

6 Second Language Reading-Writing Relations

William Grabe and Cui Zhang

As Kroll (1993), among others, has pointed out, reading has traditionally been seen as a skill to be taught separately from writing, as well as something students are somehow expected to already know about when they reach the writing course. Teaching reading in a writing course may seem like an odd idea, if not an entirely unnecessary one. It may also be the case that L2 writing teachers feel ill prepared to teach reading, especially in connection with writing. How many have actually been taught to teach the two skills together? (Hirvela, 2004, pp. 2–3)

Hirvela highlights a very important difference between first language (L1) and second language (L2) writing instruction contexts. L2 student writers, as a group, have much more limited English language skills. These limitations lead to difficulties not only with writing in English, but also with reading (as well as speaking and listening). The implication for teachers in composition classes is that reading skills must be addressed more explicitly if combined reading and writing activities are to be an important part of writing course goals, and if we want our L2 students to be successful. In addition, English L2 students typically have a range of other limitations, such as less exposure to English texts, and much more limited vocabulary knowledge. For these reasons, among others, teaching writing skills to L2 students creates unique challenges for the composition instructor, especially when reading and writing skills are expected to be used together for academic tasks (see Horning in this volume).

Reading and writing are now often combined in both English L1 and English L2 writing courses. English L1 composition classes commonly assume reasonably fluent and critical reading skills, and explicit reading instruction is seldom addressed consistently. In fact, as the quote above notes, many writing instructors feel somewhat ill-at-ease incorporating explicit reading instruction in the composition classroom, even though explicit reading support may be a good idea in certain contexts, as with L1 students. In contrast, in L2 English for Academic Purposes (EAP) language learning programs (e.g., pre-university intensive language programs), combined reading and writing tasks are often assigned, and L2 students are typically provided with direct instructional support in both academic literacy skills, though usually at a much lower level of task demand. This issue of reading instruction needs in university writing courses is one good example of some of the difficulties facing L2 students in the English L1 composition classroom. Building on the points raised in this initial example, the chapter develops four major goals: (1) identifying sources of difficulty for L2 students in the composition classroom; (2) reviewing research on the challenges facing L2 students as they carry out assignments that combine reading and writing skills; (3) highlighting implications from research for ways in which L2 writers differs from L1 writers in carrying out reading-writing tasks; and (4) offering suggestions for writing instruction that provides more realistic support for L2 students.

To introduce this chapter, we describe L2 student groups and identify the ones address in the discussion that follows. We assume that the L2 students we discuss are primarily English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) students in academic settings who have come to the U.S. to enter post-secondary institutions to earn an academic degree. Most commonly, these students are labeled as visa students or international students. Some of these students may also be immigrant students who have entered the U.S. within the past one to two years, and who have a green card, but whose control of academic English is much like international visa students (Ferris, 2009). These students have a wide range of English-language reading and writing abilities: Some ESL students have excellent reading and writing skills and have few difficulties in the composition classroom. However, most have English language difficulties that set them apart from English L1 students in the writing

classroom (especially if a university admits international students with fairly low TOEFL or IELTS scores).

A second major group of L2 students are also enrolled in post-secondary composition classes. These students are often referred to as Generation 1.5 students, and include those who may have arrived as immigrants as children or who, as younger adolescents, worked their way through some part of secondary schooling in the U.S. and are now entering U.S. post-secondary institutions. The Generation 1.5 student designation is broad and somewhat controversial (Ferris, 2009; Harklau et al., 1999; Leki, 1992; Losey, 2009), and surprisingly little is known about these students as a group, or even if they can be defined as a group.

These two groups of L2 students have some commonalities but also a number of significant differences from each other. Individual students in either group may write as well as, if not better than, most English L1 student writers (it is important not to stereotype all English L2 students). Generally speaking, however, L2 students in post-secondary composition classes have overall language proficiency levels below most L1 students. Because little empirical research has been done on Generation 1.5 students apart from a few published case studies (Ferris, 2009), we restrict our review to ESL L2 students (primarily international visa students) in post-secondary contexts.

THE L2 STUDENT IN THE L1 ENGLISH COMPOSITION CLASS

One of the most obvious issues for ESL student writers is the array of English language proficiency problems these students bring into the composition classroom. They have varying degrees of limitations with vocabulary knowledge (including spelling), grammar knowledge (including basic structures that L1 writers have no problems with), and discourse knowledge (including how to organize paragraphs and texts into expected patterns). They do not usually have the same amount of exposure to reading in English as do English L1 students, and they read slowly. As a result, they have difficulty with very long reading assignments, reading assignments that involve extensive inference “between the lines,” and reading assignments involving complex conceptual content. They also have much less experience with academic writing tasks, and do not write fluently with easier writing tasks.

Most L2 students do not have background knowledge in American culture (including cultural topics, recent popular culture trends, U.S. historical information, university background knowledge) or university course expectations (including how to behave in class, how to analyze a writing task, how to meet writing task expectations, and how to talk with a teacher). They also have different attitudes toward, and motivations for, getting a degree at a U.S. post-secondary institution (e.g., they see their stay in the U.S. as temporary). These issues are discussed in some detail in Ferris (2009), Grabe and Stoller (2011), Leki (1992, 2007), Silva (1993), and Silva et al. (1997). These differences lead to implications for writing instruction with L2 students that we suggest in the final section.

Two brief examples of these language differences between L1 and L2 students illustrate the extent of the challenges facing L2 students in the composition classroom. With respect to vocabulary knowledge, the typical L1 student entering college knows about forty thousand different English words (Grabe, 2009; Perfetti, 2010; Stahl & Nagy, 2006). In contrast, most L2 student entering university courses may know about ten thousand English words (as a reasonable guesstimate), and sometimes, many fewer words. This large vocabulary gap includes less frequently used, but informationally more important words, and L2 students are often unable to find precise wordings for complex academic writing. With respect to grammar, L2 students struggle with many complex sentences with multiple embedded meanings, whether reading these sentences or producing them. Moreover, many aspects of grammar are never fully under the command of the L2 writer. Prepositions, phrasal verbs, articles, and subject-verb agreement all represent important grammatical systems in English that often do not have transparent rules for their use.

The combination of English difficulties for L2 students in the English writing classroom are captured in a number of overviews (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Grabe, 2003; Hirvela, 2004; Paltridge & Starfield, 2007; Silva, Leki, & Carson, 1997). Most recently, Ferris (2009) categorized a wide range of differences between L1 and L2 writers, supporting many of the points made by Silva, Leki, and Carson (1997) and also adding other points. For reference, we developed an extended list of differences, drawing primarily on the discussion in Ferris (2009, pp. 13–41). (See Table 1.)

Table 1. L2 Student Differences in Reading, Writing, and Instructional Experiences in English University Writing Contexts

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Less writing practice with English academic writing tasks 2. Less support for developing critical thinking skills for academic reading and writing tasks 3. Weaker and widely varying reading skills in English 4. Very limited experiences with extensive reading and/or application of information from reading for writing tasks 5. Much less practice with specific tasks that involve reading and writing interactions 6. Weak and varied speaking and listening skills in English 7. Very limited vocabulary knowledge in comparison with L1 students 8. Very limited grammatical accuracy skills compared with L1 writers 9. Limited awareness of how to interact with other students and with the teacher, both in the class and outside of class 10. Limited awareness of how to behave in English L1 writing classes 11. Common feelings of isolation, intimidation, and frustration in English L1 writing classrooms 12. Differing motivations for being in a writing classroom in a U.S. university 13. A relative lack of <i>tacit knowledge</i> about how English texts are organized, and how they should be organized while writing (intuitive knowledge is largely missing) 14. Limited fluency in English writing—composing takes longer and proceeds with more fits and starts, and they do not produce longer automatic phrasings while writing 15. Less English L1 cultural and background knowledge to draw on

All of these differences can be overwhelming for the L2 student in the English composition classroom, and it is sometimes a marvel how so many L2 students manage to learn and develop useful skills writing in English. At the same time, L1 composition teachers can be unrealistic in their expectations: As Harklau, Losey, and Siegal (1999) state,

“the widespread expectation that adult language learners can attain completely monolingual command of an L2 is unrealistic and only possible in a nation that is overwhelmingly monolingual” (p. 8). In addition, it is not always the case that L1 students are skilled readers even if they have basic literacy skills (Horning, 2010; Moje et al., 2010; Shanahan, 2009; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008). In exploring these issues further, especially with respect to research on L2 students’ abilities to integrate reading-writing tasks, the next section reviews studies that support many of the points identified in Ferris (2009) and also in earlier syntheses.

RESEARCH ON L2 READING-WRITING INTEGRATION IN THE WRITING CLASSROOM

As Coon points out in this volume, reading and writing are often treated as separate entities in schools, and this situation exists in many countries in the world (e.g., China and Argentina). When students from these countries study in U.S. universities, they need more explicit instruction in integrating reading and writing skills (Leki & Carson, 1997). In focusing specifically on the issue of integrating reading and writing skills in writing courses, there are a number of writing tasks that are common in the university context. In many cases, success in academic writing depends on reading input to a large extent—either directly from source texts, or indirectly from background knowledge—that results from experience with texts (Hale et al., 1996; Hirvela, 2004; Horowitz, 1986; Johns, 1997; Leki & Carson, 1997; Rosenfeld, Leung, & Oltman, 2001; Spack, 1997, 2004; Zhu, 2004). These tasks make a fairly straightforward set of activities to explore in research studies, activities that also provide students with practice in combining reading and writing skills. These reading-writing tasks include:

1. Summary writing (with related issues of plagiarism and paraphrasing)
2. Note taking
3. Reading guides as homework (in which students write down responses to questions)
4. Synthesis writing tasks (including in-class essay exams)

5. Critical response papers (often a brief summary followed by a critical analysis or a personal interpretation)
6. Essay questions in subject area courses (including take-home exams)
7. Research papers

We expect that these reading and writing tasks are equally common in L1 and L2 writing contexts across the university (including pre-university, L2-intensive English program curricula, and in various disciplines across the university). Some of these tasks have been a source of L1 writing research over the years, including research on summary writing, synthesis writing, and the research paper. With respect to the other tasks listed above, it is not clear that they have been sources of extensive writing research (that is, research that provides evidence that the task leads to improved writing and/or improved reading abilities). In many cases, sufficient research simply hasn't been done and deserves greater attention from the writing research community. Given the focus of this chapter on L2 contexts, L2 research on a number of these writing task types are examined in an effort to understand how to teach them more effectively in composition classes.

In this section, we focus on four specific themes in L2 writing research that address the reading-writing relationship: summary writing (and direct copying), synthesis writing, research paper writing, and contrastive rhetoric and the problem of plagiarism in reading-based writing tasks. Summary writing is the quintessential reading-writing task, involving general comprehension, attention to main ideas, frequent re-reading of the text, translation of ideas into one's own writing production, and a responsibility to have the written summary reflect information in the text. Synthesis writing makes the same reading-writing demands on students, and also requires students to select the information most appropriate for linking ideas and issues across texts. Oftentimes, synthesis writing forces the writer to generate a discourse framework for the information distinct from the texts being read. In this way, synthesis can become a much more difficult task, especially with challenging texts. The research paper, while often discussed as a very traditional task, is still commonly assigned in both composition classes and in disciplinary courses. While the research paper can vary considerably from context to context, its common feature is a strong demand on students to integrate reading and writing skills. The final area of research review examines the notion of contrastive rhetoric

(Kaplan, 2005) and the commonly associated problem of plagiarism in student writing. This problem certainly reflects key issues in the reading-writing interaction in the writing classroom.

SUMMARY WRITING

Summary writing, or the summarization of content, forms a large portion of university academic writing (Horowitz, 1986). Research on ESL students' summary writing reveals a typical characteristic: direct copying of source text language is pervasive, and this is even more so with students of lower English language proficiency. Keck (2006), for example, found that ESL students, when compared with native English speakers, used significantly more exact copying (direct replication) and near copying (changing only one or a few words in a string) in their summary writing.

Researchers have suggested two main causes for students' reliance on direct copying. The first is related to students' English language and writing proficiency. Johns and Mayes (1990) examined eighty university-level ESL students in the U.S. and found that summaries written by less-proficient ESL students tended to directly copy original text language to a much greater degree. In contrast, higher-proficiency students performed more text modification and paraphrasing in their summaries. Similarly, Kim (2009) studied summaries written by the ESL students in an intensive English program in a U.S. university. She found that higher-proficiency ESL students produced more occasions of moderate revision and near copying of original text language, while lower-proficiency students used more direct copying (see also Keck, 2006). These studies, though limited in number, indicate the influence of ESL students' language-proficiency levels on their language use in summary writing. ESL students, especially those with lower English proficiency, find it very difficult to rephrase original text language, or they think that the language used by the original author or authors is much better than their own. Thus, they are more prone to directly "borrow" language from source texts to use in their summaries.

In addition to the issue of language proficiency, ESL students' direct copying of text language may also be traced to differences between the writing practices in their home culture and in U.S. academic contexts. Many students, especially students from China, Japan, and Korea,

have a different understanding of text ownership compared to Western countries (Pennycook, 1996). Students from certain cultural and educational backgrounds (and in the cases discussed in Pennycook, China) may think that texts do not belong to a particular author, but are documents for public use. Many teachers in Chinese educational contexts even encourage students to memorize “classic” sentences or entire texts to use in their essays. In these students’ native cultural and educational context, the practice of taking someone’s sentences and putting them in their own writing, without reference, is fairly common. Thus, students from these cultural backgrounds and educational contexts often do not have a clear understanding of plagiarism. Shi’s (2006) study of university-level ESL students and their views of plagiarism support Pennycook’s (1996) arguments. In her study, Shi (2006) interviewed forty-six students in a Canadian university from five L1 backgrounds: English, German, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese. In her interviews, the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean students said they did not extensively practice citation in their L1 writing. Even if they understood the term *plagiarism* in the abstract sense, they did not know when they needed to or how to cite.

It is also important to note the real difference, though not always recognized, between direct copying of smaller segments of text and plagiarizing as an act of handing in someone else’s work as one’s own (whether in whole or by the use of several significant segments of text). In many cases, copying reflects an inability on the part of students, most likely due to reading and vocabulary limitations, that leads them to use words showing comprehension of key ideas. Often, both teacher and students know the source text (because the source text is assigned), so there is no effort to hide the source of the words used, but rather an inability to read and write well (Horning, 2010; Valentine, 2006).

Apart from the issue of directly copying source text language, other studies of ESL/EFL students’ summary writing found that students’ abilities to write summaries were directly influenced by the level of difficulty of the source text, students’ reading comprehension abilities, different instructional activities associated with the summary task, and students’ relative unfamiliarity with the topic and task. All of these issues have been shown to affect the quality of students’ written summaries. As an example of source text difficulty, Kim (2001) studied the written summaries produced by seventy Korean university English as a foreign language (EFL) students during their freshmen

year. Students who summarized the shorter and easier text included significantly more idea units and more accurate information in their summaries; on the other hand, students who summarized the more difficult text experienced greater difficulty with language in their summaries.

With respect to the role of reading comprehension abilities, Yu (2008) studied 157 Chinese undergraduate EFL students' summaries of the same source text in English and Chinese. The students' summaries were given holistic ratings and were analyzed for the correctness of information presented. Results showed that the quality of English summaries was influenced by the students' English reading comprehension abilities (assessed by the TOEFL reading section). In a similar vein, Baba (2009) studied sixty-eight Japanese undergraduate EFL students, and showed that the quality of L2 students' summary writing was significantly influenced by their reading comprehension abilities. Baba also found that summary performance related to students' abilities to write appropriate definitions of key terms. This result suggests that differences in vocabulary proficiency and students' abilities to extract accurate information from texts are important factors in L2 summary writing.

Associated instructional activities and the topic of the text also influence summary writing. Allison, Berry, and Lewkowicz (1995) analyzed the written summaries of eighty U.S. university-level ESL students involving three instructional conditions following the reading, but before summarizing: oral discussions, reading questions, and no support. Analysis of idea units included in the students' summaries revealed an influence of reading questions on students' summary writing, but oral discussion was not shown to facilitate students' summary writing. They also found that time allotment influenced summary writing, with more writing time leading to better summaries. Finally, Yang and Shi (2003) studied six first-year MBA ESL students in a U.S. university, focusing on the processes and the quality of summary writing. Their study revealed a positive effect on students' previous, business-related writing experience and on familiarity with the topic.

Synthesizing the results of these studies, we see that L2 summary writing in English is influenced by L2 proficiency in reading and writing, L2 vocabulary knowledge, reading text difficulty, time on task, writing task experience, and topic familiarity. It is useful to point out, in light of the results from the Allison, Berry, and Lewkowicz (1995)

study, that writing assignments in English L1 composition classes often rely on discussions of a text as a springboard for writing, but such discussions may not be very helpful for L2 students. In contrast, composition classes usually do not require reading comprehension activities prior to writing from text sources, but such activities would most likely be helpful for L2 students. Some common English L1 composition practices may run counter to effective L2 student support for summary writing tasks, as well as other writing tasks, in their classes.

SYNTHESIS WRITING

Synthesis writing involves integrating two or more source texts in a writing task. Like summaries, synthesis writing is a task that students are expected to perform in university classes (Hirvela, 2004). In some cases, synthesis writing might be assigned as a writing task in a writing course. In many contexts beyond the composition class, synthesis is a normally expected outcome of reporting on reading extensive amounts of content material for a course, for an essay exam, for a research project, or for a thesis. In this section, Plakans's (2008, 2009a, 2009b) studies on the process and products of ESL students' synthesis writing represent a useful starting point for examining L2 students' performance and the difficulties they encounter. In general, Plakans (2008, 2009a, 2009b) found that reading-to-write (synthesis) tasks elicited more interactive writing processes involving personal experiences, though this finding may have also been due to the specific task requirements presented to students in her studies. While synthesis writing is usually seen as analytic or objective writing in which writers select and rearrange source text content, students in her studies were asked to use examples both from their own experience and from source texts to support their opinions on a pre-determined topic.

Plakans (2009a) examined use of reading strategies from twelve ESL students in their synthesis writing process. Participants included graduate and undergraduate students majoring in different fields in a U.S. university. She specifically focused on these students' reading strategies used in their writing processes. Results showed that ESL students' reading strategies differed between proficient and less proficient writers. Among all reading strategies utilized by students, more advanced ESL writers purposefully used more mining and global strategies, whereas less proficient writers relied on a wide range of different

reading strategies, varying from individual to individual. Mining in reading is the process of reading with the specific purpose of finding particular information. In this study, more proficient ESL writers more frequently used strategies such as scanning to find ideas to include in writing, and also re-reading the source text for information to use in writing (Plakans, 2009a). More proficient writers in the study also used more global reading strategies, including goal setting by checking the task, skimming for the gist, and asking themselves questions (Plakans, 2009a). All three of these reading strategies are empirically supported as effective academic reading strategies (Grabe, 2009; Grabe & Stoller, 2011).

In a further analysis of data gathered in the same study, Plakans (2009b) examined specific sub-processes in the synthesis writing of six ESL students (three graduate and three undergraduate students). According to her findings, when students wrote essays requiring them to synthesize information from two texts, they used the processes of organizing, selecting, and connecting in much the same ways as Spivey's (1991) English L1 students. Specifically, Spivey (1991, 1997) studied the composing processes of secondary school and university-level English L1 students while writing synthesis essays using two source texts. She identified three sub-processes in which reading and writing were integrated: organizing, selecting, and connecting. The finding that ESL students use similar sub-processes when writing synthesis essays indicates that synthesis writing promotes the integration of reading and writing strategies. However, since ESL students differ in English proficiency and in experience with this task type, the degree to which they can successfully integrate reading and writing strategies varies. In Plakans's (2009a, 2009b) studies, ESL students of different proficiency levels produced synthesis essays of different quality. However, because there were only twelve students in all, it was not clear if the differences between high- and low-proficiency learners' writing was generalizable.

Beyond studies by Plakans, Qin (2009) carried out a study of 242 Chinese EFL university students writing argument essays drawing on information from two source texts. She found that most students, who were English majors in upper-division undergraduate courses and graduate courses, were able to identify and shape the relationship between the two source texts and use argument claims from the texts in their own writing. However, students with higher levels of

English proficiency (graduate students) used more counter arguments and rebuttals, indicating more sophisticated reasoning and applications of source information. Her finding suggested that EFL students in certain advanced EFL contexts can write relatively effective argument papers in English (at least in terms of argument structuring) if they have enough writing experience and sufficient English language proficiency.

In addition to quantitative research on synthesis writing, a number of case studies have been carried out with L2 students. Spack (1997) reported on a longitudinal study of a Japanese ESL student learning while writing academic papers across three years of university study. The student's self-assessment of her synthesis essays indicated a belief that good writing in the U.S. is opinion-based. When she could not clearly express her opinion in English (her L2) and support her argument with background knowledge, but instead had to use information from the readings, she was dissatisfied with her writing even though she received good grades from her professors. She felt frustration because she did not use many of her "own words," but represented information and language primarily from source texts. This study suggests the need for teachers to be explicit about the requirements of a given writing task, and also to engage students in exploring how synthesis tasks can be carried out more generically.

Leki (2007) reported on four extensive longitudinal case studies of U.S. university ESL students' literacy development over four years. In her study, she followed L2 students in four different disciplines: engineering, nursing, business, and social work. Each of the four students had very different experiences with writing, reading, and their interaction. Most importantly, she found that most writing outside of English writing courses—even when there wasn't much—involved information that drew specifically on reading and listening skills. Leki also found that for many assignments, vocabulary limitations proved to be problematic for these students. Ongoing problems with vocabulary were most likely reflected by their approaches to reading tasks, as there were many times when assigned readings were not read if students were not to be assessed on that material, or were not using the readings for writing tasks. What was assessed for a grade mattered quite a bit for these university students across the curriculum. Also notable, in Leki's (2007) research, was how few explicit synthesis tasks were assigned over the course of these four students' undergraduate careers, especial-

ly in lower-division general education courses, where one might expect more of these types of writing tasks.

RESEARCH PAPERS

There is not extensive research on L2 students writing research papers, and existing research is largely in the form of case studies. These studies reveal common difficulties but distinct individual responses by ESL students while carrying out writing tasks. The studies reported here highlight a number of difficulties faced by ESL writers, including: (a) developing an effective organizing framework; (b) meeting the demands in mastering sub-technical academic vocabulary; (c) avoiding plagiarism and providing appropriate attributions; (d) building skills for selecting good topics for research; and (e) recognizing audience and developing authorial voice. In almost all cases, studies on research papers involve students in disciplinary rather than composition settings.

In one case study, Zhu (2005) reported on an MBA ESL student's process of writing research papers. In her study, she found that the student relied on an overview article as an organizing foundation, and then inserted additional information from other sources, resulting in the completed research paper following the structure of the overview article. This choice represented a logical strategy for a student who did not know how to collect, select, and integrate information using a framework generated by his or her own goals for writing. In the absence of explicit instruction in organizing a research paper (or a few relevant and useful models of related research papers), this student found a realistic solution to term paper writing. (See also Hirvela, 2004, and Johns, 1997, on the need for students to be taught relevant models and to interrogate those models as part of instruction.)

In a second case study investigation, Tardy (2005) reported on two ESL graduate students writing high-stakes academic papers at a U.S. university. One of the participants was a student in the Master's program in computer science writing his master's thesis; the other was an electrical engineering doctoral student writing several research papers. Over the course of the study, both participants gradually realized that they needed ways to persuade the reader more explicitly about the arguments they were making. Both were becoming more aware of the need to situate the importance of their study in their respective research literatures and to consider the audience as readers they

needed to persuade. In this study, Tardy (2005) also highlighted the importance of mentoring in the students' development of rhetorical knowledge. Explicit support by mentors greatly helped them rethink and reshape their papers during the writing process. Additionally, she suggested that explicit instruction in audience, voice, and persuasive rhetoric should be taught regularly in advanced EAP classrooms. In an extension of her case-study research among L2 graduate students in the U.S., Tardy (2009) further highlighted the importance and usefulness of explicit instruction in genre knowledge—including the particular structures, move-stages, and linguistic features in different genres.

Angelova and Riazantseva (1999), in a study paralleling that of Tardy, followed four ESL graduate students from different L1 backgrounds, touching upon many of the themes noted above and in the discussion of synthesis writing. They found that L2 students struggled with topic decisions, discourse structure, and appropriate vocabulary in their writing processes with discipline-based academic research papers. L1 students are often expected to develop their own topics, but this may be quite difficult for L2 students who do not have intuitive knowledge of what might be acceptable, or even preferred, topics. For these four ESL students, deciding on a topic for their research papers was difficult because they were not accustomed to this practice and were relative novices in their fields. With respect to text organization and vocabulary in their writing, this study revealed that these students lacked knowledge of, and had difficulty in, using discipline-appropriate essay structures and vocabularies (see also Shanahan, 2009, and Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008), for discussions of disciplinary variation in reading-writing tasks in L1 secondary school contexts). Based on interviews with both students and professors, the authors suggested that more and earlier support should be given to ESL graduate students, and that more communication is needed between students and professors about academic expectations.

Research on L2 students writing longer research papers and Master's theses points to many reading-writing problems. Even at very advanced levels, ESL students continue having problems with more limited vocabulary knowledge, impacting both their reading and writing skills. They also need to learn explicit ways to structure and organize the information they want to present in their papers. Moreover, they need to go beyond reporting information to interpret information in ways that effectively address their primary audience and support

a position or an argument. L2 students do not have experiences in writing sustained arguments or explanations, and thus need explicit instruction and support with such writing tasks. In response, a key for teachers lies in explaining and being more explicit in teaching discourse organization in texts, specific goals for writing, audience awareness, and persuasive development. To emphasize the seriousness of this problem, Leki (2007) reported that the four students she studied over four years, in general, did relatively little writing, did very few prototypical research papers, and received little instructional support for these assignments during their time as undergraduates. Much more research is needed on writing instruction and support for research papers, both in writing courses and in subject area courses—especially in upper-division courses.

CONTRASTIVE RHETORIC, SOCIALIZATION, AND PLAGIARISM

Most ESL students in U.S. university contexts are adult learners. Most have had received many years of literacy instruction in their L1 before entering U.S. universities to study English or receive a degree. The literacy instruction they received from their home countries may be quite different from U.S. educational settings. In some cultures, reading is largely defined as recitation of text, while the practices of finding main ideas and details and making inferences are never explicitly taught in their L1 reading instruction. Writing instruction in the students' L1 may also be different from practices in U.S. university settings, though not always (see, for example, Qin, 2009). In many countries in East Asian (China, Japan, Korea), for example, the argument has been made that the reader of the text is responsible for figuring out its meaning. The writer does not have to make everything clear and straightforward; in fact, a piece of writing that is too straightforward may be considered low-quality because there is no room for the reader to make inferences (Connor, 1996). When these students study in U.S. universities, they may experience difficulty in the expected/conventional reading and writing demands in U.S. university classes. At the same time, their own reading/writing behaviors may be considered inappropriate.

Literature on contrastive rhetoric has been discussed, argued over, and criticized for almost fifty years. Yet, the insight that students bring distinct socio-cultural preferences from their L1 educational socializa-

tions, and that these are reflected in their writing/rhetorical preferences, is a persuasive notion. It has been well-documented in many contexts that it needs careful consideration in any L2 writing instructional setting (Casanave, 2004; Connor, 1996, 2002, 2008; Kaplan, 2005). Since Kaplan (1966) first raised the notion of contrastive rhetoric based on his study of ESL students' paragraph structures, contrastive rhetoric has been criticized for essentializing whole groups of students and their writing abilities simply because of their L1 background. This is a legitimate concern; for example, simply because a student is Japanese does not mean he or she writes with odd or unusual patterns of text organization. At the same time, if the goal is to identify discernible patterns of variation associated with L1 socialization outcomes, and to note them as contributing factors to L2 writing performance, contrastive rhetoric represents a useful line of inquiry, one that does not essentialize as much as note socialization preferences as possible contributing factors to L2 student performance.

More recently, Connor (2004, 2008) has proposed that contrastive rhetoric be reconsidered as intercultural rhetoric, as a way to expand inquiry into rhetorical practices and written texts as they cross cultural contexts and social situations. Her goal is to integrate research that examines a wide range of written genres in a large number of contexts—both academic and professional, written by a range of writers, and achieving a number of purposes more or less effectively. These comparisons might include L1 writers in two different languages producing the same functional genres, for example: letters of recommendation, types of editorial arguments, research grant proposals, research articles in economics journals, academic book reviews, etc. Her approach, however, suggests that contrastive rhetoric, traditionally involving L1 cultural preferences and the effects of educational socialization practices on academic writing, offer useful insights for writing instruction with L2 students. Her views align with others who suggest a moderate position for the possible implications of contrastive rhetoric without having this perspective dominate other explanatory factors influencing L2 writing performance (see, for example, Casanave, 2004, and her “investigative pedagogical approach”).

One current example of English L1 writing socialization practices that has gained currency in the past decade, and is often discussed in relation to contrastive rhetoric, is the matter of plagiarism and text borrowing. For students from other cultural backgrounds, especially

some Asian and Middle Eastern countries, plagiarism is not treated as seriously as it is in North American universities. Students from multiple countries do not share the conceptual understanding of the intellectual ownership of ideas that is assumed in U.S. university settings, and this creates a cultural barrier for them.

For example, Shi (2004) investigated the influence of eighty-seven university students' L1s on their language usage from source texts and suggested significant differences in the language use and citation behaviors between English L1 and English L2 students. Participants of the study were forty-eight English L2 students in a Chinese university, and thirty-nine English L1 students in a U.S. university. They were asked to write a summary and an opinion essay based on two source texts, and their language use was compared to that of the original text. Results showed, first, that the Chinese students directly copied more source text language in longer word strings and provided few citations overall. This was even more true with their summaries because the students had to rely more so on source texts for information. Second, Chinese students did not realize they were plagiarizing by not citing the authors of the original articles.

In a second study (noted earlier), Shi (2006) interviewed twenty-five university-level ESL students who spoke Chinese, Japanese, and Korean as their L1s. She found that plagiarism was not seen as a serious issue, nor was it treated as such in their school systems. Students typically did not study citation conventions as they might apply in their L1 writing. The students' claims of not having been explicitly taught the practice of citation is also supported in Scollon's (1997) study. It showed that, in Chinese news writing, there is no standard practice for quotations, and the distinction between borrowed and original language is ambiguous.

In contrast to the above studies, Wheeler (2009) surveyed seventy-seven EFL students in a Japanese university on their judgments of two pieces of student writing on the same topic. The students gave low scores to both essays that plagiarized a (fictionally) published paragraph on the same topic, citing a lack of academic honesty to support their judgments. His results suggested that English learners with Japanese cultural backgrounds were aware of the issue of plagiarism, showing disapproval. Based on his result, Wheeler (2009) argued: (a) it oversimplifies to say that plagiarism is inherent in a particular culture, and (b) that Japanese university students are well aware of the issue of

plagiarism. Nevertheless, despite a growing recognition of the issue of plagiarism in many cultures, including China (Bloch, 2008), having an abstract understanding of plagiarism does not prevent students from plagiarizing in their writing for a variety of reasons. Research has shown that many students, though having an abstract understanding of plagiarism and being aware that they should not do it, still unintentionally and intentionally plagiarize because they do not know when to cite, how to cite, and what to cite (Pecarori, 2003).

Bloch (2008) reviewed this debate on plagiarism from the perspective of contrastive rhetoric, situating occurrences of plagiarism in L2 student writing as a possible outcome of different historical, cultural, and social orientations to writing and authorial ownership. He reviewed the history of contrastive rhetoric, tying the review in with a history of plagiarism and textual ownership (see also Horning, 2010). He also examines the arguments of researchers who assert that plagiarism is primarily a reflection of educational socialization practices and their impact on L2 students (Fox, 1994). From a pedagogical perspective, Bloch (2008) argues that contested views about plagiarism in student writing create ideal opportunities to have discussions about what counts as plagiarism, for who, and why. In this way, student views on text borrowing are treated respectfully, but experiences with plagiarism create the opportunity to teach ESL students about U.S. academic expectations for writing, ownership of ideas, and providing appropriate attribution.

Similar to Bloch (2008), Valentine's (2006) case analysis of one Chinese graduate student's (Lin) plagiarism behavior revealed the complexity behind simple "academic dishonesty" charges. Lin was charged with plagiarism and had to go through an academic hearing because his professor realized, for the final research paper, that he had used direct quotations from his sources without marking them and that there were few of his own words expressing his opinion. Lin was initially shocked because he considered himself an honest student, spending a lot of time reading the sources, understanding them, and arranging information in his paper. He directly copied the information because he misunderstood the professor's intention (to provide a point of view instead of demonstrating knowledge of the field) and the differences in acceptable citation behaviors between America and China. Through the analysis of this case, Valentine (2006) cautioned educators not to simply view plagiarism as the dishonest practice of

students, but to view it as a complicated literacy practice that involves social relationships, attitudes, and cultural values. Along the same lines, teachers should not simply punish students caught plagiarizing, but teach them appropriate literacy practices. In doing so, teachers should discuss choices that writers make while citing information in relation to different contexts and also ways to incorporate different types of knowledge into their own writing.

The four themes addressed in this section all identify ways in which reading, text input, and writing performance, in combination, introduce many complications when working with L2 students in composition classes. Summary writing is more difficult for the average L2 student (as compared with the typical L1 university student), who has certainly had much less experience summarizing in English. Both summary and synthesis writing highlight language proficiency limitations of many L2 students and the need to provide these students with more explicit reading instruction in support of text comprehension for writing. Research papers add the complexity of working with many resources for an extended length of time and the need to develop ways to use text resources effectively. All three types of reading-writing tasks highlight issues of direct copying and plagiarism. Finally, different L2 students use texts in line with varying historical, cultural, and social perspectives they bring to writing tasks in the composition classroom.

L2 LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY AND THE LIMITS ON ENGLISH L2 WRITING ABILITIES

An obvious inference running through most research on reading and writing relationships for English L2 students in university settings is that many (but not all) have limited English L2 language resources in comparison with English L1 students. It is a straightforward observation that L2 students who take the TOEFL exam, or the Cambridge-based IELTS exam, do not perform very well in writing tasks when their other language skills (e.g., grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening) are relatively weak. We would be quite surprised to find students performing well on L2 writing tasks while performing relatively poorly on all other L2 language skills (certainly in comparison with most university L1 students).

The association between L2 writing abilities and L2 language proficiency more generally suggests that L2 students can be quite different

from English L1 students in composition courses. For example, Delaney (2008), through the examination of 139 English L1 and English L2 learners at several universities, found that both her ESL and EFL participants' reading-to-write task performance (timed summaries and response essays) were influenced by their English proficiency. Works by Ellis and Loewen (2005), Jarvis (2002), Jarvis, Grant, Bikowski, and Ferris (2003), and Grant and Ginther (2000) all suggest that L2 writing abilities are correlated with L2 vocabulary knowledge—a key aspect of language proficiency. Both Leki (2007) and Spack (1997) comment on their case-study students' lack of vocabulary knowledge to read relevant material, interact effectively, or follow lectures with ease.

In research specifically concerned with the impact of reading abilities on L2 writing, Baba (2009) and Plakans (2009a) showed that reading constituted an important ability for writing performance (see also Risemberg, 1996, and Spivey and King, 1989) for L1 studies showing that reading abilities contribute to writing performance). Lee (2005), in a study involving 270 Taiwanese university students, showed that the amount of free, voluntary reading by students was the most significant factor in explaining essay writing scores. Spack (1997), in her case-study research, showed that her student experienced significant difficulties with reading as a part of her writing difficulties in both composition classes and in a range of other undergraduate courses. The impact of reading on writing is also strongly supported by the large-scale educational research of Elley (1991; 2000), showing that extensive reading and extensive exposure to print significantly impacted L2 students' writing development (see also Ferris, 2009).

This association between L2 writing and a range of L2 language skills (including reading) indicates that expectations for academic writing success among L2 students must be tempered by students' L2 language abilities generally, and also more specifically by their reading comprehension abilities. In tasks that involve some integration of reading and writing skills, L2 students need to have adequate reading comprehension abilities if the task assigned requires them to be accountable for the content of the reading text. While it is not the task of the writing teacher to also become a teacher of overall language abilities in L2 English, it is, nonetheless, important for the writing teacher to find out if English language proficiency—especially in reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge—is a major factor in an L2 student's performance on writing tasks. If this turns out to be the case (possibly

through initial writing and diagnostic tasks), the question becomes what the writing teacher's responsibilities are and the extent to which the writing teacher can accommodate the L2 student's language needs.

IMPLICATIONS FROM L2 RESEARCH ON READING-WRITING RELATIONS FOR WRITING INSTRUCTION

As we noted in *Research on L2 Reading-Writing Integration in the Writing Classroom*, most writing tasks in academic contexts require some type of reading (Leki & Carson, 1994, 1997; Johns, 2002). Students who take ESL (pre-university) writing classes may receive useful instruction in both academic reading and writing before they take mainstream university classes; however, according to Leki and Carson (1994), many L2 students state that they wanted more instruction on reading-based writing, such as summary, synthesis, and research paper writing, when interviewed after having completed pre-university EAP instruction. This desire for more practice with academic reading and writing tasks suggests that L2 students receive as much attention to their reading comprehension needs as to their writing production needs when they move into the composition classroom.

L2 students certainly need more practice in identification, interpretation, and use of main ideas and themes in texts (i.e., reading skills). However, there is relatively little explicit discussion on how to address main idea identification and interpretation in writing classes; this ability is commonly assumed by writing teachers. Most L1 students do, in fact, have good skills in main idea identification and interpretation from texts, even if they are not aware of just how they implement these skills. Because of L1 students' reading abilities, there is usually little practice given to skills in reading comprehension. Moreover, most university writing courses engage in discussions of texts assuming that the texts are understood by students. This assumption can be a reason why "discussion in preparation for writing" may not be very useful for weaker L2 students.

An additional outcome of this review of L2 research on reading and writing relations is the recognition that a number of L2 students will have difficulties with the concept of plagiarism and with not appropriating too much material directly from source texts. With L2 students, instruction in dealing with plagiarism should focus more on proactive teaching to lead students towards correct use of source texts, rather than a focus on post-writing punishment (Horning, 2010; Pec-

orari, 2003; Valentine, 2006). In addition, efforts should be made to work explicitly on paraphrasing skills to help L2 students use text information more appropriately (Keck, 2006).

It is not possible to address every difference between L1 and L2 students in the composition classroom and still have time to carry out every writing goal of the course. However, there are a number of specific suggestions that can be considered if L2 students constitute a fair percentage of students in the class. We offer suggestions that involve reading-support activities, reading-writing support activities, awareness-raising activities, and pre-discussion activities.

With respect to support for reading tasks in the composition classroom, L2 students may need more explicit intervention in comprehension, particularly when asked to read more challenging material. Providing a reading guide for students can be very helpful, especially as a preparation resource for other reading and writing tasks. A reading guide might ask students for a brief list of key ideas, the perspective or bias of the author (and what signals exist in the text for these interpretations), one or two interpretation questions that force “between the lines” thinking, a question or two about intended audience, and a question or two about a controversial issue or problem that might also be a lead-in to class discussion. L2 students would also benefit from explicit attention to the organization of a text and the rhetorical patterns used to present major information. Teachers can begin this process by simply asking how a text is organized and why it is organized that way. Attention to key, thematic vocabulary and unusual words or to metaphoric use would be helpful as well, either as an activity filling in glosses or as a homework activity directed to L2 students.

There are a number of ways writing teachers can provide L2 students with support for vocabulary development: The teacher can identify eight to ten key terms, metaphoric uses, and culturally loaded terms and ask students to work in groups to check their understanding of these terms. (This could also be done as homework for L2 students). The teacher can hand out a set of glossaries to L2 students for key and additional terms that are likely to cause problems for L2 student comprehension and interpretation of the text. The teacher can provide a set of key thematic terms on the blackboard for a quick, in-class writing response to an assigned reading, allowing L2 students to recognize vocabulary they might use in their responses. The teacher can ask L2 students to underline and nominate eight to ten words and phrases that

they can't figure out, bring them to class, and work in groups to sort them out while L1 students complete another short, in-class writing task. Teachers can also meet and share ideas about other possible ways to provide vocabulary support for L2 students who are struggling.

L2 students can also be encouraged to engage in extensive reading with texts they find interesting and are also related to course themes. Teachers can develop lists of book chapters, Internet sources, and magazine articles that allow L2 students to expand their background knowledge while also giving these students more exposure and practice with reading in English (Horning, 2010). Teachers can also give L2 students a small amount of extra credit for engaging in additional, extensive readings on a key topic. At the same time, teachers can develop a simple, section-by-section summary or outline of main points in a longer reading assignment to ensure better understanding and interpretations of texts. This support allows L2 students to read longer and more understand complex texts assigned to everyone.

More explicit attention to the purpose of reading-writing tasks would also raise L2 students' awareness of course expectations while allowing L2 students a safe way to ask questions about specific task expectations. Such attention to reading and writing goals can be developed overtly through close interrogation of the prompt, clear teacher expectations for the writing task, and critical analyses of model assignments. In preparing more generally for in-class discussions of a text, L2 students would be helped by first doing a quick-write on a key point in the text, by generating and sharing a main-idea list, or by skimming the text before discussing and reflecting on (and noting) some interesting aspect of the text. In addition, asking L2 students to generate a list of key ideas from a reading text and then write a summary is a very effective method of comprehension and writing support for L2 students (see also Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008).

It is also important to hold L2 students accountable for assigned text materials. This accountability can be created by: (1) assigning for quick response writing the next day in class; (2) generating a list of key issues or ideas from a text on the board before in-class discussions; or (3) having students respond to a key paragraph and/or statement in the text in class, and then collecting the responses. Alternatively, L2 students can be assigned to keep reading journals in which they write down ideas from the text, respond to key information, reflect on issues in the text, or comment on ways to use text material in their writing.

They can also write down four to six key words and phrases from each reading in the back of their journals that they would like to go back to and review. These journals can be collected every few weeks, checked very quickly, and given a grade.

With respect to reading-writing tasks themselves, explicit analysis of model writing assignments—especially in relation to teacher/task expectations—is very helpful for L2 students. Looking at model assignments, students can be asked to identify how issues and arguments from source texts are shaped to be persuasive for an audience. They can also examine how selected ideas from texts are attributed to the text's authors (Valentine, 2006). These awareness-raising activities should improve reading comprehension and writing performance. It is important also to ensure that writing assignments do not have tacit cultural or academic assumptions of which L2 students might not be aware. If such tacit assumptions are part of an assignment, they need to be explicitly discussed. Exploration of tacit assumptions can even be part of whole-class discussions in which students propose hidden assumptions embedded within the writing task.

Put simply, L2 students also need much more practice in writing. Reading-writing tasks need to be frequent enough so that L2 students build confidence and fluency and also receive consistent feedback on their writing. In providing feedback to L2 students, teachers or peers often need to address incorrect grammatical forms in L2 student texts. If L2 students are struggling, a goal is not to fix everything in a given assignment, but to address a few grammar problems progressively and move on with another task. It is also very helpful for L2 students to read their writing assignments aloud to others in a group so they become more aware of writing weaknesses. Reading aloud will improve phrasing, clause structuring, and sentence rhythm, and it will allow other students to give useful feedback. It also ensures accountability within the group work. Finally, peer feedback guidelines should be used to provide very explicit support to L2 students. The guidelines need to give explicit directions for what to attend to, how, and how much. Some very basic pointers could include: "Can you state what the main idea is in two sentences?"; "Does every part of the text address the main idea, or are other, non-central ideas introduced?"; "How is the text organized?"; "Is the organization clearly indicated?"; "Is there sentence variety?"; "What part of the text do you like the most, or is the most effective? Why?" (See Grabe & Kaplan (1996, pp. 382–92) for various format options.)

Of course, a brief list of possible ideas supporting L2 writers in the composition classroom does not begin to address all the issues likely to arise (see Table 1); nor does it handle many of the challenges faced by the writing teacher working with a complex mix of reading and writing abilities and L1 and L2 students. However, L2 students in the composition class are more likely to succeed with more complex reading-writing tasks if provided with concrete ways to attend to reading input and given ways to generate, organize, and revise ideas they use in their writing. L2 students are also more likely to succeed if the writing teacher finds ways to focus on key vocabulary from core texts, highlight vocabulary learning activities for L2 students (perhaps as part of more individualized classroom and homework activities), support text comprehension and interpretation, and give students more opportunities to engage in several short writing tasks (perhaps as part of the larger writing tasks in the curriculum).

Writing teachers might say that the complexities created by several L2 students in a writing course limit what she or he is able to do with all students in the class. One of the most useful ways to address this problem is for groups of teachers to get together to explore how to integrate L2 student needs with larger instructional goals. Teacher groups can begin with a set of teaching issues (such as those listed in Table 1) and prioritize those most important to address. They can make lists of suggestions and “ideas that work,” sort through them, and discuss ways to successfully adopt or adapt ideas for their teaching contexts. They can experiment in small ways with teaching ideas and report back to their group on difficulties and successes. Over time, discussions with interested colleagues are likely to provide useful techniques and tasks that will make a difference for L2 student struggling with both reading and writing.

In closing, it is important to recognize that L2 student writers encounter more challenges with integrated reading-writing tasks than do L1 students. Most L2 students who get as far as university writing classes also manage to be successful in these writing courses. It takes a tremendous amount of will and desire for L2 students to completely undertake a university education in a second language, and a large majority of L2 students are strongly motivated to succeed in their writing courses. A composition teacher who is well-informed about the challenges facing the L2 student will make it that much more likely for that student to succeed.