A Review of Process-Oriented Writing Research

Manami Suzuki
Hosei University

The purpose of this paper is to review studies of process-oriented writing and revision over 20 years. Particular focus is on research in which participants were Japanese EFL students. Included in the paper are a synthesis of L2 writing process-oriented research and an introduction of Sasaki's series of studies (Sasaki, 2000, 2002, 2005) that examined Japanese EFL writers' writing processes. How to develop Japanese EFL students' writing based on recent empirical studies (Fukushima & Ito, 2009; Romova & Andrew, 2011) is discussed. Also introduced is Fitzgerald's (1987) definition of revision in the process-writing model (Flower & Hayes, 1981a, 1981b; Hayes, 1996), and recent studies of revision in regard to (a) written corrective feedback, (b) the use of L1 and L2, and (c) experience of L1 and L2 writing are reviewed. Based on the review, suggestions for effective writing instruction for Japanese EFL students are given.

　本研究では、最近20年間のプロセス重視のライティングとリビジョンの研究に着目し、日本人のEFLの学習者を対象にした研究について考察する。第2言語におけるライティングの研究を紹介しながら、佐々木みゆき氏によって実施された日本人の英語学習者を対象にした一連のプロセス重視のライティングの研究（Sasaki, 2000, 2002, 2005）に基づき、その他の実証研究（Fukushima & Ito, 2009; Romova & Andrew, 2011）の考察並びに、日本人の英語学習者のためのライティングの指導法について考察・提言を行なう。リビジョンに関しては、Fitzgerald (1987) のリビジョンの定義を認知モデル（Flower & Hayes, 1981a, 1981b; Hayes, 1996）と共に紹介し、（a）教員による修正フィードバック、（b）第1言語、第2言語の使用、（c）第1言語、第2言語のライティングの経験を中心に、最近の研究を紹介し、効果的なライティングの指導法について提言を行なう。

THE PURPOSES of this paper are to review studies of process-oriented writing and revision over 20 years and to provide pedagogical suggestions for L2 writing and learning. Particular focus is on research in which participants were Japanese EFL students because there are a limited number of studies in this context, compared to studies in ESL contexts. A narrative review of L2 writing processes is included. First, a cognitive writing model established in the field of L1 writing research is introduced. Next, process-oriented L2 writing research in ESL and EFL contexts is introduced. Previous research on revision is also reviewed. Finally, pedagogical suggestions for writing instruction, particularly for Japanese EFL learners, are provided based on previous studies of writing processes.

A Cognitive Model of Writing Processes

A cognitive model of writing processes, which was established by Flower and Hayes (Flower & Hayes, 1981a, 1981b; Hayes, 1996; Hayes & Flower, 1980), is common in the field of L1 writing research. The model was formed based on think-aloud protocols in which learners say out loud what they think while they are completing a cognitive task (e.g., writing or solving puzzles or mathematics problems). The model shows that writing processes are not linear (i.e., first planning, then forming, and finally revising) but recursive and dynamic. Writing is influenced by the writing task environment and individual writers' motivation, affect, working memory, long-term memory, or cognitive processes (see Hayes, 1996).

Studies of L2 writing processes are investigated based on Flower and Hayes' cognitive model of writing, using think-aloud data (Matsuda, 2010). In the process-writing oriented instruction, the role of the writing teacher as coach has been emphasized as well as the role of reader and the role of evaluator (Leki, 1990). Research on L2 writing has investigated writing processes in order to find effective writing instruction. For example, Manchón, Roca de Larios, and Murphy (2009) examined processes of writing (both argumentative and narrative 1-hour essay writing by EFL learners at three levels—beginner, intermediate, and advanced) and observed that at all levels, planning occurs in the first period and next formulation is done, although all the learners' writing processes were generally dynamic. Manchón et al. also reported that revision appeared while the writing process was going on. Moreover, they found that writers at all the levels spent about 60% of the total writing time in formation. They also reported that writers with lower L2 proficiency spent more time in formation than writers with higher L2 proficiency.

Studies of L2 Writing Processes

In the field of L2 writing, the influence of L1 writing (Cumming, 1989), the influence of L2 proficiency (Cumming, 1989; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001), and the differences between expert and novice writers (Sasaki, 2000, 2002) are usually examined based on L1 writing research. The results of the studies indicate that L2 writing is a more cognitively difficult task than L1 writing and that L2 writing takes a longer time than L1 writing.

Sasaki (2000, 2002, 2005) has conducted research on Japanese EFL learners' writing processes. Sasaki (2005) explained how she developed her research of writing processes. Based on product-oriented studies (Hirose & Sasaki, 1994; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996), Sasaki conducted an exploratory study (Sasaki, 2000) and then a confirmatory study (Sasaki, 2002). Previous research on writing processes used the think-aloud method in order to observe writers' thinking processes (Bosher, 1998; Cumming, 1989; Flower & Hayes, 1981a; Hayes, 1996). However, Sasaki (2000) used a stimulated recall technique, which is a research technique for eliciting learners' retrospective reports after they complete a learning task (e.g., a writing task) for analysis. Her participants ($N = 12$) were asked about their writing process while they were watching their own writing behaviors. Sasaki adopted the categories of writing processes (i.e., planning, retrieving, generating ideas, verbalizing, rereading, and other) in Anzai and Uchida (1981), which was a study of L1 Japanese children's writing processes, and added two more categories (translating and evaluating) that she had identified in her pilot study. Sasaki suggested that the instruction of planning and writing processes is important. Sasaki also reported that the experts wrote longer texts faster than the novices and that the experts spent a longer time planning a detailed overall organization before formation. The experts' global planning was "based on their elaborated but flexible goal setting" (Sasaki, 2000, p. 282).

Writers' goals have been examined in ESL and EFL contexts (Cumming, 2006; Cumming, Busch, & Zhou, 2002; M. Suzuki, 2009a). M. Suzuki (2009a) categorized Japanese university EFL students' writing goals based on the ESL students' writing goals in Cumming et al.'s (2002) study. The categories are language, composing process, content or topic, general improvement, and communication with readers. The goal of communication with readers (e.g., to make their readers understand what they mean) was added to the categories of Cumming et al.'s study in M. Suzuki's study of writers' goals. Being conscious of potential readers (i.e., audiences in the L2-related community including an imagined L2-related community in the writers' minds) in the process of writing is important for L2 writing (Sasaki, 2009). M. Suzuki (2009a) suggested that writing instruction before formation (writing) influences writers' goals and that writing teachers should decide which goal(s) they emphasize in their writing instruction (e.g., specific language features, content, or consciousness of readers).

Instruction of Planning

One method of instruction of planning is *mapping*. Fukushima and Ito (2009) defined mapping as "an act of drawing maps to represent relationships between concepts" (p. 102). They examined the effect of 70 Japanese secondary school students' mapping on their English writing and their perceptions of writing. They reported that their participants' writing fluency increased after mapping instruction. In their study, students first drew a concept map. Each word was derived by concept from the main concept (topic) of writing in the center circle. For example, one topic word was *travel*. The next two concepts, *school trip* and *trip during Golden Week*, came from *travel*. Then other words, for example, *my family* and *Okinawa*, appeared from *trip during Golden Week*. In the Fukushima and Ito study, participants used their L1 while they were making concept maps. In the next

stage, students made Japanese (L1) sentences, using words in the concept maps. For example, a student made the sentence, "Watashi wa Golden Week ni kazoku de Okinawa ni ikimashi-ta." Then, based on the L1 sentence, the student made an English (L2) sentence, "I went to Okinawa with my family during the Golden Week." Next, the student composed a paragraph: "I went to Okinawa with my family during the Golden Week. I went to Okinawa for the first time. It took an hour and a half by airplane." Thus, students composed English sentences step-by-step from word level to larger linguistic levels (i.e., sentence and paragraph levels) and from L1 to L2. The mapping task that helped students develop their writing seemed to be appropriate for the beginning level L2 writers who were the participants.

The use of portfolios is important for the development of process writing. In Romova and Andrew's (2011) study, 41 university ESL students made a portfolio of their first and second drafts and their reflective writing. Reflective writing included "(a) the purpose of the task, the requirement in terms of content, text or organization, discourse and language features for each of the text types, and (b) what they had learnt from writing the text, what their difficulties had been and how they would work to improve the areas of difficulties themselves" (p. 115). Students submitted their first drafts with the reflective writing. With the second drafts, students submitted another reflective writing, answering questions about teacher feedback on their first drafts, self-assessment, and self-perception of learning. Romova and Andrew suggested that the use of portfolios can raise students' consciousness of recursive writing processes.

Sasaki (2000) pointed out that it takes time to acquire the writing strategies of experts (e.g., rereading or global planning). A 1-year academic writing course is not long enough for development of the process-writing strategies of experts. Thus, teachers' collaboration is necessary in order to give more opportunities for learning the process of writing and writing strate-

gies. Naoumi and Suzuki (2009) introduced their collaborative teaching with the use of portfolios in a content-based course at a Japanese university. In their study, English teachers at the same institution (university) shared their students' portfolios in order to understand the students' progress in English writing and other academic skills (e.g., presentation and research method).

Studies of Revision

Fitzgerald (1987) reviewed research on revision of written texts in L1 education and defined revision:

> Revision means making any changes at any point in the writing process. It involves identifying discrepancies between intended and instantiated text, deciding what could or should be changed in the text and how to make desired changes, and operating, that is, making the desired changes. Changes may or may not affect meaning of the text, and they may be major or minor. Also, changes may be made in the writer's mind before being instantiated in written text, at the time text is first written, and/or after text is first written. (p. 484)

Revision includes "both the mental process and the actual changes" (Fitzgerald, 1987, p. 483). Research on L2 revision has been conducted based on two orientations, product-oriented and process-oriented perspectives. Product-oriented studies compare L2 writers' first drafts with revised drafts in regard to the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001; Sachs & Polio, 2007; Van Beuningen, De Jong, & Kuiken, 2012). In an example of product-oriented research, Kobayashi and Rinnert (2001) examined three different discourse-level revisions by Japanese EFL writers. They reported that English proficiency level influenced quality of intersentential and para-

graph revision but not essay-level revision. They also suggested that explicit instruction influences essay-level revision (i.e., detecting and correcting essay-level errors) and use of correction strategies (e.g., use of metacomments). Thus, they indicated that instruction of essay-level revision is necessary. In their study, writing experience, particularly academic writing experience, was positively related to revision performance. The results confirmed previous research (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1992; Matsumoto, 1995; Riazi, 1997) that showed that extensive writing and revising improved L2 writing regardless of feedback.

With regard to research into process-oriented writing, there are few studies of processes of L2 revision besides M. Suzuki (2006, 2008). L2 writers' revision processes have mostly been researched in regard to written corrective feedback (e.g., Sachs & Polio, 2007; W. Suzuki, 2012). There are recent reviews of research on written corrective feedback (see Polio, 2012; Storch, 2010; M. Suzuki, 2014). Therefore, studies of written corrective feedback are not reviewed in this paper.

In the cognitive approach, writing including revision is regarded as problem solving (Johns, 1997; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001). The acquisition of revision skills is sequential (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001; Whalen & Menard, 1995). The ability to detect problems in a written text is acquired before the ability to correct them. Therefore, it is necessary to develop students' ability to find linguistic and rhetorical errors in their L2 writing first of all.

Studies of revision have examined the relationship between revision and the quality of subsequent writing (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001; M. Suzuki, 2006, 2008), or L1 and L2 writers' use of revision strategies (Faigley & Witte, 1981; Matsumoto, 1995). These studies showed that less-skilled writers' revisions are surface-level and lexical changes, but skilled writers' revisions are larger level and content changes. Furthermore, skilled writers revise at both local and global levels. The previous studies

have suggested that raising students' consciousness of global-level revision and reader-oriented perspectives is important.

Studies of Revision Instruction

In this section, research on revision instruction for Japanese EFL learners, which has progressed in the field of SLA research, is introduced. Hanaoka (2007) examined the effect of 37 Japanese EFL university students' comparing two native speakers' writing models to their original writing and reflective writing on two subsequent revisions. Hanaoka investigated the students' attention to form in the processes of writing and reported that the participants noticed lexical features in their writing and found solutions through the native speaker models of writing. It is noteworthy that less skilled writers' revision was limited to lexical changes. Furthermore, L2 writers have difficulty in assessing lexical errors in their writing correctly (M. Suzuki, 2009b). Lexical errors are typical errors for L2 writers and are regarded as untreatable errors (Ferris, 2003; Ferris & Roberts, 2001). It seems effective to show model writing before students revise, as Hanaoka (2007) demonstrated.

Takayama and Oikawa (2001) studied the effect of revision practice on the writing of 38 Japanese EFL high school students over a 19-week period. They report that the group with revision practice could pay more attention to local errors (e.g., articles, single and plural errors) than the group without revision practice and that the former group could write more structurally complex sentences after long-term writing practice.

W. Suzuki (2009, 2012) had 24 Japanese EFL university students do reflective writing (explanations) about a native speaker's corrections of their drafts and investigated the effectiveness on their subsequent revisions. The reflective writing was written in the students' L1 (Japanese). W. Suzuki suggested that L2 writers' reflective writing on written corrective feedback

before revision can improve accuracy in their L2 writing. The results indicated that writing teachers should give their students a chance to read and reflect on written corrective feedback before revision.

M. Suzuki (2010) examined graphic symbols that 24 Japanese EFL university students used in their self- and peer revisions (e.g., asterisk, numbers, brackets). Graphic symbols in their drafts showed places where the students noticed gaps between their interlanguage and the norms of the target language. M. Suzuki suggested that writing teachers could capitalize on this by asking students to write certain graphic symbols or codes on their drafts at places where they want to get advice or feedback from their teachers during the process of writing or revision. Graphic symbols could be a means to facilitate consensual communication between teachers and students.

The use of peer revision is also important particularly for academic writing in tertiary education (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001; M. Suzuki, 2006, 2008). M. Suzuki reported that Japanese EFL university students tended to discuss topics, content, and ideas most frequently during peer revision. As discussed earlier, skilled writers' revision tends to be content changes. Peer revision can be used for drawing students' attention to the content of their written texts. Peer revision could be implemented in L2 writing classes when teachers aim to direct students' attention toward the content of their writing. Peer discussion in an academic environment is crucial to effective writing.

With regard to the use of L1 and L2 during L2 writers' revision, Takagaki (2003) studied L2 revisions by three Japanese writers with various amounts of L1 and L2 writing experience, using think-aloud protocols. Takagaki found that L2 writers used their L1 (Japanese) more than their L2 (English), regardless of L2 writing level. Using a think-aloud method, M. Suzuki (2011) examined Japanese EFL students' use of L1 and L2 repetition (i.e., repeating words or phrases) during their self- and peer

revisions. M. Suzuki reported that L2 repetition was adopted for hypothesis testing and retrieving implicit knowledge, whereas L1 repetition elicited explicit knowledge. EFL students tend to learn and use L2 metalinguistic knowledge by means of their L1, particularly in Japan. L2 should be used in order to access L2 learners' implicit knowledge but L1 seems also important especially for EFL learners who learn L2 by using L1 metalanguage. According to Han and Ellis (1998), implicit knowledge is automatic, intuitive, memory-based knowledge of language, whereas explicit knowledge is conscious, analyzed, rule-based declarative knowledge about language and metalanguage. Importantly, in Ellis's (2008) weak interface model of SLA, explicit knowledge (e.g., knowledge about L2 metalanguage learned in L1) is considered to play a role as "a facilitator of implicit knowledge" (p. 423).

Conclusion

In this paper, research on L2 writing process over 20 years has been reviewed, particularly studies in the Japanese EFL context. Pedagogical suggestions for process-oriented L2 writing and learning have been provided. Techniques like mapping, thinking of goals for writing, reflecting on written corrective feedback in L1, and revision practice can be included in students' portfolios in process-oriented writing classes. Portfolios could be used for collaborative teaching so that English teachers at the same institutions can share and understand individual students' progress in L2 writing and learning (see, e.g., Naoumi & M. Suzuki, 2009). Moreover, writing teachers can show teachers' model writing as well as their students' good writing to demonstrate the model use of vocabulary in writing on certain topics.

Research on L1 and L2 writing processes has been conducted based on a cognitive model that developed using retrospective data such as think-aloud protocols or stimulated recalls (see Matsuda 2010). Few studies have examined L2 writers' process-

es of revision (except M. Suzuki, 2006, 2008). Furthermore, more research on L2 revision within the framework of sociocultural theory is needed, like studies of the process of peer revision (see Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Villamil & de Guerrero, 1996, 1998) in order to examine social aspects of L2 writing and revision processes. More comprehensive review including both ESL and EFL contexts, or other second or foreign language learning contexts, is also necessary to understand all the processes of L2 writing and revision, which have multifaceted aspects such as social or cognitive factors, learners' individual differences, and genres of writing (Cumming, 1998; Hayes, 1996). This review did not focus on the effect of written corrective feedback on L2 writing or revision with regard to the processes of writing, which was a limitation. More about written corrective feedback can be found in recent reviews of L2 writing research, such as Polio, 2012; Storch, 2010; and M. Suzuki, 2014.

Previous research on L2 writing processes has suggested that writing instruction with portfolios or model writing is effective for learners' awareness of writing processes and strategies (Hanaoka, 2007; Romova & Andrew, 2011). Furthermore, the previous studies indicated that learners' reflection on their writing and teacher feedback before writing or revision is also important (W. Suzuki, 2009, 2012). However, as Sasaki (2000, 2002) pointed out, novice writers have difficulty acquiring the L2 writing or revision strategies of skilled writers. Further research on the effective instruction of skilled writers' strategies (e.g., rereading and global planning) is needed.

In addition, more studies of the effect of L1 use in L2 writing and revision should be conducted as well. As Sasaki (2000) adopted Anzai and Uchida's (1981) categories of L1 Japanese children's writing processes, collaborative research or instruction with L1 psychologists or literacy educators is important to grasp the whole process of writing and revision. Furthermore, more research on primary and secondary level EFL writers, par-

ticularly Japanese EFL learners (see, e.g., Fukushima & Ito, 2009; Takayama & Oikawa, 2001) is needed because English education was introduced as a required subject in elementary schools in Japan in 2011. Research on L2 process writing can contribute not only to English education in Japan but also to English education all over the world because English is an international language and English writing is ever more important for international communication using the Internet.

Bio Data

Manami Suzuki is a Professor in the Faculty of Business Administration at Hosei University, Tokyo, Japan. Her recent research focuses on English for specific purposes (ESP), particularly Business English as a lingua franca in the globalizing world.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Miyuki Sasaki for her valuable suggestions on this article.

References

Anzai, Y., & Uchida, N. (1981). Kodomo wa ikani sakubun o kakuka [How children produce writing]. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology, 29*, 323-332.

Bosher, S. (1998). The composing processes of three Southeast Asian writers at the post-secondary level: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*, 205-241.

Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. *Language Learning, 39*, 81-141.

Cumming, A. (1998). Theoretical perspectives on writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18*, 61-78.

Cumming, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Goals for academic writing ESL students and their instructors*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cumming, A., Busch, M., & Zhou, A. (2002). Investigating learners' goals in the context of adult second-language writing. In S. Ransdell & M. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2* (pp. 189-208). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faigley, L., & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. *College Composition and Communication, 32*, 400-414.

Fathman, A. K., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178-190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 161-184.

Fitzgerald, J. (1987). Research on revision in writing. *Review of Educational Research, 57*, 481-506.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1981a). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*, 365-387.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1981b). Plans that guide the composing process. In C. H. Frederiksen & J. F. Dominic (Eds.), *Writing: The nature, development, and teaching of written communication* (pp. 39-58). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fukushima, C., & Ito, H. (2009). A study on the effectiveness of concept mapping in English writing instruction at upper secondary school in Japan. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan, 20*, 101-110.

Guerrero, M., & Villamil, O. S. (1994). Social cognitive dimensions of interaction in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*, 484-496.

Han, Y., & Ellis, R. (1998). Implicit knowledge, explicit knowledge and general language proficiency. *Language Teaching Research, 2*(1), 1-23.

Hanaoka, O. (2007). Output, noticing, and learning: An investigation into the role of spontaneous attention to form in a four-stage writing task. *Language Teaching Research, 11*, 459-479.

Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. S. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 4-30). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision in foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*, 255-276.

Hirose, K., & Sasaki, M. (1994). Explanatory variables for Japanese students' expository writing in English: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*, 203-229.

Johns, A. M. (1997). *Text, role, and context: Developing academic literacies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2001). Factors relating to EFL writers' discourse level revision skills. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 71-101.

Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 57-68). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Manchón, R. M., Roca de Larios, J., & Murphy, L. (2009). The temporal dimension and problem-solving nature of foreign language composing processes: Implications for theory. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 102-129). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Matsuda, P. K. (2010). English writing in Japan: Toward integration. *JACET Journal, 50*, 15-20.

Matsumoto, K. (1995). Research paper writing strategies of professional Japanese EFL writers. *TESL Canada Journal, 1*, 17-27.

Naoumi, E. J., & Suzuki, M. (2009). Freshmen academic skills and teacher collaboration. In A. M. Stoke (Ed.), *JALT2008 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 549-557). Tokyo: JALT.

Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 375-389.

Riazi, A. M. (1997). Acquiring disciplinary literacy: A social-cognitive analysis of text production and learning among lranial graduate students of education. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 6*(2), 105-137.

Romova, Z., & Andrew, M. (2011). Teaching and assessing academic writing via the portfolio: Benefits for learners of English as an additional language. *Assessing Writing, 16*, 111-122.

Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' uses of two types of written feedback on a L2 writing revision task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 29*, 67-100.

Sasaki, M. (2000). Toward an empirical model of EFL writing processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*, 259-291.

Sasaki, M. (2002). Building an empirically-based model of EFL learners' writing processes. In S. Ransdell & M. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2 writing* (vol. 11, pp. 49-80). Amsterdam: Kluwer.

Sasaki, M. (2005). Hypothesis generation and hypothesis testing: Two complementary studies of EFL writing processes. In P. K. Matsuda & T. Silva (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of knowledge construction* (pp. 79-92). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sasaki, M. (2009). Changes in English as a foreign language students' writing over 3.5 years: A sociocognitive account. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in foreign language contexts: Learning, teaching, and research* (pp. 49-76). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning, 46*, 137-174.

Storch, N. (2010). Critical feedback on written corrective feedback research. *International Journal of English Studies, 10*(2), 29-46.

Suzuki, M. (2006). *Negotiation processes and text changes in Japanese learners' self-revisions and peer revisions of their written compositions in English.* Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto.

Suzuki, M. (2008). Japanese learners' self revisions and peer revisions of their written compositions in English. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*, 209-233.

Suzuki, M. (2009a). Adult foreign language learners' goals for a writing task. In R. Smith (Ed.), *North East Asian Region (NEAR) Language Education Conference 2009 Working Papers*. Niigata, Japan. Retrieved from http://www.iuj.ac.jp/near/publications/pdf/NEAR-2009-08.pdf

Suzuki, M. (2009b). The compatibility of L2 learners' assessment of self- and peer revisions of writing with teachers' assessment. *TESOL Quarterly, 43*, 137-148.

Suzuki, M. (2010). Graphic symbols as mediation for self-regulation in the processes of revision. *KATE Bulletin, 24*, 13-24.

Suzuki, M. (2011). Repetition and repair in EFL writers' revision. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan, 22*, 1-16.

Suzuki, M. (2014). Dainigengosyutoku kara mita ayamari to sono syusei [Error corrective feedback from the perspective of second language acquisition]. *The English Teachers' Magazine, 63*(2), 28-30.

Suzuki, W. (2009). Improving Japanese university students' second language writing accuracy: Effects of languaging. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, 81-90.

Suzuki, W. (2012). Written languaging, direct correction, and second language writing revision. *Language Learning, 62*, 1110-1133.

Takagaki, T. (2003). The revision patterns and intentions in L1 and L2 by Japanese writers: A case study. *TESL Canada Journal, 21*(1), 22-38.

Takayama, Y., & Oikawa, K. (2001). Jiyueisakubun no cyokiteki revision shidou no kouka [A longitudinal study on the effects of revision on essays of Japanese students]. *Kanto-Koshinetsu Association of Teachers of English Kiyou (Kate Bulletin), 15*, 59-70.

Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning, 62*, 1-41.

Villamil, O. S., & de Guerrero, M. C. (1996). Peer revision in the L2 classroom: Social-cognitive activities, mediating strategies, and aspects of social behavior. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(1), 51-75.

Villamil, O., & de Guerrero, M. C. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(4), 491-514.

Whalen, K., & Menard, N. (1995). L1 and L2 writers' strategic and linguistic knowledge: A model of multiple-level discourse processing. *Language Learning, 45*, 381-418.