

L

1

2 **Learning to Write in a Second** 3 **Language**

4 ELI HINKEL
5 Department of Anthropology, Seattle University,
6 Seattle, WA, USA

7 **Synonyms**

8 Additive language; Nonnative language; Written prose;
9 Written text and discourse (units of connected speech
10 and writing)

11 **Definition**

12 Writing in a second language refers to expressing or
13 communicating ideas in a written form in a language
14 other than one's first (native) language. A second
15 language is learned after a native language that is typically
16 learned in childhood and used throughout one's lifetime
17 as the dominant language.

18 **Theoretical Background**

19 Learning to write in a second language is a process
20 foundationally and substantively distinct from learning
21 to write in a first language. In addition to learning new
22 global discourse (units of connected speech and writing)
23 constructions, how ideas are arranged, and how cohesion
24 and coherence are established, second language writers
25 must develop sufficient language proficiency in the second
26 language to enable them to convey their ideas in writing.
27 Over the last half century, the broad-based objective of
28 research on second language writing has been to develop
29 effective pedagogical models. Many of these models have
30 attempted to create strategies, tactics, various techniques,
31 and curricula for teaching second language writers
32 discourse organization skills, with a secondary focus on
33 the quality of written text.

34 In the 1950s and 1960s, early studies began with the
35 examination of rhetoric and discourse and idea structur-
36 ing in various languages. In light of the fact that the study
37 of the flow of ideas in writing represents one of the
38 foundational philosophical endeavors in the Western

literary tradition, early analyses of discourse and the 39
linguistic properties of text largely adhered to classical 40
Aristotelian and Greco-Roman rhetorical theory, such as 41
the canonical elements of discourse and stylistics. These 42
examinations established conclusively that discourse and 43
ideational paradigms differ greatly in and across languages 44
and cultures (e.g., Hinds 1976). 45

Investigations carried out in the 1960s and 1970s 46
sought to develop new knowledge based on empirical 47
data, with the overarching objective of providing theoret- 48
ical and practical approaches to teaching second language 49
writing and teacher education. In the 1980s and 1990s, 50
studies of second language writing and discourse achieved 51
a great deal of prominence and began to proliferate 52
dramatically as an outcome of an exponential growth of 53
immigration and the numbers of nonnative learners 54
enrolled worldwide at various levels of education. 55

At present, three broad domains of applied linguistics 56
research can be identified in the analysis of written 57
discourse and text with immediate or theoretical goals of 58
curricular development. In the first domain of second 59
language writing research, numerous studies have focused 60
on the organization of ideas and the flow of information in 61
discourse, as well as linguistic properties of second 62
language text, such as, for example, sentence construction 63
or uses of lexical (vocabulary) and grammar features 64
(e.g., Hinds 1987). Comparative investigations that 65
undertake analyses of similar genres and types of written 66
prose in native and nonnative writing have long been 67
considered essential in pedagogical and curricular models 68
for teaching and learning to write in a second language 69
(e.g., Hinkel 2002). 70

In general terms, an ever-expanding body of work has 71
shed light on a wide range of properties of discourse and 72
text produced in a second language, as well as systematic 73
variability in second language writing. Since the 1990s, 74
much has been learned about the structuring of ideas in 75
written prose and the smaller, the essential components of 76
discourse, also called discourse moves (Swales 1990). 77

The second domain of research in writing in general 78
and second language writing in particular has been closely 79
associated with the rapid development of technology 80
that has enabled a computerized analysis of written 81

82 and spoken text. Corpus analyses represent examinations
83 of large – a million words or more – written and spoken
84 collections of language, as it is used in real life.
85 The widespread computerized analyses of first and second
86 language corpora have radically altered how written and
87 spoken text can be studied and how its systematic
88 regularities (or exceptional occurrences of language) can
89 be analyzed.

90 An inevitable point of dissent arises whenever
91 multiple discourse paradigms or perspectives on discourse
92 construction are at play. In the late 1980s and 1990s, in the
93 third domain of studies, some researchers highlighted
94 the connections between discourse, language, and power
95 in society. Critical discourse analysts have emphasized the
96 need to address the issues of power and inequality in
97 discourse and language pedagogy, which is invariably
98 entailed in virtually all types of schooling.

99 Taken together, these investigations in the language
100 and discourse features of second language prose have
101 identified important and significant differences in the
102 features of writing in first and second languages in similar
103 genres. Research on how discourse is organized and
104 language is used in second language writing has led to
105 a greater understanding of many issues that confound
106 second language writing and its teaching and learning.

107 **Important Scientific Research and Open** 108 **Questions**

109 Research in effective pedagogical models in second
110 language writing has not even come close to the body of
111 established knowledge about the properties of second
112 language written discourse and text. As Leki et al. (2008,
113 pp. 72–73) point out, “indeed, one would be hard pressed
114 to identify foundational concepts that have aspired to
115 provide a single, guiding basis on which to organize
116 writing curricula comprehensively. . . . [L]ittle research
117 and few models of L2 writing have tried to relate
118 curriculum content directly with L2 students’
119 writing achievements.” The evolution of curricular and
120 instructional approaches to teaching second language
121 writing has been traditionally determined by factors that
122 are not necessarily related to the teaching of writing as
123 a discipline. While an enormous body of work has been
124 published on the uses of language and ideational
125 organization in the written prose of second language
126 learners, as well as their social and cultural backgrounds
127 and identities, only a handful of research undertakings
128 have set out to examine what second language
129 writers have to be able to do and how they need to be
130 taught. For instance, in many cases, second language
131 writing is not usually taught as a separate skill, but in

132 conjunction with other types of language instruction,
133 such as that in reading or grammar, or even instruction
134 in school subjects, such as literature or social studies.

135 Generally speaking, a handful of methods for
136 developing curricula and teaching second language
137 writing, including academic second language writing,
138 have emerged in the last half century. These have diverged
139 to varying extents depending on the prevailing fashions
140 and contemporary views on the effectiveness of
141 a particular writing instruction, political trends in
142 academic writing instruction, composition teaching,
143 language learning, second language learning, and
144 cognitive development.

145 In the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, much in the methods
146 and techniques for teaching second language writing was
147 derived from pedagogy in first language composition.
148 In later years, second language writing instruction has
149 striven to move away from composition studies at least
150 to some extent. Techniques prevalent in the teaching of
151 second language writing have sought to address an
152 extensive array of issues that have traditionally represented
153 major and minor foci of instruction modified to meet the
154 needs of second language learners specifically. These
155 techniques encompass generating ideas and producing
156 second language text, organizing ideas in keeping with
157 second language discourse conventions, planning and
158 outlining, paragraph and text development, drafting,
159 revising at the discourse and sentence levels,
160 considerations of audience, lexical choice, precision,
161 and vocabulary changes, dictionary uses, spelling,
162 punctuation, editing, and error correction, as well as
163 using computers for writing, grammar practice, and
164 vocabulary development.

165 Currently, two approaches to second language
166 curricula and pedagogy seem to be most commonly
167 adopted. These schools of thought on second language
168 writing pedagogy predominate in different world regions
169 and are distinct in regard to how second language writing
170 should be taught and what types of instruction best serves
171 the needs of second language learners. For instance,
172 content-based (also called theme-based) language and
173 writing instruction is commonly found in US-based
174 curricula, while genre-based (also called text-based)
175 teaching of second language writing predominates in the
176 UK, Australia, and New Zealand. It is important to note,
177 however, that neither of the two approaches is focused
178 specifically on second language writing, but rather each
179 entails integrated instruction in writing together with
180 other language skills.

181 Content-based instruction and curricula play an
182 important role in the teaching of second language writing

183 to school-age learners and academically bound students in
184 preparatory pre-university programs. In content-based
185 teaching, second language reading, writing, and the
186 attendant linguistic skills are integrated with that in
187 a subject matter, such as, say, history or geography, with
188 auxiliary grammar and vocabulary instruction. In
189 content-based curricula, second language reading and
190 writing occupy a prominent place. For example, combined
191 with instruction in the subject matter and language uses in
192 thematically cohesive readings, the teaching of second
193 language writing can address issues of discourse and
194 information flow, as well as the uses of grammar
195 constructions and contextualized vocabulary. Critics,
196 however contend that in many situations where second
197 languages are taught worldwide, the implementation of
198 content-based instruction may be simply inappropriate
199 and impractical. For example, when instruction in subject
200 areas, such as science or math, is carried out in a second
201 language, teachers often find it difficult to maintain
202 expertise in both language and the content.

203 In the UK and Australia, in particular, genre-based
204 approaches have predominated among methodological
205 directions in second language writing instruction and
206 curricular designs. Like content-based instruction,
207 genre-based teaching also represents an integrated
208 approach to teaching second language writing together
209 with reading and supplementary foci on the linguistic
210 features of writing. The genre-based approach and
211 teaching techniques draw on the foundations of systemic
212 functional linguistics and genre theory. These analytical
213 approaches have informed the teaching of second
214 language writing mostly for academic and specialized
215 purposes, such as, say, university assignments or technical
216 prose from email messages to doctoral dissertations.
217 Genre-based pedagogy seeks to equip language learners
218 to analyze written discourse while reading and to produce
219 school writing that adheres to the sociocultural norms of
220 a particular academic (or professional) genre. Many
221 experts in the teaching and learning of a second language
222 have commented, however, that genres and their linguistic
223 features may be subjective, culture-bound, vaguely

defined, or even irrelevant to diverse types of second
language learners (e.g., Widdowson 2003). 225

To date, research findings have established that second
language writers need intensive and extensive instruction
in practically all aspects of constructing discourse and
reasonably fluent and accurate text. Research has also
demonstrated that, in many cases, crucial factors that
confound second language writing and text have to do
with shortfalls of writers' language proficiencies and
restricted linguistic repertoire that significantly
undermine second language writers' ability to produce
reasonable quality texts (Hinkel 2002). Based on the
results of these studies, many researchers of second
language learning in general, and second language writing
in particular, have pointed out that even school-age
learners or highly educated adults need years of language
training to attain the levels of proficiency requisite for
effective writing. 241

New research and the development of pedagogical
theory and validated classroom practice are urgently
needed. In the end, the overarching objective of
empirically grounded and principled pedagogical models
is to provide second language writers with the necessary
skills for communicating effectively in a broad range of
contexts. 248

Cross-References 249

References 250

- Hinds, J. (1976). *Aspects of Japanese discourse structure*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha. 251
Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. 252
In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141–152). Reading: Addison-Wesley. 253
Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writers' text: Linguistic and rhetorical features*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum. 254
Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008). *A synthesis of research on second language writing in english*. New York: Routledge. 255
Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 256
Widdowson, H. (2003). *Defining issues in english language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 257