WRITING, LITERACY, AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS*

Ilona Leki

INTRODUCTION

The first charge to the contributors to this volume was to consider applied linguistics from the point of view of the subfield each of us represents. Such a formulation constructs writing and literacy research as subordinate to the super-ordinate domain of applied linguistics and this was not one that corresponded well with my own sense of my work in relation to applied linguistics. To investigate this issue further, I informally questioned other writing researchers about whether or not they consider themselves applied linguists and what they do to be applied linguistics.

The small set of answers revealed quite a split, with one group of writing/literacy researchers immediately embracing applied linguistics and defining themselves as applied linguists (even wondering what else they could be). The attitude of the other (mainly North American) group was more agitated, almost denouncing applied linguistics as pointlessly aspiring to be scientific, overly oriented toward quantitative research on narrow, decontextualized issues, ideologically naive, and yet profiting from the *cachet* of linguistics and of science such that calling oneself (however resentfully) an applied linguist lent credibility to the work of researchers otherwise thought of under the less prestigious rubric of ESL. (See Vandrick's [1997] suggestion that ESL teachers at the tertiary level in the U.S. may sometimes even hide their own identities and attempt to "pass" as English or writing teachers rather than ESL teachers, many of whom at this level are basically writing/literacy teachers.)

The reasons for such an odd configuration of allegiances are probably historical. Since structural linguistics viewed spoken language as core, teaching L2 writing and reading was long considered primarily a means of reinforcing oral language learning. Thus, as applied linguistics split away from linguistics in the 1940s and 1950s to focus less on the science of language and more on language

99

teaching (Grabe 1992), it began with a legacy of interest in spoken rather than written form. Furthermore, research in SLA (at least among those who do discourse analysis) has continued to focus on oral language, despite the fact that probably most adult and many adolescent L2 learners depend heavily on written forms to further L2 language development.[1] This applied linguistics focus on oral forms created a potential for the separation of the two sister fields of applied linguistics and L2 writing/literacy research.

L2 writing/literacy research was soon also separated from another sister field, L1 English writing research. In his account of the decoupling of English L1 and L2 writing research in the U.S., Matsuda (1998; 1999) documents the initial links between English L1 and L2 writing practitioners at the tertiary level based on the English L1 practitioners' concern to serve all students in their classes who were not experienced in writing in English. The disintegration of those links coincided with the birth of TESOL in 1966, which underscored a perceived need for specialist (i.e., applied linguistics) training in order to teach L2 writing. Consequently, English L1 and L2 writing/reading focuses diverged. Matsuda describes the sad last meetings of the applied linguists at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC, an English L1 organization), as interest in L2 writing waned among English L1 professionals. The division of labor was symbolically completed (at least at the official macro-level) when no one attended the 1965 CCCC workshop on L2 writing, and the discouraged organizers abandoned plans for future workshops.

Most L2 literacy teachers at that time had no specific training in teaching reading or writing, and had they looked to research for insights, they would have found justification for a bottom up, sentence-level, and contrastive rhetoric orientation. Thus, L2 writing and reading continued to be taught throughout most of the 1970s with an applied linguistics (i.e., a formalist) orientation and those few who published work on L2 writing no doubt considered themselves something like applied linguists. In the meantime, however, in L1 English, research into L1 writers, texts, and composing processes (such as Emig 1971 and Shaughnessy 1977) was changing L1 English writing instruction, and a new generation of L2 writing teachers in North America, dissatisfied with what they were sensing as not a very fruitful way to teach and evaluate L2 writing at the tertiary level, soon began to turn away from a linguistic approach and look to L1 perspectives for insights. Articles by Zamel (1976) and Raimes (1979) encouraged L2 writing teachers to reject, even despise, what became characterized as an ineffective and punitive-seeming approach to L2 writing, where the focus was not on communication but on correctness and where the L2 writer was necessarily cast as deficient. L2 writing teachers were exhorted to become writing teachers, not language teachers (aka, applied linguists), who were stigmatized as excessively, even exclusively focused on structure and error. In the new process approaches imported into L2 from L1 writing instruction, language concerns were grudgingly addressed almost as an afterthought only at the end of the writing process. Applied linguistics became, and for many remain, tainted with the stain of the old error-focused approaches.

Throughout the 1980s, L2 writing researchers became increasingly aware of how much was at stake in teaching/learning L2 writing. Of all the language skills or functions, only writing creates a product that can be examined independent of the physical presence of the L2 learner, disclosing student vulnerabilities that can easily remain hidden in L2 reading, for example (Leki 1993). The potential serious risks for the L2 writer may be at the core of the contentiousness that has characterized L2 writing research over the last 15 years. Although at first, the points of contention appeared to be various pedagogical issues, since the beginning of the 1990s, the debates have taken an ideological turn, starting with Santos' (1992) description of the L2 English writing profession as resolutely non-ideological compared to English L1 *because of* its roots in applied linguistics, and with Canagarajah's (1993) criticism of L2 writing researchers for not addressing ideological questions. Since that time, among L2 writing researchers, debates on such topics as EAP (Allison 1996, Benesch 1996, and Pennycook 1997), critical pedagogy (Benesch 1993), voice (Ramanathan and Kaplan 1996 and Raimes and Zamel 1997), individualism (Ramanathan and Atkinson 1999), and plagiarism (Pennycook 1994a) have been distinctly ideological.

Despite spirited and convincing depictions of mainstream applied linguistics (Grabe 1994, Grabe and Kaplan 1992) as drawing on many social-science traditions, recent criticisms of applied linguistics, from within the discipline itself, also seem to home in on perceptions of narrowness and failure to see research issues as embedded within broader educational, sociocultural, and ideological frames. As Pennycook (1996b) comments:

> One of the areas in [sic] which TESOL/applied linguistics has been
> slow to acknowledge as a fast-moving, fascinating, contentious,
> and "happening" area of research and speculation is in literacy.
> Whereas work around L2 literacy continues by and large to focus
> on the mechanics of reading and writing, a large body of work has
> focused on literacy within a far broader social and political
> context, viewing literacy as a social practice, as a central part of
> how we read the world, and as connected therefore to cultural
> frameworks and political access (1996b:163).

Literacy as social practice might here be juxtaposed against the idea of writing as "technology," which appears to represent a more mainstream applied linguistics view of writing (Grabe and Kaplan 1996). That applied linguistics continues a focus on "the mechanics of reading and writing" whereas L2 writing and literacy work has become more interested in literacy as social practice is perhaps materially seen in the fact that relatively little writing research appears in the main applied linguistics periodicals and much of what does appear could be characterized as quantitative in its methodologies. In fact, even the ideologically aware work of the genre researchers in Australia that Pennycook was reviewing in the citation above has offered until quite recently a relatively mechanical, overly simple answer to questions of empowerment through literacy: a relentless focus on

genre, a form of literacy study which is seen, and sees itself, as squarely situated at the core of applied linguistics.

Lazaraton (1998) further notes that, despite a sense among some that applied linguistics is moving from "an essentially unquestioned reliance on and preference for quasi-experimental studies employing parametric statistics in the 1980s, to a broader, multidisciplinary perspective on research methodology, as well as the nature of research itself, in the 1990s" (1998:3), applied linguistics periodicals, except for the *TESOL Quarterly*, do not reflect this change. "From 92 percent to 97 percent of the articles [in the three journals she reviewed besides the *TESOL Quarterly*] are quantitative in nature" (p. 3), a state of affairs that might in part be a cause of "…our increasingly pointed questions about the significance of our [applied linguistics] research (e.g., Rampton 1997)" (1998:3).

The pointed questions clearly suggest a dissatisfaction with the traditional applied linguistics paradigm and perhaps ways to break out of it. Larsen-Freeman (1997) sees in applied linguistics "a certain turmoil, a field in search of a new paradigm" (91), and McGroarty (1998) urges applied linguistics to take a lesson from what she calls the "constructivists" and include in its formulations greater awareness of the constructed nature of knowledge. In other words, L2 writing and literacy researchers who are dissatisfied with applied linguistics are not alone.

With these contested characterizations of applied linguistics in mind, I would like to propose three key areas in L2 writing/literacy research which are likely to be influential into the next decade. Some of this work draws fairly directly on applied linguistics traditions; some of it, on the other hand, might usefully contribute to alternative perspectives in the move to "postmodernize" applied linguistics. Finally, I will note areas where applied linguistics traditions might enhance L2 writing/literacy research.

Because *ARAL* regularly reviews current work in L2 language teaching, rather than repeat the material in its 1998 volume, I refer readers to excellent review articles by Hudson and Cumming covering theoretical perspectives in reading and writing, Bamford and Day (reading) and Raimes (writing) on teaching, and Perkins (reading) and Kroll (writing) on testing. In proper postmodern fashion, in this review I do not claim to cover the range of contributions to L2 writing/literacy research in some objective way that would somehow capture all its multiple facets. Nor can I feel confident that my choices would be those of others involved in L2 writing/literacy research. Rather I embrace the position that the perspective apparent in my choices here, as well as the views expressed, is contingent, dynamic, and necessarily limited by my own situatedness as an L2 writing researcher in North America.

NEEDS ANALYSIS

        Within education more generally, and so also within applied linguistics, traditional needs analysis explores the context for literacy acquisition by examining the target. Genre studies overlap with needs analysis through their attempt to describe target texts (Swales 1990), although researchers like Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995), as well as Swales (1990) and Johns (1997), also situate genres within social contexts and as a response to them. Contrastive Rhetoric too is often a form of needs analysis, anathema to some L2 writing researchers because of its propensity to essentialize cultures (see discussion of identity, below), partly through its static representation of their written products and its implication that L2 writers too are little more than products of a static culture (see, for example, Kubota 1997; 1999). While Contrastive Rhetoric has become more subtle and its analyses more sophisticated and sensitive in its later years (Connor 1996), Scollon (1997) suggests that Contrastive Rhetoric is a misnomer since Contrastive Rhetoric has in fact never really engaged in a rhetorical analysis which would focus on persuasion and so encompass an analysis of audience. Such an analysis would of necessity include more sensitivity to context, and to shifting contexts, which would likely loosen the stasis of simply comparing one set of textual patterns to another, which Scollon terms contrastive poetics.

        Within the context of academic writing, needs analyses like Leki and Carson (1994) and Carson, *et al.* (1992) attempt to determine the kinds of literacy demands L2 writers face at the tertiary level, presumably to then create L2 literacy classes more responsive to those needs. A very positive feature of these investigations is their inclusion of students' own views on their needs through surveys and interviews. However, needs analysis of this kind has been subject to cogent criticism by Benesch (1993; 1996), who in effect asks whose needs are actually served by the more traditional needs analyses and proposes, instead, a consideration of the broader political issues that created the "needs." In her analysis, for example, cutbacks in funding for education at her institution resulted in larger classes which, in turn, resulted in L2 learners having a more difficult time following a psychology professor's lectures. A traditional needs analysis would have led to the students being offered extra work on, perhaps, listening comprehension or vocabulary. In the critical needs analysis Benesch describes, it is the large class sizes and funding cutbacks that need to be addressed. The economic and political context, not the students, is the problem.

        But problematizing traditional views takes other angles as well. Ramanathan and Kaplan (1996), for example, question the usefulness of the unexamined transfer from L1 to L2 writing instruction of the highly prized concept of voice. Similarly Atkinson (1997) deconstructs the notion of critical thinking in relation to L2 learners. (See also three responses to Atkinson by Davidson [1998], Gieve [1998], and Hawkins [1998].) In fact, the whole notion of literacy in L1 or L2 as an unblemished good has been severely challenged in several quarters (Grabe and Kaplan 1996, Purcell-Gates 1998, Street 1993, Stuckey 1991). In L2 settings,

this negative perspective on literacy has dovetailed with Phillipson's (1992) applied linguistics work on linguicism and Pennycook's (1994b) challenge to the view that the acquisition of English worldwide is a neutral act, disengaged from political exigencies.

Within the L2 writing classroom, arguably the most potent aspect of the context for learning is the writing teacher's response to the students' writing. Ferris' (1997) and Ferris, *et al.*'s (1997) detailed studies of both L2 writing students' responses to teachers' markings and the revisions that subsequently resulted are important and extremely useful works, with direct applications to classroom teaching. But in a less traditional applied linguistics mode, and in keeping with recent moves toward seeing more closely the humans who are the central actors in L2 literacy acquisition (and toward the growing consciousness of the complex variability across these humans and over time), Hyland (1998) and Severino (1993) use qualitative and context-sensitive research methodologies which counterbalance the inadequacies of a more distanced, and more generalizable, approach. In Hyland's (1998) case study of two L2 writers in New Zealand, we meet Samorn, who requested of her writing teacher a particular focus on grammatical errors but who (unrecognized by the teacher) became increasingly discouraged when her teacher in fact did as she asked. Severino (1993), on the other hand, demonstrates three different approaches (encouraging resistance, accommodation, or assimilation) she used in a writing center to respond to differing needs of three students. We see from this work that "needs" are complex, difficult to sort out, and may require a variety of responses.

Like the Ferris/Hyland/Severino explorations, particularly useful to developing an understanding of the intersection of theoretical issues, historical forces, and students' lives are combinations of studies that illuminate these intersections from different points of view. Pennycook's (1996a) historical examination of plagiarism in the Western literacy tradition and Currie's (1998) naturalistic study of one student's use of plagiarism to help her get through her course work at a Canadian university, mutually illuminate the terrain, grounding theoretical discussion in a real life.

Finally, from applied linguistics' traditional domain of error correction, Truscott (1996) reviews the published research and comes to the rather untraditional conclusion that error correction is probably useless and potentially harmful to L2 writing students. Here too, although Truscott does not pursue the angle, what is at issue is needs analysis, but no longer constructed as the mold into which students must be squeezed by instruction. What is implied in a rejection of error correction is that there is room for differential attainments at differential speeds.

Thus, the traditional domain of needs analysis, coming from education and overlapping in a variety of ways with applied linguistics research, has become more complex with the realization of competing needs and vested interests in defining and meeting those needs.

IDENTITY

A second theme of recent L2 writing/literacy research that will surely be expanded upon in the coming decade is related to identity issues. Identity "…will be a preoccupation in any period of intense change…" (Fairclough 1997:14) and probably becomes a particularly contested terrain whenever an individual moves into any new context. In a special issue of the *TESOL Quarterly* guest edited by Norton (1997) and devoted to L2 learner identity, Thesen (1997) calls into question critical discourse analysis of individuals as the hapless sites of struggles of competing discourses (although Critical Discourse Analysis has recently incorporated a greater interest in identity as well; see Fairclough 1997). With her intention to emphasize individual human agency in these struggles, her in-depth interviews with a group of students in South Africa show how multiple home literacies inform the development of academic literacy in play with the learners' strategic positioning of themselves in relation to the dominant target (here academic) discourse. The learners are central actors. They actively engage in calculating and manipulating just how far they want to go in pushing a particular identity for themselves. Ivanic (1998) too describes an adult learner who intermingles both active resistance to and acceptance of a particular kind of literacy (academic) in favor of another kind (professional) even within the same text, underscoring the hybridity of both texts and identities. These kinds of studies, because they are sensitive to context, work to complicate views of learners and work against the kind of essentializing that has been noted, sometimes vehemently, as a danger in cross-cultural studies. (See for example, Kubota 1997; 1999, Spack 1997c, Susser 1998; see also Atkinson, to appear, for a response.)

One potentially fruitful but underrepresented type of study is in-depth interviews and observational investigations by researchers who speak the same language as the research participants. Riazi (1997) explores the initiation of a group of Farsi-speaking graduate students into discourse and literacy demands of a Canadian college of education, and Kanno and Applebaum (1995) interview Japanese speaking students on their experiences of marginalization in a Canadian high school. Further such studies conducted in students' L1s can be anticipated and will be welcome.

In addition to examining others' identities, a perhaps growing trend has been to examine one's own identity conflicts both as a literacy learner (Bell 1995) and as a literacy teacher (Spack 1997b, Vandrick 1997). Studies like these potentially offer rich and intimate perceptions.

LONGITUDINAL STUDIES AS EXTENSIONS OF IDENTITY WORK

Portrayals of individuals' struggles with L2 literacy are greatly enhanced, as well as less liable to the dangers of overly simple cultural explanations of behaviors, when studies are conducted over time, allowing investigators and readers to see transitions to and shifts among different identities in response to different environmental pressures. Although such research is time consuming, a bank of studies focusing on real students, with names, over time, is developing (Mlynarczyk 1998, Smoke 1994).

Harklau's (1999; in press) study of four students' experiences in a U.S. high school poignantly describes their transition from being considered model students (obedient, quiet, respectful, cooperative) in high school to being labeled, instantly upon moving into tertiary education, ESL students, their whole identities summed up in their writing and language skills. We also see the teachers' misguided attempts to draw on the experiences of the students in the ESL writing class by encouraging them to contrast their experiences in the U.S. with their experiences at home. For Harklau's four students, home was the U.S.; they had no real experience of their previous residences to draw on, but by repeatedly pointing them toward those residences, their teachers constructed them as outsiders they did not feel they were.

Spack (1997a) follows the on-going development of academic literacy for a Japanese college student. Initially ascribing her difficulties to some sort of Japanese approach to education, this student comes to see and demonstrate her own multiple literacies reinforcing and interweaving with each other as she confronts a variety of literacy demands in college.

My own (Leki 1999) five-year study of the literacy experiences of a Polish-speaking student shows dramatically how his educational experiences, first in a U.S. high school and then in a university, served to create an approach to education that might be called self-defeating or perhaps opportunistic. As the student, Jan, struggles to negotiate what he increasingly intensely comes to see as meaningless institutional obstacles, he cynically learns to play whatever game it takes to pass courses.

While studies like these can be extremely illuminating, they inevitably entail serious issues of representation as students' identities are created in the text for readers by researchers. The constructed nature of knowledge is most easily apparent in such studies and, it is to be hoped, promotes sensitivity to the constructed nature of all forms of knowledge, including quantitative work. (See Mortensen and Kirsch 1996 for enlightening reflections on the ethics of reporting on in-depth studies.)

Oddly underrepresented in longitudinal research are in-depth, over-time studies of students' experiences in L2 literacy classes themselves, which would

focus not on increased control over the language but on the whole experience—the interaction with other students, with the material, and with the teacher. We get a glimpse of one such set of experiences in Malicka (1996), where students' initial enthusiasm for the L2 writing course changed to boredom and irritation, changes the teacher remained unaware of. (See Villalobos 1996; also see Toohey 1998 for an example with 5-7 year olds.)

APPLIED LINGUISTICS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO L2 LITERACY RESEARCH

While mainstream applied linguistics itself has lamented the overrepresentation of English and monolingual English-speaking countries in its work, writing research probably suffers from this flaw even more so. Silva, Leki, and Carson (1997) chide L1 academic literacy researchers for their ethnocentric discussions of writing theories and processes, universalizing Western literacy contexts, and basing their conclusions about writing on the experiences of 18 year old U.S. college students. They also assert that L2 studies can offer L1 academic literacy studies access to an expanded universe of literacy development (see also Muchiri, *et al*. 1995). But in fact, L2 literacy studies, like applied linguistics, are also far too English oriented. Clearly material conditions of scholarship that Canagarajah (1996) discusses play a role in creating the lopsided overemphasis on English from monolingual English-speaking countries. But mainstream applied linguistics, particularly in its consideration of language planning issues, has a great deal to offer literacy studies, helping to develop in literacy investigators a sense of the international contexts for literacy development both in L1 and L2. Parry and Su's (1998) book, for example, consists almost entirely of student-written explorations of literacy issues in China and combines information on language policy and planning with these graduate students' reflections on their own experiences as language learners and English teachers in technical training schools.

Efforts like the special issue of the *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, guest edited by Kaplan (1995), and devoted to literacy and language planning in countries of the Pacific rim, and Brock and Walter's (1993) volume also focusing on that part of the world, need to be expanded and supplemented with information from additional areas of the world and with more grounded descriptions of students' actual experiences. Dubin and Kuhlman (1992) represents an effort in this direction as does Purves' (1992) IEA study, one in reference to which Cumming and Riazi (1996) feel more L2 literacy researchers need to position their own work.

Finally, more traditional mainstream work in applied linguistics continues to bring detailed insights into writing processes (Roca de Larios, Murphy and Manchon 1999, Zimmermann in press), focusing particularly on how and when L1 is tapped during L2 text production. In spite of such progress, however, Cumming and Riazi (1996) remind us that we are as yet still in the embarrassing situation of having no suitable model for inquiry to inform educational practices, including writing instruction.

CONCLUSION

Parks and Maguire assert that in applied linguistics, context has been "evoked but not explored" (1999:144). It seems reasonable to expect that the next decade will bring about greater attention to the multiplicity and complexity of literacy acquisition, at least partly through more detailed, "thicker" descriptions of individual acquirers within specific and carefully specified contexts: These descriptions should include both immediate contexts of educational settings and personal histories (where, it is to be hoped, the voices—the words—of these acquirers will be heard much more than they have been to this point) as well as more distanced contexts of social, cultural, economic, political, and ideological environments. (See Pennycook 1997 and Benesch 1996 for discussions of excessively limited ideas about context.)

The acquisition of literacy, like the acquisition of English, is risky, and not an implicitly beneficial or even neutral undertaking. While education by its nature inevitably entails change, obviously not all change brought about by education is for the benefit of everyone. Some are left behind and excluded from political power and a variety of social and material benefits, often on the basis of differential literacy acquisition. Initiation into the literate worlds of alien cultures and technologies can also, for example, promote education in and knowledge about inappropriate technologies, ones that may be useful in the metropolitan countries of origin but (imported into non-urban countries by their own educated elite and oriented toward concerns of the center) are useless to the periphery. This type of change creates societies that are made "...permanent parasites on the developed countries for knowledge and information..." (Pattanayak, p. vi, cited in Pennycook 1994b:21). Literacy acquisition can also create disjuncture between individuals' local or home culture and their new literate or academic culture. Maintaining a critical awareness of the dangers of literacy activities, that is, holding carefully and reflectively in mind the political and power-relation consequences of literacy activities means, as has been said many times before in the critical pedagogy literature, asking fundamental questions: Why are these people learning to read and/or write this language? What are they giving up? Who stands to benefit? Who will lose?

It seems essential that new applied linguists be carefully and thoroughly acquainted with the various critical discourses that probe and contest otherwise unexamined meaning-making structures like classrooms and educational institutions. The spread of English and the spread of literacy cannot be assumed to be benign. Without such exposure to critical discourses, applied linguists will be in unconscious complicity with the status quo, in effect, working to reproduce unjust social, economic, and political arrangements. Since the discourses that reproduce such structures are readily available (Pennycook 1997) and therefore tempting, and since the discourses that work against reproducing those structures are far less available and are often difficult to understand, an essential role for senior applied linguists is to help expose future applied linguists to contestatory discourses and, if

necessary, help demystify the sometimes dense language that can discourage novices and lead to their dismissal of these points of view.

While I earlier characterized debates surrounding academic literacy issues as contentious, it is to be hoped, nevertheless, that debate can continue but also that the most powerful voices will not drown out or silence quieter contributions in pursuit of a single correct outlook. (See Belcher 1997 on the issue of nonadversarial argumentation.) While I am not suggesting some neoliberal acceptance of everyone's happy voices and native costumes, like biodiversity, ideational diversity permits the mutations that create new questions and options, and that, in turn, can lead toward a desirable "pluralisation of knowledge" (Pennycook 1997:263).

NOTES

* I would like to thank Dwight Atkinson for his challenging and insightful reading of this manuscript.

1. I am indebted to Linda Harklau for sharing her insights on this point with me. Although SLA has drifted away from the core of applied linguistics to follow an independent course with somewhat different preoccupations (Grabe and Kaplan 1992), its interest in oral forms remains influential in applied linguistics more generally.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benesch, S. 1996. Needs analysis and curriculum development in EAP: An example of a critical approach. *TESOL Quarterly*. 30.723–738.

For readers wishing a lucid introduction to the project of critical pedagogy, Benesch offers a clear and compelling example from her own writing class. Although thoroughly grounded in theoretical issues, Benesch's account avoids the dense theoretical language of critical work, making her account accessible even to newcomers.

Harklau, L. In press. From the "good kids" to the "worst": Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*. 34.

Harklau offers a moving and convincing portrayal of a group of students in transition between high school and college in the U.S. whose identities are

actively constructed for them by the institutions in which they find themselves. The construction of these students as foreigners, though well-meaning, contradicts and undermines their own developing sense of themselves as complex individuals and cultural hybrids.

Ivanic, R. 1998. *Writing and identity*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

Through extensive interview and textual analysis, Ivanic explores the case of a writer between identities: her personal sense of herself as a budding social worker and an academic identity being pushed upon her as a student. Here again the account is eminently readable yet clearly conversant with pertinent theoretical issues.

Mortensen, P. and G. Kirsch. 1996. *Ethics and representation in qualitative studies of literacy*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

This collection of reflections reporting on qualitative research cuts to the core of what it means to represent someone else publically in writing (and profit by it, if only in terms of professional esteem and promotion). It raises concerns about colonizing the other, confronting research participants with negative evaluations of themselves, and a number of other provocative issues.

Norton, B. (ed.) 1997. *Language and identity*. [Special issue of *TESOL Quarterly*. 31.3.]

This special-topic issue touches on a number of questions related to how identities are constructed and reconstructed through the process of language learning.

Pennycook, A. 1996a. Borrowing others' words: Text, ownership, memory and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*. 30.201–230.

Pennycook offers here an example of the kind of work applied linguists might do that would work toward critical perspectives on teaching and research in L2 writing contexts. L2 professionals are called upon to see themselves as the cultural workers that they are and to embrace that identity through efforts such as this one, whose project is to demystify the unexamined assumptions in the West about plagiarism, that greatest of literary sins, which nevertheless has thrived throughout Western academic and literary life.

UNANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allison, D. 1996. Pragmatist discourse and English for academic purposes. *English for Specific Purposes*. 15.85–103.

Atkinson, D. 1997. A critical approach to critical thinking in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*. 31.71–94.

_____ 1999. TESOL and culture. *TESOL Quarterly*. 33.625–654.

Bamford, J. and R. Day. 1998. Teaching reading. In W. Grabe, *et al*. (eds.) *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18. Foundations of second language learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 124–141.

Belcher, D. 1997. An argument for nonadversarial argumentation: On the relevance of the feminist critique of academic discourse to L2 writing pedagogy. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 6.1–21.

Bell, J. 1995. The relationship between L1 and L2 literacy: Some complicating factors. *TESOL Quarterly*. 29.687–704.

Benesch, S. 1993. ESL, ideology, and the politics of pragmatism. *TESOL Quarterly*. 27.705–717.

Berkenkotter, C. and T. Huckin. 1995. *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication*. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum.

Brock, M. and L. Walters (eds.) 1993. *Teaching composition around the Pacific rim*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, S. 1993. Comment on Ann Raimes's "Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing": Up the garden path: Second language writing approaches, local knowledge, and pluralism. *TESOL Quarterly*. 27.301–306.

_____ 1996. "Nondiscursive" requirements in academic publishing, material resources of periphery scholars, and the politics of knowledge production. *Written Communication*. 13.435–472.

Carson, J. 1998. Cultural backgrounds: What should we know about multilingual students? *TESOL Quarterly*. 32.735–740.

_____, N. Chase, S. Gibson and M. Hargrove. 1992. Literacy demands of the undergraduate curriculum. *Reading Research and Instruction*. 31.25–50.

Connor, U. 1996. *Contrastive rhetoric*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cumming, A. 1998. Theoretical perspectives on writing. In W. Grabe*, et al*. (eds.) *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18. Foundations of second language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 61–78.

_____ and A. Riazi. 1996. Building models of adult second-language writing instruction. Paper presented at the seminar: Second Language Acquisition and Writing. University of Southampton, July 1996.

Currie, P. 1998. Staying out of trouble: Apparent plagiarism and academic survival. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 7.1–18.

Davidson, B. 1998. A case for critical thinking in the English language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*. 32.119–123.

Dubin, F. and N. Kuhlman (eds.) 1992. *Cross-cultural literacy: Global perspectives on reading and writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Emig, J. 1971. *The composing process of twelfth grader*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Fairclough, N. 1997. Discourse across disciplines: Discourse analysis in researching social change. *AILA Review*. 12.3–17.

Ferris, D. 1997. The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*. 31.315–339.

_____, S. Pezone, C. Tade and S. Tinti. 1997. Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 6.155–182.

Gieve, S. 1998. A reader reacts … . *TESOL Quarterly*. 32.123–129.

Grabe, W. 1992. Applied linguistics and linguistics. In W. Grabe and R. Kaplan (eds.) *Introduction to applied linguistics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. 35–58.

_____ 1994. Applied linguistics. In A. Purves (ed.) *Encyclopedia of English studies and language arts*. New York: Scholastic Leadership Policy Research. 60–62.

_____ and R. Kaplan (eds.) 1992. *Introduction to applied linguistics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

_____ 1996. *Theory and practice of writing*. New York: Longman.

Hawkins, M. 1998. Apprenticing nonnative speakers to new discourse communities. *TESOL Quarterly*. 32.129–132.

Hudson, T. 1998. Theoretical perspectives on reading. In W. Grabe, *et al.* (eds.) *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18. Foundations of second language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 43–60.

Hyland, F. 1998. The impact of teacher-written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 7.255–286.

Johns, A. 1997. *Text, role, and context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kanno, Y. and S. Applebaum. 1995. ESL students speak up: Their stories of how we are doing. *TESL Canada Journal*. 12.32–49.

Kaplan, R. (ed.) 1995. *The teaching of writing in the Pacific basin*. [Special issue of *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*. 6.1/2.]

Kroll, B. 1998. Assessing writing abilities. In W. Grabe, *et al.* (eds.) *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18. Foundations of second language teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 219–240.

Kubota, R. 1997. A reevaluation of the uniqueness of Japanese written discourse. *Written Communication*. 14.460–480.

_____ 1999. Japanese culture constructed by discourses: Implications for Applied Linguistics research and ELT. *TESOL Quarterly*. 33.9–35.

Larsen-Freeman, D. 1997. Impressions of AILA 1996. *AILA Review*. 12.87–92.

Lazaraton, A. 1998. Research methods in Applied Linguistics. *TESOL Research Interest Section Newsletter*. 5.2.3.

Leki, I. 1993. Reciprocal themes in ESL reading and writing. In J. Carson and I. Leki (eds.) *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle. 9–32.

Leki, I. 1999. "Pretty much I screwed up": Ill-served needs of a permanent
        resident. In L. Harklau, K. Losey and M. Siegal (eds.) *Generation 1.5
        meets college composition*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum. 17–43.
_____ and J. Carson. 1994. Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and
        writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly*. 28.81–101.
Losey, K. 1997. *Listen to the silences*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Malicka, A. 1996. Tasks, interaction, affect, and the writer's development: A
        descriptive study of an ESL composition class. Indiana University of
        Pennsylvania. Ph.D. diss.
Matsuda, P. 1998. Situating ESL writing in a cross–disciplinary context. *Written
        Communication*. 15.99–121.
_____ 1999. Composition studies and ESL writing: A disciplinary division of
        labor. *College Composition and Communication*. 50.699–721.
McGroarty, M. 1998. Constructive and constructivist challenges for Applied
        Linguistics. *Language Learning*. 48.591–622.
Mlynarczyk, R. 1998. *Conversations of the mind*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
Nelson, G. 1998. Categorizing, classifying, labeling: A fundamental cognitive
        process. *TESOL Quarterly*. 32.727–735.
Parks, S. and M. Maguire. 1999. Coping with on-the-job writing in ESL: A
        constructivist-semiotic perspective. *Language Learning*. 29.143–175.
Parry, K. and X. Su (eds.) 1998. *Culture, literacy, and learning English*.
        Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
Pennycook, A. 1994a. The complex contexts of plagiarism: A reply to Deckert.
        Journal of Second Language Writing. 3.277–284.
_____1994b. *The cultural politics of English as an international
        language*. New York: Longman.
_____1996b. TESOL and critical literacies: Modern, Post, or Neo?
        TESOL Quarterly. 30.163–171.
_____1997. Vulgar pragmatism, critical pragmatism, and EAP. *English
        for Specific Purposes*. 16.253–269.
Perkins, K. 1998. Assessing reading. In W. Grabe, *et al.* (eds.) *Annual Review of
        Applied Linguistics, 18. Foundations of second language teaching*. New
        York: Cambridge University Press. 208–218.
Phillipson, R. 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Purcell-Gates, V. 1998. Literacy at home and beyond. Paper presented at the
        Watson Conference on Rhetoric and Composition. Louisville, KY, October
        1998.
Purves, A. 1992. *The IEA study of written composition*. New York: Pergamon
        Press.
Raimes, A. 1979. *Problems and teaching strategies in ESL composition*. Arlington,
        VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.
_____ 1998. Teaching writing. In W. Grabe, *et al.* (eds.) *Annual Review of
        Applied Linguistics, 18. Foundations of second language teaching*. New
        York: Cambridge University Press. 142–167.
_____ and V. Zamel. 1997. Response to Ramanathan and Kaplan. *Journal of
        Second Language Writing*. 6.79–81.

Ramanathan, V. and D. Atkinson. 1999. Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 8.45–75.

_____ and R. Kaplan. 1996. Audience and voice in current L1 composition texts: Some implications for ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 5.21–34.

Rampton, B. 1997. Second language research in late modernity. *Modern Language Journal*. 81.329–333.

Riazi, A. 1997. Acquiring disciplinary literacy: A social-cognitive analysis of text production and learning among Iranian graduate students of education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 6.105–137.

Roca de Larios, J., L. Murphy and R. Manchon. 1999. The use of restructuring strategies in EFL writing: A study of Spanish learners of English as a Foreign Language. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 8.13–44.

Santos, T. 1992. Ideology in composition: L1 and ESL. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 1.1–15.

Scollon, R. 1997. Contrastive rhetoric, contrastive poetics, or perhaps something else? *TESOL Quarterly*. 31.352–358.

Severino, C. 1993. The sociopolitical implications of response to second language and second dialect writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 2.181–201.

Shaughnessy, M. 1977. *Errors and expectations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Silva, T., I. Leki and J. Carson. 1997. Broadening the perspective of mainstream composition studies. *Written Communication*. 14.398–428.

Smoke, T. 1994. Writing as a means of learning. *College ESL*. 4.1–11.

Spack, R. 1997a. The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language. *Written Communication*. 14.3–62.

_____ 1997b. The (in)visibility of the person(al) in academe. *College English*. 59.9–31.

_____ 1997c. The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*. 31.765–774.

Street, B. (ed.) 1993. *Cross-cultural approaches to literacy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stuckey, J. 1991. *The violence of literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Susser, B. 1998. EFL's othering of Japan: Orientalism in English language teaching. *JALT Journal*. 20.49–82.

Swales, J. 1990. *Genre analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Thesen, L. 1997. Voices, discourse, and transition: In search of new categories in EAP. *TESOL Quarterly*. 31.487–511.

Toohey, K. 1998. "Breaking them up, taking them away": ESL students in Grade 1. *TESOL Quarterly*. 32.61–84.

Truscott, J. 1996. The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*. 46.327–369.

Vandrick, S. 1997. The role of hidden identities in the postsecondary ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*. 31.153–157.

Villalobos, J. 1996. Process-oriented approach to writing: A case study of a writing class in English as a second language (ESL) at the college level. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa, Ph.D. diss.

Zamel, V. 1976. Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What can we learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly*. 10.67–76.

Zimmermann, R. In press. Formulating in L2 writing: Towards an empirical model. *Learning and Instruction*. 10.