

Crossing Over: Forming Linkages for Writing Pedagogy

Martha C. Pennington

Widening Horizons of Writing Pedagogy

For some time, the teaching of writing has been compartmentalized in academic “silos” separating such areas as creative, academic, and business or professional writing; K–12, (2-year or community) college, and university writing; EFL, ESL, and English “native-speaker” writing; and writing in languages other than English. As Neumann (2009: 494) observed:

The advancement of knowledge requires specialisation and departmentalisation, as well as the opportunity for free and easy cross-fertilisation. However, the dynamics of institutionalisation are overwhelmingly disciplinary....

Specialization can be useful – even necessary – for developing an academic discipline *ab initio*, such as in the case of the field of writing studies as it sought to break off from literary studies or the field of applied linguistics as it established an identity separate from mainstream linguistics. Yet after a certain period of independent development, a discipline can benefit from new perspectives and cross-fertilization that widen its remit, terms of debate, and research horizons and methodologies. Such a broadening of orientation in fields which have been narrowly focused for a time can refresh both theory and practice, leading to important insights and breakthroughs as well as, at times, new hybrid disciplines (Becher and Trowler, 2001). Although purists may not agree, it is hard not to see these kinds of disciplinary changes as progress.

The contents of this open topic issue all happen to relate to the notion of crossing over, in different senses, making new kinds of linkages for

Affiliation

School for Oriental and African Studies and Birkbeck College, University of London
email: mp64@soas.ac.uk

writing pedagogy, including between graduate L1 and L2 writers (Grav and Cayley), between resident L2 writers and international students (di Gennaro), between writing and disciplinary specialists (Murray), and between writing specialists and librarians (Refaei, Kumar, and Harmony). These linkages bring together students and academic practitioners who otherwise belong to different disciplines and departments – writing centers and departments of English, applied linguistics or TESOL, library science, and nursing – leading to blended and shared curricula, team teaching, and interdisciplinary research. Also in this issue a creative writer (Valeri) describes ways to connect screencasting media to the teaching of composition and creative writing, and a book is reviewed (De Costa) that describes literacy as translingual practice. Another book is reviewed (Costley) that argues for strengthening the connection of writing theory to sociolinguistics. In these different ways, writing pedagogy is considered to encompass technology, information literacy, and creative writing; genre, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), and Writing in the Disciplines (WID); and writing in a first language (L1) or second language (L2), specifically in English as a second or foreign language (ESL/EFL), as well as in wider contexts of multilingualism. While the specific connections proposed are novel, linkages of writing pedagogy to these different areas have been discussed before, including in numerous editorials in this journal where I have argued for the value of cross-disciplinary discourse among scholars and practitioners in writing studies, creative writing, ESL/EFL, and linguistics.

Some novel linkages proposed in this issue are between fiction and writing center theory and practice (Fitz Gerald), and between proposal writing and story-telling (Walwema). Fitz Gerald argues for using fiction to raise awareness and to create simulations of interactions between writing center personnel and students who seek help with their writing in those centers. This is an important new idea that connects writing pedagogy to a growing body of research (e.g. Djikic, Oatley, Zoeterman, and Peterson, 2009; Djikic, Oatley, and Carland, 2012; Djikic and Oatley, 2014; Oatley, 2011a, b) demonstrating the value of fiction for changing people's perspectives in ways that relate to otherwise stable attitudes and personality traits, potentially making them more open-minded and tolerant. Djikic and Oatley's (2014) review of the relevant research shows "that reading literary prose helped [to] improve empathy and the ability to understand others, and thus to change personality" (p. 499). Djikic and Oatley (2014) propose that "artistic literature" has the effects it does because "such literature mainly takes the form of simulation rather than description,... it can produce fluctuations in personality systems, and...its influence is indirect and exploratory" (p. 499). Djikic and Oatley (2014) stress the

simulative, indirect, and exploratory influence of reading such literature, as contrasted with the more direct and propositional influence of other forms of persuasion, as key to its robust effects.

In another innovative linkage, Walwema makes a strong case for teaching proposal writing as telling a story, noting the story-telling features of proposals in science as well as business and the professions. This is an important insight, given the centrality of story in human life (Boyd, 2009; Gottschall, 2012; Huston, 2008), that connects the teaching of writing in those disciplinary areas as well as more generally to the traditions of creative writing in stories and novels (e.g. Wood, 2008), to reading and interactions with children involving story-telling (e.g. Burke, 2011), and to narratives as these occur in a wide range of written and spoken genres (Gotti and Guinda, 2013). Through the lens of story-telling the teaching of writing can be connected not only to business practice (e.g. Denning, 2005) but also to social science research (e.g. Czarniawska, 2004; Polkinghorne, 1988) and to many areas of linguistic theory, including evolution of language (e.g. Dunbar, 1996; Turner, 1996), language comprehension (e.g. Emmott, 1997), and discourse analysis (e.g. Riessman, 1993). Thus are business and professional writing linked with many areas of theory and practice that would otherwise not be connected to writing pedagogy.

The fact that an issue of a journal focused on writing pedagogy happens to be composed entirely of articles which, in their different ways, involve crossing over in the sense of bringing together populations and areas of theory and practice that would normally be separate may signal a trend – either for the field or for this particular journal. If the former, this confluence of ideas may signify that writing studies has moved into a new phase of maturity in which it is broadening its horizons after a period of narrowing and specialization. If the latter, this issue may demonstrate that *Writing & Pedagogy* is reaching its own maturity and fulfilling its intended purpose of stimulating dialogue and advancing theory and practice in the teaching of writing across different contexts. In either case, this issue suggests that writing practices are being considered in ways that open the separate silos housing academic disciplines and their different discourses for inspection and interaction.

References

- Becher, T. and Trowler, P. (2001) *Academic Tribes and Territories* (2nd edition). Buckingham, U.K.: Open University Press.
- Boyd, B. (2009) *On the Origin of Stories: Evolution, Cognition, and Fiction*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Burke, M. (2011) *Literary Reading, Cognition and Emotion: An Explanation of the Oceanic Mind*. London: Routledge.

- Czarniawska, B. (2004) *Narratives in Social Science Research*. London: Sage.
- Denning, S. (2005) *The Leader's Guide to Storytelling: Mastering the Art and Discipline of Business Narrative*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Djikic, M., Oatley, K., Zoeterman, S. and Peterson, J. (2009) On being moved by art: How reading fiction transforms the self. *Creativity Research Journal* 21(1): 24–29.
- Djikic, M., Oatley, K. and Carland, M. (2012) Genre or artistic merit? The effect of literature on personality. *Scientific Study of Literature* 2(1): 25–36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/ssol.2.1.02dji>.
- Djikic, M. and Oatley, K. (2014) The art in fiction: From indirect communication to changes of the self. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts* 8(4): 498–505. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037999>.
- Dunbar, R. (1996) *Grooming, Gossip and the Evolution of Language*. New York: Faber & Faber.
- Emmott, C. (1997) *Narrative Comprehension*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Gotti, M. and Guinda, C. S. (eds.) (2013) *Narratives in Academic and Professional Genres*. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Gottschall, J. (2012) *The Storytelling Animal: How Stories Make Us Human*. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Huston, N. (2008) *The Tale Tellers: A Short Study of Mankind*. Toronto: McArthur & Company.
- Neumann, R. (2009) Disciplinary. In M. Tight, K. H. Mok, J. Huisman, and C. C. Morphew (eds.) *The Routledge International Handbook of Higher Education* 487–500. New York and London: Routledge.
- Oatley, K. (2011a) *Such Stuff as Dreams: The Psychology of Fiction*. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Oatley, K. (2011b) In the minds of others. *Scientific American Mind* 22(5): 63–67.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Riessman, C. K. (1993) *Narrative Analysis*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.
- Turner, M. (1996) *The Literary Mind: The Origins of Thought and Language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wood, J. (2008) *How Fiction Works*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Editor's Perspective on Volume 7, Number 1

The Featured Essay in this issue, “The Art of Storytelling: A Pedagogy for Proposal Writing,” by **Josephine Walwema**, shows how a proposal can be conceived and designed as a story that the writer tells in a way which engages and convinces an audience to act. Walwema begins by reviewing the literature on the proposal genre, noting that writing proposals requires technical, persuasive, and discursive skills. She then reviews the teaching of proposal writing, the challenges involved, and the reason a storytelling approach can be effective. Next, she turns to storytelling, describing the

characteristic features of stories or narratives, suggesting the ways in which this type of writing can be useful in a proposal.

Walwema then shows how storytelling can be a way to introduce and teach the proposal genre with a focus on business and technical writing. She teaches students to begin from a personal perspective on a problem, then move to a broader perspective as a way to appeal to the audience and gradually build their understanding and assent. Walwema shares her instructions and pedagogical guidelines for a proposal-writing assignment, in addition to successive drafts from two students and commentary on these. She shows how narrative can be an effective organizing principle for a proposal and how storytelling can be “an especially powerful means of persuasion.”

In the first of two **Research Matters** articles, “What Do They Mean? Comparing International and U.S. Resident Second Language Students’ Use of Sociopragmatic Markers in Writing,” **Kristen di Gennaro** strikes out in a new direction by comparing two different groups of university students whose first language is not English, international students who had completed high school overseas and resident students who had completed high school in the United States, in terms of their use of sociopragmatic markers such as hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mentions. Di Gennaro uses the term *sociopragmatic* rather than *metadiscourse* in order “[t]o highlight how such markers reflect writers’ attention to social and pragmatic meanings in their writing” as they attempt to interact with their readers. The groups, which were closely matched in the L1 backgrounds represented, consisted of five students each, all first-year university students and all with similar writing proficiency.

Based on a first-day writing sample which all students were given 45 minutes to produce, the international students as a group generated more words than did the resident L2 students, and the groups differed in the proportion of sociopragmatic markers which they produced in each of the analyzed categories. The international students used many more self-mentions and personal narratives than the resident L2 students, and the groups also differed in some of the functions which other sociopragmatic markers performed in their writing. In particular, the resident L2 students seemed to be aligning themselves more than the international students with the “standard” conventions of academic writing. The author stresses the need for instruction in the social and pragmatic aspects of writing for both of these populations of students and suggests putting them together as one combined L2 group rather than in separate classes as is more common.

Complementary to the first **Research Matters** article, the second article, “Graduate Student Writers: Assessing Needs across the ‘Linguistic Divide,’” addresses issues to do with teaching two groups of graduate students,

English L1 and L2 writers, who are often taught in separate classes. In order to test the value of using the same approach with these different student populations, the authors, **Peter Grav** and **Rachael Cayley**, taught parallel sections of a genre-based course designed to improve writing through analysis of research articles, one for EL1 and one for EL2 graduate students in life sciences, physical sciences, and social sciences. Using a common curriculum and data from questionnaires, analytical assignments in which students were to apply what they were learning in class to articles in their own fields, and meetings with students, the authors examined the students' initial receptivity to the course, the nature of their engagement with the course materials and activities, and their overall assessment of the course.

The students showed similar concerns and views on research writing, though the EL1 group had somewhat higher awareness of genre. The EL2 group placed a priority on linguistic issues but also recognized the need to work on higher order rhetorical and genre issues that were the focus of the course. Although this was for them new territory that represented a considerable challenge, the EL2 graduate students became highly engaged in and appreciative of the genre work that was at the heart of the course. The EL1 students differed from the EL2 group in that they had little metalinguistic knowledge of grammar, and they “tended to view the material and concepts being presented as self-evident” and to take a critical stance towards the research articles presented as examples. It was therefore more challenging to engage them in the course materials and activities. The final course evaluation showed that both groups had positive responses and made progress in their genre knowledge, though the EL1 group was not as convinced about the extent to which their writing had improved as a result of the course. Although their specific challenges and needs were somewhat different, Grav and Cayley conclude that a course “designed to activate implicit knowledge of academic writing conventions [can be] of equal value to both populations.”

In the first of three **Reflections on Practice** articles, “Developing Academic Writing in Undergraduate Nursing: An Embedded Co-teaching Approach,” **Jacqueline Mary Murray** describes a collaborative effort between a writing specialist and a nursing specialist working on a professional nursing degree course that has a strong emphasis on both spoken and written communication. Murray describes the embedded, co-teaching approach involving team teaching, reflective practice, and a disciplinary emphasis on nursing content and communication skills in writing that was aligned with the nursing students' other courses. She reviews the course assignments and assessments using a marking grid and notes the highly positive responses received so far from students. At this stage in the course development and evaluation, it seems that the classes are effective

in “demystifying” assessment criteria, feedback, and the expectations for written work by the student nurses, while also providing them valuable support by both writing and nursing specialists to develop the necessary skills for effective writing as a crucial part of communication in their field.

In “Working Collaboratively to Improve Students’ Application of Critical Thinking to Information Literacy Skills,” **Brenda Refaei, Rita Kumar, and Stephena Harmony** describe a collaboration between writing instructors and a librarian at a two-year open-access college to improve students’ information literacy skills. The course they developed emphasized critical review of sources and linked to the institution’s general educational outcomes that include communication and critical thinking as well as to the standards for information literacy published by the Association of College and Research Libraries, which reinforce the desired outcomes of most first-year composition courses, especially as they relate to research writing. The authors describe the rationale for the course, its methods and activities, how it was assessed, and the results of the assessment, which showed that students improved in several aspects of information literacy skills and were positive about the progress made. The authors conclude by making a strong case for writing instructors partnering with librarians “to develop instructional strategies which can help students locate, select, and evaluate sources. A one-shot library instruction approach will no longer work in helping students process the vast quantity of information available to them.”

The final article in the Reflections on Practice section is **James Fitz Gerald’s** “The Danger of Dyadic Thought: The Importance of Fiction in Writing Center Theory,” in which the author proposes the value of literature for sensitizing writing center tutors to the problems students face in their writing and their sessions with tutors. The students often lack confidence and skill in their writing, in talking about their writing, and in interacting with others about their writing, and the tutors often make assumptions and talk to students in ways that show insensitivity to students’ problems and needs. Fitz Gerald uses the example of the character Precious, from the novel *Push*, as a case study that can be introduced to writing center tutors to raise their level of awareness of the sometimes great distance between them and their students. He suggests that fiction should be given a more prominent role in writing center theory and practice, as “[having] the potential to grant its reader the perspective of unheard, dismissed, and often overlooked voices.”

The **From the e-Sphere** piece in this issue, “Screencasting for Enhanced Teaching and Learning in Blended and Online Creative Writing Classes,” is by **Laura Valeri**, a creative writer and writing teacher who makes use of screencasting in her classes. Screencasting allows a user to record on-screen

activity and then to attach video or audio narration to it. This technology, which has pedagogical value for combining demonstration and description of procedures, can now be integrated into the kinds of learning platforms that are widespread at universities. Drawing on her own experience and the published literature, Valeri reviews and critiques the available technology and suggests ways in which it can be used for teaching writing in online, hybrid, and face-to-face courses. She concludes that screencasting is a flexible, easy-to-access, and easy-to-use media application that can be a valuable addition to writing pedagogy.

In the first of two **New Books** articles, **Tracey Costley** reviews Theresa Lillis' *The Sociolinguistics of Writing*. Costley finds Lillis' book to be an important, highly readable and well-argued book laying out a more central positioning of writing within sociolinguistics. The second review, of *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*, edited by A. Suresh Canagarajah, is by **Peter I. De Costa**. De Costa offers a detailed review of the 22 chapters of this collection, which he maintains is a rich resource while noting the desirability of further interrogation of notions of bi-, multi-, and translingualism in relation to codemeshing and clearer specification of what constitutes translingual pedagogy.

2014: The Year in Review

In 2014, *Writing & Pedagogy* completed its sixth year of publication and began publishing 3 issues per year – Spring, Summer, and Winter. The extra issue meant a significant increase in the number of articles published overall and in each of the journal's sections, as follows: Editorial (3), Guest Editorial (2), Featured Essay (2), Research Matters (13), Reflections on Practice (8), From the e-Sphere (3), and New Books (7). Each issue of Volume 6 was substantial: the open topic issue was nearly 175 pages long, and the two special topics issues each came in at over 250 pages, making them essentially double issues. Content for Volume 6 included major attention to K–12 as well as university contexts and to both second-language and first-language contexts in the teaching of English. While the focus was mainly on academic writing, articles in the Reflections on Practice, From the e-Sphere, and New Books sections in Volume 6.1 featured creative writing and artistry in writing, and creativity in writing and the teaching of writing was a key topic throughout Volume 6.3. Contributors to Volume 6 included authors primarily from the United States but also from Belgium, Canada, Israel, and Hong Kong.

The first (open topic) issue addressed concerns of negotiating writing in a graduate program and in the transition to faculty status, the trade-off in school writing between standardization and individualization of

assignments, and the difficulty student writers have in maintaining a state of critical inquiry from beginning to end of the writing process. The Spring issue also contained pedagogical reflections on a bridge program for university student writers coming from overseas and on applications of puppetry in writing classes, in addition to a review of natural user interfaces to direct writing processes and display written language in artworks. Consistent with the journal's commitment to addressing academic as well as creative writing, the New Books section reviewed four books relating to the teaching of creative writing and its nature as an academic field. The second (special topic) issue centered on Feedback in the Teaching of Writing and included a historical review of the literature, a research study comparing automated and non-automated feedback modes, in addition to research studies on peer feedback, on student attitudes towards corrective written feedback, on teachers' use of corrective feedback, on use of rhetoric revision logs as a feedback mode, and on using feedback-on-feedback in an online writing center. These research-focused studies were complemented by pedagogical reflections on the utility of different modes of peer feedback and on responding to students' papers without grading. New books reviewed were an edited collection on the nature of feedback and another edited collection on automated essay evaluation. The third (special topic) issue was on Children's Writing. The first of six research studies reviewed the effects of various kinds of process writing initiatives, and the second one assessed a professional development project that applied a process writing approach while helping students prepare for a state writing test. The Winter issue included a study of students' freewriting, a linguistically focused analysis of students' reading response essays, and an investigation of how a future teacher was affected by writing practices when she was in elementary school. In the area of technology, the issue addressed the effects on student writers' identities of social networking within a multiliteracies pedagogy, use of blogging with young students, and application of PhotoVoice pedagogy with K–12 teachers and their students. Other reflections on practice centered on using writing workshop with ELL children, on inspiring the writing of first graders through a series of books in which different animals compete, and on the various features that made writing instruction effective in a university–school partnership. The final piece in the Winter 2014 issue reviewed a popular book on the use of mentor texts to teach writing.

Submissions in 2014 continued to be strong in ESL and university-level writing, while the journal experienced increases in research submissions and submissions focused on K–12 writing. As has been the journal tradition, we continued to give generous editorial assistance in maintaining our vision of *Writing & Pedagogy* as an “author-friendly” journal, with a high

proportion of “revise and resubmit” decisions on first submission – over two-thirds of submissions, approximately 70%, fell into this category in 2014. Continuing the trend for the previous years of the journal, the rate of both rejection and acceptance on initial submission was low, approximately 20% in the first case and 10% in the second case. The total acceptance rate, which includes articles accepted after being revised and resubmitted for one or more additional rounds of review, continues as in previous years to be approximately one-third of submissions.

We thank all of our Editorial Board members, the authors who contributed articles to Volume 6, and the following additional reviewers for helping to keep *W&P* strong and growing in 2014:

Mary Baron, University of North Florida (USA)
 Mark N. Brock, Cardinal Newman University (USA)
 Mark L. Richardson, Shenandoah University (USA)
 Candace A. Roberts, Saint Leo University (USA)
 Shelley K. Taylor, University of Western Ontario (Canada)
 Sherry Taylor, University of Colorado at Denver

This year Christopher John Hill continued as a part-time editorial assistant while pursuing his Ph.D. in the English Department of City University of Hong Kong. Another Ph.D. student, Joseph Alvaro, assigned to assist me in my work also provided service as an editorial assistant on the journal in the first half of the year. Thanks to both for their kind assistance.

The Journal Going Forward

This is the last issue of *Writing & Pedagogy* that I have been (or will be) responsible for. For several years, I have served (by choice) as both the substantive editor and copy editor for the journal, roles which together have grown to almost a full-time job. To reduce the editorial load on the Editor in Chief, who will maintain a full-time Professor position while leading the journal, starting with the next (Summer 2015) issue, Equinox will provide copy editing services for *W&P*, and the section editors will take an increased role in managing and vetting submissions. In addition, the journal moves in the next issue to a much more familiar style, APA format, which should save substantially on the need to edit references as contrasted with the modified Harvard referencing style which I inherited from a previous journal copy editor.

While I have greatly enjoyed the opportunity offered me by Janet Joyce, the owner of Equinox Publishing, to develop this journal, when I decided to retire from full-time employment in August I also decided to pass the

reins of the journal into new hands. I will continue for the next few years in an advisory capacity to the new Editor in Chief, Rodney Hale Jones, and maintain involvement as a reviewer of submissions and books for the journal. I have an over 20-year association with Rodney and believe it is a great benefit to the journal that he has agreed to become its next Editor in Chief, as he is ambitious and has a very high standard, which together promise to maintain the momentum achieved so far and help *Writing & Pedagogy* achieve new milestones. Rodney was my student in the M.A. TEFL program at City University of Hong Kong in the mid 1990s, went on to do a Ph.D. with Chris Candlin, then later became my colleague and the Acting Head of the English Department while I was again working at City University in 2012–14. Rodney is a brilliant scholar and a gifted writer with a background and publications in creative and academic writing, in areas ranging from discourse analysis to digital rhetoric and technology, first-year composition, ESL, and writing program administration. His Editorial Board adds many new members from North America as well as from New Zealand and Australia, China, and Europe. It includes a current Editor of *TESOL Quarterly*, Brian Paltridge, in addition to a recent Editor of *The Journal of Second Language Writing*, Rosa Manchón. The new members of the Editorial Board, including those designated as section editors, are all distinguished scholars who add strengths especially in English for Specific Purposes, Systemic Functional Linguistics, writing technologies, and writing in K–12 contexts. We can all look forward with excitement to what the journal will achieve under Rodney's able leadership with the backing and participation of this outstanding group of scholars.

Upcoming Issues

Writing & Pedagogy publishes three issues per year: one open topic issue (Spring), one special topic issue (Winter), and one other issue (Summer) – either open topic or special topic. Submissions for all issues of Volume 8 (2016) are now being accepted, including the Spring 2016 open topic issue and the Summer and Winter 2016 special topic issues (see Calls for Papers on the journal website). Note that the special topic issue on Orality and Literacy in the 21st Century: Prospects for Writing Pedagogy that was to appear this summer has been postponed till the Winter 2016 issue, 8.3, in order to solicit additional papers (see Call for Papers for that issue on the journal website). The Writing Assessment issue has been moved to Summer 2015, and a new issue added for Winter 2015 (see below).

UPCOMING SPECIAL TOPIC ISSUES

Vol 7.2 Summer 2015	<i>Writing Assessment</i>	Guest Editor: Jane Lockwood City University of Hong Kong
Vol 7.3 Winter 2015	<i>Writing Pedagogy and English for Specific Purposes</i>	Guest Editor: John Flowerdew City University of Hong Kong
Vol 8.2 Summer 2016	<i>Teaching Writing in Asia</i>	Guest Editor: Icy Lee Hong Kong Institute of Education
Vol 8.3 Winter 2016	<i>Orality and Literacy in the 21st Century: Prospects for Writing Pedagogy</i>	Guest Editor: Rosalind Horowitz University of Texas–San Antonio

CONTENTS Volume 7, Number 2 (Summer 2015)

Special Topic Issue: Writing Assessment

Guest Editor: *Jane Lockwood*

Featured Essay

Automated Writing Analysis for Writing Pedagogy: From Healthy Tension to Tangible Prospects

Elena Cotos

Research Matters

Evaluation of English Writing Assessment of Japanese University Entrance Examinations

Yumiko Moore

Assessment of Classroom Writing on Feedback Processes and Product vs. on Product Alone

Rachel Ruegg

The Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Accuracy: A Quantitative and Qualitative Examination

Arlen Parreno

Peer Assessment of Adolescent Learners' Writing Performance

Dina Tsagari and Elena Meletiadou

Information Management and Assessment of Grammar in L2 Writing

Heike Neumann

Reflections on Practice

Understanding and Providing Effective Feedback

Ahmar Mahboob

New Standards, New Opportunities: Expanding the Definition of Good Writing in School

Jennifer Berne and Susan McMahon

From the e-Sphere

Using the Developmental Path of Cause to Bridge the Gap between AWE Scores and Writing Teachers' Evaluations

Hong Ma and Tammy Slater

New Books

Assessing and Improving Student Writing in College: A Guide for Institutions, General Education, Departments, and Classrooms. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barbara E. Walvoord (2014)

Very Like a Whale: The Assessment of Writing Programs. Boulder, Colorado: Utah State University Press.

Edward M. White, Norbert Elliot, and Irvin Peckman (2015)
Reviewed by Dan Melzer

