

# **Writing Theory and Practice in the Second Language Classroom: A Selected Annotated Bibliography**

**Torild Homstad &  
Helga Thorson**

**for 1993-94 Grant Recipients  
Karen Grimstad and Ray Wakefield  
Professors, Department of German, Scandinavian, and Dutch**

**Technical Report Series  
No. 8 ♦ 1994**

**Lillian Bridwell-Bowles,  
Series Editor**

# **Writing Theory and Practice in the Second Language Classroom: A Selected Annotated Bibliography**

**Torild Homstad &  
Helga Thorson**

**for 1993-94 Grant Recipients  
Karen Grimstad and Ray Wakefield  
Professors, Department of German, Scandinavian, and Dutch**

**Technical Report Series  
No. 8 ♦ 1994**

**Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Series Editor  
Mark Olson, Editor**

**THE CENTER FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES OF WRITING**

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
227 LIND HALL  
207 CHURCH STREET S.E.  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455

- Director:** Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Associate Professor, English
- Research Assistants:** Elaine Cullen, Kathleen Sheerin Devore, Michael Kuhne, Kimberly Lynch, Pamela Olano, Mark Olson
- Policy Council:** Terence Collins, Professor, General College; Jeffrey Derby, Assistant Professor, Chemical Engineering, Institute of Technology; Emily Hoover, Associate Professor, Horticultural Science; Gerald Rinehart, Director of Undergraduate Studies, Carlson School of Management; Ray Wakefield, Associate Professor, German, Scandinavian, and Dutch.
- Faculty Affiliates:** Chris Anson, Professor, English, Director of Program in Composition and Communication; Lisa Albrecht, Associate Professor, General College; Robert L. Brown, Associate Professor, English; Ann Hill Duin, Associate Professor, Rhetoric; Donald Ross, Professor, English; Geoffrey Sirc, Associate Professor, General College; Billie Wahlstrom, Professor, Rhetoric.

Copyright © 1994 by The Board of Regents, University of Minnesota  
All Rights Reserved

ISBN 1-881221-17-2

The University of Minnesota is committed to the policy that all personnel shall have equal access to its programs, facilities, and employment without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

## **Preface**

In the 1993-94 academic year, members of the Department of German, Scandinavian, and Dutch embarked on a Center-sponsored research project investigating the role of writing in second language acquisition. As Torild Homstad and Helga Thorson point out in their introduction to this bibliography, writing has long been considered a “support skill” for learning grammar in foreign language instruction. Their research looked beyond traditional writing practices in second language acquisition for new instructional possibilities.

One aspect of the project was to search current literature in composition studies, foreign language instruction, and English as a Second Language. Their annotations show that a number of theorists and practitioners in second language instruction are pushing the boundaries of standard language instruction practices by adapting methods familiar to composition studies. For example, foreign language instructors are stressing the “process” approach to writing using and “writing-to-learn” strategies.

Homstad and Thorson offer a particularly helpful introduction to the wide range of opinions and practices concerning writing among foreign language instructors. For those engaged in foreign language and English as a Second Language instruction, the bibliography annotates articles concerned with both theoretical and practical aspects of writing instruction. The bibliography is also helpful for introducing composition theorists and practitioners to new sites for thinking about literacy.

The Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing annually funds research projects by University of Minnesota faculty to study any of the following topics:

- characteristics of writing across the University’s curriculum;

- status reports on students' writing ability at the University;
- the connections between writing and learning in all fields;
- the characteristics of writing beyond the academy;
- the effects of ethnicity, race, class, and gender on writing; and
- curricular reform through writing.

We publish informal reports on the projects, such as this bibliography by Homstad and Thorson, available in the form of technical reports. More elaborate reports and extended discussions of Center grant recipients' works are available through our monograph series.

One of the Center's goals is to disseminate the results of these research projects as broadly as possible within the University community and on a national level. We encourage discussion of Torild Homstad and Helga Thorson's annotations and interpretations of the literature currently available on using writing in the foreign language classroom. We invite you to contact the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing for information about other publications or Center activities.

Lillian Bridwell-Bowles, Series Editor  
Mark Olson, Editor  
September 1994

## **Writing Theory and Practice in the Second Language Classroom: A Selected Annotated Bibliography**

This annotated bibliography on second language writing provides an overview of some of the major ideas and resources concerning the role of writing in the second language classroom. It contains both “hands-on” material directly applicable to the language classroom and articles, which trace the historical and theoretical development of writing pedagogy in second language education. The bibliography is part of a grant funded by the Center for the Interdisciplinary Studies of Writing at the University of Minnesota to investigate ways in which writing-to-learn activities can most effectively be used in the foreign language (FL) classroom.

As theories of second language education have evolved from the grammar-translation to the audio-lingual method to the more communicative approaches that are commonly used today, ideas about how language proficiency develops and ought to be taught have also changed. Writing has commonly been viewed as a support skill, used to reinforce the acquisition of grammar, as in the grammar-translation method, or to support the memorization of CO1TeCt language structures, as in the audio-lingual method. Until recently, even the communicative approaches, with their emphasis on oral proficiency, have tended to de-emphasize writing. But ideas from writing-to-learn, writing across the curriculum, and writing for academic purposes movements in composition and English as a Second Language (ESL) have all had an impact on thinking about the place of writing in second language education.

There is ample evidence to indicate the ineffectiveness of micro-correcting student writing in developing language competencies. More research needs to be done on how



basic second language literacy can best be developed by those who are already literate in a first language. Until we know more about how second language students learn to write correctly, actual classroom practices will be slow to change.

Although the research on writing originally done in composition studies forms the basis for what is happening in second language writing research, we have, for the most part, not included these former studies in our bibliography. Most of the current research in second language writing has been conducted by ESL professionals; however, we also found many practical articles illustrating the uses of writing in FL, and ESL classrooms. We have included theoretical and historical articles so teachers can think about their own vision of language teaching and place it in a theoretical perspective, along with “hands-on” articles that demonstrate effective uses of writing in actual foreign language classes. For example, a couple of authors indicate how the appropriate and creative use of word processing may be a powerful tool in teaching second language writing. However, there are also those who are still highly skeptical about the importance of writing in foreign language curriculum; they are represented by three articles in this bibliography.

Much exciting and important work is yet to be done in exploring the relationship of the four modalities (listening, reading, speaking, and writing) to each other in second language acquisition, as well as determining the relationship between first and second language literacy. Our goal in preparing this annotated bibliography has been to learn more about the theory and practice of writing pedagogy in order to make better use of it in our own teaching as well as to make these ideas and resources available to our colleagues. Although research on writing in second language acquisition is a relatively new field, we found so much exciting material that it was difficult to decide where we

should stop adding citations. We hope that our readers will find these resources equally thought-provoking and inspiring.

## Bibliography

Anson, Chris M., et al. *Scenarios for Teaching Writing: Contexts for Discussion and Reflective Practice*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1993.

The authors of this book provide scenarios about various aspects of teaching writing. Each of the scenarios highlights a specific problem or set of problems that emerges in composition courses, focusing on both theoretical issues and practical applications. They are meant to provoke discussion; each scenario is followed by a set of discussion questions. The authors envision this book as a catalyst for discussion in graduate teaching seminars, workshops, and teacher training programs. The scenarios are organized into six sections: 1) creating effective writing assignments; 2) using reading in writing courses; 3) responding to student writing; 4) teaching grammar and style; 5) managing discourse in classes, conferences, and small groups; and 6) course designs. Although the situations have been modified, the scenarios are all “real and current” (x). They have been collected from actual events and, therefore, deal with common (yet sensitive) situations that arise in teaching writing. The scenarios vary from suspected plagiarism to responding to content/accuracy to dealing with disruptive students and more.

Barnett, Marva A. “Writing as a Process.” *The French Review* 63.1 (1989): 31-44.

According to Barnett, both students and teachers are commonly frustrated over the number of errors and the lack of improvement in student writing. In this article, she looks at how teachers traditionally assign and react to student writing. She claims that students may become more involved in editing their own work if the teacher does less

correcting. She suggests that teachers look at writing as a process, or a series of drafts, including prewriting, writing, and rewriting. Less attention to correction of grammatical errors, together with real attention to content, leads ultimately to better student compositions. Barnett claims that the advantages to both students and the teachers of process writing and writing for communication include greater quantity, higher student motivation, and more efficient use of grading time.

Brookes, Arthur, and Peter Grundy. *Writing for Study Purposes: A Teacher's Guide to Developing Individual Writing Skills*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Brookes and Grundy's approach to teaching writing "combines communicative practice, an integrated approach and humanistic principles." For them, communicative language features six elements: 1) having something meaningful to say, 2) reaching an audience, 3) working in small groups, 4) working collaboratively, 5) developing register awareness, and 6) talking naturally. The authors define humanistic principles as promoting freedom to express one's self, recognizing the learner as a resource, ensuring the learner freedom from authority, valuing self-expression as intelligent, recognizing the centrality of personal discovery, and respecting individual learning styles. Brookes and Grundy's book developed out of teaching "English for Academic Purposes." As such, they have worked with more advanced language students. Exercises are long, typically taking thirty to fifty minutes, though many could be adapted to a much shorter time span. Almost all of the exercises are based on pair or group work, and outside evaluation is discouraged. Process writing is stressed—most exercises are based on the language of argumentation, comparison and contrast, etc., rather than on solving particular grammatical problems.

Brown, Roger S. "Teaching Writing, or Cooking with Gas on the Back Burner." *Die Unterrichtspraxis* 15.2 (1982): 289-292.

In this article, Roger Brown discusses the role of writing in the second and third year of college German courses. Although he does not go as far as John Troyanovich, who claimed that extensive writing is ineffective and "free compositions" are unproductive (see separate annotation), Brown still maintains that writing must be kept in its place. His two rules on writing in the FL classroom are 1) keep it short and 2) prime students before they begin to write. This, according to Brown, includes providing famous quotations as models to memorize, emulating the stylistics of fables, and discussing false cognates and deceptive pairs (e.g., das/daß, Mal/Zeit). One technique that Brown finds particularly productive is the "Nacherzählung" (summary). However, he claims that any extensive independent writing, such as free composition, should be postponed until the third or fourth years and should be strictly limited.

Although we disagree with the conclusions of this article, we find it interesting in understanding the resistance many foreign language teachers had (and may still have) to teaching writing in the foreign language classroom.

Carson, Joan A., and Dona Leki, eds. *Reading in the Composition Classroom: Second Language Perspectives*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 1993.

This book examines the interrelationship of second language reading and second language writing. The first section contains articles that provide an historical background as well as introduce a number of issues concerning the reading/writing relationship.

Barbara Kroll's essay, "Teaching Writing IS Teaching Reading: Training the New Teacher of ESL Composition," maintains that the composition teacher must know

theories of reading in order to successfully teach students to write. The second section concerns cognitive dimensions, noting that second language research in this area is just beginning. However, initial research suggests a correlation between reading and writing ability in second language learning and the transfer of reading/writing skills across languages. Practical suggestions include establishing mediating links between students and the academy; devising a sequential, recursive syllabus based on reading and writing; and finding writing tasks that foster critical thinking and which maximize the students' interaction with the text. The third section is concerned with the social dimensions of reading in the composition classroom. According to the editors, it is in the social dimensions of literacy that pedagogical experimentation has far surpassed formal research.

Caywood, Cynthia L., and Gillian R. Overing, eds. *Teaching Writing: Pedagogy, Gender, and Equity*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1987.

This anthology focuses on aspects of pedagogy, the relationship between feminist theories and theories on writing, and notions of equity in the classroom. The individual authors focus on the theoretical dimensions of gender and writing as well as provide practical suggestions for classroom activities and models for course design. Several of the authors maintain that writing as process (rather than as product) is an essential part of an equitable classroom. The individual authors provide examples of feminist pedagogy and the teaching of writing. These include discussions of collaborative learning (Stanger), mothering as a pedagogical model (Daumer and Runze), lowering the affective filter of writers (Homing), issues of equity and peace in the writing classroom (Prey), writing as a mode of discovery (Quinn), and the use of journal writing (Perry), among others. The authors suggest ways of moving away from teacher-centered (extremely hierarchical)

classrooms to an environment that encourages equity, cooperative learning, and student empowerment.

Conrad, Lynn M., and Susan M. Goldstein. "Student Input and Negotiation of Meaning in ESL Writing Conferences." *TESOL Quarterly* 24.3 (1990): 443-460.

In this study, Goldstein and Conrad examine the discourse used in student-teacher writing conferences in an advanced ESL composition course and the effects this discourse had on subsequent revisions of the students' papers. In particular, the authors are interested in the extent to which meaning is negotiated in the writing conference and the role this negotiation plays in successful revisions of the students' drafts. Goldstein and Conrad conclude that students who negotiate meaning during the conference demonstrate more successful revisions, whereas students who do not negotiate meaning are more apt to make only surface-level changes. The authors maintain that writing conferences do not automatically ensure that negotiation will take place. Therefore, they suggest that it is necessary for both students and instructors to be aware of the discourse (i.e., issues of control, importance of input and negotiation, etc.) that takes place in the writing conference. For example, they suggest that instructors should videotape themselves during a writing conference in order to understand the complex workings of discourse. Instructors should also explicitly teach techniques for contributing input and negotiating meaning so that students can get the most out of their writing conferences.

Dvorak, Trisha. "Writing in the Foreign Language." *Listening, Reading, and Writing: Analysis and Application*. Ed. Barbara H. Wing. Middlebury, Vermont: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1986. 145-167.

After defining what "writing" is, Dvorak begins her article with an historical summary of views on learning to write in a foreign language. She maintains that with the shift towards audiolingualism, oral language took precedence in the classroom over all

other modalities. Writing, when it was used, was mainly for purposes of transcription. Even with the current shift towards a more communicative view of language, writing is still not emphasized in most foreign language classes. Dvorak claims that foreign language textbooks in the last twenty-five years have linked written composition to advanced grammar or to conversation—rather than focusing on compositional skills such as organization, clarity, and manipulating various functions (i.e., describing, informing, persuading). Dvorak also discusses the difference between written and spoken language, the relationship between writing in a first language and writing in a second language, how writing fits into Krashen's language acquisition/learning model, and writing as a developmental process.

Dvorak draws two important conclusions about writing in a foreign language: 1) "writing improvements are unrelated to grammar study," and 2) "intensive correction of student writing, which has a negative effect on writing in terms of student attitudes and motivation, has little positive effect at all" (151-152). Dvorak's final section on "Implications for Program Design and Classroom Methodology" is particularly useful. Dvorak discusses the process approach to writing, the instructor's role as reader rather than judge, and how to integrate writing into the foreign language program as a whole.

Eisterhold, Joan Carson. "Reading-Writing Connection: Towards a Description for Second Language Learners." *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*. Ed. Barbara Kroll. Cambridge Applied Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 88-101.

According to Eisterhold, the relationship between first language reading and writing indicates that better writers tend to be better readers, better writers read more than poorer writers, and better readers produce more syntactically mature writing than poorer readers. The question in second language learning is in which direction the skills are

being transferred. The most obvious model is from reading to writing, although some studies show that writing activities can be useful for improving reading comprehension and retention of information, in particular. In this *directional* model, skills acquired in one modality can be transferred to the other. It appears, though, that this transfer is not automatic, but only comes as a result of direct instruction. Another hypothesis maintains that the link between reading and writing is *nondirectional* and results from a single underlying proficiency, the cognitive process of constructing meaning. The *bidirectional* hypothesis claims that reading and writing are interactive, but also independent. Each of these models indicates a different relationship between the development of reading and writing skills, and invites different classroom approaches to the teaching of reading and writing. This issue is further complicated when we consider the second language learner who is already literate in a first language. Evidence suggests that after a certain threshold of language proficiency has been attained, first language literacy may have a positive effect on the development of second language skills. However, research also indicates that this transfer of skills is not automatic. Teachers can help their students use their first language skills in learning a second language by making clear the interrelationship between reading and writing in both the first and the target language.

Gaudiani, Claire. *Teaching Writing in the Foreign Language Curriculum*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1981.

This is one of the first comprehensive studies on writing in the foreign language classroom. Gaudiani's monograph is divided into three sections. In the main section she provides a detailed summary of how she treats writing in her French composition courses; in the second section she discusses the importance of writing across the curriculum; and in the final section (appendix) she provides syllabi, exams, handouts,

sample student texts, and sample evaluations. Her text as a whole is informative and practical. In her introduction she provides much helpful advice on how to treat writing in the FL classroom. She notes, for example, the importance of teachers writing with their students, the need to build common goals from the very beginning, and the use of the foreign language in the class. She also discusses the difference between writing in a native language and a foreign language. In the main part of her monograph Gaudiani provides a “hands-on” description of her composition classes including a list of composition topics, the philosophy behind the classroom dynamics (i.e., the class as a team), the group editing process (which focuses not only on comprehension and accuracy, but also prose style, organization, and synthesis), and the evaluation of student papers. During the second half of the semester, Guadiani begins to put more focus on prose style and has her students write “pastiche.” She describes all of her assignments in great detail and shows how she treats vocabulary, grammar, and style analysis in her classroom. Besides weekly essay writing and re-writing, Guadiani also has her students keep a journal throughout the semester. Guadiani discusses writing across the curriculum and the need to demonstrate the important of writing in all subject areas. The detailed suggestions she provides for teaching writing in the classroom are the most helpful element of the monograph. Besides the packet of handouts she provides, she also includes a helpful list of suggestions to teachers to cut down on the paperwork and the time spent correcting student papers.

Gaudiani, Claire. “Teaching Writing in the Foreign Language Curriculum.” *Strategies for the Development of Foreign Language and Literature Programs*. Ed. Claire Gaudiani. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1984. 151-171.

Gaudiani's chapter on writing in the FL classroom in her book *Strategies for the Development of Foreign Language & Literature Programs* is a shortened adaptation of her earlier study (1981) described in the entry above.

Gere, Anne Ruggles, ed. *Roots in the Sawdust: Writing to Learn across the Disciplines*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1985.

This book consists of articles from the Puget Sound Writing Program (a site of the National Writing Project) on writing-to-learn strategies. The book is more practical than theoretical and focuses on the implementation of writing-to-learn activities in the high school curriculum. Based on the belief that writing is a means of learning, the articles in this book suggest writing-to-learn techniques in a wide range of subject areas. These areas include literature, art, foreign languages, social studies, special education, science, math, philosophy, and history. Besides these content-specific articles, there are general articles on the connections between writing and thinking, the benefits of the course journal, and student comments on writing-to-learn activities. The glossary is especially helpful; it describes everything from Admit Slips to Writing Groups and provides instructors with practical suggestions and tools for using writing-to-learn strategies in the classroom. As all of these articles point out, writing-to-learn activities help students understand and engage in course material, help students think, and illustrate the various stages in the process of writing.

Greenia, George. "Computers and Teaching Composition in a Foreign Language." *Foreign Language Annals* 25.1 (1992): 33-46.

The grammar/composition course is, according to Greenia, usually one of the most traditional courses in the foreign language curricula. In this article, he suggests how using computers can restructure the composition course in positive ways for both the

teacher and the student Greenia begins by providing an overview of the current research on writing in the foreign language classroom. He then describes how he used computers in his Spanish composition course. Students were asked to carry out various kinds of writing tasks on the computer (i.e., essays, homework, peer reviews, dialogue journals, private journals, and an open bulletin board to encourage communication and interaction among students. Greenia maintains that using the computer in the composition classroom allows students to write more frequently, without increasing the instructor's work load. He describes in great detail how he implemented computer technology into his class and some of the potential problems and ethical issues that arise with this new form of technology. Greenia's article suggests that computers force language teachers to rethink what the foreign language course should look like and help us move away from a teacher-centered classroom towards a communicative community of language learners. We highly recommend this article to anyone who is thinking about using computers in the FL classroom.

Greenia, George D. "Why Johnny Can't *Escribir*: Composition and the Foreign Language Curriculum." *ADFL Bulletin* 24.1 (1992): 30-37.

Answering the question "why Johnny can't *escribir*," Greenia writes: "Johnny can't *escribir* because we have not trained him to" (30). Greenia maintains that the intermediate-or advanced-level writing classes for foreign language students usually do not concentrate on writing. Composition courses end up as either as topics course (i.e., focusing on literature or civilization) or as a grammar course. Greenia provides a list of guidelines that gives writing the attention it deserves in the foreign the language curriculum:

- 1) “The writing course should have its own place in the curriculum, but it should not stand alone as the sole undergraduate writing experience in the second language” (31);
- 2) “Writing in the foreign language in itself has not proved an effective vehicle for learning grammar...” (33);
- 3) “A foreign language writing course is a valuable language course in and of itself; it is not a service course to prepare students for something else” (33);
- 4) “Second-language writing should not be conceived of as primarily a literature course in another form...” (34);
- 5) “A focus on writing for exchanging and engaging ideas puts students with varying language strengths on a more nearly equal footing...” (35);
- 6) “All discourse generated in a writing class should be public rather than private” (35); and
- 7) “A well-developed oral component can enliven the initial exchange of ideas, help define topics... and generally serve as a platform for prewriting activities” (36).

Greenia’s article summarizes the recent research and theory on writing in the foreign languages, discusses process writing using peer review and coediting, and provides clear goals for developing writing skills in the foreign language composition course. Another interesting aspect of Greenia’s article is his brief discussion of the so-called gap between the beginning language program and third-year composition courses.

Hamp-Lyons, Liz, ed. *Assessing Second Language Writing in Academic Contexts. Writing Research: Multidisciplinary Inquiries into the Nature of Writing Ser.* Norwood. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1991.

This volume, part of the *Writing Research Series*, focuses on second language writing assessment. The individual authors discuss both the similarities between L1 and L2 writing, as well as the unique aspects of second language assessment. They focus on the history of ESL writing tests and speculate on the future direction of such tests, their validity, scoring, and assessment. The book is divided into several sections organized around the following topics: 1) the writer, 2) the task, 3) the reader, 4) relating the assessment to the academic community, and 5) accountability. In her conclusion, Hamp-Lyons summarizes each of these areas and discusses issues that need to be further researched and discussed. This volume provides a summary of theoretical research on writing assessment and various assessment models, information on scoring and response, practical suggestions for carrying out writing assessment in ESL programs, as well as discussions on issues such as cross-cultural academic literacy, the diverse academic community, and political forces such as the “English Only” movement in the United States.

Hoel, Torlaug Løkensgard. “Wergeland og skrivepedagogikk.” (“Wergeland and Composition Pedagogy”). *Norsklaereren* 2 (1989): 20-23.

Hoel shows how process-oriented writing exercises can be used to introduce students to a literary text, to motivate and help them create their own understanding of a text, and to articulate their own interpretation of a text. She illustrates this process with a series of actual exercises she used in a class with a long, difficult poem by Henrik Wergeland, one of Norway’s greatest Romantic poets.

Hoel, Torlaug Løkensgard. *Skrive-pedagogikk pa norsk: Prosessorientert skrivning i teori og praksis (Composition-Pedagogy in Norwegian: Process Writing in Theory and Practice)*. Oslo: Landslaget for norskundervisning and I. W. Cappelen Forlag, 1990.

The book begins with an overview of the major approaches to American process-writing and pedagogical theory and shows how these theories have been adapted and developed in their own way in Norway. Hoel offers a theoretical model for process writing that emphasizes writing as a tool for the discovery and development of ideas. She raises questions about planning, revision, and special problems connected to the process of writing itself. Hoel discusses the issues involved in any attempt to change the writing curriculum in the schools to bring it in line with new research and pedagogical approaches, especially difficulties with the state examination system. Hoel discusses response groups and how they function, demonstrating with transcripts from two Norwegian classrooms. As part of her conclusion, Hoel's students evaluate their own experiences of process approach after two years of process-oriented writing. Hoel believes that it is important to understand the theories behind process writing, and she presents them clearly, relating theory to its pedagogical implications (and some of the resulting problems that may arise). She also takes the reader directly into the classroom, showing the writing process at work. For Hoel, being introduced to process-oriented pedagogy meant that after twenty years of teaching she had to change not only her teaching methodologies, but also her perspective on the discipline, language, and the roles of teacher and student.

Horowitz, Daniel. "Process, Not Product: Less than Meets the Eye." *TESOL Quarterly* 20.1 (1986) 141-144.

Horowitz is critical of process-oriented approaches to teaching writing. He claims that writing multiple drafts will not lead to the ability to write in-class examination essays quickly and fluently and that this approach does not teach a variety of types of formal

writing necessary in an academic setting (reports, annotated bibliographies, etc.).

According to Horowitz, the inductive approach of process writing is suitable only to some writers and for some purposes; some students are better motivated to write by external motivators (such as grades) than internal motivators. He suggests that a process-oriented approach gives students a false impression of their own abilities and how writing will actually be evaluated outside of the language classroom.

Houpt, Sheri. "Inspiring Creative Writing through Conversation." *Foreign Language Annals* 17.3 (1984): 185-189.

Houpt suggests ways to use classroom conversations as effective "pre-writing" activities. She advocates a three-step process to writing: 1) in-class conversations, 2) a written draft, and 3) student editing of her/his own draft. Houpt outlines nine sample assignments, discussing various topics for in-class conversation and how these lead to successful writing assignments. This article would be beneficial for FL instructors (at any level) who are looking for ideas on creating effective writing assignments.

Janopoulos, Michael. "The Relationship of Pleasure Reading and Second Language Writing Proficiency." *TESOL Quarterly* 20.4 (1986): 763-768.

The results of a study of foreign graduate students admitted to Ohio State University indicate a strong correlation between the amount of L2 pleasure reading and L2 writing ability. The evidence suggests that proficiency levels for L2 reading and writing are closely related.

Johns, Ann M. "Written Argumentation for Real Audiences: Suggestions for Teacher Research and Classroom Practice." *TESOL Quarterly* 27.1 (1993): 75-90.

Of all the aspects involved in teaching writing in the second language classroom, readers' expectations (i.e., audience) have not been widely researched. In this article, Ann M. Johns provides a review of what she calls "audience literature" and describes her

research on argumentation and audience in context. Since the majority of her ESL students are engineering majors, Johns interviewed two engineering professors who were considered to be successful grant writers. These writers researched the values and interests of the grant reviewers before submitting their grant proposals. Johns concludes that, like these professionals, our students need to negotiate the relationship between their own purposes and the interest and values of real audiences. In the final section of her article Johns describes an assignment in which her ESL students wrote letters to “real and known audiences” – the college’s board of trustees and state legislators – complaining of the recent increase in student fees.

Krashen, Stephen D. *Writing: Research, Theory, and Applications.* Language Teaching Methodology Ser. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English, 1984.

In this book, Krashen discusses the research and theories on writing and their applications to pedagogy. He begins by summarizing the research on writing in several areas organized around the following questions: “1) Does reading help develop writing ability? 2) Does writing practice help develop writing ability? 3) Can writing be deliberately taught? 4) Do good writers go about the act of writing differently from poor writers? and, 5) Do good writers have different concerns in writing?”(2). Krashen concludes that increasing the time spent reading can help improve writing even more than frequent writing. By analyzing these conclusions in relation to his discussions on language acquisition and learning, Krashen states that comprehensible input (i.e., reading) is an important part of writing acquisition. Krashen suggests that “good” writers consider writing a process, have low affective filters, are aware of their audience (i.e., use reader-based prose), and concentrate (at least initially) on content rather than accuracy. Krashen argues that concerns for grammar should only appear at the final stage of the

composing process – editing. Krashen also includes an appendix in which he discusses writing in the second language, but this section is brief and uninformative. He states that very little is known about writing in a second language, but that similarities are sure to exist between writing in the student's native language and second language. Similar to composition courses taught in the native language, Krashen calls for two important pedagogical techniques: 1) increased reading for the acquisition of written language and 2) writing practice in order to develop a process approach to writing.

Kroll, Barbara, ed. *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*. Cambridge Applied Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

This volume in second language writing contains thirteen essays divided into two major sections. The first section concerns the philosophical issues underlying second language writing instruction and contains an historical review of the development of composition theories and their application to ESL/FL teaching. The second section describes a number of studies on various aspects of writing. The intention of the book is to provide an historical theoretical background that teachers and researchers can use in formulating their own philosophical approaches to the teaching of writing. We found the first section especially valuable, as the essays challenge teachers to articulate their own philosophical perspectives on writing and how these perspectives are reflected in their practices in the classroom. (Several essays from this volume are annotated elsewhere in this bibliography.)

Lalande, John F. "Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment" *Foreign Language Annals* 17.2 (1984): 109-117.

This article, originally published in *The Modern Language Journal* 66 (1982): 140-149, was awarded the Paul Pimsleur Award for research. In this study, Lalande

compares the effects of two different methods of responding to student writing in a fourth quarter German class at Pennsylvania State University. The instructors in the control group supplied corrections on the students' papers and then required the students to rewrite the essay copying the correct answers. The experimental groups' papers were marked using an Error Reduction Code. Papers were returned during the next class session and students were given fifty minutes to correct their errors. On the day before the next composition was due, students in the experimental group also filled out an Error Awareness Sheet (EASE). Here they recorded the types of errors they made on their previous essay. Lalande analyzed pre-test and post-test scores for the two groups and found that the experimental group had significantly better scores. He concludes that the combination of error awareness and problem-solving techniques is a particularly beneficial way of responding to students' writing.

Latzel, Sigbert, ed. *Fremdsprache Deutsch: Zeitschrift.fur die Praxis des Deutschunterrichts*. Munich: Goethe-Institut, 1989.

This special issue of a journal for teachers of German as a second or foreign language is devoted to the teaching of writing. The articles focus on practical applications of process writing activities in the second language classroom and are designed to increase the motivations of both language student and teacher. Activities include organizing pen-pal exchanges, writing poetry, using computers, and a variety of other activities. Most of these ideas could be easily adapted to be used effectively in other languages and at varying levels of instruction.

Leki, Dona, and Tony Silva, eds. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

*The Journal of Second Language Writing* is a new publication, begun in 1992 and published three times a year. It is devoted to “publishing theoretically grounded reports of research and discussions of central issues in second and foreign language writing and writing instruction.” Each issue contains a short annotated bibliography of recent research in ESL and FL composition, a feature which will be especially useful to those interested in keeping up with current developments in second language writing research without having to read dozens of different professional journals.

Leki, Ilona. “Coaching from the Margins: Issues in Written Response.” *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*. Ed. Barbara Kroll. Cambridge Applied Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 57-68.

Leki addresses the issue of how teachers should respond to student writing by first raising questions about why writing is taught to second language learners. Are the goals for second language students’ primarily grammatical accuracy or global comprehensibility? Do teachers expect students to take risks in order to express themselves or develop a sense of style, or do they stress linguistic control? How instructors define these goals will determine, to a great extent, how they respond to student writing. Another factor is the teacher’s varied roles as audience (reader), coach, and evaluator. Current research indicates that teachers’ comments have depressingly little impact on student writing. It appears that what is most helpful is that the teacher comment on writing while it is in process, or during a sequence of assignments that are all related to an on-going project. Teachers often have difficulty when they attempt to respond to the content of student writing, not to seem as if they are appropriating the student’s text. Many teachers find it difficult to separate their roles as evaluator from that

of coach. Leki concludes that although we have some ideas of what types of responses are helpful in improving student writing, more research needs to be done.

Magnan, Sally Sieloff. "Teaching and Testing Proficiency in Writing: Skills to Transcend the Second-Language Classroom." *Proficiency, Curriculum, Articulation: The Ties that Bind*. Ed. Alice C. Omaggio. Middlebury, Vermont: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1985. 109-136.

This article, part of the collection from the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages entitled *Proficiency, Curriculum, Articulation: The Ties that Bind*, discusses the proficiency guidelines for writing and the impact of writing on the curriculum. It also provides classroom ideas for teaching writing. Probably the most helpful part of this article is the final section on responding to student writing. In this section, Sally Sieloff Magnan discusses different forms of responding to writing such as peer response, dialogue journals with the teacher, discussing the instructor's writing as a sample, providing tape recorded oral feedback, and using checklists. She also discusses different grading scales such as holistic or global scales, the use of the T-unit (ratios), etc. The majority of the article examines the proficiency guidelines for writing in great detail. The author provides a writing sample (in French, German, and Spanish) for each level and discusses the main characteristics of that particular level. She then speculates on what a proficiency exam in writing would look like and provides sample questions. The author also provides a list of activities for teaching writing at the various levels – although this list is neither exciting nor creative. Her discussions on the relationship between speaking and writing, her overview on process writing and its impact on the curriculum, and her section on grading are interesting and informative. She concludes that it is important for

foreign language teachers to consult colleagues in other disciplines (especially English and composition) in order to learn more about current methods for teaching writing.

Mayher, John S., Nancy Lester, and Gordon M. Pradl. *Learning to Write/Writing to Learn*. Montair, N.J.: Boynton/Cook, 1983.

The title of this book, *Learning to Write/Writing to Learn*, is based on two important views of writing: 1) that one learns to write by writing and 2) that writing provides a means for learning. The book, intended for teachers of grades K-4 and all disciplines, is both practical and theoretical. It draws on research on the relationship between writing and learning of composition experts such as James Britton, Donald Graves, Janet Emig, and Linda Flower. The authors summarize recent research in writing, provide examples of writing, and offer suggestions for writing-to-learn strategies in the classroom. Each chapter ends with a set of questions and/or tasks, which could be used for further discussion. For those who are thinking about using a dialogue journal in their classes, we highly recommend pages 22-35 in the chapter entitled “Constructing Our World Through Writing.” Other areas of interest are the discussions of the process of composing, the role of instruction in facilitating the development of writing abilities and the writing process, creating “real” audiences for writing, and responding to and evaluating writing. The authors suggest that the most important goal of this book is “to help teachers run writer- and learner-centered classrooms” (7). They discuss writing-to-learn in all areas of the curriculum, provide practical suggestions for empowering students in the process of learning, and advocate the use of collaborative response groups, peer editing, and conferencing. The authors maintain that the content of what we are teaching (i.e., mathematics, history, foreign language) is not as important as the process

of learning *how to learn*. The ultimate goal, they claim, is to help students grow as learners.

Omaggio, Alice C. "Becoming Proficient in Writing." *Teaching Language in Context: Proficiency-Oriented Instruction*. Boston: Heinie & Heinie Publishers, Inc., 1986. 221-272.

Omaggio promotes an approach that integrates writing practice with practice in listening, speaking, and reading. She sees writing skills being developed on a continuum from primarily a support skill for speaking to a functional communicative activity in itself. Using the ACTFL guidelines, Omaggio provides samples of student writing (in French, German, and Spanish) at various levels. She suggests a variety of writing activities appropriate to each skill level, as well as ways of evaluating and providing constructive feedback on student writing (holistic, analytical, primary trait scoring).

Osterholm, Kathryn K. "Writing in the Native Language." *Listening, Reading, and Writing: Analysis and Application*. Ed. Barbara H Wing. Middlebury, Vermont: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1986. 117-143.

This article does not deal with writing in a foreign language (see instead the article by Trisha Dvorak above), but rather provides a theoretical overview of writing in one's native language. The article is divided into three main sections: 1) writing in the language arts, curriculum, and modern theories of composition; 2) process models of writing and the instructor's role as facilitator; and 3) evaluating student writing.

Osterholm begins with a definition of writing and maintains that she does not consider "mechanical" aspects of writing (i.e., vocabulary lists, labeling grammatical parts, transcription, etc.) in this article. She discusses the influences of cognitive psychologists (Bruner, Piaget, Vygotsky) on the theory of composition and the connections between writing and learning. She also provides a theoretical overview of writing as a process and

discusses obstacles to the process (writer's block, writing apprehension, etc.). Osterholm maintains that the change of focus from the written product to the process of writing has necessitated a change in classroom dynamics. The popular lecture format of instruction is now being replaced by writing workshops, conferences, and peer groups. The instructor's role in this new setting is that of facilitator. Osterholm lists several strategies for facilitating the process of writing. These include invention strategies (i.e., pre-writing strategies such as brainstorming, clustering, free-writing, mapping), syntactic analysis and sentence combining, and computer-assisted instruction. In the final section of this article Osterholm provides a theoretical overview of evaluating a piece of writing. She summarizes the research on error analysis, teacher response to writing, self-evaluation, and peer response. This article is theoretical, but also well-written and informative. It provides an overview of the research and theory of writing composition.

Pennington, Martha C. "Exploring the Potential of Word Processing for Non-native Writers." *Computers and the Humanities* 27 (1993): 149-163.

This article discusses how computers might affect second language learners. Using computers in the composition process appears to affect the way people write, discuss, learn, and organize ideas, and the computer offers new resources and approaches to writing for the second language teacher. Computer users tend to write more spontaneously and produce a greater quantity of material. Word processing encourages more revision and allows students to concentrate on higher-level revision. Using the computer allows for more individual attention and encourages students to show more initiative and take more risks in their writing. Computer use can also have a positive effect on the attitude of the second language learner. However, Pennington admonishes that while word-processing shows great potential in teaching second language writing,

that potential will not be realized without adequate basic instruction in computer use or if individual learning styles are ignored.

Peterson, Deborah. "Writing to Learn German." *Roots in the Sawdust: Writing to Learn Across the Disciplines*. Ed. Anne Ruggles Gere. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1985. 47-59.

This text is one of many chapters on the theory and applications of writing-to-learn, researched and compiled by the Puget Sound Writing Program, in a collection entitled *Roots in the Sawdust: Writing to Learn across the Disciplines*. Although we highly recommend the book as a whole (see separate annotation above), we have singled out Peterson's article because it is particularly relevant for foreign language teaching. In this article, Peterson discusses how she uses writing-to-learn techniques to help build oral and written proficiency, to improve organizational skills, to teach grammar, and to reflect on cultural issues. Through the use of a journal, students reflect on the learning process, record class activities, and "work out" fears and frustrations. Peterson suggests that activities such as brainstorming, clustering, lists, and first thoughts are helpful both in encouraging communication in class and as pre-writing activities. Peterson also discusses how she uses the journal to help students learn grammar and as a way to help students understand cultural differences. Through a partner system, students provide feedback on their partners' journals. The journals are also checked periodically by the instructor. Although Peterson is discussing a high school German class, her insights and practical examples of writing-to-learn activities are extremely helpful for language teachers at all levels and institutions. Peterson maintains that because her classes are relatively large—forty in her first-year classes and thirty in her second-year class; she finds writing-to-learn techniques a particularly productive way to get all students involved.

Peyton, Joy Kreeft, and Jana Staton, eds. *“Dialogue Journals in the Multilingual Classroom: Building Language Fluency and Writing Skills through Written Interaction.”* Writing Research: Multidisciplinary Inquiries into the Nature of Writing. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1993.

Published in 1993 as part of the Writing Research Series, this book provides a wealth of information on the theory and practice of using dialogue journals in the classroom. This study, as the editors suggest, is unique because of the collaborative research efforts between the research team and the classroom teacher, Leslee Reed. Reed, a sixth-grade teacher, has been using dialogue journals in her classes for more than fifteen years. In the early 1980s Reed was transferred to a school in Los Angeles. The students in her sixth-grade class came from twelve different countries and spoke ten different languages. This particular study focuses on the use of the dialogue journal in the multicultural and multilingual classroom. Several of the contributors study aspects of language acquisition by analyzing specific linguistic features of writing in the second language through the course of a school year. Lengthy excerpts from student journals are not only interesting, but also demonstrate the range of functions that the journal serves in and outside of the classroom. Leslee Reed’s chapter discusses the benefits of the dialogue journal: it serves as an aid to lesson planning; provides a way to individualize instruction; it is a source of information about students’ backgrounds, needs, and interests; and it “provides a channel for honest communication” (36). Reed provides a step-by-step description of establishing and maintaining dialogues through journal writing.

Joy Kreeft Peyton’s chapter on the development of beginning writers focuses on the linguistic and social developments of six students in Leslee Reed’s sixth-grade class

throughout the year. In the third part of the book Jana Staton, Roger W. Shuy, and Joy Kreeft Peyton discuss features of student and teacher writing as they relate to language acquisition in their respective chapters. Staton analyzes Reed's responses to students' writing in order to determine if she adjusted her own language according to students' language proficiency levels. Similarly, Shuy examines the use of language functions (reporting, requesting, thanking, etc.) in both teacher and student writing, and Joy Kreeft Peyton studies the use of teacher questions in promoting student interaction.

In the final section of the book the authors discuss the overall impact of interactive writing: the effect of teacher strategies in dialogue journal writing (ch. 7) and features of dialogue journal writing compared to other in-class writing (ch. 8). Even though the book concentrates on a sixth-grade classroom, this study is a rich resource for anyone interested in using dialogue journals. We highly recommend it to instructors teaching at all levels in all disciplines at all institutions. Its emphasis on second-language learners makes it a particularly relevant and important resource for second language teachers.

Raimes, Ann. "Out of the Woods: Emerging Traditions in the Teaching of Writing." *TESOL Quarterly* 25.3 (1991): 407-430.

In this article, Raimes surveys the history of writing instruction and research on writing from 1966-1991. She concentrates on four approaches to L2 writing instruction: 1) the focus on the *form* of the text itself, 2) the focus on the *writer* and the cognitive processes used in the act of writing, 3) the focus on the *content* of the text, and 4) the focus on the *reader*. Then she describes five particular problems that are frequently discussed by ESL instructors: 1) the topics for writing (i.e., should they be academic or personal?), 2) "real" writing, 3) the nature of the academic discourse community, 4)

contrastive rhetoric, and 5) responding to student writing. Many of the problems here are specific to the ESL classroom, but several of them carry over to the foreign language classroom as well. Raimes concludes her article with what she calls five “emerging traditions of recognition” (421). She maintains that these are not new methodologies, but rather emerging traditions that reflect shared recognitions. These are: 1) recognition of the complexity of composing, 2) recognition of student diversity, 3) recognition of learners’ processes, 4) recognition of the politics of pedagogy, and 5) recognition of the value of practice as well as theory.

Richards, Jack C. “From Meaning into Words: Writing in a Second or Foreign Language.” *The Language Teaching Matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 100-117.

Richards states that the nature and significance of writing has often been underestimated in language teaching, and in FL teaching writing has often been synonymous with teaching grammar and sentence structure. The audio-lingual method of language teaching – where speaking is primary – leads to a product-based approach where writing is a means of reinforcing the appropriate grammatical and syntactic forms of spoken language. Techniques include providing more models and preventing student errors in composition. A process approach, on the other hand, focuses on the cognitive processes in writing rather than on the product. In the process approach there is a shift from language-focused activities to learner-centered tasks in which students assume greater control over what they write and how they write. They evaluate their own writing. Richards points to the shift in roles for the teacher from evaluator to facilitator. He provides a very useful list of instructional activities appropriate to each phase of writing: rehearsing/prewriting, drafting/writing, and revising.

Robb, Thomas, Steven Ross, and Ian Shortreed. "Salience of Feedback on Error and Its Effect on EFL Writing Quality." *TESOL Quarterly* 20.1 (1986): 83-95.

This article describes a study designed to evaluate the effects of different types of feedback on error in the written work of second language writers. Four methods of providing feedback were contrasted, ranging from overt error correction to a simple notation of number of errors per line. In each case students revised their compositions. Results of the study indicate (in concurrence with Semke) that more direct methods of feedback do not tend to produce results commensurate with the amount of effort required to draw the student's attention to surface errors. It does suggest, however, that over time, practice in writing has a positive effect on writing accuracy.

Semke, Harriet D. "Effects of the Red Pen." *Foreign Language Annals* 17.3 (1984): 195-202.

This article is a summary of a research project carried out during the spring of 1980 at the University of Minnesota. Semke compares the effects of four methods of responding to student writing. She analyzes eight sections of German 1103 (students in the third quarter of their first year). Two sections of the course were assigned to four different experimental groups. The instructors in these four experimental groups responded to the students' free-writing assignments (Tagebucher) as follows: (1) the instructors in Group 1 provided comments and questions to the content of the essay only; (2) the instructors in Group 2 corrected errors by filling in the correct form; (3) the instructors in Group 3 used a combination of the above methods (they provided comments as well as corrections); and (4) the instructors in Group 4 provided feedback in the form of a symbolic code, and the students had to re-write the assignment,

correcting their own errors. Semke provided a pre-test and a post-test for all sections, and asked students to fill out questionnaires on their attitudes toward writing. Semke concludes that providing corrections does not increase writing accuracy, writing fluency, or general language proficiency. Providing engaging comments and positive feedback, she claims, has the most positive effect in terms of student attitudes toward writing and toward language learning in general.

Shih, Mary. "Content-Based Approaches to Teaching Academic Writing." *TESOL Quarterly* 20.4 (1986): 617-648.

Shih claims that functional and process-centered approaches to writing do not adequately prepare students to function in a university setting. She advocates a content-based approach that different from traditional approaches in four major ways: writing from personal experience is de-emphasized, focus is on what is said more than how it is said, skills are integrated as in university course work, and extended study of a topic and some independent study/research precedes writing with more input from external sources. Instructional approaches might include topic-centered modules or mini-courses, content-based academic writing courses, team-teaching of courses with a subject-area specialist, or use of guest lecturers.

Silva, Tony. "Second Language Composition Instruction: Developments, Issues, and Directions in ESL." *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*. Ed. Barbara Kroll. Cambridge Applied Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 11-23.

Silva's article describes the developments of the four most influential approaches to ESL writing instruction and the implications of these different approaches in the classroom. In *controlled composition*, writing is seen as a secondary skill and learning to write as an "exercise in habit formation" where "the text becomes a collection of sentence

patterns and vocabulary items – a linguistic artifact, a vehicle for language practice” (13). *Current-traditional rhetoric* perceives writing as “basically a matter of arrangement, of fitting sentences and paragraphs into prescribed patterns” (14). A typical approach would involve reading and analyzing a text to determine text type (exposition, argumentation, contrast, description, etc.) and structure (introduction, body, conclusion). This would be used as a prose model for the student’s own composition. The process approach emphasizes the relationship between the act of composition and thinking. This calls for creating a workshop environment with the teacher acting as a facilitator who helps students devise strategies for planning, writing, revising, and editing. English (or writing) for academic purposes focuses on developing the ability to recognize the academic discourse genres and to produce satisfactory academic prose. Silva says there are as yet no comprehensive theories of L2 writing. Researchers and instructors need to develop a real understanding of the L2 writing process that takes into account the contributions of writer, reader, text, context, and their interaction before viable approaches to the teaching of L2 compositions can be developed. The majority of available information on L2 writing has been based on research in ESL. As useful as this research is, serious attention needs to be paid to issues particular to second (foreign) language writing.

Swaffer, Janet “Language Learning Is More than Learning Language: Rethinking Reading and Writing Tasks in Textbooks for Beginning Language Study.” *Foreign Language Acquisition: Research and the Classroom*. Ed. Barbara F. Freed. Foreign Language Acquisition Research and Instruction. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Co., 1991. 252-279.

Swaffer compares the treatments of reading and writing activities in several French and Spanish textbooks. She claims that most of the recent beginning language textbooks do not incorporate a cognitively based, communicative use of reading and

writing. Swaffer compares the length of reading passages in four textbooks, the amount of English compared to the foreign language in each text, the percentage of authentic versus edited texts, the use of grammar explanations versus the illustration of grammar in functional use, and the use of sentential and suprasentential exercises in each language textbook. Swaffer concludes that there is a reluctance to use longer texts and suprasentential writing in the beginning language textbook. She claims that recursive tasks (those involved in reading and writing) are especially important for the adult language learner. Swaffer calls for a revised canon that employs learner-based activities. She suggests three important modifications to the current canon: 1) students need early exposure to familiar content and quantitative reading, 2) recursive tasks need to be stressed from the outset, and 3) text books should provide links between the recognition of formal accuracy and comprehension of the subject matter.

Terry, Robert M. "Teaching and Evaluating Writing as a Communicative Skill." *Foreign Language Annals* 22.1 (1989): 42-54.

Terry argues that while most writing tasks in the second language classroom are designed as skill-getting activities, we need to and can practice more communicative writing skills – informing, relating, questioning, persuading, etc. He claims that most students, even at a beginning level, can write for communication if the tasks they are asked to carry out are realistic, meaningful, occasioned by need, and appropriate to their level of linguistic sophistication. He lists several kinds of writing tasks where appropriate activities can be designed for various levels of students and explains in detail six writing activities, which could be successfully adapted to other language classes. In the second half of this article Terry addresses the issue of evaluation. He argues that holistic scoring is a more efficient and effective method of evaluating written work than meticulous,

tedious discrete point scoring. Holistic scoring also emphasizes the importance of the communicative content of the writing sample. Terry provides several examples of holistic scoring techniques and their application to a student paper.

Troyanovich, John. "How Defensible Is Writing as an Objective in Short-Term Foreign Language Experiences?" *Foreign Language Annals* 7.4 (1974): 435-442.

Deeply rooted in the audio-lingual tradition, Troyanovich maintains that there is no place for writing in the foreign language classroom. He claims that the "writing bias" or over-emphasis of writing in the classroom stems from Martin Luther's rejection of the oral tradition of the Church. In this article Troyanovich suggests that drills and activities that cannot be done orally should not be done at all. Writing, he states, should not be a part of the foreign language curriculum for two reasons: 1) students often are incapable of writing well in their native language and 2) students preparing compositions or dialogues try to translate vocabulary and concepts from their native language (i.e., they use their native language as a point of departure). Troyanovich advocates an audiolingually-structured classroom based solely on the spoken word.

Valdes, Guadalupe, Paz Haro and Maria Paz Echevarriarza. "The Development of Writing Abilities in a Foreign Language: Contributions toward a General Theory of L2 Writing." *Modern Language Journal* 76.3 (1992): 333-352.

Historically, the development of writing skills has been of secondary interest in foreign language classes. But changing assumptions about the importance of writing in American education and in ESL are beginning to have an effect on foreign language education as well. Most of the research on second language writing has been conducted by ESL professionals, and the authors of this article call for a more active engagement of foreign language educators in this area. The authors' own contribution is a study that challenges assumptions about the development of writing skills inherent in the ACTFL

proficiency guidelines. The proficiency guidelines suggest that FL learners are not able to write in paragraphs or show evidence of organizational ability in their second language writing until they have reached the intermediate-high level. Based on their own study of students of Spanish, the authors challenge this assumption. Their research suggests that positive language transfer plays an important role in development of writing skills in a second language. They call for further research in order to develop an adequate theory of second language writing and its relationship to first language literacy skills.

Winer, Lise. "Spinach to Chocolate: Changing Awareness and Attitudes in ESL Writing Teachers." *TESOL Quarterly* 26.1 (1992): 57-79.

This article demonstrates the importance of teacher education in teaching writing in the second and foreign language classroom. Throughout this paper the author supplies information from student journals in her TESL writing practicum, a methodology course required for graduate students in the ESL/EFL program. She traces how the students' awareness of and attitudes toward writing changed throughout the course. At the outset of the course, students' attitudes towards writing were predominantly negative. The author addressed four student concerns in particular: 1) a dread of writing, 2) boredom and/or intimidation with composition topics, 3) insecurity about their writing skills, and 4) insecurity about their teaching skills and ability to provide adequate and accurate feedback to their students' writing. Winer lists five strategies that she found helpful in changing student teachers' negative attitudes toward their own writing as well as their attitudes about teaching writing. Based on course components of her writing methodology practicum, Winer suggests 1) having student teachers design writing tasks and requiring the class to complete them, 2) requiring student teachers to revise these tasks, 3) providing guided peer coaching and feedback, 4) providing guided practice in

topic development, and 5) helping student teachers develop an understanding of the writing process through journal writing.