

Conclusion

In short, curriculum development involves at least the six major categories of curriculum activities listed in this article, which included a total of 15 curriculum facets and almost 100 individual subparts (see Figure 1). It is important to recognize that all of these categories of activities, facets, and subparts may interact with one another; that is, choices made with regard to one subpart will affect the choices that can be made with respect to other subparts. All of this can seem rather daunting if not framed clearly in terms of the tremendous benefits that can accrue from doing curriculum development.

See also: Assessment of First Language Proficiency; Communicative Language Teaching; Language Teaching Traditions: Second Language.

Bibliography

- Alderson C & Beretta A (eds.) (1992). *Evaluating second language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brindley G (1984). *Needs analysis and objective setting in the Adult Migrant Education Program*. Sydney, Australia: Adult Migrant Education Service.
- Brinton D M, Snow M A & Wesche M B (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York: Newbury House.
- Brown J D (1993). 'Social meaning in language curriculum, of language curriculum, and through language curriculum.' In Alatis J (ed.) *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1992*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. 117-134.
- Brown J D (1995a). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.
- Brown J D (1995b). 'Language program evaluation: Problems and solutions.' In Grabe W (ed.) *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, XV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 227-248.
- Brown J D (ed.) (1998). *New ways of classroom assessment*. Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Brown J D (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown J D (2004a). *Testing in language programs: A comprehensive guide to English language assessment*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Brown J D (2004b). 'Research methods for applied linguistics: Scope, characteristics, and standards.' In Davies A & Elder C (eds.) *The handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 476-500.
- Brown J D & Hudson T (2002). *Criterion-referenced language testing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown J D & Rodgers T (2002). *Doing second language research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Byrd P (ed.) (1995). *Material writer's guide*. New York: Heinle & Heinle.
- Dick W, Carey L & Carey J O (2000). *The systematic design of instruction* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson Educational.
- Iwai T, Kondo K, Lim D S J, Ray G, Shimizu H & Brown J D (1999). *Japanese Language Needs Assessment 1998-1999*. (NFLRC NetWork No. 13) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved April 30, 1999 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.lll.hawaii.edu/nflrc/NetWorks/NW13/>.
- Lynch B K (1995). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch B K (2003). *Language assessment and program evaluation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McDonough J & Shaw C (2003). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teachers guide* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Nunan D (1985). *Language teaching course design: Trends and issues*. Adelaide, Australia: National Curriculum Resource Centre.
- Pennington M C (1995). 'The teacher change cycle.' *TESOL Quarterly* 29(4), 705-731.
- Rea-Dickins P & Germaine K (1992). *Evaluation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rea-Dickins P & Germaine K P (eds.) (1998). *Managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Richards J C & Lockhart C (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Toffler A (1991). *Power shift: Knowledge, wealth, and violence at the edge of the 21st century*. New York: Bantam.
- Tomlinson B (1998). *Materials development for language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson B (ed.) (2002). *Developing materials for language teaching*. New York: Continuum International Publishing.
- van Ek J A & Trim J L M (1991). *Threshold level 1990: Modern languages*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: Council of Europe Publishing.
- White R V (1988). *The ELT curriculum: Design, innovation and management*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Widdowson H G (1981). English for specific purposes: Criteria for course design. In Selinker L, Tarone E & Hanzeli V (eds.) *English for academic and technical purposes: Studies in honor of Louis Trimble*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Witkin B R & Altschuld J W (1995). *Planning and conducting needs assessments*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Second Language Writing

T Silva, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Context

In light of increasing globalization and written electronic communication, worldwide interest in second language writing (L2W) has increased rapidly during the past 25 years. L2W instruction is available from kindergarten through graduate school and beyond.

However, while work on L2W and writing instruction is now being done throughout the world, across educational levels, and in a number of languages, the majority of work to this point has been done in North America (due to the existence of required composition courses) at the college level (where research is most viable) in English (due to its dominant position in the world). This bias will be reflected in what follows. Fortunately, scholarship on L2W and writing instruction is growing rapidly in Europe, Asia, Australia, and elsewhere; thus, it can be expected that in the next 25 years, L2W and writing scholarship will become truly international in scope.

Definitions

L2W will be defined here as writing done in a language other than one's mother tongue. The term 'second language' will encompass both second (writing in a context in which the target language is dominant) and foreign languages (writing in a context where the target language is not dominant); 'writing' will refer to composing written text (as opposed to orthography). In a more general sense, L2W will be seen as purposeful and contextualized communicative interaction that involves both the construction and the transmission of knowledge; its basic elements are the writer, the reader, text, and context, and the interaction of these elements in authentic settings.

History

L2W studies has grown primarily out of work done in applied linguistics and composition studies. A brief account of the recent history of composition studies and applied linguistics will be offered to provide context for the examination of the history of L2W.

Composition Studies

The roots of contemporary composition studies in North America, defined as the study and teaching of writing, can be traced back to the beginning of the 19th century. The model for first-year composition

was a course that focused on reading and writing about the canonical literary works of the day. What students were taught about grammar, style, and organization, which were the staples of this course, was derived from these works.

Early in the 20th century, resistance to the belletristic focus and the imposition of the literary canon on writing courses began to mount. This resistance promoted student self-expression in writing, the social utility of writing courses, and the preparation of students to function in a democratic society.

With the advance of the 20th century, the division between literary scholarship and the teaching of writing in English departments grew wider. The increasing independence of the discipline of composition studies was reflected in its professionalization, examples of which are the founding of a professional organization and a scholarly journal. Other manifestations of the maturing of the field included advocacy for writing teachers and program administrators, the incorporation of knowledge from other disciplines, and the expansion of different avenues of inquiry (specifically, a move toward empirical research in composition).

The second half of the century brought even greater independence and change. The 1960s saw the return of classical rhetoric, the beginning of empirical study of composing processes, and an increased focus on the notion of a writer's authentic voice. The 1970s brought the notion of writing as a cognitive process and its application in both teaching and research, the recognition of student diversity in language and culture, the distinction between home and school language, and the encouragement of teachers outside of composition studies to give serious attention to teaching students how to write in their own disciplines.

In the 1980s, writing began to be seen as a socio-cultural as well as a cognitive process and as an interdisciplinary field. Rhetoric became epistemic, involved in creating as well as transmitting knowledge, and the notion of discourse communities strongly took hold. The process of professionalization continued with the proliferation of graduate programs in composition studies, the establishment of a national center in the United States for the study of writing, the production of a comprehensive bibliography of composition scholarship, and an increase in outlets for publication overall. Tension between literature and composition faculty in U.S. departments of English also grew. Composition studies had become overtly political and had begun to inquire seriously into issues such as race, class, and gender.

The 1990s saw growing interest in postmodernism and cultural studies, social constructivist thought, and historical and archival studies of the field, all a function of an increasingly reflective attitude among composition professionals. Also foregrounded were longitudinal empirical research, a critique of composing process research and pedagogy, an increased focus on diversity with regard to language and cultural issues, and an explosion of interest in the use of computers and related technologies.

Applied Linguistics

It can be argued that applied linguistics has been around for hundreds of years. However, most commentators place the birth of contemporary applied linguistics, at least in North America, near the middle of the 20th century, particularly in 1941, with the founding of English language institutes and the establishment of applied linguistics journals. The motivation for all of this focus on language research was to a great extent the need for language training for military personnel in World War II. The theory that followed was a blend of American structuralist linguistics and behaviorist psychology; its manifestations, among other things were contrastive analysis, instruction based on the notion of operant conditioning, and discrete point language testing.

In the 1950s, applied linguistics' primary focus remained on L2 instruction, although there was some work on literacy and language arts. This decade also saw the appearance of graduate programs in and centers for applied linguistics. In addition to work on language teaching, the 1960s brought increased interest in language assessment, language policy, and the incipient research area of second language acquisition. The theoretical basis of applied linguistics began to move from structuralism to generative grammar, which would influence the field only indirectly via psycholinguistic inquiry that would later spawn the notion of interlanguage and studies in second language acquisition. This decade also saw the establishment of national and international professional applied linguistics organizations.

In the 1970s, while the foci of the 1960s continued, there was growth and interest in such areas as bi- and multilingualism, the rights of linguistic minorities, language policy and planning, and teacher training. In addition, new theoretical orientations that continue to the present day were put forward. These orientations included anthropological and sociological ideas that led ultimately to the influential notion of communicative competence. This work later manifested itself in the functional analysis of discourse, the development of courses in language for specific purposes, and the linguistic study of genre.

Applied linguistics in the 1980s began to go far beyond focusing on L2 learning and pulling work from only linguistics, psychology, and education. New foci included studying language use in academic and other professional settings, translation, lexicography, language and technology, and corpus linguistics; new disciplinary areas of influence were anthropology, sociology, political science, public administration, and English studies, particularly composition, rhetoric, and literary theory.

The 1990s and the first years of the new millennium brought even further expansion of work in applied linguistics, especially in terms of language learning and teaching (e.g., language awareness, attention and learning, task- and content-based learning, teacher/action research), in the critical appraisal of previous and current work (e.g., in language analysis, pedagogy, and rights), in ethical issues in language teaching and assessment, and in the viewing of applied linguistics as a discipline that mediates between research and practice.

Second Language Writing

Although developments in L2W have been greatly influenced by work in composition studies and applied linguistics, the unique contexts of L2W require distinct perspectives, models, and practices. In the recent history of L2W, a number of approaches or orientations (more or less specific to L2W) have vied for the attention of L2W professionals. These approaches or traditions will be addressed in order of their appearance on the L2W stage.

Controlled Composition

Controlled composition can be seen as an offshoot of the audiolingual approach to language teaching in that it shares two of its central tenets: the idea that language is speech (from structural linguistics) and that learning is habit formation (from behaviorist psychology). Thus, it is not difficult to understand why, within this tradition, writing is regarded essentially as reinforcement for oral habits and as a secondary concern.

In the controlled composition classroom, the primary focus is on formal accuracy. The teacher employs a controlled program of systematic habit formation in an attempt to avoid errors (presumed to be related to first language interference) and to reinforce appropriate second language behavior. Practice with previously learned discrete units of language is privileged over concerns about ideas, organization, and style; imitation and manipulation of carefully constructed and graded model passages are the central activities. Overall, in the controlled composition tradition, writing functions as a service activity, reinforcing

other language skills. The goal of writing instruction is habit formation. Students manipulate familiar language structures; the teacher is an editor privileging linguistic features over ideas. The text is seen as a collection of vocabulary or sentence patterns; there is negligible concern for audience or purpose.

Linguistic analysis dominated the research in this tradition and is still a major focus, though it has become more functional and less formal over the years. Early work in the linguistic analysis of second language writers' texts involved contrastive analysis (comparing the grammatical structures of two languages, for example, Spanish and English, in an attempt to ascertain structural differences, which were believed to pose the greatest problems for second language writers) and error analysis (locating, counting, and categorizing errors to discern patterns of error in written texts). Formal features examined include primarily lexical and syntactic phenomena; features such as number of words per t-unit and clause structures have been used to measure fluency, accuracy, and complexity in second language writers' texts.

Current Traditional Rhetoric

Increasing awareness of second language writers' need to produce extended written texts lead to the realization that there was more to writing than constructing grammatical sentences. The result of this realization was the ESL version of current traditional rhetoric (based on contemporary work in composition studies that focused on the written product, the analysis and classification of discourse, usage, and style), which emphasized the importance of organization above the sentence level. This approach owes much to the notion of contrastive rhetoric – the notion that writers' different cultural and linguistic backgrounds will be reflected in their rhetoric, with rhetoric typically (implicitly) seen as primarily a matter of textual structure. Thus, first language interference was believed to extend beyond the sentence to paragraphs and longer stretches of text.

The basic concern in this tradition was the logical construction and arrangement of discourse forms. Of primary interest, especially in the early years, was the paragraph, where the focus is on its elements (for example, topic sentences) as well as options for its development (for example, comparison and contrast). Another important concern was essay development, actually an extrapolation of paragraph principles to complete texts. This involved larger structural entities (for example, introductions) and organizational patterns or modes (for example, exposition).

Classroom procedures associated with this tradition have tended to focus students' attention primarily on form. At the most basic level, students are

asked to choose among alternative sentences within the context of a provided paragraph or text. At a higher level, learners are instructed to read and analyze a model text and then apply the knowledge gleaned from this analysis to a parallel piece of original writing. At their most complex, exercises require students (already given a topic to write on) to list and group relevant facts, develop topic and supporting sentences on the basis of these facts, put together an outline, and compose a text of their own.

In short, this tradition sees writing as basically a matter of arranging sentences and paragraphs into particular patterns; learning to write requires developing skills in identifying, internalizing, and producing these patterns. The writer uses provided or self-generated data to fill out a pattern; thus, the reader is not confused by an unfamiliar pattern of expression. The text is made up of increasingly complex discourse structures (that is, sentences, paragraphs, sections, and so on), each embedded in the next largest form; and all of this takes place within an academic context, wherein the instructor's evaluation is assumed to reflect a community of educated native speakers.

By far, the largest single research focus in this tradition has been contrastive rhetoric. The focus of this work has been on characterizing how first language "cultural thought patterns" are reflected in second language writers' texts, how some cultures put the responsibility for successful written communication on the writer and others on the reader, and how differences between 'collectivist' and 'individualist' tendencies manifest themselves in L2W. The most commonly compared linguistic or cultural backgrounds have been Arabic, Chinese, English, Japanese, and Spanish. Contrastive rhetoric has been and is still a controversial issue, with some of its critics arguing that the notion can lead to stereotypes and others suggesting that the differences seen between groups are a matter of development rather than transfer. A number of other specific rhetorical features have been addressed in the literature. These include hedging, indirectness, reader orientation, introductions, metadiscourse, rhetorical preferences, and voice.

The Process Approach

Dissatisfaction with controlled composition and current traditional rhetoric, due to the belief that neither adequately engendered thought or its expression and to their perceived linearity and prescriptivism, paved the way for the process approach, another import from mainstream composition studies. This tradition sees the composing process as a recursive, exploratory, and generative process wherein ideas are discovered and meaning made. It is believed that guidance

through and intervention in the process was preferable to the imposition of organizational patterns or syntactic or lexical constraints and that, where there is a need or desire to communicate, content will determine form to convey meaning successfully.

In the classroom, the process tradition calls for providing and maintaining a positive, encouraging, and collaborative workshop environment and for providing ample time and minimal interference to allow students to work through their composing processes. The objective is to help students develop viable strategies for getting started, drafting, revising, and editing. From a process perspective, then, writing is a complex, recursive, and creative process that is very similar in its general outlines for first and second language writers; learning to write requires the development of an efficient and effective composing process. The writer is engaged in the discovery and expression of meaning; the reader is engaged in interpreting that intended meaning. The product (that is, the written text) is a secondary concern, whose form is a function of its content and purpose. In the process tradition, it is up to the writer to identify a task and an audience and to make the response to the former meet the needs of the latter.

The advent of the process approach prompted research on composing that focuses on the person (that is, the writer) and the process (that is, strategies) involved in writing. Many variables affecting second language writers have been identified and addressed in the literature. The second language writer has been looked at primarily in terms of the extent of transfer of first language proficiency or writing ability to L2W and the relationship between general second language proficiency and L2W ability. Also of interest are the possible connection between L2W ability and first language writing experience and expertise, writing apprehension, gender, learning style, language and instructional background, the second language writer's perceptions with regard to writing and writing instruction, and the amount of reading (in both first and second languages) a second language writer engages in. Research in this area has gone from seeing writer variables as simple and relatively discrete to very complex and greatly intertwined.

There is also a substantive body of scholarship on second language writers' composing processes. Predominant in this area are general composing process studies, that is, research that looks at L2W processes holistically. There are also studies that focus on particular subprocesses and elements of the composing process. The most common of these are studies of planning, drafting, revising, and editing. However, a number of other elements have also been examined. These include translating, backtracking, formulating,

monitoring, the use of the first language when writing in the second, language switching, and the use of dictionaries and background texts when composing.

English for Academic Purposes

Perceiving theoretical and practical problems and omissions with regard to the process approach, critics suggested that the emphasis in ESL composition research and instruction be shifted from the writer to the reader, in particular academic and professional discourse communities. Most of the aforementioned criticism of the process approach came from proponents of an English for academic purposes orientation wanting to consider more seriously issues such as developing schemata for academic discourse, deriving insights from research on contrastive rhetoric, understanding what constitutes realistic preparation for academic work, learning about the nature of high-stakes academic writing tasks, giving students a better idea of how university writing is evaluated, and, generally, understanding the sociocultural context of academic writing.

Instruction in writing English for academic purposes focuses primarily on academic discourse genres and the range and nature of academic writing tasks. This instruction is meant to help students work successfully within the academic context. The instructional methodology suggested aims at recreating, as well as possible, the conditions under which actual university writing takes place and involves closely examining and analyzing academic discourse genres and writing task specifications; selecting and intensively studying materials appropriate for a given task; evaluating, screening, synthesizing, and organizing relevant information from these sources; and presenting these data in a form acceptable to the academy.

To sum up, in the English for academic purposes tradition, the emphasis is on the production of texts that will be acceptable at English-medium institutions of higher education; learning to write is part of becoming socialized into the academic community. The writer is pragmatic and interested primarily in meeting the standards necessary for academic success; the reader is a player in the academic community who has clear and specific expectations for academic discourse. The text is viewed as a more or less conventional response to a particular writing task that fits a recognizable genre; the context is the academic discourse community. Although the English for academic purposes tradition has grown and prospered, some have questioned its emphasis on writing in various disciplines (particularly in scientific and technical fields), pointing out the difficulty in learning and teaching the discourses of fields unfamiliar to L2W instructors.

Research in writing English for academic purposes has looked primarily at the issues of audience and, more recently, genre. The audience research has focused primarily on one particular readership: the academic discourse community, in particular, college and university professors and, to a lesser extent, editors of scholarly journals. This research has been performed primarily through surveys and addresses academics' beliefs, practices, expectations, reactions with regard to errors, literacy skills, and writing problems. The question of whether and how students should be initiated into the academic discourse community has also been debated.

In recent years, the study of genre in L2W has become very popular. In addition to general treatments of genre, many studies of particular written genres have appeared. Some address general types or modes of writing, such as narrative, descriptive, and argumentative writing as well as personal, academic, business, technical, and legal texts. A number of more specific text types addressed include summaries, essay examinations, laboratory reports, research papers, theses, dissertations, research articles, experimental research reports, and letters of reference.

Recent Trends

Recent years have seen the development of a number of new approaches, or perhaps it would be better to say extensions of prior orientations and traditions. These include a belletristic orientation focused on responding to literary texts and on reading and writing connections, an orientation based on work in critical theory and cultural studies, focusing explicitly on political and ideological matters, a genre orientation based on text analysis and work in corpus linguistics, and an orientation focused on general inquiry and rhetorical principles.

Current Status

For a long time (until the 1990s or so), L2W was primarily pedagogical in nature, borrowing, often uncritically, from composition studies and applied linguistics, working in their shadows, so to speak. However, in recent years, L2W has become a much more independent discipline in terms of mapping out its philosophical bases, theories, modes of inquiry, politics, and programmatic issues, as well as pedagogy.

Philosophy

Applied linguistics tends toward a positivist inquiry paradigm, with its realist ontology, objectivist epistemology, and empirical and manipulative methodology. It values certain truth and adopts a modernist

orientation. Composition studies tend toward a relativistic paradigm, with its constructivist ontology, subjectivist epistemology, and hermeneutic methodology. It values consensus and adopts a postmodern orientation. The philosophical basis for inquiry in L2W studies reflects its lineage in the sense that it is a blend of the ideologies and inquiry paradigms of applied linguistics and composition studies. L2W studies favor a humble and pragmatic rationalism, with a modified realist ontology, an interactionist epistemology, and a multimodal methodology. It values contingent knowledge and adopts an orientation that incorporates elements of both modernism (e.g., progress, optimism, rationality) and postmodernism (e.g., relative and contingent knowledge, difference).

Theory

Applied linguistics theory grows primarily from linguistics; composition studies grow from rhetoric. Incipient L2W models and theories, in addition to drawing from these areas, look to psychological, sociological, educational, and other disciplines, and while there currently exists no well-developed theory of L2W, there seems to be a consensus that a such a theory would see L2W and first language writing as saliently different; address both the individual (cognitive) and social aspects of L2W; include consideration of second language writers' personal characteristics, composing processes, and written texts; be reasonably comprehensive and internally consistent; be informed by relevant work in relevant neighboring disciplines, and be sensitive to cultural, linguistic, and experiential differences of individuals and societies.

Politics

Current explicit commentary on political matters has its roots in work done in the early to mid-1990s. There were claims that L1 writing tended toward the ideological and L2 writing tended toward the pragmatic, and L2W professionals were warned against the uncritical acceptance of L1 writing ideology. In response to this, it was suggested that all forms of ESL instruction were political, that neutrality was a myth, and that a pragmatic position supports the status quo. It was also argued that L2 writing pedagogy is just as ideologically charged as L1 writing pedagogy, though not as openly articulated or discussed. In response came a denial of a necessary connection between pragmatism and an accommodationist ideology and a challenge to ideologist discourse. There was a call for adoption of critical theory and pedagogy, a critical pragmatism, and a subsequent critique of critical approaches to L2W.

A smaller cluster of work at the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century looked at ideology from a cultural perspective. It was claimed that L1 composition's principles and practices reflect an individualist ideology and that applying them with students whose culture may not share this ideology is problematic. In response, it was argued that, despite cross-cultural differences, such notions as voice, peer review, critical thinking, and textual ownership were not inherently individualistic. Other areas addressed included language bigotry in mainstream composition classes against speakers of nonprestige varieties of English; the role of power in the evaluation of L2 students' writing; L2W theory in terms of research methodology, discourse style, and gender sensitivity; the politics of textual production and consumption; how pedagogical approaches can help second language writers position themselves in vernacular and academic communities; strategies for advocating for ESL student support services; and the perceived efficacy of L2W instruction.

Research

Research in applied linguistics is typically empirical; research in composition studies is primarily hermeneutic. L2W studies employ both hermeneutic (narrative, historical, philosophical) and empirical (qualitative and quantitative) research methods to investigate both basic (the nature of the phenomenon of L2W) and applied (L2W instruction) problems.

In recent years, L2W research, has become better informed, theoretically and methodologically, has developed greater depth and breadth, has begun to use more mixed designs, and has gone from simple to more complex perspectives, toward a broad-based social understanding and toward greater inclusivity.

Specifically, its basic research foci have included writer characteristics (L2 writing ability, L2 proficiency, L2 writer background, and L1 influence on L2 writing), composing processes (planning, thinking, translation, rereading, revising, and editing), and written text (genre, organization, L2 text quality, text length, syntax, lexis, and errors). Its applied research foci have included content-based instruction, voice/identity, reading and writing, computers and technology, grammar and vocabulary, peer interaction, plagiarism, teacher response, literature, and film.

Programmatic Issues

Programmatic issues in L2W and writing instruction have been addressed mainly in three areas: assessment, instructional contexts, and instructional

Assessment

Basic issues in assessment have included discussions of direct vs. indirect/objective writing tests; holistic, analytic, and primary trait rating; rater training; raters with or without experience with L2 writers; validity; reliability; and variables such as linguistic and rhetorical elements, subject matter knowledge, cultural expectations, nationality, reading comprehension, and amount of L1/L2 reading.

Instructional Contexts

Instructional contexts are discussed in terms of level (elementary, secondary, undergraduate, and graduate), aim (specific purposes vs. general categories), foci (composing processes, genre, grammar, and content), and type (basic/remedial, bilingual, immersion, submersion, sheltered L2, mainstream composition, cross-cultural, adjunct, writing across the curriculum, intensive L2 programs, and writing centers).

Instructional Topics

The main instructional topics that have been addressed include audience; cohesion; collaboration; computers and technology; conferences; content-based instruction; conventions; dictionary use; drafting; editing; error correction; freewriting; grading; grammar instruction; journals; literature; model/sample texts, peer review/response/evaluation/tutoring; plagiarism; planning/invention; portfolios; reading assignments; reading and writing; reformulation; research papers; sentence combining; sequenced writing assignments; teacher response; writing from sources; revising strategies; text analysis; topics/tasks/themes; translation; tutoring/writing centers; video/film; vocabulary; and workshops.

Future Directions

L2W seems to be moving toward a substantial treatment of three related issues: (inter)disciplinarity, professionalization, and inclusivity.

(Inter)disciplinarity

The field of L2W studies has come to view its parent disciplines neither as places to go for authoritative answers to its questions nor as role models to be emulated or imitated, but as areas with their own interests and agendas, strengths and weaknesses, and issues and problems that generate information and insights for L2 writing professionals to consider. While continuing to be sensitive to developments in other disciplines, the field of L2 writing has matured to the point of being able to resist the temptation to

try to import easy answers from other disciplines into the complex contexts of L2 writing. In addition, L2W studies have begun to draw on ideas from a number of other disciplines, e.g., psychology, sociology, and education.

Professionalization

The field of L2W studies has achieved a certain amount of independence and a distinct identity. It has a journal devoted exclusively to work in the area, professional conferences and symposia, book series, monographs, collections, and increased recognition in neighboring disciplines. However, it faces a number of challenges. One is continuity. It is the case that many specialists in the area do not work in Ph.D.-offering units, which prompts questions about where the next generation of L2W professionals will come from. Cutbacks in funding at research universities also make L2W studies vulnerable on this account.

To meet this challenge, it will be necessary for research universities with large numbers of second language writers in their graduate schools to recognize the need to hire full-time, tenure-track L2W specialists to run writing support programs and prepare teachers to staff these programs. It will also be necessary for Ph.D. programs in applied linguistics/second language studies and composition studies to see L2W as a viable research area and to accommodate students wishing to perform doctoral research in this area. That is, there will be a need for interdisciplinary cooperation and collaboration.

Inclusivity

As previously mentioned, currently, the majority of work done in L2W is carried out in North America with precollegiate and undergraduate college writers. For L2W studies to thrive, it will be necessary to encourage the expansion of L2W research, to look more and more closely at, for example, L2W in English outside of North America, in other second/foreign languages, in elementary and secondary schools, in bilingual education programs, with Deaf and hard-of-hearing students, in adult education programs, at the graduate level, and in the workplace.

Broadening the scope of L2W scholarship will require the efforts of scholars, publishers, and editors. Scholars will need to adopt a more global view, to promote a basic understanding of writing in general and L2W, to increase collaboration between specialists in North America and elsewhere, and to be willing to hold and attend conferences outside of North America.

Publishers and editors will need to create more outlets for publication outside of North America, to

increase the accessibility of L2 writing scholarship, to distribute L2 writing research on-line, to be willing to publish research in languages other than English, and to start or continue to provide free or reduced-price copies (hard or electronic) of publications where prices are prohibitive.

Conclusion

The field of L2W studies is clearly becoming a mature discipline – it has begun to reflect on its history, reexamine its basic assumptions about L2W and writing instruction, synthesize research, and build models and theories. It is in transition from a tradition that sees L2W practitioners as consumers of imported instructional approaches and their accompanying research programs and ideologies to experienced and seasoned professionals with an understanding of the nature of L2W and a familiarity with relevant research from within and outside the field, who can reflect critically on knowledge of theory and on the results of inquiry from any relevant discipline so that they can develop their own models and theories, form their own research agendas, and, in their role as teachers, decide for themselves what makes sense for their students, for their objectives and teaching styles, and for their political, instructional, and classroom contexts.

See also: Applied Linguistics: Overview and History; Cohesion and Coherence: Linguistic Approaches; Discourse Studies: Second Language; Genre and Genre Analysis; Languages for Specific Purposes; Rhetorical Structure Theory; Second and Foreign Language Learning and Teaching; Second Language Studies: Curriculum Development; Style; Text and Text Analysis; Writing and Cognition.

Bibliography

- Belcher D & Braine G (eds.) (1995). *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Belcher D & Hirvela A (eds.) (2001). *Linking literacies: Perspectives on L2 reading-writing connections*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Blanton L L & Kroll B (eds.) (2002). *ESL composition tales: Reflections on teaching*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Brauer G (ed.) (2000). *Writing across languages*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.
- Campbell C (1998). *Teaching second-language writing: Interacting with text*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinle & Heinle.
- Carson J & Leki I (eds.) (1993). *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.