

Technical Report No. 51-B

Annotated Bibliography of Research on
Writing in a Non-Native Language:
Part II

Jane Stanley

July, 1996

PREFACE

This annotated bibliography of research in second language writing is intended to update and supplement Sandra R. Schecter and Linda A. Harklau's *Annotated Bibliography of Research on Writing in a Non-Native Language*, published in 1992, as Technical Report No. 51, by the National Center for the Study of Writing. The present bibliography follows the categorization scheme established in the 1992 publication. That is, it groups references under the following categories:

1.0 TEXT FEATURES

1.1 Error Analysis of Syntax and Mechanics: References in this category focus on errors in non-native writers' texts. These include morphological, grammatical, and lexical errors.

1.2 Discourse Features: These references include studies of the organization, structure, content, and stylistic features of non-native writers' texts. Some studies contrast L2 writers' text features with those of L1 writers.

2.0 NON-NATIVE WRITING PROFICIENCY DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Bilingual Emergent Literacy: This study considers the development of literacy in young bilingual children.

2.2 Later Elementary and Secondary: This study focuses on literacy development of slightly older bilingual children.

2.3 Literate Adults: This category addresses the developing proficiency of L2 writers at university level.

3.0 WRITING PROCESS

3.1 Relationship to attitude: No references were found in the search undertaken for this updated bibliography.

3.2 Revision: This study considers the revision processes and difficulties of L2 writers.

3.3 Effect of Task and Other Variables: These studies focus on the effect of various task types on the written products and on the processes. Note that the Schecter and Harklau bibliography included computer-assisted instruction in this category. However, since there have been many entries in this area since 1992, the present bibliography groups these references in a separate category, 5.5.

4.0 NON-NATIVE WRITING AND OTHER LANGUAGE SKILLS

4.1 Reading/Writing Relationship: No references were found in the search undertaken for this updated bibliography.

4.2 Speaking/Writing Relationship: These studies investigate the correlation between oral proficiency in L1 and L2 writing skills.

5.0 INSTRUCTIONAL FACTORS

5.1 Curriculum and Program: References in this group examine the effect of particular instructional practices and contexts in the development of L2 writing skills. Also considered are the effects of program settings.

5.2 Teacher Response: These studies consider the effect of teacher response on L2 writers and writing. Note that the Schecter and Harklau bibliography titled this category "Response to Writing" and included within it studies of writers' own responses and peer response. The present bibliography groups these latter studies separately, in 5.3.

5.3 Writer Response, Peer Response: This category includes studies of writers' responses to their teachers' comments, as well as peers' responses.

5.4 Assessment: This category was added to the classification scheme to include studies which address general issues of assessing L2 writing.

5.5 Computer-Assisted Instruction: This category was added to include the large number of studies on the efficacy of CAI on L2 writers and writing.

Sources consulted in the compilation of this bibliography are as follows:

January 1993-April 1995 (update of Technical Report 51)

Dissertation Abstracts International
ERIC Documents
Journal of Educational Computing Research
Journal of Second Language Writing
TESOL Quarterly
TESL Canada Journal
Writing Center Journal
Written Communication

January 1984-April 1995 (supplement to Technical Report 51)

ELT Journal
System

Annotated Bibliography of Research on Writing in a Non-Native Language: Part II

Jane Stanley

University of California at Berkeley

1.0 TEXT FEATURES

1.1 Error Analysis of Syntax and Mechanics

Crewe, W. J. (1990). The illogic of logical connectives. *ELT Journal*, 44 (4), 316-325.

Studies the misuse, and, particularly overuse, of logical connectives in undergraduate writing.

Ferris, D. (1994). Lexical and syntactic features of ESL writing by students at different levels of L2 proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (2), 14-20.

Studies 160 texts by L2 writers (placement essays): identifies 62 quantitative, lexical and syntactic features, from which 28 text variables are extracted. High frequency use of these variables correlates positively with overall writing proficiency as measured by holistic scores.

1.2 Discourse Features

Field Y. & Oi Y. (1992). A comparison of internal conjunctive cohesion in the English essay writing of Cantonese speakers and of native speakers of English. *RELC Journal*, 23 (1), 45-48.

Analyzes organizational cohesion devices in the English essays of 6 native English speakers and 6 native Cantonese speakers (6th Form). Finds that the Cantonese speakers use a higher frequency of these devices, and that the two groups differ in the choice and placement of cohesive devices.

Johnson, D. (1992). Interpersonal involvement in discourse: Gender variation in second language writers' complimenting. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (3), 196-215.

Examines peer reviews of 35 L2 women students to see if any differences exist between the complimenting strategies they use when addressing male and female classmates. Strategies studied include positive evaluation, intensifiers, personal referencing and framing. Finds that this group, in contrast to a group of L1 writers, did not vary their complimenting strategies with the sex of the addressee.

Johnson, P. (1992). Cohesion and coherence in compositions in Malay and English. *RELC Journal*, 23 (2), 1-27.

Examines cohesion in expository essays in Malay and English written by native speakers of each language, as well as essays written by Malay ESL students. Finds no difference in the amount of cohesive devices, but does find differences in the type of devices used.

King, P. (1989). The uncommon core: Some discourse features of student writing. *System*, 17 (1), 13-20.

Analyzes the use by students of English-for-Science-and-Engineering of certain categories of nouns in their texts. Finds that both "sub-technical" and "text-structuring" words were used to fulfill referential and discourse-oriented functions.

Lavin, C. (1992). From first language literacy to second language oracy to second language literacy: The act of writing in a foreign language context. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 53 (5),1432A.

Investigates the influences of L1 literacy skills and L2 oral proficiency on L2 writing. Finds strong correlation between L2 oral proficiency and L2 writing, but not between L1 literacy and L2 writing.

Maser, P. J (1992). Politeness strategies in business letters by native and nonnative English speakers. *English for Special Purposes*, 11 (3),189-205.

Compares the use of politeness strategies used in business letters written by native English speakers and by nonnative English speakers. Finds that the strategies used by nonnative English speakers are less formal and more direct.

Reid, J. (1992). A computer text analysis of four cohesion devices in English discourse by native and non-native writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1. (2), 79-107.

This contrastive rhetoric study of 768 essays in English by Arabic, Chinese, Spanish, and English native speakers attempts to ascertain whether there are “distinctive, quantifiable” differences in the texts produced by the 4 groups. (The Writers’ Workbench software program was used.)

Salager-Meyer, F. (1989). Principal component analysis and medical English discourse: An investigation into genre analysis. *System*, 17 (1), 21-34.

Studies 51 scholarly papers by L2 writers of medical English to identify the communicative functions fulfilled through the use of 17 grammatical variables (e.g. verb tense, voice and form). Develops 3 axes of distribution of variables that correlate with the genres of case reports, editorials and research papers.

Severino, C. (1993). The doodles in context: Qualifying claims about contrastive rhetoric. *Writing Center Journal*, 14 (1), 44-62.

Discusses Kaplan’s (and others) research on contrastive rhetoric in light of the organizational patterns that Taiwanese, Hong Kong, and People’s Republic of China students report using, as well as three groups’ histories of writing instruction.

2.0 NON-NATIVE WRITING PROFICIENCY DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Bilingual Emergent Literacy

Mallow, F. (1993). The writing development of kindergarten children in ESL and the changes in the pedagogical practices of these teachers: A collaborative study. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54 (8), 844-845A.

Examines the writing of kindergarten children in an ESL program, as well as the instructional practices of their teachers. Findings indicate support for writing instruction at the kindergarten level for ESL students.

2.2 Later Elementary and Secondary

Ulanoff, S. (1993) Dialogue journal writing and the mediated development of writing: How do second language learners engaged in authentic activities develop as writers? *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54 (7), 2542A.

Follows the dialogue journal writing of nine students for three years, beginning in the 5th grade. Three students were instructed in English only, six in bilingual classes (three early exit, three late exit). Finds growth in all students' writing proficiency, but greatest progress for the late-exit bilingual students.

2.3 Literate Adults

Tarone, E. (1993). The writing of Southeast Asian-American students in secondary school and university. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (2), 149-72

Studies Southeast Asian-American immigrants and shows that English writing skills for mainstreamed students are the same at the 8th, 10th, and 12th grade levels and are the same as nonnarrative university students. Results suggest that age on arrival is a more important factor than the number of years in the U.S.

Valdez, G., Haro, P. & Echevarria, M. (1992). The development of writing abilities in a foreign language: Contributions toward a general theory of second language writing. *Modern Language Journal*, 76 (3), 333-375.

Compares the writing products and skill development of Spanish language learners with the assumptions of foreign language teaching faculty about the development of writing skills. Calls for more attention to writing instruction in foreign language classes.

Compares the writing products and skill development of Spanish language learners with the assumptions of foreign language teaching faculty about the development of writing skills. Calls for more attention to writing instruction in foreign language classes.

3.0 WRITING PROCESS

3.2 Revision

Lee, Y. (1993). Revision breakdowns in academic writing of Chinese graduatelevel ESL students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54 (3), 8445A.

Studies the revision of Chinese graduate students. Finds limited ability to detect, diagnose and fix errors. Finds also that problems in organization and usage are addressed ineffectively.

3.3 Effect of Task and Other Variables

Arndt, V. (1987). Six writers in search of texts: A protocol-based study of L1 and L2 writing. *ELT Journal*, 41 (4), 257-67.

Studies the composing practices of Chinese ESL postgraduate students as they write academic texts in both English and Chinese. Finds much variation in the writers' approach to the task, as well as a limited understanding of the nature of the task.

Blanton, L. L. (1987). Reshaping ESL students' perception of writing. *ELT Journal*, 41 (2), 112-18.

Studies the effects of various tasks and interaction structures of L2 writers with classmates and with teachers on the reduction of writers' apprehension and the increase of proficiency.

Burgos, M. (1993). The metacognitive processes of nonnative English speaking high school students during the composing process. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54 (6), 2092A

Uses think-aloud protocols to examine the metacognitive processes of 8 nonnative speakers of English as they complete two writing tasks. Finds that students whose comments indicate concern for content and organization receive higher scores on their papers than do students whose comments include frequent rereadings.

Johnson, K. (1992). Cognitive strategies and second language writers: and second language writers: A reevaluation of sentence combining. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(1), 61-75.

Analyzes think-aloud protocols used by advanced L2 writing students in sentence completion tasks. Finds that the students restate content, construct meaning, engage in higher- and lower-order planning, and evaluate the appropriateness of particular constructions. However, students do not evidence attention to issues of cohesion in their think-alouds:

Koda, K. (1993). Task-induced variability in foreign language composition: A language-specific perspective. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26 (3), 332-346.

Studies the effect of the task on the quality and length of compositions written by American, English-speaking students of Japanese. Finds that descriptive and narrative tasks pose different linguistic demands and that the ability to expand and elaborate subtopics accounts for most differences in scores.

Peirce, B.N. (1994). Using diaries in second language research and teaching. *English Quarterly*, 26 (3), 22-29.

Considers the use of diaries and critical dialogue in the language learning process and development of 5 immigrant women. Identifies the construct of social identity as critical to the women's adaptation process. Argues for the importance of diary-keeping in promoting the women's critical reflection as they negotiate their identities.

Pennington, M., & So, S. (1993). Comparing writing process and product across two languages: A study of six Singaporean university student writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (1), 41-63.

Studies the relationship between process skills and product quality for students writing in Japanese as an additional language. (Their first language is either English or Chinese.) Finds no clear relationship between process skills and resulting product.

Seaman, A. (1993). Visual literacy and second language fluency: The process of composing in a second language from a visual prompt. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54 (8), 2929A.

Studies high school ESL students' responses to picture prompts. Finds that the more skilled writers evidence less dependence on the actual content of the picture:

4.0 NON-NATIVE WRITING AND OTHER LANGUAGE SKILLS

4.2 Speaking/Writing Relationship

Schleppegrell, M. (1984). Using input methods to improve writing skills. *System*, 12 (3), 287-92. .

Compares two ESP classes for Egyptian economists with a view to the development of writing proficiency. One class is structured around conversation and extensive writing, while the other relies on developing listening and reading skills. Finds that the listening-reading class has greater gains in writing proficiency.

Weissberg, B. (1994). Speaking of writing: Some functions of talk in the ESL composition class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3 (2), 121-39.

Explores the role of speaking in university-level ESL composition classes. A study of the instructional discourse in 5 classes finds that very little of the classroom talk develops into either the invention or development of topic. Nor does classroom talk result in oral rehearsal of potential texts.

5.0 INSTRUCTIONAL FACTORS

5.1 Curriculum and Program

Cumming, A. (1992). Instructional routines in ESL composition teaching: A case study of three teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (1), 17-35.

This case study of the common instructional routines used by three experienced composition teachers finds that six routines account for all teaching practices. Finds, also that these teachers' instruction systematically focuses on student task performance, rather than on presentation of content. .

Geranpayeh, A. (1993). Functional controlled writing. ERIC Doc. 360 937.

Investigates the effects of explicit instruction on the rhetorical functions of generalization and classification. Finds that explicit instruction has a beneficial effect on the foreign language writing proficiency of a group of university-level Farsi speakers. .

5.2 Teacher Response

Caulk, N. (1994). Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (1),181-88.

Studies peer-response activities in L2 writing classes to discover (1) whether students give good advice to their peers, and (2) what differences there are between peers' comments and teachers' comments. Finds that teachers' and peers' comments served useful, complementary purposes.,

Devenney, R. (1989). How ESL teachers and peers evaluate and respond to student writing. *ELT Journal*, 20 (1), 77-90.

Studies 39 ESL students and 13 ESL teachers in college composition classes to review Newkirk's (1984) findings regarding the differences between teachers' and peers' evaluations of student texts. Finds that the role and function of teachers and students differs markedly in evaluation tasks.

Makino, T. (1993). Learner self-correction in ESL written composition. *ELT Journal*, 47 (4), 337-41.

Studies the effectiveness of various teacher cues in helping Japanese EFL students correct their own errors in written compositions.

Sheorey, R. (1986). Error perceptions of native-speaking and non-native speaking teachers of ESL. *ELT Journal*, 40 (4), 306-12.

Compares the responses of native-English-speaking ESL teachers with nonnative ESL teachers (Indian) to ESL college students' writing. Finds that while the two groups of teachers differ in their perception of error gravity, both rate errors such as verb tense, subject-verb agreement, and question structures as most serious.

Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, 23 (1),103-10.

Compares the effect of two different ways of responding to student essays (holistic feedback on meaning, and discrete-item attention to form) on a linguistically diverse group of college freshmen. Finds that holistic response is more likely to result in improvements in grammatical accuracy.

5.3 Writer Response, Peer Response

Caulk, N. (1994). Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28 (1),181-88.

See 5.2, above.

Davies, N: F., & Omberg, M.. (1987). Peer group teaching and the composition *class. System*, 15 (3), 313-23.

Describes a FL composition course that uses peer group teaching techniques at both prewriting and revision stages:

Devenney, R.. (1989). How ESL teachers and peers evaluate and respond to student writing. *ELT Journal*, 20 (1), 77-90.

See 5.2, above.

Goldstein, L. M., & Conrad, S. M. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly*, .24 (3), 443-60.

Examines students' level of control over interactions in student-teacher writing conferences. Considers students' level of participation and clarification requests. Also assesses how students deal with the revisions discussed in the conferences and the role of negotiation in a successful conference.

Jacobs, G. . (1987). First experiences with peer feedback on compositions: Student and teacher reaction. *System*, 1(3), 25-33.

Describes students' and teachers' initial reactions to working in peer feedback groups in an FL composition course. Suggests strategies for making peer feedback teams function more effectively.

Jacobs, G. (1989). Miscorrection in peer feedback in writing class. *R E L C Journal*, 20 (2), 68-76.

Finds a low level of "miscorrection" in group writing activities. This suggests that peer feedback can play a role in the development of writing ability.

Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT Journal*, 46 (3), 274-84.

Supports peer evaluation sessions as effective in ESL classrooms, and makes suggestions for more effective organization of groups.

Nelson, G., & Murphy, J. (1992). An L2 writing group: Task and social dimensions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (3), 171-194.

Examines two aspects of writing groups: the task dimension and the social dimension. Finds that, largely, students stayed on task by discussing each other's texts. However, also found nonconstructive and sharply critical interactions among group members. Casts doubt on the benefit of writing groups.

Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language Writing: A case study of ESL adult learners. *TESL Canada Journal*, 11 (2), 46-70.

Surveys 3 ESL writing teachers and 39 of their students as to their feedback preferences. Finds that the students prefer teacher feedback over non-teacher feedback, and that the teachers prefer, and use, non-teacher feedback frequently.

Radecki, P. M., & Swales, J. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16 (3); 355-65.

Surveys ESL students as to their preferences for feedback type on their written work. Identifies three categories of students: receptors (46%), semi-resistors (41%), resistors (13%). As students progress in their English language development they became less tolerant of their teachers' feedback roles.

Seaway, K. D. (1993). "This is hard, isn't it?" Children evaluating writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27 (2), 233-58.

Describes criteria used by NNS children in grades 2-6 when evaluating writing. Shows that the students are critical evaluators, and that they focus on meaning regardless of age and author. Also, the students are influenced in their evaluations by the pedagogical focus of their ESL classes.

Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (3), 217-34.

Compares the peer evaluation group interactions in two college-level writing classes, one using the standard practice of modeling expected peer group behaviors, the other class using a lengthy preparation for peer group work that included discovering “rules” for effective response. Finds that the group given lengthy preparation demonstrates more engagement in the task, more productive communication about writing, and gives clearer guidelines for revision.

5.4 Assessment

Austika, G. G. (1993). Analytical assessments of foreign students’ writing. *RELC Journal*, 24 (1), 61-72.

Studies native-English-speaking ESL teachers’ assessment of L2 writing samples using a scoring technique based on the “ESL Composition Profile” (Jacobs, et al.). Finds that the category for vocabulary produces the most variance in total scores. In descending order the other categories are content, language use, organization, and mechanics.

Caudery, T. (1990). The validity of timed essay tests in the assessment of writing. *ELT Journal*, 44 (2), 121-31.

Finds no significant difference in the scores for timed and untimed essays written by ESL students. Calls for further research regarding different time limits, writers’ educational backgrounds, communicative aims, composition length, etc.

Chiste, K. B. & O’Shea, J. (1988). Patterns of question selection and writing performance of ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 22 (4), 681-84.

Studies students’ pattern of question choice and writing performance on writing competence test. Finds that students favored first and second questions in 4-question sets.

Green P. S. & Hecht K: (1985). Native and non-native evaluation of learners’ errors in written discourse: *System*, 13 (2), 77-97.

Compares the performance of German’ L1 students on an English writing task and their teachers’ assessment of the text with the performance and assessment of native-English-speaking students on the same task. Questions the role of usage in teacher assessments.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (1994). Examining expert judgments of task difficulty on essay tests. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3 (1), 49-68.

Finds that experts agree about the level of difficulty of writing prompts and prompt task type, but that they cannot successfully predict which prompts will result in high or low scores for L2 writers.

Janoupoulis, M. (1992). University faculty tolerance of NS and NNS writing errors: A comparison. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1 (2), 109-21.

Surveys faculty response to 24 sentences containing errors commonly produced by NNS writers. Analysis of the 6-point scale of tolerance completed by faculty members shows them to be more tolerant of NNS errors than of errors perceived to have been made by native speakers. This suggests that faculty members may use a more lenient standard when evaluating the writing of NNS writers.

Johns, A. (1991). Interpreting an English competency exam: The frustrations of an ESL student. *Written Communication*, 8 (3), 379-401.

Considers the case of a Vietnamese L1 student in ESL class and his performance on a writing competency exam that assesses content, rhetorical organization and preparation. Raises concerns about the purposes, development, and evaluation of writing assessment instruments.

Kobayashi, T. (1992). Native and nonnative reactions to ESL Compositions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26 (3), 537-56

Studies the responses of 269 native English speakers and native Japanese speakers of English (from professional, graduate and undergraduate backgrounds) to ESL compositions written by Japanese college students. Aspects considered important by the readers include grammar, clarity of meaning, naturalness, naturalness, and organization.

Ruetten, M. K. (1994).. Evaluating g ESL students performance on proficiency exams. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3 (2), 85-96.

ESL Students are found to be twice as likely to fail an institutional exit exam (although these students frequently do pass on appeal) Suggests portfolio assessment as a more valid assessment tool for L2 writers

Sweedler-Brown C. O. (1993). ESL essay evaluation. The Influence of sentence-level and rhetorical features. *Journal of Second .Language Writing*, 2 (1); 3-17.

Studies the ratings 'given to ESL university-level essays by experienced raters untrained in ESL methodology. Finds that these raters placed far more emphasis on the sentence-level features than on rhetorical features.

5.5 Computer-Assisted Instruction

Brock, M. N. (1990). Can the computer tutor? *System*, 18 (3), 351-59.

Examines second-language classroom applications of computerized text analysis by ESL writers, suggesting that the Grammatik III disk-based analyzer may not be a suitable addition to an ESL composition curriculum.

Brock, M. N. (1993). Three disk-based text analyzers and the ESL writer. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (1), 19-40.

A comparison of the efficacy of three popular computer programs as to the analysis of texts written by ESL students. Results indicate occasional incorrect advice and emphasis on relatively trivial issues, raising doubts about their effectiveness as a stand-alone revision aid for ESL writers.

Dam, L. et al. (1990). Text production in the foreign language classroom and the word processor. *System*, 18 (3), 325-34.

Observation of ESL students' small group writing activities involving a word processor finds the word processor to be a valuable tool in promoting writing abilities.

Davidson, C., & Tomic, A. (1994). Removing computer phobia from the writing classroom. *ELT Journal*, 48 (3), 205-13.

Discusses the use of computers with ESL students, and focuses on a pilot program that includes word processing in ESL writing classes. The program uses "student computer experts" as peer tutors to introduce word processing.

Ferris, D. R. (1993). The design of an automatic analysis program for L2 text research: Necessity and feasibility. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2 (2), 119-129.

Uses data from a large L2 corpus (160 texts, 62 variables) and demonstrates that a computer program designed for first-language texts is not accurate enough to capture completely the structures used by L2 writers. Suggestions are offered for an L2 text analysis program.

Huffman, D. T., & Goldberg, J. R. (1987). Using word processors to teach EFL composition. *System*, 15 (2), 169-75.

Reviews specific word processing programs to teach ESL composition strategies. . Discusses advantages and drawbacks of such features as spell checkers, prompting markers, and formatting programs. Suggestions are presented for enhancing students' writing skills

Pennington, M. (1991). Positive and negative potentials of word processing for ESL writers. *System*, 19, (3), 1167-75

Explores the benefits and drawbacks of ESL student writers' composing with word processors.

Pennington, M. (1992). Beyond off-the-shelf computer remedies for student writers: Alternatives to canned feedback. *System*, 20 (4); 423-37.

Advises against the use of text analysis programs marketed as grammar checkers and style analyzers that provide students with "canned" feedback. Argues that the feedback does not offer effective instruction, particularly to nonproficient writers. Alternative approaches for giving feedback in the electronic medium are offered.

Peyton, J. (1993). Teaching with text: Computer networks to develop students' computer literacy. ERIC Doc. 357 616.

Studies the writing development of six deaf students using Electronic Networks for Interact, an interactive computer networking system that enables classwork or group discussions to be conducted on-screen. Finds a positive effect on students.

Silver, N., & Repa, J. (1993). The effect of word processing on the quality of writing and self-esteem of secondary ESL students: Writing without censure. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 9 (2), 265-283.

Studies the effect of using computers for composing in terms of the writing quality and self-esteem of beginning ESL students. Finds positive effects for writing quality, but not for self-esteem.

Wang, Y. (1993). E-mail dialog journaling in an ESL reading and writing classroom. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54 (9), 3361A.

Compares two groups, one writing e-mail dialog journals, and the other using pen and paper. Finds that the e-mail group writes more and receives longer responses.

AUTHOR INDEX

Arndt, V., 4
Austika, G., 9
Blanton L., 4
Brock, M., 10, 11
Burgos, M., 4
Caudery, T., 9
Caulk, N., 6, 7
Chiste, K., 9
Conrad, S., 7
Crewe W., 1
Cumming, A., 6
Dam, L., 11
Davidson, C., 11
Davies, N., 7
Devenney, R., 6, 7
Echevarria, M., 3
Ferris, D., 1
Ferris, D.R., 11
Field, Y., 1
Geranpayeh, A., 6
Goldstein, L., 7
Green, P., 9
Hamp-Lyons, L., 9
Haro, P., 3
Hecht, K., 9
Huffman, D., 11
Jacobs, G., 7, 8
Janoupoulis, M., 10
Johns. A., 10
Johnson, D., 1
Johnson, K., 4
Johnson, P., 2
King, P., 2
Kobayashi, T., 10
Koda, K., 5
Lavin, C., 2
Lee, Y., 4
Maier, P., 2
Makino, T., 6
Mallow, F., 3
Manglrsdorf, K., 8
Murphy, J., 8
Nelson, G., 8
Oi, Y., 1
Peirce, B., 5
Pennington, M., 5, 11
Peyton, J., 12
Radecki, P., 8
Reid, J., 2
Repa, J., 12
Ruetten, M., 10
Saito, H., 8
Salager-Meyer, F., 2
Samway, K., 8
Schleppegrell, M., 5
Seaman, A., 5
Severino, C., 3
Sheorey, R., 7
Sheppard, K., 7
Silver, N., 12
So, S., 5
Stanley, J., 9
Swales, J., 8
Swales, J., 8
Sweedler-Brown, C., 10
Tarone, E., 3
Tomic, A., 11
Ulanoff, S., 3
Valdez, G., 3
Wang, Y., 12
Weissberg, B., 5