

## *A Little More Relevance*

**Tony Cimasko**  
*Miami University*

### **Introduction**

Like mainstream first-year composition (FYC), second language (L2) composition has faced difficulties in preparing students for the particular types of writing they will encounter in their upper-level major courses. In attempting to address writing needs shared across diverse disciplines, critics have cited approaches that are inevitably too general or of little relevance to those specific disciplines. These critics observe that each discipline brings with it such large bodies of unique discourse practices and relationships that arguments for a generic, broadly applicable “academic discourse” are called into question. Nevertheless, L2 first-year composition omits the rigor found in upper-level college writing (see Steven Schmidt’s essay in the printed volume of this collection) and remains focused on general “academic discourse.” The specific genres and discourse norms found at different points across the curriculum are left for more focused instruction later in students’ undergraduate careers, when students are already immersed in their majors.

In light of the disconnect between first-year composition and writing in the disciplines, this essay examines an activity designed to encourage ESL students to look at the kinds of written genres facing them in their majors and to talk and write explicitly about connections between those genres and their work in first-year composition. The ultimate goal of the activity is to make FYC into an ongoing resource that will continue to have relevance once the semester has finished.

## **Composition and Disciplinarity**

Prior to the establishment of first-year composition, writing existed in what has been described as a state of virtual invisibility: Writing for any given discipline was assumed to be a natural outgrowth of engagement with the work of that discipline, a set of skills that were coupled with the nonwritten aspects of the field—skills that would grow concurrently as the student developed his or her knowledge of the content of the field (Russell). With the influx of nontraditional students into the academy—first out of an increasing need for a more highly educated Industrial Age workforce, then again in the post-World War II era in the form of returning soldiers taking advantage of new educational opportunities, and more recently by American minorities and immigrants—assumptions about the “natural” acquisition of good writing through disciplinary work weakened, and explicit inculcation into “proper” academic writing was seen as the solution. At first, “proper” academic writing was conceived as a set of universal standards into which particular disciplinary content could be added; this model was later refined into a set of modal subskills (i.e., narrative, summary, argument, etc.) that was believed to be found in all fields, forming the nucleus of a generalized “academic discourse” (Bhatia; Dudley-Evans; Muchiri et al.; Sutton).

It is this assumption, that a broad range of discourse features are to be found in the writing of all disciplines, that has led to criticism of first-year composition for both first language (L1) and second language (L2) students, as well as various attempts meant to refocus writing instruction on disciplinary particulars and to better prepare students for writing in their majors. Opposition to generalized “academic discourse” in first-year

composition tends to focus on the situated nature of writing and rhetoric and on the very limited nature of “academic discourse”—if such a coherent and consistent set of norms is to be found at all. In other words, by attempting to address all, it is argued that composition addresses little (Arms et al.; Johns, “Teaching”; Larson; Leki, “Coping”). Critics also cite the difficulty of convincing students to engage in writing norms that they see as irrelevant to their majors (Roemer, Schultz, and Durst; Shih).

Proposed solutions to this problem have taken various forms. Collaborations with content-specific instructors in a variety of arrangements loosely organized under the banner of Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) represent the most widespread attempt to address these criticisms within the basic framework of established composition instruction. Writing Across the Curriculum programs may take place primarily within composition departments; under such arrangements, interdisciplinary contacts are conducted either through students themselves in cooperation with their major instructors and working on major-related writing projects, or a writing department’s WAC center may bring knowledgeable “informants” from the disciplines into writing courses in some instructional capacity. The students within a given first-year composition classroom still represent a variety of majors, and those from outside the composition field become consultants rather than primary instructors or influences on curriculum (Johns, “ESL”; Russell). Learning community approaches (Arms et al.; Dudley-Evans) yield more authority than WAC to noncomposition specialties, focusing on a single major and allowing instructors to more rigorously pursue the particular rhetorical norms of the major. Moving even farther from the centrality of the composition program, writing specialists may help to create writing courses housed within target departments and

academic programs themselves. Under such arrangements, student and instructor contacts take place within the content area department/program, with composition-based writing specialists limited to the role of consultants (e.g., Walker).

Defenders of traditional composition have acknowledged the basic need for greater relevance to the academy as a whole. At the same time, however, they have also argued that only some changes are needed rather than yielding primary disciplinary authority to other disciplines (hence, the undesirable label of “service course”) or dissolving first-year composition altogether (Roemer, Schultz, and Durst; Sutton). Some of these arguments find traction in demands for disciplinary autonomy on the part of composition (Arms et al.; Roemer, Schultz, and Durst).

For second-language learners, pedagogical and philosophical differences with mainstream rhetoric and composition (e.g., Silva and Leki), program-level cultural differences (Atkinson and Ramanathan; Johns, “ESL”), and recognition that many students do not have the same learning and usage needs for English writing as their domestic counterparts (e.g., Silva), have led to the creation of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses. As the names suggest, both of these options, particularly ESP and its focus on discipline-specific genres, have somewhat narrower interests than traditional first-year composition (Leki, “Coping”; Muchiri et al.; Shih). As with most of the alternatives already discussed, EAP and ESP are housed in dedicated ESL or composition programs rather than in the disciplines. ESP, however, is not an option associated with first-year college students, but instead with junior- and senior-level undergraduates and with graduate students (Johns and Dudley-Evans; Shih). An additional shortcoming—one that is also found in mainstream

composition—that is frequently cited is the generalized language and composition orientation of the *instructors* themselves, who readily admit to being unaware of the rhetorical specifics of the disciplines to which their students belong (Arms et al.; Leki, “Good Writing”). Like their mainstream counterparts, then, ESL students are often left with generic “academic discourse,” rather than a focus on the particular disciplinary forms of English that are needed, or at least being moved toward a “novice approximation” of disciplinary norms (MacDonald).

### **Class Curriculum and Introducing the Plan**

The activity that I will be describing that connected ESL first-year composition with discipline-based writing took place at a large Midwestern university. Participants in the study were thirteen undergraduates, mostly but not all first-year students. The students came from diverse national backgrounds: South Korea (three students), the People’s Republic of China, Indonesia, Malaysia (two each), India, Taiwan, Turkey, and Venezuela (one each). Gender was heavily imbalanced toward males, with only five of the thirteen students being female. Self-ratings of English writing ability—confirmed in project writing throughout the semester—were “average” for most of the students, with only one of the thirteen initially describing his or her own writing as “below average.” Six students majored in engineering, two in management, and one each in actuarial science, biology, economics, and interior design, with one undecided.

The general format of the composition course had been designed several years earlier as a parallel to mainstream first-year composition, and the ESL students enrolled in the course were expected to fulfill the same department-mandated learning objectives

as their mainstream counterparts—that is, build up an awareness of writing conventions shared across academic disciplines, in preparation for eventual writing in the disciplines. The general curriculum for ESL first-year composition was based substantially on Ilona Leki's ("Building Expertise") "sequenced writing project," in which students each identify topics that will form the core of five writing assignments throughout the semester. Staying with the same topic (and, as Leki argues, freeing students to focus on linguistic concerns), the students write through four major projects of increasing rhetorical concern with audiences: a formal topic proposal, a literature review, an interview report, and an argumentative essay. Aside from this basic format, instructors are given leeway to design any course activities they see as appropriate.

Within this framework, the instructor for this particular project introduced two activities, one linked directly to the sequenced writing project and the other intended to begin bridging the gap between first-year composition and writing in the disciplines. The first, labeled "Exploring the Genre" or EtG, was designed to provide students with a framework for analyzing the texts and contexts of unfamiliar genres. Students were given a small collection of writings from each genre and were asked to address a dozen or so questions on the language choices, content, structure, goals, and readership of each. In collaborative groups, students reviewed and answered these questions on a blog, which was reviewed and then revised by the instructor. The finished product was intended to offer students a detailed guide to the expectations of the genre they were about to engage. At first, all EtG questions were provided by the instructor, but, in subsequent projects, the instructor asked students to prepare questions on their own. For the final project, students themselves were entirely responsible for these questions. Some of these questions were

repeated from earlier projects and some were unique to each genre. It was hoped that students would be able to appropriate the approach in their future academic writing.

The second activity introduced into the course—and the primary focus of this essay—was more experimental than the first. Labeled “Genre Hunt,” the activity provided students with three opportunities to explore the genres they would encounter in their respective majors. Like the project discussed in Howard Tinberg’s chapter in the printed volume of this collection, students were required to go outside the writing classroom and the library and to acquire information firsthand. The Genre Hunt began simply and early in the semester: Students were asked to contact professors of three upper-level classes in their major programs for the names (or brief descriptions, or both) of significant writing projects in those courses. At about the mid-semester mark, they were required to contact the original professors again, acquire at least one sample of each genre, and provide a brief analysis of it. They were allowed to take any approach to the analysis they wished, although the Exploring the Genre approach mentioned previously was specifically suggested, and, with an absence of alternative models, it was assumed that EtG would become the default choice. At the end of the semester, with these analyses complete and with the entirety of their first-year composition projects behind them, students were believed to be in a position to compare the features of these projects with the upper-level genres and to find points of connection. Students reviewed the four major projects, including reviewer comments, and noted how particular features, audience expectations, and writer practices recur in the Genre Hunt samples. In this way, students would (ideally) be better able to make connections between first-year

composition and their majors, getting more long-term value out of the composition experience.

### **Describing—and Finding—Genres in the Disciplines**

Initial contact with course instructors for the names or brief descriptions of disciplinary genres presented no difficulties. All the students were able to find instructor names and email addresses through course catalogs, department websites, and the university directory and were able to identify three genres for their future work. The next step in the project, describing the genres in detail, presented far more difficulties than had been anticipated. Several weeks before the due date for their descriptions, more than half the class reported professors refusing requests for samples, pledging—but not fulfilling—requests for samples, and failing to respond to requests. Due to these issues, I was forced to scale back the scope of the project, asking for descriptions of only one genre rather than all three. This enabled more, but not all, students to conduct their analyses. Before discussing these problems, though, I will first attend to the writing done by students who were able to acquire project samples.

As already mentioned, the students were given the freedom to report their results in any way they felt would be useful to them later in their undergraduate careers, although with a lack of alternative models, it was expected that Exploring the Genre would become the default approach in some capacity. This, however, was not the case. Rather than posing and answering a series of text- and context-based questions, many of the students wrote paragraphs that marginalized, and sometimes ignored, contextual



information. A longer-than-average example description of a lab report illustrates this “text-only” approach:

---

### **Introduction to Fluid Mechanics**

Lab reports are usually written after an experiment on some things are done. The common structure for a lab report contains introduction, methods or procedures, analysis and results, conclusion and sometimes includes appendixes as well.

The language used in a lab report is usually scientific and formal language. A lab report is usually written in a very organized and structured way, where the contents are arranged accordingly and each content will be numbered or bulleted. Furthermore, a lab report will have tabulated data or graphical illustration of the data collected. The length of a lab report varies from experiment to experiment. However, it will usually be more than 4 pages. In addition, a lab report must have a one page cover which usually states the subject code and the name of the subject, the time and date of the lab and the names of the students involved in the experiment. The sources used to write a lab report is based on the results of the experiment and other related materials only.

---

While information of the kind represented here can be useful, it is information of a very basic kind, focused on surface characteristics that can be identified easily by most students without benefit of deeper analysis. By marginalizing or ignoring context and associations between text and context, students miss key rhetorical dimensions of the genre being studied; from this perspective, “effective” writing in the genre becomes a matter of compliance with hard rules rather than awareness of the motivations for those

rules, negotiation with the rules, and a measure of flexibility in the name of improved audience connection. By remaining focused on surface text details, reports of those details were scattered and disorganized.

Others in the class opted for a basic outline of the genre structure:

---

### **Behavioral Economics**

This is a behavioral economics course. This course had a group experiment design project to be submitted by the students. The paper had to be written in a certain way. You had to conduct as a scientific experiment with theoretical model and predictions along with a testable hypothesis. Then would follow design procedures method. Along with the actual results and accurate details on how the experiment was performed in order to be duplicated to get the same results. All of these categories were to be included to write the paper.

---

A few structured their descriptions in ways that seemed to mirror basic instructions given by instructors rather than analyses of successful texts:

---

### **Human Resource Management**

The type of genre of this assignment is group analysis, and critical writing. This class has a group project and presentation based on given topic. Students need to analyze simulated situations, and provide their reasonable opinions by credible researches.

---

A handful of students, while following the same patterns, focused only on individual instantiations of the genre rather than features that may be present in the genre as a whole:

---

### **Managerial Policy**

The type of genre of this assignment is written analysis. Students are asked to identify the relevant industry that allows him/her to perform the most meaningful analysis of "Breckenridge". This student chose the "Craft Brewing Industry". He then describes and analyses the strengths and weaknesses, goals, strategic moves, problems, and alternative recommendations. There are issues such as rivalry, profitability, equity, and such. Everything is done with technical management language and terms.

---

These four samples highlight a perspective on texts as relatively isolated from community practices and rhetorical relationships, except perhaps for grades awarded by course professors. This isolated view of writing in the disciplines may be one that has persisted from previous academic experiences, despite students by this point having spent half a semester of composition routinely discussing the social situatedness of writing. It may, however, be a clear recognition of the *actual* social situatedness of the undergraduate academic writing contexts, that writing for a grade in an undergraduate course in fact has very little clout or impact beyond the grade or the course in which it is written.

Out of a possible thirty-nine text samples (three texts for each of thirteen students), the students were able to acquire only twenty samples. In less than half of these

instances, the samples could be obtained directly from the course instructors; in those cases where instructors were not providing assistance, I brainstormed other potential sources in conferences with the students: teaching assistants, older acquaintances who had completed one or more of the courses, and Google searches for course and professor names. When these did not work and the students were unable to carry out the project either in part or in its entirety, they were asked to write in detail about the problems they encountered.

The lack of access was entirely unexpected, becoming the biggest barrier to the project, and one that future writing instructors interested in implementing this or a comparable activity should plan around. The most common difficulty was getting no response from the professor, even after multiple emails. When professors responded negatively, reasons ranged from maintaining the confidentiality of former students, to a lack of retained records from prior semesters, having taught the course for only one semester and therefore having no samples to offer, and writing as a substitute for tests and a consequent desire to avoid circulating answers. When teaching assistants and personal acquaintances were unable to help, they too commented that they had not retained writing from previous semesters.

### **From Freshman Composition to the Future**

Nevertheless, about half of the students were able to get at least one genre sample and were in a position to use the activity according to its original intent. Some of those who had been able to secure genre samples integrated an awareness of context and audience

beyond grades into their lists, demonstrating a measure of development beyond their thinking and writing in their previous work on the Genre Hunt:

---

This is a solution of the homework from my class. In this solution, there are many blocks and sketches. It has to explain what is the equation for? How to get the equation? And why use this formula? There has to be some analysis and assumption. The language used in this solution is scientific and formal language. There are some sentences to explain the condition and type of the system, and then explain how to design a new system meet the requirement.

---

For some, this chance to connect composition and their respective majors indicated significant differences between the two. The students themselves saw these differences as an impediment to deriving many useful insights before attempting to write in the genre themselves:

---

I was able to find only one paper for the genre hunt 1. This was a lab report for food chemistry (FN 453). This lab report has 6 parts: Lab Conditions, purpose, procedure, Results, discussion, and references. This lab report is similar to the one I did in English this semester. In project 2 and 4 I had to research and put references on them just as the lab report. Also when writing all the projects in the introduction I had to write what is the purpose of the project which is similar to the "purpose" of the lab report. Other than that, the lab report is really different from those I did in English class this semester.

---

Examples such as this demonstrate an attempt to tease out similarities from situations in which those similarities were limited.

Lack of similarity was not the only impediment to providing rich comparative details, however. In a number of cases where linkages between composition projects and the target genre were more plentiful, some students listed only highly generalized comments, without providing rationales for their existence or specific details. In such cases, students were unlikely to find their Genre Hunt analyses particularly useful in guiding their future writing:

---

The genre I found was chemistry lab report, and basically the lab report contains objective, data collection, data analysis and result. The part of objective is similar to the summary of literature resource in Project 2. One needs to give a general description of what and how the team finished the lab. Like what we did in Project 2, one ought to be objective and not give personal judgment on the objectives. The part of data analysis is like what we did with the evidence in Project 4. One needs to use data to support his/her opinion.

**Case analysis:**

**Project 2:**

1. how to analyze and comment based on the information given.
2. citing sources and bibliography.

**Project 4:**

1. how to make an argument.
  2. how to attack the opposition's points.
-

In their attempt to build lists that would cover the most frequent and/or substantial ongoing writing issues, many of the students generated lists of highly generic issues—a number of which were not specific to comments made in the context of first-year composition—as well as concerns of mechanics and grammar:

---

My advice list for future is as follows:

1. Try to be objective and find good source to write academic writing
  2. Try to do in-text citation for credibility from readers
  3. Try to do not write "I think" at academic persuasion essay.
  4. Generally, state specific authors' opinion based on credible sources.
  5. Try to write a topic sentence at each paragraph.
  6. Try to use good transition words.
- 

Also, many of the concerns cited by the students as paramount to their future writing tended to be local issues rather than global ones:

---

1. Try to use quote or cite the source, when you copy from other's source.
  2. Don't start with "I" "You" "We" not much.
  3. Try to show the main idea clear in the introduce paragraph.
  4. When you use some sources from other web-site, don't just copy and rewrite with your word.
  5. try to put the topic sentence in each a paragraph for reader who could understand what it is exactly saying.
-

Many of the lists were “do” and “do not” lists unaccompanied by statements of rationale:

- 
- do not reference myself too much in academic writing
  - do enough research to show plentiful details
  - use a pronoun when the object is definite
  - do not use vague word such as "opinion"
  - do not use rhetorical questions much
  - do not count on authority of researched evidence (do not have a person's name in the topic sentence)
  - do not use "such as" statement in complete arguing sentence
- 

In this and other examples, some students suggested that they continue to see little or no relation to audiences and the norms of context in their writing. In this case, however, with fewer definitive links to any one course in their major, it is more difficult to unambiguously interpret this as a lack of awareness of these dimensions. Nevertheless, there remains the possibility that views of decontextualized academic discourse *as a whole* seem to have persisted, even near the end of the composition course. This is not necessarily denial of discourse operating in context; rather, it may be that students place exclusive or near-exclusive priority on text regardless of the existing context issues, an issue that is just as important in reading (see Patrick Sullivan’s essay in the printed volume of this collection) as in writing.

Finally, some students avoided textual features and instead commented on important issues in their writing processes:



- 
1. Writer's Block—Will always be there, and always will be. You must just start to write anything even if you have no idea about the project in your mind. By starting to write something, the idea will flow in; keep it up until the whole structure starts to appear.
  2. If you're stuck, go and talk to the people who will have idea, especially the instructors. Don't keep it to yourself.
  3. Eliminate the "All or nothing" attitude.
  4. Lesson from Topic Proposal: Be descriptive and not superficial.
  5. Lesson from Literature Review: Find a subtitle of writing that you can many sources to elaborate on. Blog sources are mostly biased so try to avoid it.
  6. Lesson from Interview Report: In dealing with other people, especially corporate people, setting must set a very early appointment; they will not attend to your needs in short term, unless it's beneficial for them. Prepare your interview questions accordingly and relating to the interviewer's background.
  7. Lesson from Argumentative Essay: To have a strong opinion and argument, you have to keep on reading and researching from the various angle of the story. Don't agree to just one opinion but be open to others and criticizing is good too.
  8. Conclusion: Writing is an art to convey your message, it is important to develop this skill. By continuously practicing the correct way, you will eventually achieve a high satisfaction.

---

### **Genre Hunt and Prospects for Student Writing**

The Genre Hunt activity is primarily a means for making first-year composition more directly relevant to the future writing that students will engage in the disciplines. This

mirrors the transition from traditional school-only writing to relevant writing beyond schools seen in Tinberg's essay in the printed volume of this collection. It is also important to note the activity's historical connections with rhetoric and composition's movement toward connecting the written word to its particular social contexts and vice versa. Since the publication of Karen Burke Lefevre's landmark article, research and (ideally) writing instruction have been minimizing attention to grammar and other rule-governed mechanical concerns that hold true across contexts with information on audiences, activity, and ideology, asking questions about the situatedness of writing. In other words, the definition of what "good writing" means has shifted, becoming more contingent and less rule governed.

But these changes over the past quarter century may conflict with entrenched norms of writing that many students encounter in high school English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education in their home countries, leading to some of the difficulties encountered in the Genre Hunt exercise. For the students in the composition class who restricted their Genre Hunt guides to grammar, vocabulary, and other local-level writing concerns, many reported having had high school EFL writing experiences that were based primarily upon abstract, decontextualized rules with no clear connection to particular social contexts. In addition, this kind of information tended to be handed down through textbooks and teachers rather than being discovered or inferred by learners themselves. Among these, many commented that high school writing experiences in their *first* language were much the same—restricted to rules of correctness. Even those whose Genre Hunt guides managed to move beyond mechanical considerations into audience-specific matters restricted their comments to very general criteria, such as "be descriptive

and not superficial” and “use [of] credible sources.” Despite exposure to the strong rhetorical orientation of the first-year composition class itself, these students fell back upon the comfortable and proven effectiveness of mechanical and universally applicable criteria when left to their own devices in the Genre Hunt exercise.

### **Pedagogical and Professional Implications**

This Genre Hunt project is only one trial attempt to tease out relevant connections between ESL composition, FYC, and Writing Across the Curriculum—or to construct those associations in the first place. It is my hope that this project will be useful as a starting point for our profession to reflect on and design a range of practical approaches to FYC and first-year ESL courses. Furthermore, and perhaps more important, I believe introducing students to writing in the disciplines is an essential way for students to begin transitioning out of high school-level writing and into true college-level work. This is a critical and difficult process, as Casey Maliszewski and Merrill Davies both suggest in their essays for this collection (see the printed volume). For students to engage real “college-level” work, they must be asked to complete writing assignments in which disciplinary writing dominates—with the understanding that “good writing” in any given major will likely be different in many crucial ways from “good writing” in other majors.

This is also an approach to writing that requires of students the ability to analyze and understand the different values of each discipline’s form of writing and to be able to do so independently. Tying first-year composition to the disciplines will make the composition experience more worthwhile for FYC and ESL students, especially if it is

done in a way that simultaneously makes connections with those students' cultural backgrounds and prior experiences (see Yufeng Zhang's online essay in this collection).

Finally, successful transitions between the writing and learning norms of high school—where generally applicable concepts of “good writing” are given to students by sources of academic authority, and those of higher education—where students are often required to independently identify distinct and diverse forms of disciplinary knowledge—will rely upon increased communication. Perhaps the best place to achieve this is at the local level, where school administrators and teachers can interact more frequently with college writing program administrators and instructors, as well as professors from other college departments. Working locally, participants in such forums (hosted by regional colleges and/or district boards of education) can focus on specific curricula and on the requirements of particular student populations. Useful exchanges can be made on the national level, too, particularly through the National Council of Teachers of English.

### **Works Cited**

- Arms, Valarie Meliotes, Sarah Duerden, Meredith Green, M. Jimmie Killingsworth, and Paul Taylor. “English Teachers and Engineers: A New Learning Community.” *International Journal of Engineering Education* 14 (1998): 30–40. Print.
- Atkinson, Dwight, and Vai Ramanathan. “Cultures of Writing: An Ethnographic Comparison of L1 and L2 University Writing/Language Programs.” *TESOL Quarterly* 29 (1995): 539–68. Print.
- Bhatia, Vijay K. “A Generic View of Academic Discourse.” *Academic Discourse*. Ed. John Flowerdew. London: Pearson, 2002. 21–39. Print.

- Davies, Merrill J. "Making the Leap from High School to College Writing." *What Is "College-Level" Writing? Volume 2: Assignments, Readings, and Student Writing Samples*. Ed. Patrick Sullivan, Howard Tinberg, and Sheridan Blau. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2010. 119–33. Print.
- Dudley-Evans, Tony. "Common-Core and Specific Approaches to the Teaching of Academic Writing." *Academic Writing in a Second Language*. Ed. Diane Belcher and George Braine. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1995. 293–312. Print.
- Johns, Ann M. "Teaching Classroom and Authentic Genres: Initiating Students into Academic Cultures and Discourses." *Academic Writing in a Second Language*. Ed. Diane Belcher and George Braine. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1995. 277–91. Print.
- . "ESL Students and WAC Programs: Serving Varied Populations with Diverse Needs." *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies of/for Continuing Writing Across the Curriculum Programs*. Ed. Susan H. McLeod, Eric Miraglia, Margot Soven, and Christopher Thais. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2001. 141–64. Print.
- Johns, Ann M., and Tony Dudley-Evans. "English for Specific Purposes: International in Scope, Specific in Purpose." *TESOL Quarterly* 25 (1991): 297–314. Print.
- Larson, Richard L. "The 'Research Paper' in the Writing Course: A Non-Form of Writing." *College English* 44 (1982): 811–16. Print.
- Lefevre, Karen Burke. *Invention as a Social Act*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1987. Print.
- Leki, Ilona. "Building Expertise through Sequenced Writing Assignments." *TESOL Journal* 1 (1992): 19–23. Print.

- . “Coping Strategies of ESL Students in Writing Tasks across the Curriculum.” *TESOL Quarterly* 29 (1995): 235–60. Print.
- . “Good Writing: I Know It When I See It.” *Academic Writing in a Second Language*. Ed. Diane Belcher and George Braine. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1995. 23–46. Print.
- MacDonald, Susan Peck. *Professional Academic Writing in the Humanities and Social Sciences*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1994. Print.
- Maliszewski, Casey. “Home Schooled.” *What Is “College-Level” Writing? Volume 2: Assignments, Readings, and Student Writing Samples*. Ed. Patrick Sullivan, Howard Tinberg, and Sheridan Blau. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2010. 257–66. Print.
- Muchiri, Mary N., Nshindi G. Mulamba, Greg Myers, and Deoscorous B. Ndoloi. “Importing Composition: Teaching and Researching Academic Writing beyond North America.” *College Composition and Communication* 46 (1995): 175–98. Print.
- Roemer, Marjorie, Lucille M. Schultz, and Russel K. Durst. “Reframing the Great Debate on First-Year Writing.” *College Composition and Communication* 50 (1999): 377–92. Print.
- Russell, David R. *Writing in the Academic Disciplines: A Curricular History*. 2nd ed. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 2002. Print.
- Schmidt, Steven. “Moving the Tassel from the Right to the Left.” *What Is “College-Level” Writing? Volume 2: Assignments, Readings, and Student Writing Samples*. Ed. Patrick Sullivan, Howard Tinberg, and Sheridan Blau. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2010. 267–79. Print.

- Shih, May. "Content-Based Approaches to Teaching Academic Writing." *TESOL Quarterly* 20 (1986): 617–48. Print.
- Silva, Tony. "Toward an Understanding of the Distinct Nature of Second Language Writing: The ESL Research and Its Implications." *TESOL Quarterly* 27 (1993): 657–77. Print.
- Silva, Tony, and Ilona Leki. "Family Matters: The Influence of Applied Linguistics and Composition Studies on Second Language Writing Studies—Past, Present, and Future." *The Modern Language Journal* 88 (2004): 1–13. Print.
- Sullivan, Patrick. "What Can We Learn about 'College-Level' Writing from Basic Writing Students?: The Importance of Reading." *What Is "College-Level" Writing? Volume 2: Assignments, Readings, and Student Writing Samples*. Ed. Patrick Sullivan, Howard Tinberg, and Sheridan Blau. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2010. 233–53. Print.
- Sutton, Brian. "Writing in the Disciplines, First-Year Composition, and the Research Paper." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 2 (1997): 46–57. Print.
- Tinberg, Howard. "What is College-Level Writing? The View from a Community College Writing Center." *What Is "College-Level" Writing? Volume 2: Assignments, Readings, and Student Writing Samples*. Ed. Patrick Sullivan, Howard Tinberg, and Sheridan Blau. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2010. 170–82. Print.
- Walker, Kristin. "Using Genre Theory to Teach Students Engineering Lab Report Writing: A Collaborative Approach." *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication* 42 (1999): 12–19. Print.

Zhang, Yufeng. "The Impact of ESL Writers' Prior Writing Experience on Their Writing in College." *What Is "College-Level" Writing? Volume 2: Assignments, Readings, and Student Writing Samples*. Ed. Patrick Sullivan, Howard Tinberg, and Sheridan Blau. Urbana, IL: NCTE, 2010. Web.

---

**Tony Cimasko** is currently a visiting assistant professor in the English Department of Miami University, where he is teaching graduate and undergraduate writing courses and is contributing to the further development of the university's ESL writing program. His primary research interests include the contributions of second language writers to academic and professional genre texts, and changes made to genres in the interest of pedagogy. He is also interested in other L2 writing concerns, TESOL, research methodologies, and multimodal composition.