English L2 Composition Pedagogy: Approaches and Ideologies

Roger J. Davies

Department of English

Faculty of Education

Ehime University

1. Introduction

If fields of study such as discourse linguistics and rhetoric (both classical and modern) help specify the writing canon of modern English, informing us of the standards, norms, and conventions that define effective writing, how they originated, and why they continue to be valued, the goal of research in composition pedagogy is to provide approaches, methods, and techniques which will tell us *how* such writing should be taught in the classroom. At present, however, most theories of composition pedagogy "operate more on a principle of critical reaction to a previous approach than on cumulative development" (Raimes, 1991, p. 412). The result is that "the present anarchy of the discipline of what is commonly categorized as 'composition'" (Kinneavy, 1971, p. 1) is "less clearly defined now...than it was [three decades ago]" (op. cit.).

In order to make sense of the multiplicity of approaches to composition pedagogy currently proliferating in the field, it is essential to have a clear understanding of the theoretical assumptions that underlie them. As Grabe and Kaplan (1996, p. ix) point out, "a comprehensive study of writing in first language contexts is itself a difficult interdisciplinary undertaking, [as] one must consider perspectives from English, education, linguistics, psychology, and sociology." In second language contexts, a diverse set of academic disciplines converge on the study of L2 writing, giving rise to a sometimes bewildering variety of research paradigms, teaching methodologies, and terminological problems that make the study of written discourse across cultures "a daunting task" (ibid.), and one of the "trickiest problems of language description and teaching" (Mauranen, 1993, p. xi). Moreover, the emergence of L2 composition instruction as an independent area of specialization within applied linguistics with its own theoretical models and empirical research has only come about within the last two or three decades; as a result, like other developing fields, "ESL writing [has] looked to and borrowed theories from its L1 counterpart" (Santos, 1992, p. 1). Therefore, in order to clarify current approaches to L2 composition instruction, it is first

necessary to examine the assumptions and ideologies that define L1 composition theory.

2. English L1 composition instruction

Of primary importance for understanding compostion instruction in L1 contexts are crucial differences between British and American spheres of influence in the English-speaking world. The blunt fact is that L1 composition instruction in post-secondary institutions is "markedly noninternational" and the United States is "all but alone in offering L1 basic writing courses and programs at the university level,"[1] with one of the consequences being "a certain insularity in the [American] L1 composition profession" (Santos, 1992, p. 10; after Faigley, 1986). Composition instruction in America generally falls under the auspices of English departments, in which there is normally a clear-cut divide between literature and composition specialists, with the latter often complaining of "a lack of respect and understanding" (ibid., p. 7) and their lack of status as "unprivileged instructors" (Swales, 1990, p. 11; see also Johns, 1997). Significant numbers of researchers contend that many of these departments often have an express and radical ideological and sociopolitical agenda (e.g., Crews, 1986; Clifford, 1989; Kimball, 1990; Santos, 1992). As Santos (1992, p. 2) states, "to an outsider, one of the most striking features of L1 composition [in the modern American college] is the extent to which it sees itself ideologically."[2] Although it is difficult to accurately determine the type and quality of instruction taking place in the wide range of American post-secondary institutions today, it seems clear that while there continues to be a strong emphasis on teaching practical, form-based writing skills in many university composition courses, the English departments in a great many American universities also promote approaches to writing which are overtly ideological in nature.

The British situation is somewhat different, perhaps because the UK has never had to process tens of thousands of students through Freshman English courses, as in America. This is partly due to the fact that British education has traditionally been "more elitist and therefore requires more from the intending student in the way of qualifications and skills, and partly because most...specialist undergraduate courses never actually demand a formal measurement of students' ability to write" (Hebron, 1984, p. 91). It is also true that British secondary school students score markedly higher in almost all areas of writing competence than their American counterparts (see, for example, the results of a project of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), entitled the *International Study of Written Composition*, reported on in Purves, 1992). Nevertheless, as Hosbaum (1984) points out, standards of literacy have also been declining in the UK,[3] and in addition to accepting increasing numbers of university entrants with marginal levels of L1 writing competence, there is a determined effort in Britain at the present time to attract more foreign students, most of whom will have to be provided with basic instruction in academic writing skills (often in sheltered, semi-autonomous writing centers specifically designed for this purpose).[4] Thus, although discussions about L1 composition pedagogy are

generally centered on the American academic experience, since this is where most of the data is to be found, a "major concern of current tertiary education [worldwide] is academic writing and educational institutions are paying extraordinary attention to the writing skills of students [as evidenced by] a recent burgeoning of 'writing laboratories' at universities... across the world" (Kachru, 1997, p. 337).

Taxonomies for categorizing theories of L1 composition vary greatly, reflecting perhaps the continuing, and often heated, ideological debate in the English-speaking world over how mother tongue writing skills should be taught. Many current theories focus on the notion of "process," which should be understood as an "antithesis" to previous ways of teaching L1 writing, "proffering an antidote" to the perceived inadequacies of traditional, product-oriented approaches which focus mainly on form and structure (Coe, 1987, p. 13).[5] There is not one process approach, however, but many, and today "conflicts...among adherents of 'the process approach' to teaching composition...are far more significant than the opposition between process and product..." (ibid.). Models of instruction depend very much on which particular writing process one chooses to emphasize: writing as communication (expressivism), writing as learning (cognitivism), or writing as a social act (social constructionism):

> [A]ny process approach, by definition, concerns itself with one or more of the *hows* formalists traditionally ignore: *how* writers create; *how* writers think, feel, and verbalize to enable writing; *how* writers learn while writing; *how* writing communicates with readers; and *how* social processes and contexts influence the shaping and interpreting of texts. (ibid., p. 14)

As Faigley (1986) and Johns (1990) point out, these three major perspectives on L1 composition process are also relevant for understanding developments in L2 composition instruction, and each can be identified by their "emphasis and their advocates." The expressivist view (e.g., Elbow, 1981; Moffet, 1982; Murray, 1982) stresses the personal voice in writing, the cognitivist view (e.g., Flower & Hayes, 1980; Flower, 1989) focuses on the intellectual processes a writer goes through while composing, and the social constructionist (also termed constructivist) view (e.g., Bizzell, 1982; Bruffee, 1986; Trimbur, 1989) considers writing as a social artifact with political and ideological implications. Social constructionism is also "commonly associated with critical theory and critical pedagogy, as represented...by Pennycook (1989) and Peirce (1989)" in L2 contexts (Santos, 1992, p. 2).

According to Santos (ibid.), to the extent that the teaching of L2 writing has borrowed from L1 composition pedagogy, "it has done so primarily from two of the three perspectives within L1 process theory; namely, the cognitivist (e.g., Raimes, 1987) and the expressivist (e.g., Spack, 1988), while neglecting the third, the social constructionist." This assertion has been challenged in some quarters, however, and depends largely on how the term "process theory" is defined. There are also multiple, and often conflicting, views regarding the label "social constructionism" and its place within this scheme. Some researchers, such as Johns (1990), classify social constructionism as distinct from process theory, and as having an important influence on the development of L2 writing pedagogy, while others, such as Silva

(1992), make no mention of it at all in this context. Each of these approaches to composition process will be discussed below within a historical framework of theories of L2 composition pedagogy.

3. English L2 composition instruction

L2 composition instruction can been viewed historically as "a succession of approaches and orientations to L2 writing, a cycle in which particular approaches achieve dominance and then fade, but never really disappear" (Silva, 1990, p. 11). According to Silva (1990), the four most influential approaches to L2 composition instruction in modern times can be considered as follows: (1) controlled composition, which stresses the lexical and syntactic features of a text; (2) current-traditional rhetoric, which emphasizes discourse-level text structures; (3) the process approach, which attends to writers' composing behaviors; and (4) English for academic purposes (EAP), which focuses on the writer as a member of the academic discourse community.[6] However, the divisions between these approaches to L2 composition instruction are "by no means discrete and sequential" (Raimes, 1991, p. 412), resulting in a "merry-go-round of approaches [which] has a number of negative effects on the discipline [including] a great deal of confusion and insecurity among ESL composition teachers" (op. cit., p. 18), as well as a polemical and sometimes rancorous debate among their proponents over the value of these models in the classroom.

3.1 Controlled composition

Silva (ibid., pp. 12–13) states that controlled composition, or guided composition, had its roots in Fries' oral approach, the precursor to the audiolingual method of L2 teaching which stressed the primacy of speech. Writing was considered of secondary concern, used essentially to reinforce oral habits, and functioning mainly as "the handmaid of the other skills." It was learned through habit formation with the writer simply manipulating previously learned language structures and primarily concerned with formal linguistic features. Typical exercises included reordering scrambled sentences, identifying topic and supporting sentences, doing paragraph completion exercises, and so on. The text itself was seen as a collection of sentence patterns and vocabulary items, and there was little concern for either the notion of audience or the purpose of writing. As Silva (p. 13) notes, although this approach receives almost "ritual condemnation" in the literature today, it is still alive and well in many L2 composition classrooms and textbooks.

3.2 Current-traditional rhetoric

With the coming of the 1960s, increasing attention began to be focused on EL2 students' needs in producing written discourse, leading to the belief that controlled composition was not enough, that there was more to writing than building grammatical sentences, and that there needed to be a bridge between controlled and free writing. This

new approach became known as current-traditional rhetoric and can be characterized by its...

> ...emphasis on the composed product rather than the composing process; the analysis of discourse into words, sentences, and paragraphs; the classification of discourse into exposition, narration, description, and argument; a strong concern with usage (syntax, spelling, punctuation) and with style (economy, clarity, emphasis); the preoccupation with the informal essay and research paper; and so on. (Young, 1978, p. 31; see also Berlin & Inkster, 1980)

According to Silva (1990, p. 14), in current-traditional rhetoric there is a central concern with "the logical construction and arrangement of discourse forms"; a primary interest in the paragraph, as composed of topic sentences, supporting sentences, concluding sentences, and transitions; an emphasis on various modes of reasoning (e.g., illustration, exemplification, comparison and contrast, classification, definition, cause and effect, and so on); and emphasis on essay organization, comprising an introduction, body, and conclusion.

Expository and argumentative writing are considered of primary importance for university-level L2 writers, and classroom attention is focused on form, teaching students how to organize syntactic units into larger patterns and providing them with forms within which they can operate. In such contexts, teachers generally insist that writers should "pre-reveal the form of the text...and the content...within the first paragraphs..., provide generalizations at appropriate points in the discourse, and maintain and develop topics in a manner accessible to the reader," employing appropriate forms of discourse organization and using proper cohesive devices (Johns, 1990, p. 27).

In short, from the perspective of current-traditional rhetoric, "writing is basically a matter of arrangement, of fitting writing into prescribed patterns" (Silva, 1990, p. 14). The text is seen as a collection of "increasingly complex discourse structures (sentences, paragraphs, essays), each embedded in the next largest form" (ibid.), while the "implicit context" for writing is academic, and "the instructor's judgment is presumed to mirror that of the community of educated native speakers" (ibid.). Although it is still dominant in L2 composition textbooks and classroom practices today, current-traditional rhetoric has also been criticized for teaching forms in prescriptive patterns. According to its opponents, this type of form-dominated approach differs from its predecessor (i.e., controlled composition) only in that rhetorical patterns rather than grammatical features are now presented as the paradigm (Raimes, 1991, p. 412).

3.3 Process approaches

Starting in the 1970s, L2 teachers and researchers began to react against form-dominated approaches to writing motivated in large part by dissatisfaction with their ability to foster creative thought and expression. Current-traditional rhetoric was thought to be too controlled, too linear and prescriptive, and the process approach became the new dominant paradigm, as researchers argued that L2 writers who already knew how to compose in their L1 would benefit from the use of similar strategies in their L2. As stated above, however,

the process approach actually embodies a variety of different perspectives, depending on the particular writing process being emphasized: expressivism, cognitivism, or social constructionism.

3.3.1 Expressivism

Expressivism, which reached its zenith in the early 1970s, sees writing as a creative act in which the "true self" of the writer is discovered and expressed. Proponents of the expressivist movement encourage students to "take power over their own prose," and teachers advocating this point of view are likely to be "nondirective," facilitating writing activities which "promote writing fluency and power over the writing act" (Johns, 1990, p. 25). Composition tasks, such as journal writing and personal essays, typically emphasize self-discovery, and students are encouraged to write "with honesty, for themselves" (ibid., p. 30). Advocates of expressivism contend that writing is an individual act and that writers should "create" their own audience within, establishing the "purpose, meaning, and form" of their writing in a way that conforms with the text and its purposes (ibid.).

3.3.2 Cognitivism

According to Johns, the cognitivist approach has had far more influence on L2 composition instruction than expressivism (ibid.). Its leading proponents have tried to identify "higher-order thinking skills with problem-solving" in the process of writing, and research is most often based on think-aloud protocols which have revealed that "complex writing processes are not linear or formulaic but rather individual and recursive" (ibid., p. 26). Students are typically required to do extensive planning, which includes "defining the rhetorical problem, placing it in a larger context..., exploring its parts, generating alternative solutions, and arriving at a well-supported conclusion" (ibid.). Once the problem has been identified and the solution planned, "students continue the *writing process* by translating their plans and thoughts into words, and by reviewing their work through revising and editing" (ibid.). The goal is to create writers who can "guide their own creative process" (Flower; cited in Johns, ibid.) and develop a self-awareness of their inner process of writing through the use of a large repertoire of powerful writing strategies.

Researchers such as Zamel (1983), Spack (1984), and Raimes (1987) have applied L1 cognitivist theories to L2 composition research, and conclude that L1 and L2 students are very similar in terms of the processes they go through when writing. Teachers using this approach in L2 writing contexts will generally try to "prepare students to write through invention and other prewriting activities..., encourage several drafts..., require...revision at macro levels [often through group collaboration], and delay...correction of sentence-level errors until the final editing stage" (Johns, 1990, p. 26). This approach sees composing as non-linear and exploratory, and writing as a complex, recursive, and creative process or set of behaviors in which writers discover and reformulate their ideas.

The two central tenets of this approach to process writing are that content determines

form and good writing is involved writing. Thus, content, the need to communicate meaning, and the desire to express ideas take precedence over organizational and syntactic concerns—the focus is on the writer and the process he or she undergoes, rather than the form of the product. To facilitate this endeavor, the classroom is designed to be "a positive, encouraging, and collaborative workshop environment where students have ample time and a minimum of interference" (Silva, 1990, p. 15). Guidance from teachers is thought to be preferable to control, and the teacher's role is to help students develop strategies at different stages of writing, while feedback and correction often take place in the form of peer collaboration.

3.3.3 Social constructionism

Social contructionism is an approach to L1 composition pedagogy which is particularly difficult to characterize because the concept carries a wide range of connotations and is defined in different ways by different researchers. Furthermore, there is little agreement on the extent to which it has impacted L2 composition instruction. Social constructionism is generally viewed as "consciously ideological," with an implicit political agenda for social reform in which writing is seen as "a social act that can only take place within and for a specific context and audience" (Johns, 1990, p. 27). Social constructionists argue that "reality, knowledge, thought, facts, texts, selves and so on are constructs generated by communities of like-minded peers" (Bruffee, 1986, p. 776), and the nature of written discourse is determined for the writer by this "discourse community." Social constructionism rejects "the traditional view that writing is an act of an individual mind attempting to express itself" (Santos, 1992, p. 3) because "what we normally regard as individual, internal, and mental is actually social in origin" (Bruffee, 1986, pp. 784). This implies "a drastic reorientation of a wide range of ideas" such as cognition (socially based), knowledge (socially justified belief dependent upon social relations, not reflections of reality), and objectivity (impossible to achieve, since the social is naturally subjective); as a consequence, speech and writing are perceived as social constructs (Santos, 1992, p. 4).

Allied with the more extreme versions of social constructionism is a political ideology which is "left-wing or Marxist in nature" and which provides "a major part of the pedagogical framework of the theory" (ibid.). Radical social constructionists such as Berlin (1988) advocate a "Marxist liberatory pedagogy" which is "self-consciously aware of its ideological stand, making the very question of ideology the center of classroom activities" (p. 478). Inherent in this stance is the belief that "education must be understood as inherently political and ideological" (Santos, op. cit.), and that "students must be taught to identify the ways in which control over their lives has been denied them, and denied in such a way that they have blamed themselves for their powerlessness" (Berlin, 1988, p. 490). When applied to teaching, "the unequal power relations between student and teacher in the traditional classroom must be circumvented," and learning itself must be "negotiated among students and between students and teacher" (Santos, op. cit.). Collaborative learning

is one pedagogical result of social constructionist theory, which stresses that learning should take place through group efforts in reaching consensus through negotiation. As a result, "a composition class would proceed via group negotiation and consensus at every stage of the writing process...; [t]he teacher's role is initially to introduce the task, making sure it is an open-ended one—i.e., with no set answer or pre-conceived, favored result..." (ibid., p. 5).

Social constructionism has "not met with unmitigated enthusiasm," however. It has been "less charitably" described as a response to the "presumptively dreary though necessary labor of teaching composition" (Santos, 1992, pp. 7 – 8; after Freedman, 1987), and "the call for...politicization...a self-serving excuse to avoid the hard job of teaching the basics" (Siegel, 1991, p. 38). Some have "decried the tendency toward 'groupthink'," others have defended the value of the individual voice of the writer, while still others find the ideological orientation distasteful (Santos, 1992, p. 6), denouncing "the epistemological position which asserts that our use of language is what constructs society, that reality is not described in language—rather that there is no reality except as soaked in discourse" (Moberg, 1990, p. 67). Clifford (1989, p. 517) objects to the "influential resurgence of intellectual Marxism within English studies," while as "no less a figure in L1 composition" than Maxine Hairston expresses the feelings of many in the following letter to *College English*:

> I have been reading *College English* with increasing irritation in the last several months, and finally I just have to protest. I find the magazine dominated by...fashionably radical articles that I feel have little to do with the concerns of most college English teachers.... I'm also very concerned about the image of the profession I think the magazine would convey to the public if they read it...: that of low-risk Marxists who write very badly, are politically naive, and seem more concerned about converting their students from capitalism than in helping them to enjoy writing and reading. (Santos, op. cit.)[7]

Although critical approaches to pedagogy such as social constructionism illustrate how discourse is "shaped by relations of power and ideologies, and the constructive effects discourse has upon social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and belief" (Widdowson, 1995, p. 158), critical theory "not only describes discourse but interprets it as social practice" (ibid.), equating social and linguistic theory with sociopolitical and ideological commitment. Because of this ideological commitment, particular interpretations are privileged, and this, according to Widdowson (ibid., p. 159), undermines its validity as a vehicle for analysis, since there is rarely a suggestion that alternative perspectives are possible—the interpretation offered is presented as being uniquely validated by the textual facts.

Finally, to the extent to which social constructionism can be considered part of the process approach to writing (and there is considerable ongoing debate on this issue), the question remains as to the extent of its impact on L2 composition instruction. Santos (1992, pp. 6-7) argues that social constructionism has received scant attention in L2 writing for a number of reasons. One is that "L1 composition, residing mostly in English departments, has been highly influenced by critical literary theories, whereas ESL writing has identified

itself as part of applied linguistics, accommodating itself to the prevailing standards of inquiry and research in that field," and adopting a research paradigm in which dominant studies are quantitative rather than ideological (ibid., p. 8). Secondly, there is a powerful school of thought within the ESL community which sees L2 composition instruction in essentially *pragmatic* terms, as exemplified in the following opinion by Swales:

> I shall not consider differences that arise as a result of differing ideological perspectives...such as those found in the work of neo-Marxist(s).... A specific reason for this exclusion is that the proposed approach is not activated by a wish to make a contribution to intellectual history..., but rests on a pragmatic concern to help people, both non-native and native speakers, to develop their academic communicative competence. (1990, p. 9)

Thirdly, there are significant differences between ESL and EFL approaches to composition that must be taken into consideration. The primary frame of reference for social constructionism is "American society [with] its inequalities, its exclusions, its power structures" (Santos, op. cit.). Teaching overseas, however, "makes critical pedagogy much more problematic [as the] aims tend to be incompatible with explicit ideology in the classroom" (ibid., pp. 9–10). If this argument is correct, "only features of collaborative learning would seem to have a chance of gaining a hold in ESL, not for the affiliation with social constructionist theory, but rather for the possible effectiveness of the groupwork procedures" (ibid., p. 12).

Recent developments in the field, however, suggest that these issues may not be so clearcut, and it has been argued that advocates of social constructionism are, in fact, vigorously applying their ideological precepts to many other fields,[8] including L2 teaching contexts, although increasingly, such studies "may come dressed in elaborate statistical costumes" (Gross & Levitt, 1994, p. 12). Bizzell (1987; cited in Johns, 1990, p. 25), for example, claims that becoming a member of an academic discourse community presents special problems for L2 learners, who must often develop "multiple literacies" in order to be accepted, and maintains that these students should not be forced to acquire academic literacy. Rather, it is the academy itself that should adapt and become more open to the many cultures that the students represent: "We must help our students...to engage in a rhetorical process that can collectively generate...knowledge and beliefs to displace the repressive ideologies an unjust social order would inscribe in the skeptical void" (Bizzell, 1990, p. 671). Canagarajah (1987, p. 303) concurs:

> In practicing academic writing, students are acquiring not only a skill, certain cognitive processes, or communicative competence, but also the set of preferred values, discourses, and knowledge content of the academic community. Students coming from non-English-speaking communities will need to confront the temptation to give up their native discourses based on local knowledge and take up the academic discourse which enjoys much more power and prestige. [S]uch ideological reproduction will destroy the distinctiveness of local communities in the long run and simply make them clones or satellites of the Western academic-military-

industrial complex. That is, the internationalization of academic discourse through writing will be instrumental in ushering in the international hegemony of Western discourses and institutions.

Such "composition as colonization" perspectives contend that L2 composition teachers should not present just one privileged form of text (i.e., Standard Written English) as the most logical and desirable, and that alternative rhetorics should be valued. This ideology equates L2 composition instruction with "cultural imperialism," and advocates a greater degree of "cultural relativism," as well as an acceptance of "rhetorical pluralism." These accusations of "cultural imperialism" and "composition as colonization" in L2 teaching practices, arising from the ideological influences of social constructionism, have also been strongly criticized in many quarters, however:

> [O]ne of the concerns of 'critical linguistics' is the global encroachment of English on other languages and cultures. Applied linguistics is being rebuked...(e.g., Pennycook, 1994) for its complacency and ignorance of critical and postmodern paradigms of language.... This view also exists within cross-cultural rhetorical studies [where teachers are urged] to avoid cultural imperialism in writing courses.... These views have been variously criticized as being overly and impractically sensitive, or even representative of subtle, even unconscious, manifestations of patronizing and postcolonial attitudes of superiority (Makoni, 1995). They have also been characterized as illogical, in that they assume some apparently utopian ideal of value-free teaching, and over-deterministic, in that it is doubtful that language alone can 'shatter the world view' or otherwise 'culturally demolish' an established society (Barrow, 1990).[9] (Holyoak & Piper, 1997, pp. 139–140)

Interviews conducted by Holyoak and Piper (1997) with a group of postgraduate students studying in various fields and for whom English was a second language would seem to confirm this perspective. The initial reaction of these students to questions regarding whether they felt "victimized or disadvantaged" by English academic discourse was one of incredulity and bemusement: "Their approach was entirely pragmatic: 'I must write for my audience'; 'I want to be understood'; 'I want to be taught "English" English not "Japanese" English'" (p. 140). Holyoak and Piper report that "[w]ithout exception, they indicated that issues of linguistic or cultural domination were not important to them. These were not sensitivities or concerns which they shared" (p. 141):

> Our informants [believed] that their respective cultures, and they themselves, were sufficiently strong and dynamic to determine the directions in which the acquisition of English took them. While acknowledging the influence of English rhetoric on academic texts written in their native languages, they viewed as patronizing any suggestion that they were impotent victims of a dominant culture with no control over their cultural destiny. (ibid., p. 140)

In short, it seems that if teachers want to truly "empower their students," perhaps the most effective and practical approach would be to assist them in becoming highly proficient in the academic discourse systems they have elected to learn. As Santos (1992, p. 12)

states, "knowledge and experience [are] the strongest force against an ideological emphasis [and will lead to] greater emphasis on the cognitive, academic, and pedagogical rather than on the sociopolitical, which usually only gathers momentum when other explanations appear inadequate."

3.3.4 Process writing: Conclusions

Although the cognitivist approach to process writing was generally well received in L2 composition circles and still has many adherents, "teachers did not all strike out along this new path [and] the radical changes that were called for in instructional approach seemed to provoke a swift reaction" (Raimes, 1991, p. 410). The common thread of criticisms against process writing is that, "in its almost exclusive concern with psycholinguistic, cognitive, and affective variables, [it] has failed to take into account the many forces outside of an individual writer's control which define, shape, and ultimately judge a piece of writing" (Horowitz, 1986b, p. 446). In other words, process writing creates an "erroneous assumption ...that writers work in a cultural vacuum..." (ibid., p. 447), and "in its attempt to develop... students' writing skills, creates a classroom situation that bears little resemblance to the situations in which those skills will eventually be exercised" (ibid., 1986a, p. 144). As Horowitz (ibid., pp. 141) points out, "[t]hough initially offering fresh insight into an important area of teaching..., [the process approach] has now been miscast as a complete theory of writing," and while admitting that it has "undeniable merits" if viewed as a useful collection of teaching techniques rather than a full-fledged theory of writing, he goes on to raise a number of cautions about an "uncritical acceptance" of process writing:

> [I]ts emphasis on multiple drafts may leave students unprepared for essay examinations...; overuse of peer evaluation may leave students with an unrealistic view of their abilities...; trying to make over bad writers in the image of good ones may be of questionable efficacy; and...the inductive orientation of the process approach is suited only to some writers and some academic tasks. (ibid., 1986b, p. 446)

Above all, critics have questioned whether this kind of instruction realistically prepares students for higher level academic work. Opponents of the process approach argue that in addition to not addressing a number of theoretical and practical issues central to L2 writing, it does not adequately prepare students for writing compositions of an academic nature: "It creates a classroom situation that bears little resemblance to the situations in which [students' writing] will eventually be exercised" and gives students "a false impression of how university writing will be evaluated" (Horowitz, 1986a, pp. 143 & 144). Leki and Carson (1997, p. 63), for example, question the idea of personal empowerment as a pedagogical goal, arguing that "student-centered pedagogy, with its attendant focus on personal experience...may work against students by denying them access to 'powerful genres.'" They state that "giving students direct acquaintance with text-responsible writing...transforms the class from one that is solipsistic and self-referential into one that becomes central to

students' academic and personal growth" (ibid., p. 64). Swales (1986; cited in Horowitz, 1986b, p. 446) maintains that an approach which "emphasizes less the cognitive relationship between the writer and his or her internal world and more the relationship between the writer, the writing environment and the intended readership...has much to recommend it." Although conceding the usefulness of some "soft process" at lower levels of L2 composition (1990, p. 220), he suggests that process writing is of less value "when students are... required to deliver texts to a world outside the ESL classroom...a world populated by readers with highly-developed schemata and fully cognizant of the ground rules of the genres with which they are professionally engaged" (ibid.). In short, the process approach "overemphasizes the individual's psychological functioning and neglects the sociocultural context, that is, the realities of academia" (Silva, 1990, pp. 16–17).

3.4 English for academic purposes

An alternative approach, suggested by proponents of English for Academic Purposes (EAP), is to shift the emphasis in L2 composition from the writer to the reader, i.e., to the academic discourse community, and to focus on academic discourse genres and a wide range of academic writing tasks as a means of preparing students for integration into this community. According to Silva (ibid., p. 17), EAP stresses the following: the conditions in which actual university writing tasks are carried out; the close examination and analysis of academic discourse formats; "the selection and intensive study of source material"; "the evaluation, screening, synthesis, and organization of relevant data from these sources"; and "the presentation of these data in acceptable academic English form." In brief, the stress is on audience: writing is seen to involve the production of texts which must meet the standards of the academy, and "learning to write is part of becoming socialized into the academic community—finding out what is expected and trying to approximate it" (ibid.). Writers approach these tasks from an essentially pragmatic point of view, orienting their written production to the standards and requirements of the academic discourse community, while the audience is "the teacher as reader," an initiated expert member of the discourse community, who has "the power to accept or reject writing as coherent, as consistent with the conventions of the target discourse community." In academic contexts, this faculty audience is seen as someone who has "well-developed schemata for academic discourse and clear and stable views on what is appropriate" (Silva, 1990, p. 17), but also as someone who is "particularly omniscient" (Johns, 1990, p. 31).

Within English for Academic Purposes, there are actually two separate but related perspectives, each with a different view of the teaching of the language of academia. The first, which is sometimes known as EAP proper, supports the stance that there is a "general set of tasks and a basic academic language" that students can acquire with the help of informed instruction, and the general academic demands that students will be expected to meet in the course of their studies form the basis of instruction. The second, which encompasses both English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and Writing across the Curriculum

(WAC), maintains that general knowledge alone will not suffice and that specific academic discourse communities have certain unique characteristics which must be uncovered and taught (Johns, 1990, p. 29). Advocates suggest that L2 writing courses be directly linked to content courses in the "adjunct model" (e.g., Brinton et al., 1989; Snow & Brinton, 1988), or loosely grouped with courses in other disciplines (e.g., Benesch, 1988). In such courses, the main emphasis is on "the instructor's determination of what academic content is most appropriate in order to build modules of reading and writing tasks around that content" (Raimes, 1991, p. 411). In addition, autonomous L2 writing classes are sometimes wholly or partially replaced by "team teaching, linked courses, topic-centered modules or mini-courses, sheltered...instruction, and...courses/tutorials as adjuncts to designated university content courses" (Raimes, ibid.; after Shih, 1986).

English for Academic Purposes has generated its own extensive body of research (Raimes, 1991, p. 412), mostly in terms of surveys of the expectations of faculty members (e.g., Santos, 1988; Johns, 1991), the study of genres (e.g., Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993; see below), the identification of basic academic writing skills that are transferable across disciplines (e.g., Johns, 1988a), the analysis of the rhetorical organization of technical writing (e.g., Selinker et al., 1978), the study of student writing in content areas (e.g., Selzer, 1983; Jenkins & Hinds, 1987), and surveys of the content and tasks students will encounter during their academic careers (e.g., Bridgeman & Carlson, 1983; Canseco & Byrd, 1989). In recent years, the EAP approach to L2 composition instruction has gained many adherents, although critics charge it with too much emphasis on scientific and technical fields, and a need for a more humanities-based orientation toward "general principles of inquiry and rhetoric" (ibid.). These issues continue to be actively and publicly debated at the present time (see, for example, Spack, 1988; Braine, 1988; and Johns, 1988b).

3.4.1 Genre analysis

A relatively new field of study with direct links to both EAP and text linguistics is genre analysis. Swales (1990, pp. 1–2) describes genre analysis as a "means of studying spoken and written discourse for applied ends," a bridge between Applied Discourse Analysis on the one hand and L1/L2 composition pedagogy on the other. Typically, this kind of endeavor takes place in post-secondary educational institutions and is categorized as English for Academic Purposes (EAP), English for Specific Purposes (ESP), or Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC).[10] In terms of its applications for composition pedagogy, genre analysis examines written discourse in academic and professional settings in order to accomplish specific tasks, such as the writing of research articles, business letters, resumés, and so on. This type of research is particularly important in EL2 contexts because "the training of people to process and produce academic and research English is a major international endeavor" and the ability to write advanced academic English remains a major goal of tertiary education worldwide (Swales, 1990, p. 1).[11] Long and Richards (cited in Swales, 1990, p. vii) concur: "The role of language in academic settings is of vital interest to all those

concerned with tertiary education...," and the principal focus of research in this area is on issues such as "rhetorical styles and discourse types employed in such settings—whether these are unique to a given language or culture or reflect universal modes of academic discourse...."

Historically, genre analysis arose from "quantitative studies of the linguistic properties of functional varieties or *registers*" such as the occurrence of certain kinds of verb forms in scientific English (Swales, op. cit.). These ground-breaking investigations into syntax, voice, and vocabulary led to studies providing a "deeper or multilayered textual account" of academic writing; in addition, an orientation towards helping EL2 speakers created "a strong interest in the linguistic manifestation of rhetorical and organizational features," as well as a continued focus on issues such as syntactic and lexical choices (ibid., pp. 3–4). Genre analysis successfully adapted a rhetorical approach "originally used for highly-valued literary, political or religious discourse to more mundane academic writing [with] the built-in assumption that discourse is indeed both socially-situated and designed to achieve rhetorical goals" (ibid., p. 5). As such, it integrates the work of several different traditions, and "attempts to make a virtue of eclecticism for..., to be eclectic is to be able to borrow profitably from the activities of several distinct discourse communities" (ibid., p. 13).

The concept of discourse community is central to both genre analysis and composition pedagogy, although the term is not yet well defined: "like many imperfectly defined terms, it is suggestive, the center of a set of ideas rather than the sign of a settled notion":

> Use of the term 'discourse community' testifies to the increasingly common assumption that discourse operates within conventions defined by communities, be they academic disciplines or social groups. The pedagogies associated with...academic English now use the notion of 'discourse communities' to signify a cluster of ideas: that language use in a group is a form of social behavior, that discourse is a means of maintaining and extending the group's knowledge and of initiating new members into the group, and that discourse is epistemic or constitutive of the group's knowledge. (Hertzberg, 1986; cited in Swales, 1990, p. 22)

This "cluster of ideas" can be summarized as follows: "language use is a form of social behavior..., discourse maintains and extends a group's knowledge..., and discourse is epistemic or constitutive of the group's knowledge" (Swales, 1990, p. 29; after Herzberg, 1986). This third claim is expressed in a slightly different form by Bizzell:

> In the absence of consensus, let me offer a tentative definition: a 'discourse community' is a group of people who share certain language-using practices. These practices can be seen as conventionalized in two ways. Stylistic conventions regulate social interactions both within the group and in its dealings with outsiders: to this extent 'discourse community' borrows from the sociolinguistic concept of 'speech community'. Also, canonical knowledge regulates the world-views of group members, how they interpret experience; to this extent 'discourse community' borrows from the literary-critical concept of 'interpretive community'. (cited in Swales, 1990, p. 29)

Like the concept of discourse community, the term *genre* also suffers from "variable and uncertain usage" (Swales, 1990, p. 1): It is "a fuzzy concept, a somewhat loose term of art" (ibid., p. 33) which is difficult to classify because genres themselves are "unstable entities"; i.e., "the number of genres in any society is indeterminate and depends upon the complexity and diversity of society" (Miller, 1984; cited in Swales, 1990, p. 43):

> A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style. Communicative purpose is both a privileged criterion and one that operates to keep the scope of a genre as here conceived narrowly focused on comparable rhetorical action. In addition to purpose, exemplars of a genre exhibit various patterns of similarity in terms of structure, style, content and intended audience. If all high probability expectations are realized, the exemplar will be viewed as prototypical by the parent discourse community. (op. cit., p. 58)

Because different genres (e.g., research articles, business letters, editorials, presentations, theses, books) have different sets of communicative purposes, their schematic structures are different. Moreover, there can be subgenres within genres, such as the research article being comprised of subgenres such as the survey article, the review article, the state-of-the-art article, and so on. Genres also transcend individual languages and national borders. As Widdowson (1979, p. 61) points out, "[s]cientific exposition is structured according to certain patterns of rhetorical organization which, with some tolerance for individual stylistic variation, imposes a conformity on members of the scientific community no matter what language they happen to use." Moreover, the existence of these "transnational discourse communities" in a wide range of scientific disciplines "is likely to lead to universalistic tendencies in research genres" (Swales, 1990, p. 65).

Although one of the principal aims of genre analysis is to "gain insights into the nature of genre that will be useful in ESP [i.e., EAP] materials writing and teaching" (Dudley-Evans, 1987; cited in Malmkjaer, 1991, p. 176), recent research approaches have also attempted to correlate linguistic features of texts with human cognition, explicitly linking genre analysis with schema-based approaches to reading research.[12] For example, Hewings and Henderson (1987) conducted a study on the reading comprehension difficulties of students who were unfamiliar with (i.e., had no schema for) academic writing. Their conclusions, which highlight the connections between genre analysis, schema theory, and pedagogy, suggest that instruction which includes a concentration on macrostructural elements, combined with an emphasis on lexical signaling, can be effective in enhancing the reading efficiency of such students (ibid., p. 173).

As Swales (1990, p. 81) points out, a genre-based approach to academic writing pays particular attention to the rhetorical organization of texts, and this also concerns "the role of *schemata*, their characteristics and their relationships to genre acquisition." From this

perspective, the concepts of discourse community and genre can be seen as interlocked, functioning in the following way:

> Discourse communities are sociorhetorical networks that form in order to work towards sets of common goals. One of the characteristics that established members of these discourse communities possess is familiarity with the particular genres that are used in the communicative furtherance of those sets of goals. In consequence, genres are the properties of discourse communities; that is to say, genres belong to discourse communities, not to individuals, other kinds of grouping or to wider speech communities. ...Genre-type communicative events (and perhaps others) consist of texts themselves (spoken, written, or a combination) plus encoding and decoding procedures as moderated by genre-related aspects of text-role and text-environment. ...The acquisition of genre-skills depends on previous knowledge of the world, giving rise to *content schemata*, knowledge of prior texts, giving rise to *formal schemata*, and experience with appropriate tasks. (ibid., pp. 9–10)

In other words, our assimilated life experiences give rise to content schemata, while our prior experiences with texts, both oral and written, provide information structures and rhetorical elements which give rise to formal schemata. This prior knowledge of the world, and of texts, not only allows us to interpret facts and concepts (i.e., content), but also calls up "interactive procedures and routines" which have been given a wide range of labels, including scripts, scenarios, frames, and routines. Knowledge of such procedures derives from both non-verbal and verbal experience in terms of prior texts, as well as from prior life experiences, giving rise to the formation of formal schemata, or "background knowledge of the rhetorical structures of different types of texts" (Carrell, 1983, p. 31). Content and formal schemata thus interact to "contribute to a recognition of genres and so guide the production of exemplars" (ibid., p. 86).[13] When content and form are familiar, texts will be easily accessible, whereas when they are not, texts will be relatively inaccessible—in the latter case, "rhetorical form is a significant factor, more important than content, in the comprehension of the top-level episodic structure of a text" (Carrell, 1987, p. 476).

4. Conclusions: Integrating process and product

In summary, there are a variety of *approaches* to teaching English L2 composition, all of which are based on "theoretical positions and beliefs about the nature of language, the nature of language learning, and the applicability of both to pedagogical methods" (Brown, 1987, p. 51). For the past three decades, there has been a heated and sometimes vitriolic debate taking place in the English-speaking world about the way writing skills should be taught that centers on two basic approaches to the teaching of composition, most often described as process vs product. At present, however, there is a growing consensus among writing experts that the "radical dichotomization" created by this polarity is counterproductive and misleading, resulting in an extremely negative effect on the discipline and causing "a great deal of insecurity and confusion among ESL composition teachers" (Silva, 1990, p. 18).

In fact, it is becoming increasingly evident that effective writing instruction requires the integration of both points of view. As Kaszubski (1998, p. 173) observes, "a number of... authors have recently spoken in favour of keeping the balance between process and product, fluency and accuracy, and content and form." Kaplan (1988, p. 296), for example, points out that a composition is "a product arrived at through a process," while Purves and Purves (1986, p. 184) maintain that in "a cultural approach to writing we cannot disentangle 'process' from 'product'" because in viewing writing as a culturally-determined, cognitive activity, the act itself becomes inextricably linked to its results. An increasing number of composition textbooks are also being written from a similar standpoint, as exemplified in the introduction to *Write to be Read*: "The methodology is a blend of both the process and product approaches to writing. The process approach encourages students to develop their thinking about a topic. The product approach, relying heavily on student essays as models, helps writing students meet the expectations of educated native speakers of English" (Smalzer, 1996, p. v). Textbooks designed for teacher training and development are also advocating that composition teachers maintain a balance between process and product, as well as between content and form, as illustrated by the following excerpt from *A Course in Language Teaching*:

> The purpose of writing, in principle, is the expression of ideas, the conveying of a message to the reader; so the ideas themselves should arguably be seen as the most important aspect of the writing. On the other hand, the writer needs also to pay some attention to formal aspects: neat handwriting, correct spelling and punctuation, as well as acceptable grammar and careful selection of vocabulary. This is because much higher standards of language are normally demanded in writing than in speech: more careful constructions, more precise and varied vocabulary, more correctness of expression in general. Also, the slow and reflective nature of the process of writing in itself enables the writer to devote time and attention to formal aspects during the process of production.... One of our problems in teaching writing is to maintain a fair balance between content and form when defining our requirements and assessing. (Ur, 1996, p. 163)

It would thus seem that the distinction between these two positions has been overstated, and that the process/product debate has produced a false and misleading dichotomy (Spack, 1988, p. 29), "a strawman which has been created by some composition researchers" that has little relevance to students' actual writing needs (Grabe and Kaplan, 1996, p. 34).

Nevertheless, at the university level, where the development of academic writing skills is the primary objective, an appropriate balance between process and product perspectives is important in establishing an effective teaching methodology. At the tertiary level, "composition instruction which concentrates on the academic essay provides the basis for all other forms of academic writing" (Smalzer, 1996, p. v), and as Kaszubski (1998, pp. 173–174) points out, "the academic approach, with its pragmatic emphasis on conventionality, has a lot to offer to advanced EFL learners, who, themselves, are often university students expected to comply with academic standards [in] essay writing." In meeting these standards, Leki and

Carson (1997, pp. 63–64) question whether writing that makes personal experience and individual self-expression (i.e., expressivism) the primary focus of composition instruction realistically prepares students for higher level academic work.[14] On the other hand, as Horowitz (1986a, pp. 141) points out, although the process approach is not in itself a complete theory of writing, it does offer a useful collection of teaching techniques that can have beneficial effects in certain contexts:

> Multiple drafts? Of course. Too many of our students believe that once it is down on the page, their job is finished.... Group work? Certainly. Our students surely can teach each other as much as or more than we can teach them. Get it down on the page and then organize it? This will help some of our students prepare for some academic tasks. Choose topics of personal interest? This has always been an effective technique at the lower levels. Gentle peer evaluation? Since we are teaching a developmental skill, we certainly must walk the line between discouraging our students with low grades and giving them a false impression of their abilities. (ibid., p. 143)

Research suggests that by integrating cognitive views of process writing with text-oriented (i.e., product) approaches to L2 composition instruction, an effective teaching methodology can be developed that will provide solutions to the academic writing difficulties of EL2 students, especially at higher levels of academic study. In general, these text-oriented approaches emphasize linguistic features of text from a number of different perspectives that are "by no means discrete and sequential" (Raimes, 1991, p. 412). The most influential of these approaches include controlled composition, which stresses lexical and syntactic features in writing; current-traditional rhetoric, which emphasizes discourse-level text structures; and English for Academic Purposes, which focuses on the writer as a member of the academic discourse community. Specific elements of each of these approaches can be of value in providing EL2 students with instruction in academic writing at the university level: controlled composition in terms of remediation related to lower-level linguistic features; current-traditional rhetoric because of its central concern for "the logical construction and arrangement of discourse forms" (Silva, 1990, p. 14); and EAP in terms of its focus on academic discourse genres and writing tasks designed to prepare students for integration into the academic discourse community.

Notes

1. Kehe and Kehe (1996, pp. 110 & 112) state that college freshmen in the US will normally take English 101 (essay-writing) and English 102 (research-paper writing), while students with "minimum competency" skills will be placed in remedial-level writing courses, which sometimes also incorporate EL2 students. In American colleges, students are said to write an average of "eight papers of 1–5 pages per (16-week) semester" in English 101, where the focus is often on the basic modes of writing (ibid.). Teachers of English 102 provide instruction on different aspects of research paper writing, emphasizing, in particular, the ability of students to paraphrase and synthesize information from sources (ibid.). Of note is the fact that in recent times "remedial courses in composition have

doubled and tripled on [American] university...campuses" (Valdés et al., 1992, p. 333), with some professors claiming that many American students are now entering college without previous experience in employing the modes of writing, and others arguing that "considering the lack of writing done in American high schools nowadays, as many as half of...American students could probably benefit from taking an ESL Writing class" (Kehe & Kehe, 1996, p. 111). Recent statistics seem to support this contention; for example, "the California State University system reported in 1998 [that] forty-seven percent [of its incoming freshmen] failed to pass an [entry-level] English placement test" (Moving on, 2000, p. 7). Due to ongoing budget cuts in higher education, a pattern that has also been developing in many American universities is the "blurring of the distinction between ESL writers and L1 basic writers," with many campuses offering writing courses that amalgamate the two types of course (Santos, 1992, p. 12).

2. Santos (1992, pp. 2–3) provides a list of current titles of books, journal articles, and conference presentations in support of this contention: "Composing Ourselves: Politics, Commitment, and the Teaching of Writing" (Lunsford, 1990); *The Social Uses of Writing: Politics and Pedagogy* (Fox, 1990); "Rhetoric and Ideology in the Writing Class" (Berlin, 1988); *The Social Construction of Written Communication* (Rafoth & Rubin, 1988); "Writing as an Act of Power: Basic Writing Pedagogy as Social Practice" (Purdue, 1984); "The Politics of Literacy" (Rouse, 1979), and so on.

3. Hosbaum states that...

> ...[British] universities are accepting students at a level of literacy that would not have been permitted as recently as ten years ago. Academics are primarily concerned with their own areas of study and have little time to assess English prose composition. The student will be penalized if he cannot write coherently under examination conditions; yet his previous circumstances of education may well have protected him from ever finding out what coherent expression entails. ...Students who have never been taught to write ordered prose are expected to write ordered prose at university [and] the provision of courses to improve L1 students' standards remains patchy: some...make specific provision, while others pretend the problem does not exist. (1984, pp. 72–73 & 75)

4. Jordan (1997, p. 2) states that in UK universities these courses "are normally run by Language Centres, English Language (Teaching) Centres or Units, or departments with various other broadly similar names. If they are not free-standing, the majority are located in Departments of English, Linguistics, (Modern) Languages or Education."

5. Traditional methods of teaching L1 writing were criticized for "radically dichotomiz[ing] form from 'content'...and emphasiz[ing] structure: sentence structure, paragraph structure, essay structure, even the proper structures for term papers, business letters, resumes..." (Coe, 1987, p. 14). Behind this emphasis on structure, is the metaphor of "form [as] a *container* to be filled" (ibid., p. 15), but the question of substance is avoided by defining "content" as outside the field of composition (ibid., p. 16). Coe (ibid., p. 14) provides a brief historical outline of the failings of this traditional model of writing, and the development of new approaches emphasizing composition process:

> [It was assumed that] if the proper forms were defined, they could be described and exemplified for students. After students wrote, they could be shown where their writing failed to match the ideal forms. And then, the formalists hoped, students would correct their writing to create a better match. Unfortunately, most students failed to do this because the formalists told them only *what* to do, not also *how* to do it. Until a few decades ago, however, this was not a major social problem because such students also failed to stay in school. Although data vary from country to country and region to region, we may safely say that only after World War II do even half the students who start grade one complete high school. But then radical changes in the nature of work and other social realities led to declining drop-out rates and increasing post-secondary enrollment, creating a need for a pedagogy that would work with students who used to disappear before senior high school....

Hebron (1984, p. 87) concurs:

> The basic problem...grew out of the mass nature of American college education. As enrolments increased and as more groups within the population came to attend college, it became increasingly obvious that the

> sophisticated elaborate speech and writing skills that instructors traditionally expected from students were just not being acquired by many freshmen. Responses to the 'events of [the 1960s]'—affirmative action, open colleges and the like—all simply brought in more and more students who just *could not write*.

6. For a slightly different four-part taxonomy, see Raimes, 1991.

7. Trimbur (1990, pp. 669–670), a leading advocate of social constructionist theory and its applications in collaborative learning, argues in reply:

> The fact of the matter is that the intellectual context of composition studies has changed over the past five or ten years as teachers, theorists, researchers, and program administrators have found useful some of the ideas and insights contained in contemporary critical theory, whether feminist, poststructuralist, neopragmatist, or neoMarxist.... Some teachers...do indeed want to do more than help students 'enjoy writing and reading'. I see writing and reading as powerful tools for students to gain greater control over their lives and to add their voices to the ongoing debate about our communal purposes.

8. A raft of recent publications, for example, has decried the encroachment of the political and ideological agendas of social constructionism into the realm of science. Authors such as Gross and Levitt (1994), Gross et al. (1996), and Sokal and Bricmont (1998), denounce contemporary cultural theories which claim that physical reality is a social and linguistic construct largely determined by dominant ideologies, and argue that as humanists, social scientists, and literary theorists on the academic left deconstruct scientific texts, principles and practices that underlie the whole history of western scientific achievement are now under attack, with far more serious potential consequences for western societies than the current "political correctness" debates currently being waged on university campuses.

9. Horowitz (1986a, p. 143) also speaks for a good many practitioners in the field when he asks:

> Who are we to try to change the value structures of our students? Many of our students, for better or for worse, have been highly conditioned by the demands of their native education systems.... This may offend some teachers' humanistic sensibilities and may, according to certain Western psychological theories, prevent these students from reaching their full human potential, but...we, as teachers, would be better advised to tap into the motivation behind it than to try to restructure our students' thought patterns.

10. There is still a good deal of disagreement with regard to definitions of these categories. According to Swales, however, WAC and EAP can be seen as serving different populations, although there is certainly some overlap: in the former, mostly native-speaking, university undergraduates in English-speaking countries; in the latter, predominantly non-native speakers in educational institutions throughout the world, ranging from pre-college students to senior professors (1990, p. 6). Malmkjaer (1991, p. 176) also places genre analysis "within English for Specific Purposes (ESP) oriented studies."

11. "[T]he fact that English now occupies an overwhelmingly predominant role in the international world of scholarship and research...entails that the coming generation of the world's researchers and scholars need...to have more than adequate professional skills in the English language if that generation is to make its way without linguistic disadvantage in its chosen world (Swales, 1990, p. 10)." Moreover, the highest expectation of instruction in EL2 programs is "to raise the level of the students' language proficiency to somewhere fairly close to that of an average native speaker..." (i.e., native speaker competence is a point of arrival). But in the research world, "the aim is to help people achieve a level of competence that, in career-related genres at least, surpasses that of the average native speaker." This is achieved when "non-native speakers can operate as members of the anglophone discourse communities that most likely dominate their research areas." Thus, genre analysis is concerned with advanced English in an "academic climate that gives...weight to publication and presentation..., increasingly at the graduate student level" (ibid., pp. 10–11). In addition, the academic world itself is "divided into privileged researchers and unprivileged instructors." Efforts to provide instruction in "senior genres" (in order to go up the academic ladder) are important because they can provide individuals with the skills needed to escape from "the ivory tower ghetto of remediation." Therefore, the research article, in particular, can be seen as

a genre-based vehicle for attaining influence in higher places (ibid., p. 10).

12. Hewings and Henderson define the assumptions underlying schema theory as follows:

> Schemata are abstract generic concepts constructed in the mind on the basis of patterns of experience.... They are stored in long term memory and may be perceived as a framework we call up to help store new ideas and information. If appropriate schemata are already stored in the brain it is an easier matter to activate them than to try to establish new concepts and ideas on a sketchy or non-existent foundation. (1987, p. 167)

Swales (1990, p. 81) also states that...

> ...[t]he concept of schemata was introduced by Bartlett as long ago as 1932 to explain how the information carried in stories is rearranged in the memories of readers or listeners to fit in with their expectations. In Bartlett's experiments British students re-interpreted Apache folk-tales so that they fitted in with their own schemata, or prior knowledge structures, based on their European folk-tale experiences. Since then there have been many further studies in both L1 and L2 contexts that have shown that human beings consistently overlay schemata on events to align those events with previously established patterns of experience, knowledge and belief.

13. According to Carrell (1983, p. 87), the ways in which these two types of schemata interact is still incompletely understood, however:

> [T]he more serious problem is how to measure the separate or interactive contributions of both content and formal schemata when considering the processing of naturally-occurring texts...in natural...settings. In other words, real people in real language-processing situations encounter texts which have simultaneously a content expressed in a given rhetorical form. What we need to know...is what the relative contributions are of both prior knowledge in the content area as well as the prior knowledge of the rhetorical form.

14. Leki and Carson (1997) also point out that "what is valued in writing for writing classes is different from what is valued in writing for other academic courses" (p. 64). They report that even in EAP classes 52% of the writing assigned were personal "in the sense that the source of information for these assignments was personal experience and knowledge. Only 7% of the writing topics assigned in other courses were primarily personal; these topics drew instead upon information students were to gather from some source text external to their personal experience and knowledge" (p. 42).

References

Benesch, S. (Ed.). (1988). *Ending remediation: ESL and content in higher education*. Washington, DC: TESOL.

Berlin, J. (1988). Rhetoric and ideology in the writing class. *College English, 50*, 477–494.

Berlin, J., & Inkster, R. (1980). Current-traditional rhetoric: Paradigm and practice. *Freshman English News, 8*, 1–5, 14.

Bhatia, V. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language in professional settings*. London: Longman.

Bizzell, P. (1982). College compositions: Initiation into the academic discourse community. *Curriculum Inquiry, 12* (2), 191–207.

Bizzell, P. (1987). Language and literacy. In T. Enos (Ed.), *A sourcebook for basic writing teachers* (pp. 125–137). New York: Random House.

Bizzell, P. (1990). Beyond anti-foundationalism to rhetorical authority: Problems defining "cultural literacy." *College English, 52*, 661–675.

Braine, G. (1988). A reader reacts. *TESOL Quarterly, 22*, 700–702.

Bridgeman, B., & Carlson, S. (1983). *Survey of academic writing tasks required of graduate and undergraduate foreign students* (TOEFL Research Rep. No. 15). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Brinton, D., Snow, M., & Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York: Newbury House.

Brown, H. (1987). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bruffee, K. (1986). Social construction: Language and the authority of knowledge; A bibliographic essay. *College English, 48*, 773–790.

Canagarajah, A. (1993). Up the garden path: Second language writing approaches, local knowledge, and pluralism. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 301–306.

Canseco, G., & Byrd, P. (1989). Writing required in graduate courses in business administration. *TESOL Quarterly, 23* (2), 305–316.

Carrell, P. (1983). Some issues in the role of schemata, or background knowledge, in second language comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 1*, 81–92.

Carrell, P. (1987). Content and schemata in ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*, 461–482.

Clifford, J. (1989). Discerning theory and politics. *College English, 51*, 517–532.

Coe, R. (1987). An apology for form: Or, who took the form out of process? *College English, 49*, 13–28.

Crews, F. (1986). Skeptical engagements. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Faigley, L. (1986). Competing theories of process: A critique and a proposal. *College English, 48*, 527–542.

Flower, L. (1989). *Problem-solving strategies for writing*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1980). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 31*, 365–387.

Freedman, C. (1987). Marxist theory, radical pedagogy, and the reification of thought. *College English, 49*, 70–88.

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

Gross, P., & Levitt, N. (1994). *Higher superstition: The academic left and its quarrels with science*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gross, P., Levitt, N., & Lewis, M. (Eds.). (1996). *The flight from science and reason*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hebron, C. (1984). Newcastle Polytechnic's writing centre and its origins: A description of an innovation. In R. Williams, J. Swales, & J. Kirkman (Eds.), *Common ground: Shared interests in ESP and communication studies* (pp. 87–97). Oxford: Pergamon.

Hewings, A., & Henderson, W. (1987). A link between genre and schemata: a case study of economics text. *English Language Research Journal, 1*, 156–175.

Holyoak, S., & Piper, A. (1997). Talking to second language writers: Using interview data to investigate contrastive rhetoric. *Language Teaching Research, 1* (2), 122–148.

Horowitz, D. (1986a). Process not product: Less than meets the eye. *TESOL Quarterly, 20* (1), 141–144.

Horowitz, D. (1986b). What professors actually require: Academic tasks for the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 20* (3), 445–462.

Hosbaum, P. (1984). Standards of written expression among undergraduates. In R. Williams, J. Swales, & J. Kirkman (Eds.), *Common ground: Shared interests in ESP and communication studies* (pp. 63–75). Oxford: Pergamon

Jenkins, S., & Hinds, J. (1987). Business letter writing: English, French, and Japanese. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*, 327–345.

Johns, A. (1988a). The discourse communities dilemma: Identifying transferable skills for the academic milieu. *English for Specific Purposes, 7*, 55–60.

Johns, A. (1988b). Another reader reacts. *TESOL Quarterly, 22*, 705–707.

Johns, A. (1990). L1 composition theories: Implications for developing theories of L2 composition. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 24–36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Jordan, R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Y. (1997). Cultural meaning and constrastive rhetoric in English education. *World Englishes, 16* (3), 337–350.

Kaplan, R. (1988). Contrastive rhetoric and second language learning: Notes toward a theory of contrastive rhetoric. In A. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures* (pp. 275–304). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kaszubski, P. (1998). Enhancing a writing textbook: a national perspective. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 172–185). London: Longman.

Kehe, D., & Kehe, P. (1996). Professors' expectations of foreign students in freshman-level courses. *JALT Journal, 18* (1), 108–115.

Kimball, R. (1990). *Tenured radicals: How politics has corrupted our higher education*. New York: Harper & Row.

Kinneavy, J. (1971). *A theory of discourse*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

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

Malmkjaer, K. (1995). (Ed.). *The linguistics encyclopedia*. New York: Routledge.

Mauranen, A. (1993). *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Moberg, G. (1990). The revival of rhetoric: A bibliographic essay. *Journal of Basic Writing, 9*, 66–85.

Moffett, J. (1982). Writing, inner speech, and meditation. *College English, 44*, 231–244.

Moving on, without moving up (2000, Jan. 28). *The Daily Yomiuri*, p. 7.

Murray, D. (1982). *A writer teaches writing*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Peirce, B. (1989). Toward a pedagogy of possibility in the teaching of English internationally. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 401–420.

Pennycook, A. (1989). The concept of method, interested knowledge, and the politics of language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 589–618.

Purves, A. (1992). Reflections on research and assessment in written composition. *Research in the Teaching of English, 26* (1), 108–122.

Purves, A., & Purves, W. (1986). Viewpoints: Cultures, text models, and the activity of writing. *Research in the Teaching of English, 20* (2), 174–197.

Raimes, A. (1987). Language proficiency, writing ability, and composing strategies: A study of ESL college student writers. *Language Learning, 37* (3), 439–468.

Raimes, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 25* (3), 407–430.

Santos, T. (1988). Professors reactions to the academic writing of nonnative-speaking students. *TESOL Quarterly 22*, 69–90.

Santos, T. (1992). Ideology in composition: L1 and ESL. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*, 1–16.

Selinker, L., Todd-Trimble, M., & Trimble, L. (1978). Rhetorical function and shifts in EST discourse. *TESOL Quarterly, 12* (3), 311–320.

Selzer, J. (1983). The composing processes of an engineer. *College Composition and Communication, 34* (2), 178–187.

Shih, M. (1986). Content-based approaches to teaching academic writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 20* (4), 617–648.

Siegel, F. (1991, Feb. 18). The cult of multiculturalism. *The New Republic*, pp. 34–40.

Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11–23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smalzer, W. (1996). *Write to be read*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Snow, M., & Brinton, D. (1988). The adjunct model of language instruction: An ideal EAP framework. In S. Benesch (Ed.), *Ending remediation: ESL and content in higher education* (pp. 33–52).

Washington, DC: TESOL.

Sokal, A., & Bricmont, J. (1998). *Fashionable nonsense: Postmodern intellectuals' abuse of science.* New York: Picador.

Spack, R. (1984). Invention strategies and the ESL college composition student. *TESOL Quarterly, 18* (4), 649–670.

Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly, 22,* 29–52.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trimbur, J. (1989). Consensus and difference in collaborative learning. *College English, 51,* 602–616.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Valdés, G., Haro, P., & Echevarriarza, M. (1992). The development of writing abilities in a foreign language: Contributions toward a general theory of L2 writing. *Modern Language Journal, 76* (3), 333–352.

Widdowson, H. (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature, 4* (3), 157–172.

Young, R. (1978). Paradigms and problems: Needed research in rhetorical invention. In C. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Research on composing: Points of view* (pp. 29–47). Urbana, Ill: National Council of Teachers of English.

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