

CHAPTER 9

Adolescent Second-Language Writing

LINDA HARKLAU
RACHEL PINNOW

Second-language writing is a relatively new field drawing from second-language acquisition and composition studies. Most of the work to date has focused on the college level, and research specifically addressing adolescent second- and foreign language writing remains sparse, characterized by isolated studies with few sustained threads of inquiry. This chapter is organized around what we know about three major questions about adolescent second-language writing. We first address whether and how adolescent second-language writing might be different from first-language writing in terms of text and discourse features and composing and editing processes. We then consider what the research tells us about how second-language writing develops in adolescents as a function of age and proficiency. Next we identify major issues in adolescent second-language writing instruction, including the frequency and quality of second-language writing instruction; the role of first-language in second-language writing instruction; the integration of bilingual writers into monolingual writing classrooms; the relationship between second-language writing and content learning; linking second-language writing instruction to adolescents' home and community experiences; implications of Internet and communication technologies for adolescent second-language writing; and assessment. We conclude with an agenda for further research and implications of second-language writing research for adolescent literacy studies.

America's youth today are the most linguistically and culturally diverse in U.S. history. One in five is an immigrant or the child of immigrants. As in other industrialized societies around the world, "Millennial" youth in the United States are increasingly multilingual. They take for granted the digital technologies that have made worldwide communication so immediate and accessible. In an age of globalization, this generation of adolescents is more and more likely to write across languages and cultures. Yet scholarship has barely begun to investigate how ad-

Adolescence might lend distinctive linguistic, cognitive, developmental, and sociocultural characteristics to second-language (L2) writing. In fact, we believe this may be the first comprehensive review of research specifically on adolescent second-language writing.

The field of second-language writing is a relatively new one, with one foot in applied linguistics and second-language acquisition and the other in composition studies (Matsuda, 1998; Silva & Leki, 2004). The majority of work in this field to date has focused on the college level (see, e.g., Canagarajah

2002; Ferris & Hed; Schecter & Harkl; finds that research and foreign language (Parks, Huot, Ham; Roca de Larios, M; Much of the literat; curricular approach in this review. Only extant work on a based on systematic inquiry, and much needed; we indicate ture inquiry might featured adolescent but we have yet to a aspects of this age Rabia, 2003; Lee, 2 & Yue, 1996; Seng 1994, for studies of 2004; de Courcy, 2 2002; Gamaroff, Montano-Harmon, 2003; Way, Joiner; studies of written Haslett, 2002; Gha hosseini, 2005; Sh for studies of the e texts). In addition, in secondary school are perhaps the sin L2 writers both in ternationally (see, Tylor, Lazarus, & considerably more texts (O'Brien, 20 languages examine extremely limited. En language medium in 8 viewed. Ten percent writing, and only 5 languages. Work is esp cent L2 writing in or non-Roman scri Although the no self is rightfully co Madeboncoeur & refine it as corres high school in the U ately 12–18 years. Note that although language (or L2) and keeping with c field, the terms are and studies of ado

2002; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Leki, 2007; Schecter & Harklau, 1992). Our review finds that research on adolescent second- and foreign language writing remains sparse (Parks, Huot, Hamers, & Lemonnier, 2005; Roca de Larios, Murphy, & Marín, 2002). Much of the literature consists of essays on curricular approaches that are not included in this review. Only a small proportion of extant work on adolescent L2 writing is based on systematic theoretical or empirical inquiry, and much more work in this vein is needed; we indicate below the directions future inquiry might take. Many studies have featured adolescent L2 writers incidentally, but we have yet to address potentially unique aspects of this age group (see, e.g., Abu-Rabia, 2003; Lee, 2004; Pennington, Brock, & Yue, 1996; Sengupta, 2000; Wong et al., 1994, for studies of writing process; Clachar, 2004; de Courcy, 2002; Dyer & Friederich, 2002; Gamaroff, 2000; Makinen, 1992; Montano-Harmon, 1991; Schoonen et al., 2003; Way, Joiner, & Seaman, 2000, for studies of written texts; and Franken & Haslett, 2002; Ghahremani-Ghajar & Mirhosseini, 2005; Shaw, 1997; Tsang, 1996, for studies of the effects of L2 writing contexts). In addition, even though adolescents in secondary school foreign language classes are perhaps the single largest population of L2 writers both in the United States and internationally (see, e.g., Rijlaarsdam, 2002; Taylor, Lazarus, & Cole, 2005), we need considerably more research on these contexts (O'Brien, 2004). Finally, the second languages examined in studies remain extremely limited. English was the second-language medium in 85% of the studies we reviewed. Ten percent focused on French L2 writing, and only 5% focused on other languages. Work is especially needed on adolescent L2 writing in non-European languages or non-Roman script systems.

Although the notion of "adolescence" itself is rightfully contested (Harklau, 2007; Vadeboncoeur & Stevens, 2005), here we define it as corresponding to middle and high school in the United States, or approximately 12–18 years of age. We also wish to note that although we use the terms *second language* (or L2) and *foreign language* here, in keeping with established usage in the field, the terms are also somewhat limiting, and studies of adolescent L2 writing are in-

creasingly moving to a more complex "multicompetence" perspective on multilingual students' use of language (Cook, 2002; Ortega, 2006). For example, in multilingual contexts such as Hong Kong, English is rarely a first language but is so widely used that it cannot be considered a second or foreign language (Sengupta, 2000). A further example: In the U.S.–Mexico border area, a range of standard and nonstandard dialects of both the first and second languages (Montano-Harmon, 1991) abound, and in the Caribbean, Creole writers may use dialects that vary in distance from the standard (or "acrolect") to the vernacular (or "basilect") (Clachar, 2004).

This review is organized around major questions about adolescent L2 writing that have occupied international researchers, educators, and policymakers: How is adolescent L2 writing different from first-language (L1) writing? How does L2 writing develop in adolescents? And what are the major issues in L2 writing instruction for adolescents?

HOW IS ADOLESCENT L2 WRITING DIFFERENT FROM L1 WRITING?

Differences between first-language and second-language writing and between monolingual and multilingual writers have been investigated from a variety of perspectives.

How Might Text and Discourse Features Differ?

L2 writers are likely to make more errors and different kinds of errors in texts than monolingual students even after protracted learning and instruction (Silva, 1993). For example, Yu and Atkinson (1988) found that Chinese L1 Hong Kong adolescents made errors in English L2 lexical item choices, noun inflections, word classes, spelling, determiners, verb tense/aspect, subject-verb agreement, active/passive voice, and preposition choice even after education in English medium schools. Reynolds (2002) found that English-proficient students were better able to adjust types of causality markers employed in their texts for different composition topics and genres than middle

school Spanish L1, English L2 learners. He suggests that L2 learners may favor a narrative mode of development across topics. In a subsequent study, Reynolds (2005) found that the texts of English L2 learners display far less informational density than texts of English-proficient students. L2 writers' texts also evidenced more idiosyncratic use of grammatical features and varied in whether they aligned grammatical usage with the genre elicited by composition prompts (e.g., they might use first person instead of imperative forms or "you" when giving directions or instructions).

Adolescent L2 learners' texts display less lexical diversity (vocabulary variety) than those of proficient bilingual students (Reynolds, 2005). Bilingual students tend to have smaller, more colloquial, less academic vocabularies in L2 than monolingual students of the same age (Hinkel, 2002; Laufer, 1998; Lee, 2003), so augmenting vocabulary is a major concern for adolescent L2 writing. Nevertheless, passive vocabulary size and use in reading has tended to be better studied and understood than active, productive vocabulary use (Laufer, 1998). Gains in adolescents' L2 passive vocabularies may not translate into greater ability to use vocabulary productively in free compositions. In fact, the gap between passive and active vocabulary knowledge may actually increase with language proficiency (Laufer, 1998). Lee (2003) suggests that systematic vocabulary instruction can have positive effects on the variety of vocabulary used by adolescents in compositions as well as on the frequency of sophisticated, infrequent vocabulary items.

Some writing genres, particularly summaries, may be more linguistically demanding for adolescent L2 writers to produce than others (de Courcy, 2002). Moreover, even writers who are quite proficient at the level of syntax and vocabulary may nevertheless apply implicit L1 discourse conventions (Connor, 2002). Studies of adolescent writers show differing L1 and L2 conventions for length of the text, length of sentences, and conjunction use; linear organization or deviations from the main idea; stringing together ideas through adding or explaining, as opposed to enumerating; the extent of writers' responsibility for conveying meaning versus readers' responsibility for text in-

terpretation; the extent to which texts serve as self-actualization for writers; and the extent to which texts focus on sensory description and detail, plot line, or thesis (Dyer & Friederich, 2002; Montano-Harmon, 1991). When such differences exist, it suggests a need for explicit instruction. The uniqueness of cultures' rhetorical forms and the persistence of such forms in L2 writing has been questioned, however (e.g., Atkinson, 2004; Kubota, 1999). Plagiarism and inappropriate use of source materials, whether from lack of linguistic resources or differences in cultural conventions, may be a problem for adolescent L2 writers (de Courcy, 2002). More cross-cultural research is needed to ascertain whether or how genre conventions are taught to adolescent L2 writers. For example, Schleppegrell, Achugar, and Oteiza (2004) describe a project in which secondary school teachers working with English L2 learners were explicitly trained to use functional linguistics to analyze the structure of history texts. While focusing on decoding, the authors note that the method might be a starting point for a writing curriculum.

How Might Composing and Editing Processes Differ?

Work on L2 writing process has proceeded largely under the assumption that L2 detracts from cognitive processing and that writing in an L2 leads to less sophisticated outcomes (see, e.g., Abu-Rabia, 2003). Work has therefore focused on how L1 and L2 enter into adolescents' composing processes and where L2 might "short circuit" composing ability. In recent years Chenoweth and Hayes's (2001) distinction between resource, process, and control levels of the writing process in bilingual students has become influential. Roca de Larios, Marín, and Murphy (2001) and Schoonen et al. (2003) argue that existing models of composing based on monolingual composing processes have not given adequate theoretical or empirical attention to the interaction of L2 fluency or automaticity on metacognition and planning processes. Monolingual models have also presumed that thoughts are separated from their translation into words rather than integrated. Studies in this area suggest that L1 and L2 writing ability are correlated (Schoonen et al., 2003; but see

Yakabayashi, 2002, for a contrary view). However, L2 text form is more linear and generates greater coherence than writing in L1, leading learners to give significantly more attention to solving problems than to generating vocabulary (Larios et al., 2001). For problem solving, writing in L2 is at a lower fluency level, with older L2 writers spending more time on their linguistic formulae, compensating for lack of fluency in younger or less proficient writers (Larios, Manchón, & Murphy, 2003). Further research on linguistic retrieval speed, with L2 writing requiring more linguistic knowledge than L1 writing.

Further work on decoding and L2 composing in L2 may employ a combination of techniques, including think-alouds and interviews to assess writing experience. Roca de Larios et al. (2003) note the need to analyze writing skill across languages and reflects on values and attitudes about writing (Smagorinsky, 2001). Roca de Larios et al. (1995) argue that collaborative composing in L2 can lead to a breakdown into the process of writing, which is equally promising approach. Roca de Larios et al.'s (2003) longitudinal study of cultural equation models of writers.

Response and error marking are especially important issues. Current pedagogical practices of error marking in grammar practice and develop writers' self-correction (Ferris, 2002). Research that even though self-correction improves adolescent revision processes (Schoonen et al., 1994), teacher corrections are necessary and are ignored (Schoonen et al., 2004), the majority of students resist such training and prefer teacher editing and marking of errors (Schoonen et al., 2003).

which texts serve writers; and the external sensory description or thesis (Dyer & O-Harmon, 1991). In addition, it suggests a unique perspective. The uniqueness of writing has been discussed by Atkinson, 2004; and inappropriateness, whether from differences in writing or differences in the problem for the writer (Courcy, 2002). The need to address genre conventions for L2 writers. For example, Oteiza and Oteiza, 2003, in which secondary writing with English L2 writers is discussed. The need to use functional structure of writing in decoding, and method might be a good curriculum.

Writing and Editing

Research has proceeded to show that L2 development is more complex and that L2 writers are less sophisticated than L1 writers (Abadia, 2003). Work has shown that L1 and L2 writing processes are different. The "circuit" composition model of Chenoweth and Oteiza, 2003, between resource, and the writing process has become important. Oteiza, Marín, and Oteiza et al. (2003) show that the process of composing is different. Theoretical or empirical research of L2 fluency, metacognition and bilingual models of writing are separation into words and sentences in this area. Writing ability are different, 2003; but see

Wakabayashi, 2002, for contrasting results). However, L2 text formulation is more laborious and generates greater cognitive load than writing in L1, leading adolescent writers to give significantly more of their attention to solving problems with structure and vocabulary than to generating text (Roca de Larios et al., 2001). However, the nature of problem solving varies by age and proficiency level, with older and more proficient L2 writers spending more time on upgrading their linguistic formulations and less on compensating for lack of L2 knowledge than younger or less proficient writers (Roca de Larios, Manchon, & Murphy, 2006). Schoonen et al. (2003) further suggest that there is a linguistic retrieval speed threshold for writing, with L2 writing more dependent on L2 linguistic knowledge and processing speed than L1 writing.

Further work on differences between L1 and L2 composing in adolescents may profitably employ a combination of research techniques, including verbal protocol analysis and interviews to gauge writers' subjective experience. Roca de Larios et al. (2006) note the need to analyze how the transfer of writing skill across languages is socially mediated and reflects old and new cultural values and attitudes about writing (see, e.g., Smagorinsky, 2001). Swain and Lapkin (1995) argue that collaborative dialogue while composing in L2 can provide a unique window into the process. A very different but equally promising approach is Schoonen et al.'s (2003) longitudinal analysis using structural equation modeling with a large sample of writers.

Response and error feedback are especially important issues in L2 composing. Current pedagogical theory advocates selective error marking coordinated with targeted grammar practice and strategy training to develop writers' self-sufficiency as editors (Ferris, 2002). Research indicates, however, that even though such training is effective and improves adolescents' L2 writing and revision processes (see, e.g., Sengupta, 2000; Wong et al., 1994), and even when most teacher corrections are found to be unnecessary and are ignored by students (Lee, 2004), the majority of students nonetheless resist such training (Sengupta, 1998) and prefer teacher editing and comprehensive marking of errors (Lee, 2004). Furthermore,

one study (Franken & Haslett, 2002) found that English L2 adolescents in New Zealand produced more linguistically accurate and complex essays with more information when working alone than when working with peers on topics in which they possessed adequate background knowledge. The effectiveness of peer collaboration also appears to differ with adolescents' L2 proficiency levels (Lapkin & Swain, 2002) and background knowledge (Franken & Haslett, 2002). The ideal peer editor for an adolescent may be another more proficient L2 learner (Felderholdt, 2001; Strasser, 1995). In all, studies suggest that proficiency, cultural context, and dynamics of social interaction all affect L2 adolescent writers' ability to work as peer collaborators and editors, but more work is needed in this area.

HOW DOES L2 WRITING DEVELOP IN ADOLESCENTS?

Because of the "inherent bias in the research towards university L2 writers" (Reynolds, 2002), L2 writing has thus far been conceptualized as a phenomenon of individuals who have completed literacy development in L1. On the other hand, developmental theories of writing have been based primarily on the experiences of monolingual young children. However, more research is urgently needed on school-age learners, for whom development of second language and literacy coincide (Reynolds, 2002).

A handful of studies have looked at L2 writing development as a function of age. Especially useful are comparative studies of adolescents and L2 writers in other age groups. Some abilities are apparently not age-specific. For example, Wald (1987) finds that the age of Spanish L1 English L2 writers had little effect on ability to differentiate spoken and written language in terms of syntactic complexity. Other aspects of L2 writing development appear to be affected by age. Comparing bilingual Basque-Spanish adolescents who had studied English for the same number of years but at younger and older ages, Cenoz (2002) finds that older learners' compositions were rated more highly, suggesting that adolescence confers some advantages in the pace of L2 writing development. Roca de Larios et al. (2001)

find that when compared to college students, Spanish high school students spent more time on text formulation in both L1 and L2 and significantly less time on planning and revision. High school writers often reinterpreted the task (e.g., from argumentation into personal narrative) and engaged in more off-task commentary. More comparative studies would be useful to gauge if and how differences in cognitive maturity and composing experiences distinguish adolescent L2 writers from better-studied adults and children. Longitudinal studies of the same writers are also necessary to capture development (Reynolds, 2005; Schoonen et al., 2003). Reynolds (2005) argues that adolescent L2 writing development needs to be conceptualized in terms of ability to produce appropriately a widening range of written genres. On a broader level, Welch, Hodges, and Warden (1989) argue that early intervention in elementary school might be crucial to adolescents' long-term development as multilingual writers and scholars.

Other studies have posited stages of adolescent L2 writing development as a function of increasing proficiency. For example, adolescents interviewed by de Courcy (2002) reported that as novice L2 writers, they had depended heavily on composing in L1 and translating, and on bilingual text resources such as articles and dictionaries, to generate L2 text. With increasing proficiency, they began to generate text in L2 but remained dependent on L1 for prewriting and planning processes. Studies of development based on cross-sectional analysis of both highly and poorly rated L2 essays suggest that more proficient adolescent English L2 writers use fewer simple clauses, make fewer errors linking clauses (Leong & Wee, 2005), organize information in more hierarchical fashion, include more elaboration and specific detail, and conclude essays at a higher level of generality than less skillful writers (Makinen, 1992). Studies have also looked at L2 writing proficiency development as a function of instructional interventions. Day and Shapson (2001), for example, tested an experimental curriculum that improved Canadian French immersion students' use of conditional verbs in writing. Evans and Fisher (2005) found that even extremely short (6–11 day) high school study-abroad experiences were associated with gains in British

adolescents' French L2 writing performance in terms of text length and use of expressive language including verbs indicating likes and dislikes and adjectives of evaluation.

Only a handful of studies have offered explicit theoretical frames for examining adolescent L2 writing proficiency development. Some (see, e.g., Cenoz, 2002; Yu & Atkinson, 1988) relate their findings to Cummins's (1981) "threshold hypothesis," suggesting that students must develop a critical level of proficiency in their first language in order to reap cognitive, linguistic, and academic benefits from bilingualism. Swain and Lapkin (1998, 2000) advocate a sociocultural framework that views dialogue as both communication and cognitive tool in improving L2 adolescent writing. Tsang (1996) draws upon Krashen's (1984) input hypothesis, which argues that intensive and extensive reading "input" is the primary determinant of L2 writing development. Tsang found positive effects for an adolescent L2 writing curriculum based on this theory (but see Lightbown, Halter, White, and Horst, 2002, for contrasting results). On the basis of case studies of three Spanish L1 English L2 adolescents in a California middle school, Valdés (1999) proposes a seven-stage model of L2 writing development in adolescents, encompassing communicative tasks performed (e.g., providing personal information, explaining, expressing opinions), syntactic and discourse organization, and mechanics. Valdés also argues for theoretical models to take the writing of fluent bilingual rather than monolingual adolescents as the appropriate target for proficiency development. In all, studies have looked at development in terms of age or L2 proficiency but have rarely addressed both. Developmental research on adolescent L2 writing could also use more diverse and stronger theoretical frames and more longitudinal research (Parks et al., 2005).

WHAT ARE THE MAJOR ISSUES IN ADOLESCENT L2 WRITING INSTRUCTION?

Does L2 Writing Instruction Take Place?

There are surprisingly few studies documenting whether writing even takes place

regularly in classroom language is the ex those that do sugg on is highly varia high school second- 1995; García, 1999 1999) and foreign la Greany, 2004) in th as foreign language nington et al., 199 struction is provide on teachers' attitud (Pennington et al. 2004) as well as st achievement (Penn could certainly use mation on whethe taught across a bro classrooms interna

What Is the Role

Relatively few emp ined L1 use in ado tion, and most hav the United States v ciety's dominant l for example, Yu a tend that Chinese versely affected b struction, based performance in L a subsequent stud reported that both used in varying p instruction, deper rooms were teach dividual students' demic achievement teacher's immedia French immersion Lapkin (2000) s writing activities ported the devel cent L2 writers n nitive demands, negotiate meani Wakabayashi (20 tle difference wh were initially sc lish, but studen early age into p the classroom r formed better c who did not. H

regularly in classrooms where the second language is the explicit object of focus. Those that do suggest that writing instruction is highly variable. This is the case for high school second-language classrooms (Fu, 1995; García, 1999; Harklau, 1994; Valdés, 1999) and foreign language classrooms (Stepp-Greany, 2004) in the United States, as well as foreign language classrooms abroad (Pennington et al., 1996). Whether writing instruction is provided seems to depend in part on teachers' attitudes and teaching approach (Pennington et al., 1996; Stepp-Greany, 2004) as well as students' level of academic achievement (Pennington et al., 1996). We could certainly use much more basic information on whether and how L2 writing is taught across a broad spectrum of secondary classrooms internationally.

What Is the Role of the L1?

Relatively few empirical studies have examined L1 use in adolescent L2 writing instruction, and most have been conducted outside the United States with L1 speakers of the society's dominant language. In Hong Kong, for example, Yu and Atkinson (1988) contend that Chinese L1 adolescents were adversely affected by English L2 medium instruction, based on students' overall poor performance in L2 compositions. However, a subsequent study (Pennington et al., 1996) reported that both Chinese and English were used in varying proportions during writing instruction, depending on whether the classrooms were teacher- or student-centered; individual students' language proficiency, academic achievement, and motivation; and the teacher's immediate objective. In a Canadian French immersion program, Swain and Lapkin (2000) showed that use of L1 in writing activities among adolescents supported the development of the L2. Adolescent L2 writers may use L1 to diminish cognitive demands, manage the L2 writing task, negotiate meaning, and focus on form. Wakabayashi (2002) found that it made little difference whether Japanese L1 students were initially schooled in Japanese or English, but students who transitioned at an early age into programs where English was the classroom medium of instruction performed better on writing tasks than those who did not. However, two other studies of

English L2 writers in Japan find that language of instruction is less important than amount of composing instruction and experience (Dyer & Friederich, 2002; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002), suggesting that L1 writing instruction can provide a strong basis for L2 writing instruction. Studies of the role of L1 in L2 writing instruction for language minority adolescents are even more rare. Glynn, Berryman, Loader, and Cavanagh (2005) found that students in New Zealand educated in a Maori L1 immersion program with home and school participation and culturally appropriate instruction through middle school could be transitioned into English L2 instruction in high school without impairment of L1 writing skills. García (1999) found that bilingual instruction in itself did not provide a benefit if it was tied to writing tasks that adolescents did not find motivating.

How Do We Integrate Bilingual Students into Monolingual Writing Classrooms?

Many L2 adolescent writers, particularly in Western immigrant-receiving countries, are educated alongside monolingual and proficient bilingual students in "mainstream" classrooms where L2 is the medium of instruction. Although scholars (see, e.g., Meltzer & Hamann, 2004, 2005; Meltzer & Okashige, 2001) have argued that the principles of effective literacy instruction for all adolescents are quite similar to the principles of teaching English learners, empirical reports suggest that English learners in mainstream classrooms may not receive high-quality writing instruction (Duff, 2001; Harklau, 1994, 2001; Valdés, 1999), especially when they are placed in low-track classes where opportunities for extended writing tend to be most limited (Harklau, 1994; Townsend & Fu, 2001). Harklau (1994; 2001) and Fu (1995; Townsend & Fu, 2001) found an implicit deficit orientation in many mainstream writing teachers' attitudes toward English learners, with teachers equating bilingualism with linguistic and even cognitive deficiency. To address such attitudes, O'Bryne (2001) describes a collaborative project by English as a second language (ESL) and mainstream educators in Toronto to develop a curriculum focusing on student writing strengths in

content and organization, rather than weaknesses in grammar and usage and a curriculum that provided structured opportunities to develop forms of literary response that were already familiar to L1 monolingual English-speaking students.

What Is the Relationship of L2 Writing and Content Learning?

Although there has been a significant amount of scholarship in recent years on content-based and "sheltered" content instruction for L2 learners (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000; Stryker & Leaver, 1997), there has nonetheless been little specifically on the role of L2 writing in adolescents' learning of subject matter. Extant studies are concerned primarily with research report writing. These suggest that adolescent L2 writers benefit from training in using libraries and finding appropriate source materials (Villalva, 2006; Werner & Stone, 1993), evaluating the validity and utility of sources (Clankie, 2000), and representing conflicting opinions and information (Villalva, 2006). Welch et al. (1989) further find that explicit training in research and study skills improved L2 learners' self-ratings of writing ability as well as their affiliation with scholarly identity and academic ethos. At a more fundamental level, Valdés (1999) points out that we do not yet know if L2 writing actually facilitates or interferes with learning in bilingual adolescents, and if so, how and under what circumstances.

How Do We Tie L2 Writing Instruction to Adolescents' Home and Community Experiences?

Scholars (e.g., Fu, 1995; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004) argue that linking school-based literacy tasks to adolescent L2 learners' homes and communities is key to maintaining their motivation to learn. Yet several scholars identify a disconnect between home and school literacies for adolescent L2 learners. García (1999), for example, finds that Latino immigrants with little formal schooling in a New York city high school actually wrote a great deal out of school, producing journals and poetry to share with peers. However, school-based writing instruction

overlooked these literacy practices in order to teach academic writing and often stymied students' writing production by demanding correct mechanics. Likewise, Fu (1995) shows that Lao L1 adolescents connect with L2 English writing through the exploration of personal experience, but that the experience was largely ignored in their high school classes. Weinstein (2002) examines how bilingual youth used tagging graffiti, poetry, and rap and song lyrics within student enclaves to express their lived home and community realities and to express a sense of belonging. However, once again these practices were largely overlooked by educators and the school curricula. These studies suggest a need to better prepare educators to link bilingual adolescents' out-of-school literacy practices to in-school academic work.

Efforts along these lines include Landay (2001) "Accelerated Literacy" class in which L2 English high school students worked with photography to capture a visual record of their families and communities, then translated visual images into student poems, letters, and stories and created a performance based on both. Callahan (2002) likewise argues for a broader conceptualization of composition as multimodal design including original narratives produced via audio and video recordings. Glynn et al. (2005) describe and evaluate an English L2 literacy class for Maori L1 students embedded in a program in which the school coordinated with family and community members to provide culturally appropriate instruction. Villalva (2006) found that L1 Spanish students relied on social networks as primary sources for their writing, much as some students might rely on print sources, and argues for an examination of how writers are socialized into different norms for inquiry and language use outside school. Several scholars (Barbieri, 1998; Blair, 1991; Toffoli & Allan, 1992; Vreeland, 1998) advocate autobiographical and family history approaches to connecting language-minority student writing to home and community and to tap students' experiences of acculturation, alienation, and struggle as immigrants. Harklau (2000), however, finds that adolescent immigrants had written autobiographies repeatedly in their school careers and cautions that

such approaches can reinforce stereotypes about immigrants and neglect the multilingual adolescents' identities.

Kiernan (1991) critiques literacy in commercial high schools and advocates an L2 curriculum that incorporates content learning. Several studies are ethnographic (Goldstein, 2005; Wolfe, 1996), and Quintero (2002) advocates L2 writing instruction as a means of examination of community. These approaches aim to be both descriptive and prescriptive, writing toward critical reflection on their educational, social, and plans for change. However, only one study (Gharemani-Ghahremansini, 2005) that focuses on the political context outside the school, indicating that more interventions are needed in the home (2002) and Wolfe (1996) programs are most successful when implemented outside the conventional classrooms in community programs. Furthermore, writing is assumed to be a multiple contexts in and out of school, require innovative approaches. Villalva (2006), for example, levels of analysis: a focus on the learner as artifact; a focus on the learner, student, research types of interactions affect their L2 writing production; how writing is produced; work is still in development; primarily at language-minority; actually none has explored school literacies in adolescent heritage or foreign language

What Are the Implications of New Technologies for L2 Writing Instruction?

An emerging vein of research looks at communication (CMC) and communication technologies

such approaches can reinforce stereotypes about immigrants and neglect other aspects of multilingual adolescents' experiences and identities.

Kiernan (1991) critiques the lack of civic literacy in commercial high school ESL materials and advocates an L2 writing curriculum that incorporates community service learning. Several studies advocate critical ethnographic (Goldstein, 2002), critical literacy (Ghahremani-Ghajar & Mirhosseini, 2005; Wolfe, 1996), and Freirian problem-posing (Quintero, 2002) approaches to integrate L2 writing instruction in a broader examination of community and societal issues. These approaches aim to move adolescents past descriptive and instrumental uses of writing toward critical self-examination of their educational, social, and political goals and plans for change. However, we found only one study (Ghahremani-Ghajar & Mirhosseini, 2005) that focused on a sociopolitical context outside North America (Iran), indicating that more international perspectives are needed in this area. Goldstein (2002) and Wolfe (1996) suggest that programs are most successful when implemented outside the confines of traditional classrooms in community-based or summer programs. Furthermore, if adolescent L2 writing is assumed to be the product of multiple contexts in and out of school, it will require innovative approaches to research. Villalva (2006), for example, includes three levels of analysis: a focus on language (text) as artifact; a focus on how the roles (e.g., learner, student, researcher, advocate) and types of interactions available to youth affect their L2 writing process; and a focus on how writing is produced in context. Such work is still in development and has looked primarily at language-minority students; virtually none has explored the role of out-of-school literacies in adolescents' learning of heritage or foreign languages.

What Are the Implications of New Technologies for Adolescent L2 Writing Instruction?

An emerging vein of adolescent L2 writing research looks at computer-mediated communication (CMC) and Internet and communication technologies (ICT). Some studies

have used computer-mediated communication frameworks to examine the use of computers and word processing programs for traditional modes of writing instruction, such as pen pals and peer editing (Fedderholdt, 2001; High, Hoyer, & Wakefield, 2002; Strasser, 1995). These studies find that even these relatively simple uses of technology increase students' motivation and forge stronger social relationships among peers. They increase student involvement in cross-cultural peer response by making possible the rapid and easy exchange of information (Fedderholdt, 2001; Strasser, 1995). Young (2003), in a study of Taiwanese high school students, found that MOOs, chat rooms, and e-mail provided adolescents with ample time to compose and respond in the L2. Learners were also able to write about controversial topics that cultural norms might not usually allow in face-to-face communication. Young (2003) thus concludes that a CMC environment can lower students' affective filters, allowing them to interact in the L2 freely as well as enhancing critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication skills.

Recent work has focused on how the evolving literate practices of millennial adolescents are prompting redefinitions of the very notions of *literacy* and *text* (Callahan, 2002; New London Group, 1996; Pahl & Roswell, 2006; Kern & Warschauer, 2000). In many nations, the use of ICT is increasing adolescent literacy demands even as adolescent home uses of ICT vastly broaden definitions of what counts as literacy (Moje, Young, Readence, & Moore, 2000). For example, Lam (2000, 2004) suggests that the Internet creates unique opportunities for adolescents to employ L2 writing for the purpose of navigating social identity development through social interactions with other L2 writers. In one study, Lam (2000) found that a Chinese adolescent used English L2 writing in an online international Japanese pop music fan forum to create an online identity and forge social affiliations with peers. Lam (2004) also documented how two Chinese L1 adolescent immigrants were socialized into the language and literacy practices of a bilingual chat room virtual community. Black (2005) likewise found that an online fo-

rum—a fanfiction virtual community—provided an adolescent with authentic peer feedback and improved L2 writing. These cases illustrate how ICT-rich environments can afford adolescents access to authentic L2 written interactions and access to peer cultures in ways that are unavailable to them in traditional classrooms.

The application of ICT to adolescent L2 writing instruction is not clear-cut, however. Pinnow (n.d.), for example, finds that schools are often unable to provide L2 writers with relevant and uncontrived interaction on the Internet such that its literacy-building potential can be fully exploited. Moreover, even if schools could provide such access and interaction, popular culture embedded in Internet-based communication can be violent, profane, sexist, racist (Alvermann & Heron, 2001), or commercialized (Zuengler, 2004) and thus not represent values that educators want to endorse or perpetuate. ICT-based communication can also exclude or marginalize, as well as draw in L2 writers (Duff, 2001; van Lier, 2003). Nevertheless, studies suggest that overlooking the potential power of ICT in adolescent L2 writers' lives may result in a school curriculum that is out of step with students' lived experience. For example, Ingram and O'Neill (2002) find that although Australian foreign language teachers rated electronic communication with native speakers as a low priority, their students rated it as a much higher priority.

More research remains to be done on the contrast between adolescents' prolific L2 writing in online forums versus disengagement in school settings. Emerging ecological models of inquiry (Moje et al., 2000; van Lier, 2004) offer a valuable approach to exploring the hybrid, layered identities that bilingual adolescents create for themselves in online forums, highlighting the interplay of L2 writing with sociocultural influences and environmental factors. We could also use more work on how L2 writers deploy multiple modalities to compensate for gaps in language proficiency. Few studies have focused on how technology and multimedia alter adolescents' L2 composing processes (Parks et al., 2005) or how instruction could exploit the scaffolding potential of multimodal composition for novice L2 writers (Pinnow, n.d.). Another gap lies in understanding how

L2 writing teachers' conceptualizations of technology affect classroom implementation (Parks, Huot, Hamers, & Lemonnier, 2002).

What Is the Role of Assessment?

In many countries adolescence has become a key time for high-stakes standardized examinations that determine school completion, college entrance, and ultimate life chances. Increasingly these examinations demand proficiency in L2 writing. In the United States, for example, the advent of SAT and ACT timed writing tests, as well as state high school writing graduation tests, will no doubt reshape L2 writing instruction in North American schools. Yet we found virtually no work on the role of assessment in adolescent L2 writing. There is a potential disjunction between L2 writing instruction that emphasizes a protracted process of drafting, redrafting, and feedback, and timed examinations that demand impromptu essays in a short period (Caudery, 1990; Pennington et al., 1996; Sengupta, 1998). The procedures associated with standardized assessments of adolescent L2 writers' texts have also drawn critique. Gamaroff (2000), for example, finds that writing test raters from L1 and L2 English backgrounds differed in their assessments of adolescents' L2 essays in terms of the sources to which they attributed errors, the relative weight they gave to different error types, and how grave they considered errors to be. Way et al. (2000) find that both the elicited genre (e.g., description, expository essay, narrative) and prompt type (simple or "bare" prompt vs. prompt with relevant L2 vocabulary or prompt with prose model) had a significant impact on the quality of French L2 writing produced by English L1 high school students. They note, however, that the proficiency scale used to assess L2 writing in U.S. foreign language classrooms (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2001) does not address genre or prompt type. While limited evidence suggests that time limits do not affect the quality of L2 writers' essays (Caudery, 1990; Kroll, 1990), this finding could use corroboration. The growing importance of assessment in adolescent L2 writing will necessitate more research in coming years.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Adolescent second-language writing is awaiting further exploration. A small amount of evidence suggests that every contribution varies, with many gaps that limit generalizations and conclusions. School writing is scattered and could be more impactful by developing a research inquiry regarding what works. Evidence lends distinctiveness to the writing of L2 learners. Work on pedagogy represents the bulk of current L2 writing instruction, grounded both theoretically and empirically. More research is urgently needed on L2 writing in large-scale contexts both in North America and globally. We also found a need for dialogue between second language research agendas and writing research. We defined writing broadly and found that very few studies are going outside the narrow confines of reports. However, multimodality makes many different forms of writing—summaries, lists, diaries, and journals, poems, websites, and these for different purposes not in a second language or second language text (2002). We therefore define the agenda for research on writing to include these.

In developing this tendency for adolescent use terms that are linguistically and culturally specific. On a practical level, too few details are grounds to discern L2 writers. On a considerable danger of a catch-all term that White monolingual else who may see other than statistical thus believe all

CONCLUSIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

Adolescent second-language writing is a field waiting further exploration. Although a small amount of extant research makes the field's contribution valuable, the field has gaps that limit our ability to draw firm conclusions. Scholarship at present is needed and could make a much greater impact by developing sustained avenues of inquiry regarding whether and how adolescents' distinctive characteristics to the field of L2 learners and multilingual students. Work on pedagogical approaches, at the bulk of scholarship on adolescent L2 writing instruction, must be better grounded both theoretically and empirically. Research is urgently needed on adolescent L2 writing in languages other than English, both in North America and internationally. We also found a notable lack of dialogue between specialists in English L2 and languages other than English regarding research agendas and paradigms. Even though we defined writing broadly in our review, we found that very few researchers define writing outside the narrow parameters of essays and reports. However, as recent work on modality makes clear, writing takes many different forms, including note taking, diaries, lists, charts and graphs, diaries, journals, poetry, prayers, blogs, and e-mails, and these forms all may serve different purposes not only in learning to write a second language but also in learning a first and language through writing (Harklau, 2000). We therefore urge a broadening of the agenda for research on adolescent L2 writing to include varied forms and purposes. In developing this review, we have found a paucity for adolescent literacy research to use terms that are too broad in discussing students historically and culturally diverse students. On a practical level, we sometimes found a few details about participants' backgrounds to discern whether they were in fact second-language writers. On a broader level, there is considerable danger that *diverse* becomes a catch-all term that creates a binary between monolingual students and anybody who may speak a language or dialect other than standard edited English. We believe all literacy researchers, not just

second-language specialists, must be more attentive to important distinctions in adolescents' specific linguistic and cultural backgrounds, the community and societal contexts in which they become bilingual, and their proficiency and literacy levels in L1 and L2.

Finally, we are in great need of theories of adolescent literacy that take multilingual students as their norm. Our dependence on monolingual models of teaching and learning literacy leads us to define L2 writing merely as a problem or L2 deficit, rather than considering writers' entire linguistic repertoires and resources. Nevertheless, multilingual students outnumber monolingual students globally, and adolescent second-language writing research would benefit by paralleling the recent move in the field of second-language acquisition toward a model of "multicompetence" (Cook, 2003; Ortega, 2006; Valdés, 1999) that can explore the complex ecology of linguistic and cultural assets that multilingual students bring to composing.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Rabia, S. (2003). The influence of working memory on reading and creative writing processes in a second language. *Educational Psychology*, 23, 209-214.
- Alvermann, D. E., & Heron, A. H. (2001). Literacy identity work: Playing to learn with popular media. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 45, 118-122.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2001). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines—Writing* (Rev. ed.). Retrieved October 26, 2006, from www.actfl.org/files/publicwritingguidelines.pdf.
- Atkinson, D. (2004). Contrasting rhetorics/contrasting cultures: Why contrastive rhetoric needs a better conceptualization of culture. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3, 277-289.
- Barbieri, M. (1998). Holding memories, shaping dreams: Chinese children's writers' notebooks. *Voices from the Middle*, 6, 41-48.
- Black, R. (2005). Access and affiliation: The literacy and composition practices of English-language learners in an online fanfiction community. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 49, 118-128.
- Blair, L. (1991). Developing student voices with multicultural literature. *English Journal*, 80, 24-28.
- Callahan, M. (2002). Intertextual composition: The power of the digital pen. *English Education*, 35, 46-65.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *Critical academic writing*