experiences of four project sites across the U.S and argue that the kinds of structural and organizational changes these sites undertake—creating partnerships within, between, and beyond schools—are necessary for schools to respond effectively to immigrant student needs.

Blanton, L. L. (1999). Classroom instruction and language minority students: On teaching to "smarter" readers and writers. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 119-142). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This chapter describes some of the problems ELLs confront in college preparatory writing instruction. After an exploration of problems in the areas of placement, curriculum, and pedagogical practices, the author makes observations and recommendations on ways to improve instruction through attention to critical literacy, assessment, power, and engagement of ELLs in academic writing.

Connections: Knowledge of audience, language, culture, and politics; Writing process and strategy

Faltis, C. J. (1999). Creating a new history. In C. J. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, & ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 1-9). New York: Teachers College Press.

This chapter contrasts the growing presence of bilingual secondary school students with the dearth of research on these students and related secondary school programs. The author suggests that this discrepancy arose because, to date, elementary school children have been the focus of language acquisition research, educational programs, and legal actions over educational rights. The chapter introduces a volume of new research that focuses attention on secondary school bilingual students.

Faltis, C. J., & Wolfe, P. M. (Eds.). (1999). *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school*. New York: Teachers College Press.

This edited volume contains ten chapters by various authors that address research, theory, and practice related to immigrant and language-minority ESL students in U.S. secondary schools. The chapters are organized in three sections: Students, Curricula, and Program Considerations.

Ferris, D. R. (1999b). One size does not fit all: Response and revision issues for immigrant student writers. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 143-157). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This chapter explores differences in the ways teachers respond to international students and immigrant ESL students. The author describes several studies on teacher response to ESL writers' work and presents suggestions for future research. Implications for responding to L2 writers especially students who have been in the U.S. for a long time, are presented.
Connections: Writing process and strategy; Error, usage, and syntactic correctness

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

This volume in the Michigan Series on Teaching Multilingual Writers offers a synthesis of research on error correction in writing classes, as well as suggestions for teachers of L2 writers. The chapters present arguments for and against error correction of L2 writing, along with recommendations on the knowledge teachers need of grammar, approaches to correction, and ways to teach grammar minilessons and self-editing strategies to help L2 writers effectively.
Connections: Writing process and strategy; Knowledge of audience, language, culture, and politics; Stylistics; Error, usage, and syntactic correctness

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This volume offers guidance for ESL writing teachers that is both practical and informed by research and theory. The authors provide an overview of issues in the field of second language writing, and go on to address reading-writing connections, syllabus design and lesson planning, text selection and task construction, teacher and peer feedback, treatment of error, assessment, and technology.
Connections: Genre; Writing process and strategy; Knowledge of audience; Error, usage, and syntactic correctness

Frodesen, J. (2001). Grammar in writing. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.) (pp. 233-248). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

This chapter summarizes controversies about the role of grammar in writing instruction for ELLs. The author provides guidelines and suggested activities for integrating grammar into writing instruction, including text-based exercises teachers can assign to help students identify and correct errors and develop editing strategies.
Connections: Error, usage, and syntactic correctness; Writing process and strategy

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.

This chapter presents a review of literature on the relationship between L2 reading and writing as discussed in research and how it informs practices. The author provides possible implications of studies on instructional practices in postsecondary settings, as well as future directions for research and practice.
Connections: Writing process and strategy

Harklau, L. (1999). The ESL learning environment in secondary school. In C. J. Faltis & P. M. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 42-60). New York: Teachers College Press.

This chapter offers an overview of the experiences of ELLs in secondary schools. Drawing on a three-year ethnographic study at a suburban northern California high school, the study focused on Chinese American immigrant students. ESL and mainstream classes are described in terms of spoken and written language use, with a focus on form, socialization, and tracking.
Connections: Error, usage, and syntactic correctness.

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

This paper advocates for a more prominent role for writing in classroom-based studies of second language acquisition, arguing that literacy is a central element in the communication and transmission of subject matter. The author compares spoken and written modalities in second language acquisition and offers implications for second language and writing research.

Harklau, L., Losey, K. M., & Siegal, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This edited volume contains 12 chapters by various authors who explore linguistic, cultural, and ethical issues related to college writing instruction for U.S.-educated linguistically diverse students. This book distinguishes between these long-term U.S. resident ELLs, termed "generation 1.5," and the internationally educated ESL students typically served by college ESL programs. The volume is organized in three parts: Students, Classrooms, and Programs.

Hartman, B., & Tarone, E. (1999). Preparation for college writing: Teachers talk about writing instruction for Southeast Asian American students in secondary school. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 99-118). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This chapter reports on two previous studies of Southeast Asian American students in secondary schools in Minneapolis and St. Paul whose writing skills did not improve from grade 8 to their first year in college. The follow-up study explores perspectives, instruction, and writing expectations of ESL and mainstream teachers of English and other content subjects in the schools in which the students were enrolled. Implications for teaching are presented.

Connections: Writing process and strategy; Internal logic and coherence; Error, usage, and syntactic correctness

Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). Taking stock of research and pedagogy in L2 writing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 597-613). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This chapter provides a survey of recent developments in research and pedagogy in L2 writing, discussing shifts in ways the field views L2 writers, their texts, and the contexts for their writing. Promising innovations in instruction are explored and future directions proposed.

Connections: Genre; Writing process and strategy; Error, usage, and syntactic correctness

Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This volume focuses on the need for explicit teaching of English grammar and lexicon to ELLs learning to write in the academic environment and provides research-based support for such teaching. The three sections focus on an overview of how to teach ELL writers essential writing skills , the components of English sentences and their functions, and the rhetorical features of text.

Connections: Genre; Writing process and strategy; Internal logic and coherence; Knowledge of audience, language, culture, and politics; Stylistics; Error, usage, and syntactic correctness

Hudelson, S. (2005). Taking on English writing in a bilingual program: Revisiting, reexamining, reconceptualizing the data. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 207-220). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This chapter revisits a study conducted in the early 1990s by Hudelson and Irene Serna on a group of Spanish-speaking elementary school students enrolled in a bilingual program. The study was informed by constructivism, whole language, and emergent literacy approaches. Here, the author reconsiders the research questions, data collection methods, and interpretations of her results in light of three recent areas of scholarship: (1) the Vygotskian sociocultural perspective; (2) critical theory that posits U.S. bilingual and ESL classrooms as sites of cultural, social, and political struggle; and (3) ethnographic case study.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

This text highlights the benefits of using genre-based pedagogy for teaching L2 learners how to write. An overview of the major theoretical perspectives concerning genre in the classroom is followed by classroom strategies for practitioners. Tasks and discussion questions are included in each chapter.

Connections: Genre; Internal logic and coherence; Knowledge of audience, language, culture, and politics; Stylistics

Johns, A. M. (1999). Opening our doors: Applying socioliterate approaches to language minority classrooms. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 191-209). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Johns advocates for a socioliterate approach to teaching L2 students, focusing on an understanding of how each person is shaped by the social nature of language and text. The chapter describes the goals of a socioliterate classroom and the functions and practices of such a classroom.
Connections: Genre; Writing process and strategy; Error, usage, and syntactic correctness

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

This edited volume includes chapters by several noted authors on a range of issues significant in teaching academic writing to postsecondary nonnative English-speaking students. Each of the chapters presents research and literature on a particular issue, with implications for teaching practice in the writing classrooms of postsecondary ELLs.

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

This article presents a brief history of L2 writing and literacy research and its connections to applied linguistics, L1 writing research, and ESL instruction. The author recommends three areas of research for the field: needs analysis of the literacy demands placed on L2 writers, literacy research related to identity issues, and longitudinal studies that reveal the transitions and shifts in literacy and identity development.
Connections: Usage and syntactic correctness

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

This chapter looks at the dynamics of the field of second language writing through an interdisciplinary perspective. The influence of composition studies and second language studies is discussed, as are several pedagogical approaches reflecting a range of understandings of the nature of writing. The author recommends a continuation and expansion of interdisciplinary connections.
Connections: Writing as process and strategy; Internal logic and coherence

Muchisky, D. & Tangren, N. (1999). Immigrant student performance in an academic intensive English program. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 211-234). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

The study compares placement scores and subsequent performance in an intensive English program for immigrant U.S. high school graduates and international students placed in the program as preparation for entrance to the regular freshman curriculum. The study highlights the differences between the oral and written performance of immigrant and international students in relation to prior learning and success at college-level learning.
Connections: Internal logic and coherence; Knowledge of audience, language, culture, politics

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.

This chapter explores the impact of technology on second language writers, second language writing processes and products, and second language writing instruction. Word processing, including its advantages and disadvantages and its effects on student attitudes, planning, and texts, is discussed. The author discusses electronic networks, suggesting implications for peer response feedback and for communication patterns.
Connections: Genre; Writing process and strategy; Error, usage, and syntactic correctness

Reynolds, D. W. (2005). Linguistic correlates of second language literacy development: Evidence from middle-grade learner essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 19-45.

This study compares linguistic fluency in the writing of middle-grade U.S. ESL and regular language arts students. Using measures of fluency defined in studies by Reppen (1994, 2001), the author finds that the writing of RLA students contains more information, displays more lexical diversity, and employs rhetorical structures more appropriately than the writing of ESL students. The author suggests that instruction in writing for different purposes and audiences can enhance the development of ESL students' linguistic fluency.
Connections: Error, usage, and syntactic correctness; Stylistics

Rodby, J. (1999). Contingent literacy: The social construction of writing for nonnative English-speaking college freshmen. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 45-60). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This chapter presents a participant-observer study conducted by three freshman composition instructors on the ways classroom context is involved in student writing development and the causes of success or failure of NNESs experiencing difficulty in English. Through case studies of two students, the author looks at the interdependence between literacy development, motivation, and social roles and contexts. Implications for the structure of educational programs are presented.
Connections: Writing process and strategy

Silva, T., & Brice, C. (2004). Research in teaching writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 70-106.

This chapter presents a review of the development in second language writing instruction over the last four years. Research and its implications for teaching practice are discussed. Research is categorized under several subtopics, including composing processes, written texts, assessment, voice and identity, peer interaction, and others.
Connections: Error, usage, and syntactic correctness

Valdes, G. (1999). Incipient bilingualism and the development of English language writing abilities in the secondary school. In C. J. Faltis & P. M. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 138-175). New York: Teachers College Press.

This chapter presents a case study of three Latino students in a California middle school with a view to examining the problems of newly arrived immigrants in acquiring academic writing skills in U.S. secondary schools. The studies examine the instruction the three students received and their development as writers in English. Suggestions are made for how mainstream teachers can work successfully with students new to English.
Connections: Writing process and strategy; Internal logic and coherence

APPENDIX D
Additional Resources

Adam, C., & Artemeva, N. (2002). Writing instruction in EAP classes. In A. Johns (Ed.), *Genre in the classroom: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 179-196). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns 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), 227-257.

Atkinson, D. (2001). Reflections and refractions on the *JSLW* special issue on voice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10,* 107-124.

Atkinson, D. (2003a). L2 writing in the post-process era: Introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 3-15.

Atkinson, D. (2003b). Writing and culture in the post-process era. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 49-63.

Atkinson, D. (2005). Situated qualitative research and second language writing. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 40-64). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Badger, R. & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal, 54*(2), 153-160.

Belcher, D., & Braine, G. (Eds.). (1995). *Academic writing in a second language.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for academic purposes.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Berlin, L.N. (2005). *Contextualizing college ESL classroom praxis: A participatory approach to effective instruction.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Biesenbach-Lucas, S., & Meloni, C. (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. (2000). E-mail and word processing in the ESL classroom: How the medium affects the message. *Language Learning and Technology, 5*(1), 135-165.

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,* 347-364.

Byrd, P., & Reid, J. (1998). *Grammar in the composition classroom: Essays on teaching ESL for college-bound students.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

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

Carson, J. G. (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. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Casanave, C. P. (2005). Uses of narrative in L1 writing research. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.). *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 17-32). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 267-296.

Chiang, Y. D., & Schmida, M. (2002). Language identity and language ownership: Linguistic conflicts of first-year university writing students. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Enriching ESOL pedagogy* (pp. 393-412). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cho, Y. (2003). Assessing writing: Are we bound by only one method? *Assessing Writing, 8,* 165-191.

Cohen, A. D., & Brooks-Carson, A. (2001). Research on direct versus translated writing processes: Students' strategies and their results. *Modern Language Journal, 85*(2), 169-188.

Comber, B., & Simpson, A. (2001). *Negotiating critical literacies in the classroom.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Conrad, S. M., & Goldstein, L. M. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher-written comments: Text, contexts, and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 147-179.

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. (1998). Theoretical perspectives on writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18,* 61-78.

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

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

Cumming, A. (2003). Experienced ESL/EFL writing instructors' conceptualizations of their teaching: Curriculum options and implications. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 71-92). New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Currie, P., & Cray, E. (2004). ESL literacy: Language practice or social practice? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(2), 111-132.

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

Dobson, B., & Feak, C. (2001). A cognitive modeling approach to teaching critique writing 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.

Duffy, J. (2000). Never hold a pencil: Rhetoric and relations in the concept of "preliteracy." *Written Communication, 17,* 224-257.

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.

Ellis, R., & Yuan, F. (2004). The effects of planning on fluency, complexity, and accuracy in SL narrative writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26,* 59-84.

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. 43-58). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Esmaelli, H. (2002). Integrated reading and writing tasks and ESL students' reading and writing performance. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 58*(4), 599-622.

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,* 235-249.

Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(2), 315 -339.

Ferris, D. (2003). 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,* 161-184.

Ferris, D., Pezone, S., Tade, C. R., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 6*(2), 155-182.

Fishman. S. M., & McCarthy, L. (2001). An ESL writer and her discipline-based professor: Making progress even when goals do not match. *Written Communication, 18,* 180-228.

Flowerdew, L. (2000). Using a genre-based framework to teach organizational structure in academic writing. *ELT Journal, 54*(4), 369-378.

Freeman, Y. S., & Freeman, D. E. (2002). *Closing the achievement gap: How to reach limited-formal-schooling and long-term English learners.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Frodesen, J., & Holton, 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.

Frodesen, J., & Starna, N. (1999). Distinguishing incipient and functional bilingual writers: Assessment and instructional insights gained through second-language writer profiles. In L. Harklau, K. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition* (pp. 61- 80). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fu, D. (2003). *An island of English: Teaching ESL in Chinatown.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

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

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

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: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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.

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.

Hamp-Lyons, L., & Kroll, B. (2001). Issues in ESL writing assessment: An overview. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Landmark essays on ESL writing* (pp. 225-240). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 31–38.

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

Haswell, R. (2005). Researching teacher evaluation of second language writing via prototype theory. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 105-120). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback in L1 writing. *Modern Language Journal, 80*(3), pp. 287-308.

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

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: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hinkel, E. (2005). Analyses of second language text and what can be learned from them. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 615-628). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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., & Pierson, H. (2000). Portfolios: Vehicles for authentic self-assessment. In G. Ekbatani & H. Pierson (Eds.), *Learner-directed assessment in ESL* (pp. 105-126). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

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

Hyland, K. (2002a). Authority and invisibility: authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*, 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. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 17-29.

Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(4), 693-722.

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.

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.

Johnston, B. (2003). *Values in English language teaching.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jordan, J. (2004). Feminist composition pedagogies in ESL tutoring. In B. Norton & A. Pavlenko (Eds.), *Gender and English language learners* (pp. 43-56). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Kasper, L. F. (2000). Content-based ESL instruction; Theoretical foundations and pedagogical applications. In L. F. Kasper, et al. (Eds.), *Content-based college ESL instruction* (pp. 3-25). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kasper, L. F. (2000). The internet and content-based college ESL instruction: Reading, writing, and research. In L. F. Kasper, et al. (Eds.), *Content-based college ESL instruction* (pp. 183-201). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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.

Kutz, E. (1998). Between students' language and academic discourse: Interlanguage as middle ground. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies* (pp. 37-50). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lam, W. S. E. (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.

Land, Jr., R. E., & Whitley, C. (1998). Evaluating second language essays in regular composition classes: Toward a pluralistic U.S. rhetoric. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies* (pp. 135-144). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Lee, H. K. (2004). A comparative study of the rise of word-processors in ESL writers' performance in paper-based and a computer-based writing test. *Assessing Writing, 9*(1), 4-26.

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

Lee, S. H. (2003). ESL learners' vocabulary use in writing and the effects of explicit vocabulary instruction. *System, 31,* 537-561.

Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(2), 235-260.

Leki, I. (2001). Hearing voices: L2 students' experiences in L2 writing courses. In Silva, T. & Matsuda, P.K. *On second language writing* (pp. 17-27). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Leki, I. & Carson, J. (1997). "Completely different worlds:" EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(1), 39-69.

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

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

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

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

Master, P. (2000). Grammar in content-based instruction. In L.F. Kasper, et al. (Eds.), *Content-based college ESL instruction* (pp. 93-106). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Matsuda, P. K. (1999). Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of labor. *College Composition and Communication, 50*(4), 699-721.

Matsuda, P. K. (2005). Historical inquiry in second language writing. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 33-48). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

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

Minett, A. J. (2004). Earth aches by midnight. In S. Bruce & B. Rafoth (Eds.), *ESL writers: A guide for writing center tutors* (pp. 60-70). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Boynton/Cook.

Mlynarczyk, R. W. (1998). *Conversations of the mind: The uses of journal writing for second-language learners.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *Teaching English as a Second Language – Electronic Journal, 6*(2), A-1.

Newell, G. E., 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.

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

Paltridge, B. (2001). *Genre and the language learning classroom.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Peregory, S. F. & Boyle, O. F. (2005). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A resource book for K–12 teachers* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Polio, C. (2003). Research on second language writing: An overview of what we investigate and how. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 35-65). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Raimes, A. (1998). Teaching writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18,* 142-167.

Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999a). Ethnographic approaches and methods in L2 writing research: A critical guide and review. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(1), 44-70.

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

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.

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

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,* 311-328.

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.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 23-30.

Rorschach, E. (2004). Five paragraph theme redux. *NWP Quarterly, 25*(1), 16-25.

Santos, T. (2005). The role of grammar in TESL and composition. In J. Frodesen & C. Holten (Eds.), *The power of context in language teaching and learning* (pp. 153-162). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

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.

Schlepegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Shultz, K. (2002). Looking across space and time: Reconceptualizing literacy learning in and out of school. *Research in the Teaching of English, 36,* 356-390.

Silva, T. (1997). On the ethical treatment of ESL writers. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(2), 359-363.

Silva, T. (2001). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Landmark essays on ESL writing* (pp. 191-208). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Silva, T. (2005). On the philosophical bases of inquiry in second language writing: Metaphysics, inquiry paradigms, and the intellectual zeitgeist. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.). *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 3-16). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Silva, T., Leki, I., & Carson, J. (1997). Broadening the perspective of mainstream composition studies. *Written Communication, 14,* 398-428.

Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2002). Literate at home but not at school: A Cambodian girl's journey from playwright to struggling writer. In G. Hull & K. Schultz (Eds.), *School's out: Bridging out-of-school literacies with classroom practice* (pp. 61-90). New York: Teachers College Press.

Smith, W. (2005). What can pragmatics tell us about developing writers? In J. Frodesen & C. Holten (Eds.), *The power of context in language teaching and learning* (pp. 163-172). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

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.

Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language. *Written Communication, 14,* 3-62.

Spack, R. (1998). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies* (pp. 85-104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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.

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

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

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.

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., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(2), 147-170.

Tuzi, F. (2004). The impact of e-feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers and Composition, 21*(2), 217-235.

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.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard 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.

Weissberg, R. (2005). Talking about writing: Cross-modality research and second language speaking-writing connections. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 93-104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wennerstrom, A. (2003). *Discourse analysis in the language classroom: Vol. 2. Genres of writing.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Wilhelm, K. H., & Rivers, M. (2001). An audience approach to EAP writing assessment: Learners, teachers, outsiders. *Applied Language Learning, 12*(2), 177-190.

Wolfe-Quintero, K., & Segade, G. (1999). University support for second-language writers across the curriculum. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition* (pp. 191-209). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wolfersberger, M. (2003). L1 to L2 writing process and strategy transfer: A look at lower proficiency writers. *Teaching English as a Second Language-Electronic Journal, 7*(2), A-6.

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.

Yamada, K. (2000). Helping novice EFL/ESL academic writers appreciate English textual patterns through summary writing. *JALT Journal, 22*(1), 196-208.

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.

Zamel, V. (1998). Strangers in academia: The experiences of faculty and ESL students across the curriculum. In V. Zamel & R. Spack (Eds.), *Negotiating academic literacies* (pp. 249-264). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Zhu, W. (2001). Interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(4), 251-276.

Zhu, W. (2001). Performing argumentative writing in English: Difficulties, processes, and strategies. *TESL Canada Journal, 19*(1), 334-50.

REFERENCES

Adger, C. T., & Peyton, J. K. (1999). Enhancing the education of immigrant students in secondary school: Structural challenges and directions. In C. J. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 205-224). New York: Teachers College Press.

Akyel, A., & Kamisli, S. (1997). Composing in first and second languages: Possible effects of EFL writing instruction. In K. Pogner (Ed.), *Writing: Text and interaction* (pp. 69-105). Odense Working Papers in Language and Communication, 14.

Blanton, L. L. (1999). Classroom instruction and language minority students: On teaching to "smarter" readers and writers. In L. Harklau, K. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition* (pp. 119-142). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Casanave, C. P. (2003). Looking ahead to more sociopolitically-oriented case study research in L2 writing scholarship (but should it be called "post-process"?). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 85-102.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of grammar.* Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Crosscultural aspects of second language writing.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Faltis, C. J. (1999). Creating a new history. In C. J. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, & ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 1-9). New York: Teachers College Press.

Faltis, C. J., & Wolfe, P. M. (Eds.). (1999). *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ferris, D. (1999a). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D. (1999b). One size does not fit all: Response and revision issues for immigrant student writers. In L. Harklau, K. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition* (pp. 143-157). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J .S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Frodesen, J. (2001). Grammar in writing. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 233-248). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Gonglewski, M. (2001). Hypermedia: Enriching L2 compositions. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Pedagogy of language learning in higher education: An introduction.* Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

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.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing.* London: Longman.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1997). The writing course. In K. Bardovi-Harlig & B. Hartford (Eds.), *Beyond methods: Components of second language teacher education* (pp. 172-197). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Harklau, L. (1999). The ESL learning environment in secondary school. In C. J. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 42-60). New York: Teachers College Press.

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

Harklau, L., Losey, K. M., & Siegal, M. (Eds.). (1999). *Generation 1.5 meets college composition.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Harklau, L., Siegal, M., & Losey, K. M. (1999). Linguistically diverse students and college writing: What is equitable and appropriate? In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition* (pp. 1-14). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hartman, B., & Tarone, E. (1999). Preparation for college writing: Teachers talk about writing instruction for Southeast Asian American students in secondary school. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition* (pp. 99-118). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Hawaii Department of Education. (1999). *Making Sense of Standards*. Honolulu: Author.

Hedgcock, J. (2005). Taking stock of research and pedagogy in L2 writing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 597-613). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hudelson, S. (2005). Taking on English writing in a bilingual program: Revisiting, reexamining, reconceptualizing the data. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 207-220). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Johns, A. (1997). *Text, role, and context: Developing academic literacies.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Johns, A. (1999). Opening our doors: Applying socioliterate approaches (SA) to language minority classrooms. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition* (pp. 159- 171). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kroll, B. (2001). Considerations for teaching and ESL/EFL writing course. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed., pp. 219-232). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

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

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

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

Lindfors, J. W. (1980). *Children's language and learning.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003a). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 65-83.

Matsuda, P. K. (2003b). 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.

Muchisky, D., & Tangren, N. (1999). Immigrant students performance in an academic intensive English program. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 211-234). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning 50*(3), 417-528.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pennington, M. C. (1996). The computer and the nonnative writer: A natural partnership. Creskill, NH: Hampton 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.

Pew Hispanic Center. (2005). *Hispanics: A people in motion.* Washington DC: Author.

Piaget, J. (1971). The theory of stages in cognitive development. In D.R. Green, M.P. Ford & G. P. Flamer (Eds). Measurement and Piaget. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Reid, J. (2001). Responding to ESL students' texts: The myths of appropriation. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Landmark essays on ESL writing* (pp. 209-224). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Reynolds, D. W. (2005). Linguistic correlates of second language literacy development: Evidence from middle-grade learner essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14,* 19-45.

Rodby, J. (1999). Contingent literacy: The social construction of writing for nonnative English-speaking college freshman. In L. Harklau, K. Losey, & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition* (pp. 45- 60). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rumberger, R., & Gándara, P. (2000). The schooling of English learners. In E. Burr, G. Hayward, B. Fuller, & M. Kirst (Eds.). *Crucial issues in California education.* University of California and Stanford University: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Rumbaut, R. G., & Ima, K. (1988). *The adaptation of Southeast Asian refugee youth: A comparative study.* Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Scarcella, R. (2003). *Academic English: A conceptual framework.* Santa Barbara, CA: The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Silva, T., & Brice, C. (2004). Research in teaching writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24,* 70-106.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 327-369.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(2), 111-122.

Valdes, G. (1998). The world outside and inside schools: Language and immigrant children. *Educational Researcher 27*(6), 4-18.

Valdes, G. (1999). Incipient bilingualism and the development of English language writing abilities in the secondary school. In C. Faltis & P. Wolfe (Eds.), *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, & ESL in the secondary school* (pp. 138-175). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

The Education Alliance at Brown University

Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory (LAB)

LAB DIRECTORS AND BOARD

Adeline Becker
Executive Director, The Education Alliance

Mary-Beth Fafard
Executive Director, The LAB at Brown University

Peter McWalters
Chair, LAB Board of Governors

Aminda Gentile
Vice Chair, LAB Board of Governors

BOARD MEMBERS

Rafael Aragunde Torres
Alice Carlan
Richard H. Cate
Charles F. Desmond
Edward J. Doherty
David Driscoll
Michele Forman
Susan A. Gendron
Noreen Michael
Richard P. Mills
Elizabeth Neale
Peter J. Negroni
Basan N. Nembirkow
Patrick C. Proctor, Sr.
Robin D. Rapaport
Betty J. Sternberg
Lyonel B. Tracy

222 Richmond Street
Suite 300
Providence, Rhode Island

Phone: 800-521-9550
Web: www.alliance.brown.edu