ED 376 700   FL 022 543

AUTHOR   Fischer, Ruth Overman
TITLE   Teaching Writing in the ESL/EFL Classroom: An
             Annotated Bibliography.
PUB DATE   Oct 93
NOTE   8p.
PUB TYPE·   Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; Classroom Techniques;
             *English (Second Language); Higher Education;
             Linguistic Theory; *Second Language Instruction;
             Second Language Learning; Teaching Methods; *Writing
             (Composition); Writing Attitudes; *Writing
             Instruction; Writing Processes; *Writing Research;
             Writing Skills

ABSTRACT
             This annotated bibliography contains 32 citations of
journal articles, book chapters, and books that focus on the teaching
of writing in English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) and
English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) classrooms. (MDM)

Teaching Writing in the ESL/EFL Classroom
An Annotated Bibliography

Ruth Overman Fischer
October 1993

Allaei, S. & Connor, U. (1990). Exploring the dynamics of
cross-cultural collaboration in writing classrooms. The
Writing Instructor, 10, 19-28.

Recognize the importance of peer response groups in a process-
oriented writing class but note the problems in expecting
students from different cultures to be able to work in small
groups without preparation. Refer to the fields of
sociolinguistics and contrastive rhetoric for information
teachers need to prepare students to work collaboratively.

Bell, J. (1991). Using peer response groups in ESL writing
classes. TESL Canada Journal, 8(2) 65-71.

Supports the use of Peer Response Groups in the ESL writing class
and presents a rationale and procedure for group work which
provides effective supportive feedback.

Chan, M. (1988). What we already know about teaching ESL
writers. English Journal, 77, 84-85.

Asserts that writing teachers, especially those who know and
understand the process model of teaching writing, are better
equipped to work with ESL writers than they thought they were.
Researchers have found the composing processes of native English
speakers and ESL students are similar.

Goldstein, L., & Conrad, S. (1990). Student input and
negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. TESOL
Quarterly, 24, 443-460.

Researches the connection between student participation and
negotiation of meaning in writing conferences and improvement in
subsequent drafts. Results indicate that students who were
actively involved in the negotiation of meaning during the
writing conferences used input from the conferences to make
improvements in their revised drafts.

Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across
languages. TESOL Quarterly, 24, 43-60.

Researches the ways in which four advanced non-native English
speaking writers revised argumentative essays written in English
and in their native languages. Results showed similar revision
strategies across languages as well as student abilities to use

both transfer and adaptation of revision strategies from their first language.

Johns, A. (1986). The ESL student and the revision process: Some insights from schema theory. <u>Journal of Basic Writing</u>, <u>5</u>, 70-80.

Discusses an ESL student's reliance on L1 reading schema when producing written discourse in English and the breakdown in coherence this reliance can cause. Demonstrates ways in which schema theory can facilitate an ESL student's awareness of the expectations that native English speaking readers have of written text.

Johnson, D., & Roen, D. (Eds.). (1989). Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students. White Plains, NY: Longman Inc.

Include eighteen articles about the teaching of writing to ESL students across age groups and proficiency levels. Part I deals with "Settings, Networks, and Concerns", Part II with "Rhetorical Concerns in Writing," and Part III with "Culture, Second Language Writing, and Creativity."

Leki, I. (1992). Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Presents background information on the teaching of writing in English to nonnative speakers, along with principles of second language acquisition, a comparison of ESL and basic writers, a description of the behaviors and attitudes of various ESL writers, and characteristics of the writing behaviors of ESL students.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. <u>Foreign Language Annals</u>, <u>24</u>, 203-218.

Reports on a survey of 100 ESL students in freshman composition classes to find out what types of teacher feedback was most helpful to them in their writing. Results indicate that students equate good writing with error free writing. Suggests that teachers and students need to discuss what is meant by good writing and how students can make better use of teacher feedback.

Leki, I. (1991). Twenty-five years of contrastive rhetoric: Text analysis and writing pedagogies. <u>TESOL Quarterly</u>, <u>25</u>, 123-143.

Provides an overview of the research in contrastive rhetoric since Kaplan's study in 1966. Connects this research with

current writing process pedagogy and shows implication for the
ESL writing classroom.   Provides an extensive bibliography.

MacGowan-Gilhooly, A.   (1991).   Fluency first: Reversing the
    traditional ESL sequence.   Journal of Basic Writing, 10, 73-
    87.

Reports on research done at City College of the University of New
York on the ESL department's newly implemented whole language
approach to reading and writing.   The program consists of three
levels, which focus respectively on the development of fluency,
clarity, and correctness.   Grammar and usage questions are
addressed within the context of a piece of writing.   Results
indicate that ESL students are learning to write better using
this method.

Mackie, A., & Bullock, C.   (1990).   Discourse matrix: A practical
    tool for ESL writing teachers.   TESL Canada Journal, 8(1), 67-
    77.

Basing their work on Kaplan's contrastive rhetoric and Coe's
discourse matrix, the authors present a technique which allows
teachers to help students discover mismatches between the
rhetorical patterns of student texts and those of English.

McAlpine, L.   (1989).   Teacher-as-reader: Oral feedback on ESL
    student writing.   TESL Canada Journal, 7(1), 62-67.

Asserts that students need feedback on early drafts which
recognizes writing as a way of clarifying and communicating
meaning and describes a think-aloud procedure which allows
teachers to provide this kind of feedback.

Nelson, G., & Murphy, J.   (1992).   An L2 writing group: Task and
    social dimensions.   Journal of Second Language Writing, 1,
    171-190.

Examine peer writing groups to investigate the effectiveness in
the way such groups performed along task and social dimensions,
categorizing their responses according to the study of language,
life general knowledge, life person knowledge, procedure and
format.   Found that, although students stayed on task when
responding to each other's writing, their social interactions
often frustrated and disappointed the participants.   Suggest that
students be trained specifically in supportive response
techniques.

Perkins, K. & Brutten, S. (1990). Writing: A holistic or atomistic entity? Journal of Basic Writing, 9, 75-84.

Research supports the assertion among new paradigm process-oriented teachers that ESL students learn to write in a holistic way and efforts to break up writing into discrete focal segments, i. e., content, organization, vocabulary, language usage, and mechanics) is detrimental to their development as writers.

Peyton, J., Staton, J., Richardson, G., & Wolfram, W. (1990). The influence of writing tasks on ESL students' written production. Research in the Teaching of English, 24, 142-171.

Their research showed that the quality of student writing, as measured by quantity, complexity, topic focus, and cohesion, is higher when students are allowed to choose their own topics. Suggest that students be asked to write in a variety of ways (topic, purpose, and audience) and that writing assessment be based on samples of these varieties

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 229-258.

Applies research methodologies in L1 writing for studying the composing process of student writers to studying the composing

processes of unskilled L2 writers. Draws on conclusions of the investigation to describe the needs of these writers.

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

Reviews the approaches for teaching writing over the previous twenty five years from those which focused on form, both linguistic and rhetorical, to those which consider the issues of process, academic content, and reader expectations. Discusses five controversial issues coming out of the transition to the newer approaches: appropriate topics for ESL writers, attitudes toward authentic student writing, writing academic discourse, contrastive rhetoric, and ways of responding to student writing. Provides an extensive bibliography.

Redicki, P. & Swales, J. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. SYSTEM, 16, 355-365.

Reports that as ESL students become more involved in writing for their disciplines, their reliance on feedback from their language teacher decreases, often because they think that the language teacher knows language but not the rhetorical conventions of their discipline. Because different students respond differently

to different types of feedback, teachers need to become aware of
these differences and develop varying feedback strategies.

Roby, J. (1990). The ESL writer and the Kaleidoscope self. The
    Writing Instructor, 10, 42-50.

Suggests that when ESL students write in English, their
construction of self is quite different from that of their L1
self. Coming out of multiple discourses, they need to be
encouraged to use English in projects designed to help them
investigate their place in the world community on their own
terms.

Rodrigues, R. (1985). Moving away from writing-process worship.
    English Journal, 74(5), 24-27.

Presents reasons that writing teachers have voiced objections to
the use of the writing process approach in their classrooms.

Rothschild, D., & Klingenberg, F. (1990). Self and peer
    evaluation of writing in the interactive ESL classroom: An
    exploratory study. TESL Canada Journal, 8(1), 52-65.

Submit that ESL students can and should be taught how to evaluate
their writing by means of rating scales. Results of their study
indicate that ESL student writers benefited from such training by
an increased awareness of the criteria of good writing and by
their more positive attitudes of themselves as writers.

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

Discusses the reasons that L1 writing process pedagogy has not
been widely adopted and adapted in ESL writing programs.

Spack, R. (1984). Invention strategies and the ESL college
    composition student. TESOL Quarterly, 18, 649-670.

Suggests that teaching ESL composition students ways of using
various invention strategies from such areas as classical and
modern rhetoric and communication studies would benefit these
students in generating ideas for their writing. Presents
invention procedures used in a freshman composition class and the
invention notes of one ESL student.

Watson, C. (1982). The use and abuse of models in the ESL
    writing class. TESOL Quarterly, 16, 5-14.

Explores the way in which models of expected writing have been
used and the validity of the claims that state that these models
are useful. Suggest that a process-oriented approach which

integrates reading and writing might prove more beneficial than a strict models approach.

White, R. (1987). Approaches to writing. In M. Long & J. Richards (Eds.), Methodology in TESOL: A book of readings (pp. 259-266). New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Asserts that writing is as important as listening, speaking, or reading and can be used for assessment to provide a different kind of classroom activity, including quiet time for the teacher and feedback on how well students understand current material. Students should be provided with writing activities appropriate to their level: manipulating sentence parts (Stage I), parallel writing activities (Stage II), sentence and paragraph construction (Stage III) and complete compositions (Stage IV).

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 16, 195-209.

Discusses ways in which a student uses writing to generate, clarify, and organize her ideas in a piece of writing. Suggests that such discovery writing is essential in order for the student to find out what she really wants to communicate.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing process of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. TESOL Quarterly, 17, 165-187.

Studies the composing processes of six advanced ESL writing students to determine ways in which these students used writing to discover and clarify meaning. Results indicate that these writers generate ideas before looking at clarification and language use. Calls into question any writing pedagogy which would not allow such exploration through composing.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 79-101.

Explores the ways in which ESL teachers respond to student writing and notes that their responses are similar to those or L1 writing teachers. Reports that these responses treat initial student drafts as final and apply a prescriptive grammar-focused stance which fails to consider the developmental nature of the composing process. Stresses the need for teachers to respond to student drafts in ways appropriate to the development of a piece of writing.

Zamel, V. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 697-715.

Reports on classroom research which focuses on the ways writing pedagogy affects students' success in writing in English.

Findings suggest that student are more successful in their development as writers a situation in which a writing process pedagogy, as opposed to the traditional product-oriented model, has been implemented. Encourages teachers to become researchers within their classrooms.

Zamel, V. (1990). Through students' eyes: The experiences of three ESL writers. Journal of Basic Writing, 9, 83-98.

Investigates the experience of three male ESL writing students in two separate writing courses. Notes that the affective aspects of the students with respect to themselves as writers differed in the two learning environments, to their detriment. Asserts that teachers need to be aware of the way their students' beliefs, expectations, and perspectives influence their writing performance.

Zamel, V. (1992). Writing one's way into reading. TESOL Quarterly, 26, 463-485.

Asserts that the transmission model of reading does not allow students to interact with written text in a meaning-making exploratory manner. Argues that writing as a heuristic device, provides students with ways of connecting with and comprehending what they are reading.