English-language writing instruction in Poland: Adapting to the local EFL context

Melinda Reichelt
University of Toledo, USA

Abstract

This paper is intended to foster reflection about the development of a locally-suitable approach to English-language writing instruction in Poland. In order to provide background information to contextualize a subsequent discussion of English-language writing, the paper starts with a brief overview of the history of L2 writing instruction, including an overview of the four most influential approaches to teaching ESL composition in the U.S. from 1945–1990: Controlled Composition, Current-Traditional Rhetoric, the Process Approach, and English for Academic Purposes. This is followed by a discussion of the concept of a „needs analysis," where it is noted that needs analysis is complex in foreign language contexts such as Poland, where students may not have obvious, immediate needs for writing in English after graduation. The notion of needs analysis is illustrated with an example drawn from the English Institute at the University of Łódź. The needs analysis indicated that some students of English had negative attitudes and/or anxiety towards writing in English, but some had positive attitudes based on previous experiences with creative and expressive writing. Additionally, it was determined that students needed to learn many skills for writing academic papers that they had not learned in secondary school and that require extensive instruction and practice. Based on the needs analysis, it was determined that the purposes of a new writing course for first-year English majors should be to foster and develop positive attitudes

toward writing and to support students' academic work. The assignments and activities for the course are described. Additionally, a description is provided of the possible purposes that Polish students in general might have for writing in English, the goals that instructors might pursue in assigning writing, and the types of writing teachers might assign. Recommendations are provided for responding to student writing.

A brief history of L2 writing instruction

Historically, much of the research about teaching writing in English as an L2 has focused on teaching writing in English as a Second Language (ESL), i.e., writing that is undertaken in a language that is not the writer's native language but is the dominant language of the surrounding context. More recently, however, a growing amount of research has focused on teaching writing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL), i.e., writing that is undertaken in a language that is neither the writer's native language nor the dominant language in the surrounding context. The research and teaching of EFL writing has been heavily influenced by work that focuses on ESL writing. Because of this influence, it is important to understand the history of ESL writing instruction. Silva (1990) provides a useful sketch of the history of teaching writing in ESL. Silva focuses on what he sees as the four most influential approaches to teaching ESL composition, starting in around 1945, which he views as "the beginning of the modern era of second language teaching in the United States" (11).

According to Silva (1990), these four most influential approaches to teaching ESL composition in the U.S. from 1945–1990 are Controlled Composition, Current-Traditional Rhetoric, the Process Approach, and English for Academic Purposes. Each of these approaches has been influential not only in the United States, but in Poland as well. Silva (1990) writes that controlled composition, sometimes known as guided composition, has the same theoretical roots as the audio-lingual approach to language teaching,

which sees speech as the primary form of language, and views language learning, and all learning, as a matter of habit formation. In this approach, writing is seen as a means for language practice, not the expression of ideas. Language learning relies on habit formation, imitation, and manipulation of fixed patterns. Writing activities involve students' working with previously learned language structures, completing exercises that require them to undertake substitutions, transformations, and expansions of these linguistic forms. Silva notes that this approach is out of fashion, and that L2 writing specialists do not discuss it frequently in the literature, unless they do so to condemn it. However, he notes, the approach is "alive and well in many ESL composition classrooms and textbooks" (1990: 13).

Current-Traditional Rhetoric

The most dominant approach to teaching writing in the ESL classroom, argues Silva (1990), is Current-Traditional Rhetoric — even though it is out of fashion in the professional literature. This approach developed in the mid 1960s in recognition of the fact that ESL students needed to write extended discourse, and thus needed a bridge between controlled writing and free writing. Silva explains that the central theme of Current-Traditional Rhetoric is that writing is a matter of arranging discourse. Thus, Current-Traditional Rhetoric focuses on teaching students to arrange sentences into paragraphs of prescribed patterns, and then to arrange paragraphs into prescribed essay forms. These forms include illustration, comparison, contrast, classification, definition, description, narration, argument, and cause-effect. This approach relies on the use of models and focuses on teaching students "topic sentences, support sentences, concluding sentences, and transitions" (1990: 14). Silva notes that the influence of Current-Traditional Rhetoric is seen in many well-known ESL composition textbooks and in current pedagogical practice.

The process approach

According to Silva (1990), dissatisfaction with Controlled Composition and Current-Traditional Rhetoric seems to have motivated interest in the process approach to writing instruction in ESL. The idea was that neither

Controlled Composition nor Current-Traditional Rhetoric encourages creative thinking or expression of ideas. The actual process of writing that real writers go through was seen as non-linear and recursive, and the goal of the process approach is to help guide students through this process rather than to tightly control the process. Within the process approach to writing instruction, the writer is at the center, and he or she is to develop effective writing processes and to discover and express meaning. The organizational pattern of the writing is determined by the content and the purpose of the writing, not by a pre-determined format. Within the process approach, students write multiple drafts of a paper, receive feedback from the teacher and/or peers, revise their writing by re-arranging, adding, deleting, and modifying ideas, and edit it to address linguistic and punctuation concerns.

English for Academic Purposes

According to Silva (1990), critics of the process approach to writing instruction believe that the focus of attention in ESL writing instruction should shift from the writer to the reader. In the U.S., critics questioned whether the process approach to writing successfully prepares ESL students for the academic writing they must do in their other university courses. The alternative proposed is an approach called English for Academic Purposes, which focuses on academic writing tasks, including specific academic genres that students are likely to need to produce in their university studies. Often, the focus within English for academic purposes is on scientific and technical fields. As Silva writes, this approach attempts to help students produce writing that is "acceptable at an American academic institution" (1990:17), and to help students try to figure out what is expected in such a community so that they can try to "approximate it" (1990: 17). Critics of this approach believe that it is more appropriate for writing courses to have humanities-based approaches and "to focus on general principles of inquiry and rhetoric" (Silva, 1990: 17).

Silva calls this succession of one approach after another a "merry-go--round of approaches," (1990: 18), arguing that this constant change does not "encourage consensus on important issues" or "preservation of legitimate insights" (18). He suggests that approaches to ESL writing instruc-

tion should be evaluated in a principled way, with an understanding of the writer, the reader, the text, and the context. This paper focuses especially on context. Since most of the ESL writing theory and pedagogy stems from the U.S., not Poland, it is important to ask the following question: What approaches, assignments, and pedagogical activities are appropriate for teaching English-language writing in the Polish context? Of the approaches and assignment types associated with the four approaches to teaching ESL composition that are outlined above, which, if any, might be appropriate for various contexts of teaching EFL writing in Poland? Needs Analysis is an important tool for addressing this question.

Needs Analysis

Brown defines needs analysis as "the activities involved in gathering information that will serve as the basis for developing a curriculum that will meet the learning needs of a particular group of students" (Brown, 1995: 35). According to Brown, teachers have been conducting needs analyses informally for a long time, but formal needs analysis is a relatively new activity.

Brown discusses several ways in which information can be collected in a needs analysis. These include looking at existing records and other data; giving students a test to measure their level of skill; conducting interviews with students, instructors, and administrators; holding meetings; and administering questionnaires. Brown goes on to note that a needs analysis can be conducted before a curriculum has been developed, or it can be used to evaluate an existing curriculum. [For more on needs analysis, see Belcher, 2006; Benesch, 1996; and Long, 2005.]

The complexity of needs analyses in EFL contexts

In the published literature, there is little discussion of needs analysis for writing in EFL contexts. Most published literature on L2 students' writing needs has come from ESL contexts and has been based on the needs of ESL writers in English-medium universities. For example, Leki and Carson (1994) investigated which writing skills taught in ESL writing courses at U.S universities were considered by students to be "most useful in dealing

with the demands of other content courses" (81). Additionally, Ferris and Hedgcock's (2005) discussion of needs analysis in ESL composition is clearly skewed towards the U.S. context; like Leki and Carson (1994), they focus on analyzing the needs of ESL students who will have to write in English in their classes in various subjects in a U.S. university.

Although these analyses of writing needs are useful for the contexts in which they were undertaken, it is important to note that English-language writing instruction in EFL contexts is different from English-language writing instruction in ESL contexts. Students in EFL contexts may have lower overall English-language proficiency levels than their ESL counterparts, given the fact that they are not living in a context in which English is the dominant surrounding language. Additionally, EFL students' motivation for learning English may be lower in EFL contexts than in ESL contexts, simply because the students have fewer opportunities to use English in their daily lives. Of course, there are exceptions to this, and motivation is influenced by many individual and contextual factors. Also, if the group under analysis is English majors in an EFL context such as Poland, then the group may indeed have quite high English-language proficiency. In any case, when deciding what kinds of writing activities and assignments students should undertake, it is important to consider students' current and future needs for writing, their wants and desires, their preferences, their proficiency levels, and their attitudes.

To illustrate how these things might be taken into consideration when designing a writing curriculum, an example of a needs analysis is presented here regarding English-language writing conducted in Poland, in the Faculty of English at the University of Łódź. In summer 2011, with the support of a Fulbright Senior Fellows Program, I collaborated on a project in the English Institute with Łukasz Salski, a faculty member in the English Institute at the University of Łódź who has strong interest in writing and who founded the first writing center in Poland to tutor undergraduate students. The purpose of our work was to create a new two-semester-long writing course for first-year English majors. A writing course had existed in the past for these students, but it had been eliminated because a new integrated skills course had been introduced to replace previous Practical

Melinga Reichelt

English classes. However, after the writing course was eliminated, the staff realized that students needed preparation both for writing their BA and MA theses and for writing course papers; there were also indications from students that they were not doing enough writing. Faculty realized that, in fact, some sort of writing course was very much needed. The integrated skills course, necessary as it was for general language development, was not enough to provide sufficient writing practice, especially in the academic context.

It was decided that, before a new course was designed, a needs analysis was necessary. I therefore conducted twelve in-depth interviews with English instructors in the department and with a handful of students. I also talked to one of Łukasz's classes about their ideas for the new writing course. In these interactions, we discussed the previously-existing writing course, the kind of writing English majors need to do in their various classes, and the nature of their BA and MA theses. Students also discussed their attitudes and feelings about writing, which they found necessary, but which caused some of them anxiety. Based on this information, along with information gleaned from examination of MA and BA theses written by previous English majors, we came to several decisions about the new writing course.

Aims of the new writing course

First, we determined that the purposes of the new writing course for first--year English majors should be primarily twofold: to foster and develop positive attitudes toward writing and to support students' academic work. We were eclectic in our approach to writing instruction, aiming to let students' needs shape the curriculum, rather than being wedded to a single approach to writing instruction, such as the current-traditional approach, the process approach, or the genre approach.

We felt it was very important that the new curriculum should foster and develop positive attitudes toward writing, so that students could view writing as enjoyable and meaningful. During the first semester of the writing class, the focus was to be on creative and expressive types of writing that would encourage students to perceive writing as something that could

be fun, that could be used to express themselves, and that could serve their own purposes. We also wanted this writing to be enjoyable enough to help students overcome any anxiety or dread they had about writing in English. For example, some of the writing assignments given in the first semester include a description of a place, the re-telling of a story from a different character's perspective, writing an autobiography, and a short self-evaluation/reflection at the end of the semester.

Additionally, we wanted the class to support students' academic work, including helping them to pass the first-year opinion essay exam; teaching them about academic writing for other courses; and preparing them for the BA (and eventually MA) thesis. In the second semester, students focus on all the steps they need to do to learn to write a research paper.

We chose to focus on these two goals for writing for several reasons: In discussions, many students exhibited negative attitudes and/or anxiety about writing in English. Additionally, some students expressed positive attitudes toward undertaking creative and expressive writing, based on previous experiences with it. Students also indicated that they needed to learn many skills for writing academic papers in their classes, skills that one does not usually learn in secondary school, and that require extensive instruction and practice.

Decisions were made regarding the general teaching approach that might be adopted. Łukasz and I suggested that, in order to foster positive attitudes toward writing, teachers should design in-class work that involved students being active, often including a workshop style in which students would engage in brainstorming, planning, and free-writing. Additionally, we decided that to foster student engagement, students should have opportunities in class to interact with their peers, either in large group discussions , with partners, or in small groups, including undertaking peer review of each other's papers. We found that students who had already had these experiences in their writing class had responded positively to them.

 In conducting our needs analysis and discussion, we were cautious not to simply implement, wholesale, teaching approaches that are used in the U.S. It was important that the curriculum we developed fit the students for whom it was developed. Our ideas were significantly impacted by Leki

Melinga Reichelt

(2001). who outlines several challenges of teaching writing in EFL contexts. Some of the challenges she describes are familiar and obvious, including the fact that classes may be large, teachers may have little training or experience in teaching L2 writing, and students may have little experience writing in their native language, much less in English. But, beyond these obvious challenges, Leki writes about challenges that she describes as being of an "ideological nature" (197) and being "less obvious but more powerful and far-reaching" (197), including the following: "the right to resist center imposed materials and methods" (197), that is, the right to resist materials and methods that come from ESL environments; "the need for dialogue with students about the role of writing in their lives, and the need to make L2 writing enhance learner options rather than limit them, so that for learners, writing in L2 becomes not a pointless additional burden but a powerful means of accomplishing personal goals" (197).

Purposes and assignments for writing in English

In Poland, students at various levels and institutions have a range of reasons for wanting or needing to write in English. Of course, these vary by age, and from individual to individual. They include (but are not necessarily limited to) the following: to pass exams, to communicate with peers outside Poland, for future employment, for university studies (depending on their major), for personal expression/fun, and to reinforce overall English skills. Instructors, whether at the junior high school, high school, university, private language institutes, or in other institutions, should think about these and other reasons that students might need or want to write in English, and should ask their students about motivations for writing in English. Based on this, teachers can determine what kinds of writing assignments might be appropriate for their students.

Students, especially secondary-level students, may be motivated to learn English in general in order to participate in international youth culture, that is, to communicate with peers outside Poland. Seedhouse (1995) describes this phenomenon in relationship to 14–18–year-olds in Spain, who he says want "to see themselves as sophisticated, internationally mobile Europeans of the future, for whom ability in English is vital" (60). For

students who are motivated to learn English to communicate with other English users, assignments such as writing e-mails, Facebook posts, or blogs might further students' motivation for learning English by providing them with opportunities to use English for real communication that accomplishes students' goals rather than only instructor goals.

Additionally, some students are interested in learning to write in English for future or current employment. Instructors can tap into this motivation by helping students write CVs or resumes, job application letters, and business letters. Students might also design websites related to their profession and/or write professionally-related blogs. They can gather information about a professionally-related topic through outside reading and interviews, creating a blog that showcases their knowledge about a specific topic in their chosen field. This will help students expand their knowledge about topics that are relevant to their own lives and goals. Conducting interviews with specialists in their field can help them make professional contacts, and writing their blog will offer students the opportunity to showcase their expertise to potential employers.

Of course, university students might also need to write in English during their period as students. Students should undertake the kind of English-language writing required in their upper-level courses in their area of study. This is relatively straightforward for English instructors if they are teaching students who are studying English, because English instructors are generally familiar with the types of writing that English majors have to do. However, it presents challenges to instructors who teach writing to students in areas such as engineering, science, and business. To foster these students' writing abilities, instructors might ask students to investigate the roles of writing in English in their profession, and the features of that writing. Students can read and analyze relevant examples of such work written in English, and they can interview professionals about the needs for writing in English in their field. Lax and Reichelt (2001) describe an ESL writing course for first-year university students in the U.S. that requires the ESL students enrolled to investigate writing in their major. This publication might provide inspiration for similar assignments in some contexts in Poland.

Some students may be motivated to write in English for fun or to express themselves. However, many students may not have positive attitudes toward writing in English, but may instead fear or dread it. To address this situation, instructors can create assignments designed to decrease anxiety by allowing students to exercise their creativity and powers of self-expression while writing in English. Such assignments may be more appropriate for younger students, that is, students at the secondary level or below, or for students studying English at the university who may simply have a love of language. However, such "fun" assignments might be appropriate for other students as well, especially if those students see them as useful in helping reinforce their overall English-language proficiency. Students might be asked to write stories and poems, based on another text. For example, they might be given a story to read, and then be asked to re-tell the story from one of the character's perspectives. Alternatively, students might be given a poem to read and be asked to turn it into a story — or vice versa, that is, they might be asked to read a story and turn it into a poem. They might also be asked to read a story and then to write a letter that one character in the story might write to another. Students can be given the beginning of a story and be asked to write an ending. Or they might be given a list of new vocabulary words and be asked to write a story or poem, using all of those words. For all of these assignments, students can work in pairs or small groups, if the instructor feels that this will enhance student motivation and enjoyment.

In some cases, it is very hard to identify any specific current or future needs a student might have for writing in English, beyond perhaps passing required exams. This might be especially true for secondary students, whose future is unclear. In this case, writing for fun might be a good option. Additionally, writing can be used as a way of reinforcing students' overall language skills, including vocabulary and language structures. Because writing is slower than speaking, it allows the English-language user to have as much time as they need to formulate what they want to write. However, it is important to make sure that reinforcing vocabulary and grammar is not always the only purpose for writing that teachers put forth, be-

cause this can cause students to forget that the real purpose of writing is communication.

When considering all of these ideas for writing assignments, the instructor should base decisions about writing assignments on students' needs and desires. Instructors should consider what kinds of writing might meet students' current or future needs and tap into students' motivations. Of course, one of the easiest ways of finding out about what students think about writing, and what kind of writing they want and need, is to talk to them about it.

Approaches to feedback on writing

It is important to keep in mind that just as the types of assignments we give should be influenced by the students we teach and their needs for writing, the way we respond to student writing should be influenced by who our students are, and what their needs and purposes for writing in English are. Also, given the time that it takes to respond to student writing, instructors need to constantly consider how to ease their workloads in order to avoid exhaustion.

First, in deciding how to respond to student writing, instructors should consider the purpose of the writing. If the primary purpose is to reinforce vocabulary and grammatical structures, then it may be appropriate to carefully mark all or most grammar errors, and not to attend closely to the content of students' writing. However, giving too many assignments that focus primarily on grammar and vocabulary does not help students see writing as an act of communication and self expression. An over-focus on this kind of writing leads students to see the purpose of writing as primarily to display good grammar and vocabulary. Additionally, receiving feedback on writing that focuses only on grammar and vocabulary problems can be demoralizing and demotivating for students. Fortunately, there are other options for providing feedback.

One option is responding to only the content of students' writing. For example, if the purpose of a given writing assignment is to foster students' fluency, and to help them to see writing as an enjoyable means of self--expression, instructors might assign journal writing or short creative or

expressive writing pieces, simply providing brief comments or questions about what students say in their writing. For many students, doing this kind of writing is freeing and enjoyable. Of course, students should be informed in advance of the purpose of such writing and be told how the instructor will be responding — and why. Instructors should also be careful not to overburden themselves with this kind of assignment, since it can result in a heavy reading load for the instructor. However, teacher responses to such writing can be short and encouraging rather than long and detailed. Another possibility for journal writing is asking students to exchange journals with a student partner, either one in the same class or one in another class taught by the same or a different instructor. Students can get to know each other personally, or students might be asked to discuss course content with each other, e.g., in a literature or linguistics class. In this case, the students respond to each other, and the instructor simply monitors the writing, skimming it over for general ideas and giving students credit for the work. Also, students might be asked to complete individual writing assignments designed for them to express their thoughts or generate ideas for future, more formal writing. Again, instructors can inform students in advance that they will be responding only to the content of the students' writing.

For other assignments, peer review can be a very good way of easing the instructor's burden and engaging students in the writing process. In peer review, students exchange papers or read their papers aloud to a partner or group to receive feedback. Usually, but not always, such feedback focuses primarily on the ideas and organization of the writing, although students can also point out serious vocabulary problems or passages where grammar problems are so severe that they obscure the writer's meaning. Instructors can also save themselves time by telling students in advance that the instructor will be reading a group of students' assignments and, instead of providing feedback on each individual piece of writing, will be discussing in class some of the problems appearing frequently in students' writing. Such problems might relate to a range of factors, including formatting of the paper, organization of the paper, the ways ideas are developed, grammar, and vocabulary.

Additionally, in universities where there is a writing center, instructors can urge (or require) students to visit the writing center for a tutorial. For example, the Institute of English at the university in Łódź has a writing center that serves students who are studying English as their major subject. Students can make appointments with tutors who will provide the students with various kinds of feedback on their written assignments and will also help students plan papers, generate ideas for writing, revise, and edit.

Instructors might also make their feedback more effective and efficient by marking grammar errors selectively, that is, focusing on only one or two types of grammar problems in a paper, marking them directly or simply noting at the end of the paper what type or types of grammar errors the student should work on. Alternatively, the instructor might mark only the grammatical errors in the paper's first or second paragraph, in order to give the student a sense of the types of errors he or she is making. Of course, students should be told that this is the approach the instructor is taking and that the fact that the instructor is marking only some errors does not mean that grammatical accuracy is considered unimportant, nor that the instructor missed the errors. Instead, it means that the instructor is strategically marking only a pattern of error in order to highlight an error type that the student made frequently. Students can be told that some research on second-language writing instruction indicates that error correction is not effective. Research also suggests that focusing on the communicative aspects of writing, that is, the content or message of writing, in itself improves second language writers' grammatical accuracy over time. See Truscott (1996) for a discussion of this issue.

In some cases, it is more efficient for instructors to provide feedback on student writing before students turn in a final draft of their work. In other words, in some cases, it might be useful to apply a process approach to writing in which students write one or more drafts of a paper and receive feedback from peers and/or the instructor before receiving a grade on their papers. Students can thus use the feedback they receive to make their final draft better. If instructors spend a great deal of time responding to an early draft of a student's paper, they should probably

not spend too much time responding to the final draft since, once the student has turned in a final draft, the student cannot undertake further revision.

Grading rubrics can be useful tools for evaluating final drafts. In the appendix are examples of two grading rubrics. The first is one used at the University of Toledo, in the U.S., in an ESL writing class for first-year university students, none of whom are English majors. The rubric is for a specific assignment: a research paper. This rubric is intentionally weighted in favor of areas other than grammar. Thus, it does not punish students for being non-native speakers of English. The ESL students in the class are not majoring in English, but instead in areas such as science, business, and engineering. They must write papers that are as challenging as those written by native-English-speaking students, who are also required to take composition classes. If the ESL students' writing is strong in other areas, such as content, organization, and correct use of MLA style, they can still receive acceptable grades, even with some grammar problems.

The second grading rubric, also in the appendix, was created for papers written by students in the English Institute at the University of Łódź. This grading rubric is designed for a different context from the one used at the University of Toledo, and a different group of students than the previous rubric; therefore, not surprisingly, it is quite different from the University of Toledo rubric. This rubric can be used for various kinds of papers, unlike the Toledo rubric, which is paper-specific. This rubric focuses on different aspects than the one used in Toledo, and it is weighted differently because it is designed for students studying English as a main subject, who are expected to have stronger language skills than my students, who are first--year university students studying fields other than English. When responding to students' papers, it is important to consider the student population and the purpose of the writing assignment.

Conclusion

When deciding what kinds of writing tasks to assign and how to respond to students' writing, instructors must consider an array of factors, including the following:

1. What are students' immediate or future needs for writing, if they have any?
2. What are their desires, preferences, and dislikes regarding writing?
3. What role might writing play in the overall English curriculum? What might its purpose be?
4. Based on the answers to the above, what kinds of classroom activities, writing assignments, and feedback are appropriate and possible for the students in question?
5. What kinds of feedback on writing are feasible and useful?

It is hoped that these questions might not only be of use to instructors, but that they might also serve as guidelines for administrators and other decision-makers as they designing curricula, assignments, and evaluation procedures.

Appendix: Grading Rubrics

Rubric 1, used at the University of Toledo

Grading Sheet: Research Project
Student's Name..
Comments..
....
Introduction that contains a thesis statement that takes a position.   30
....
Well-organized body paragraphs that each start with a topic sentence andsupport the position (argument) that you take with your thesis statement.   90
....
Correct use of parenthetical documentation to give credit to your sources.   45
....

Concluding paragraph that sums up or emphasizes your position. 15

....

A list of references in correct MLA format. 45

....

Sentence structure and other grammar. 45

....

Spelling, punctuation, and format. 30

....

Extra credit for Writing Center visit + /5 points

TOTAL = ___/300 points

Rubric 2, used at the English Institute, University of Łódź.

YEAR TWO ESSAY EVALUATION FORM

AUTHOR: ....

TITLE: ....

CATEGORY		POINTS					COMMENTS (WHERE NECESSARY)
CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION	Does the author have a clear point to make?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Is there sufficient support for the thesis and a variety of ideas?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Does the content always pertain to the topic?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Are the ideas organized in a logical way?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Is paragraphing generally clear and logical?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Are the introduction and conclusion used efficiently and effectively?	1	2	3	4	5	

SOURCES AND CITATIONS	Is the choice of sources appropriate and sufficient?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Are sources quoted, paraphrased, and summarized correctly and efficiently?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Are the citations introduced correctly and efficiently?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Are the in-text citations complete and correct?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Is the list of works cited/ references complete and correct?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Is the appropriate documenting system and format used consistently?	1	2	3	4	5	
LANGUAGE AND STYLE	Does the author use varied and precise vocabulary?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Is the vocabulary choice correct and appropriate for the genre?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Does the author use varied and precise structures?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Is the grammar correct and appropriate?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Is spelling, punctuation, capitalization correct?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Overall, is the style and register appropriate for the genre.	1	2	3	4	5	
	Is the paper free from obvious L1 interference?	1	2	3	4	5	
	Does the paper make a smooth and interesting reading?	1	2	3	4	5	
FURTHER FEEDBACK (IF APPROPRIATE)							

IMPORTANT! A SCORE BELOW 60% IN ANY OF THE THREE AREAS ABOVE FAILS THE WHOLE ESSAY

TOTAL: .... POINTS

REVIEWER'S NAME: ....

These bands could apply if the paper was assessed on the typical 2–5 scale: <60 - **2** 60–69 - **3** 70–74 - **3+** 75–84 - **4** 85–89 - **4+** 90–100 - **5**

References

Belcher, D. 2006. English for Specific Purposes: Teaching to perceived needs and imagined futures in worlds of work, study, and everyday life. *TESOL Quarterly*. 40: 133–156.

Benesch, S. 1996. Needs analysis and curriculum development in EAP: An example of a critical approach. *TESOL Quarterly*. 30: 723–738.

Brown, J. D. 1995. *The elements of language curriculum*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle.

Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. 2005. *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Lax, J., and Reichelt, M. 2001. Writing about writing: An innovative first-year composition program. *Issues in Writing*. 11: 64–82.

Leki, I. 2001.Material, educational, and ideological challenges of teaching EFL writing at the turn of the century. *International Journal of English Studies*. 1: 197–209.

Leki, I., and Carson, J. 1994. Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly*. 28: 81–101.

Long, M. 2005. *Second language needs analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. 1995. Needs analysis and the general English classroom. *ELT Journal*. 49: 59–65.

Silva, T. 1990. Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 11–23.

Truscott, J. 1996. Review article: The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*. 46: 327–369.

Melinda Reichelt is Professor of English at the University of Toledo, where she directs the ESL writing program and teaches courses in TESOL and linguistics. She has published multiple articles on second language writing and is co-editor, with Tony Cimasko, of *Foreign Language Writing Instruction: Principles and Practices* (Parlor Press, 2011).