

The Integration of Sources into Text

Simone Allen

Monash University

1. Introduction

Writing tasks such as assignments, reports, tests and essays constitute a significant component in the assessment of students' levels of achievement worldwide (Leki and Carson 1994). However, the expectations and conventions associated with the work requirements for the successful completion of a course vary considerably according to the academic institution. Indeed, research has shown that variation exists even within one academy between the writing tasks administered across academic levels, disciplines and fields (Freedman 1987; Marsella, Hilgers and McLaren 1992; Lynch and McGrath 1993). Therefore, any shift to a new academic environment does not merely involve adaptation to one set of uniform conventions that are applicable across all disciplines (Spack 1985, 1988, 1997; Leki and Carson 1994, 1997). As graduation is contingent upon the acquisition of the respective discourses of the disciplinary courses in which students are enrolled (Angelova and Riazantseva 1999), a student's ability to read and write assigned tasks according to the relevant guidelines, or to become literate within a subgroup of the academic community, is of particular importance (Spack 1997).

Despite the importance of writing tasks to a student's academic success (Leki and Carson 1994), students, regardless of whether they are entering a given tertiary institution in the same or a different country, encounter challenges and difficulties in the process of adjusting to new expectations, standards or requirements. Given students' difficulty in acquiring academic discourse and the importance of writing tasks to a student's academic success (Leki and Carson 1994), researchers have invested considerable time examining the production of writing and endeavouring to determine what enables the writing of a successful academic composition.

Initially, early studies focused upon the written product and each stage leading to its completion. However, the emphasis of research shifted to examine the cognitive, internal processes activated while composing (Flower and Hayes 1981; Zamel 1982) because researchers identified that studying a written product at each stage of its completion facilitated the identification of differences or changes in comparison with the previous stage, but it did not expose the catalyst of changes nor the influences on

the composing process (Flower and Hayes 1981). The individual writer controls the form of the written product through their inner decisions or choices and the strategies they employ (Flower and Hayes 1981; Stein 1990a). Therefore, writing was no longer viewed as a linear, stage-by-stage process (Flower and Hayes 1981), but as a non-linear process where each mental process or the inner choices of the writer could occur at anytime during the composing process (Flower and Hayes 1981; Stein 1990a).

Further research investigated the role of the writer's choices upon their selection of reading material, for while there are some tasks which invoke the writer's prior knowledge or require the writer to communicate their ideas without referring to a text (Flower 1990), a common feature of academic writing tasks is the requirement that students justify and demonstrate the originality of their position through the incorporation of facts, ideas, theories and concepts from sources external to their personal knowledge or experience (Campbell 1987; Spack 1988; Campbell 1990; Flower 1990; Stein 1990a; Leki and Carson 1997; Hyland 2000).

Although some source material may be assigned, often students are responsible for searching for relevant material. How a student accumulates resources and evaluates those that merit reading may be influenced by their previous knowledge or experiences, which to some extent pre-determines their view on the topic concerned and thus ultimately the creation of the written task (Britton et al 1975; Ruiz-Funes 1999b). As Smith (1983) suggests, reading is "less a matter of extracting sound from print than of bringing meaning to print" (Ruiz-Funes 1999b: 515). Thus, a writer interprets and comprehends the reading material by making inferences based on their prior knowledge of the topic, and this interpretation of the reading material influences the decisions made throughout the writing process and thereby the form the written product assumes (Britton et al 1975; Flower and Hayes 1981). Finding connections between the source text material and the writer's knowledge enables the writer to organise the ideas so that they make sense to him/her, or so that they may use them to support the argument they have developed (Campbell 1987; Stein 1990b). The reading and use of source material therefore plays a crucial role in the writing of an academic task.

Yet, while the reading and use of source material is fundamental to the writing of an academic task, it seems that in the transition to a new academic setting and its associated academic discourse conventions, it is the integration of reading material or,

in other words reproducing source text information in their own way, that poses the greatest difficulty for student writers (Britton et al 1975: 46). Campbell (1987) cites Johns' (1985) account of university students' struggle to integrate source text information into their writing:

Unskilled, or, ...unacculturated writers...often do not know what to do with information to integrate it and make it appropriate for the assignments given. When faced with these types of assignments, my students...tend to present information on paper as they have originally read or memorised it. Therefore, rather than tangled discourse, my students' writing appears to be coherent in spots, because it has been taken directly from the text or lecture. Yet the whole is not coherent, since the information has not been moulded to fit the writer's purposes and the requirements of the assignment (Campbell 1987: 3).

Given the range of processes involved in synthesising one's own ideas with the ideas of others elicited from reference texts (including reading, planning, monitoring, writing, revising and editing), in addition to students' lack of familiarity with academic writing conventions, it is not surprising that students face significant challenges when commencing study at a new institution (Campbell 1987).

1.2 Previous Research on Citation

However, despite students' quandary with incorporating source text material into an original written text and researchers' growing interest in examining reading to write processes and their role in students' acquisition of academic literacy, relatively little research has specifically examined this most vital aspect in the link on the continuum of reading and writing processes even though the most original academic paper integrates facts, ideas, concepts and theories from other sources (Campbell 1987, Campbell 1990; Chen 2000; Hyland 2000).

The majority of research has been based on students' reading to write processes with respect to their first language (L1), which in an overwhelming number of studies has been English (Campbell 1990). Of those second language (L2) studies carried out, most require L2 writers of English to complete a writing task in their L2 to fulfil the requirements of an ESL subject, which may differ from the reading to write activities that participants are required to complete for the academic subjects that L1

writers of English also undertake at the same academic institutions. Moreover, subjects of previous studies have been required to undertake reading to write assignments that were designed for the research in classrooms or time limited circumstances. A classroom or time-limited setting may pose different problems for students as it differs from the everyday context in which they complete the majority of academic tasks. As a consequence of the changed setting, subjects' behaviour may diverge from their usual behaviour (Nelson 1990). More specifically, while students may possess the ability to integrate source text information without copying in an out of class setting without time limitation, this may not occur in a classroom situation (Campbell 1990). Therefore, any data collected under such conditions may not be representative of a student's usual work, or in other words, their writing ability, and the findings of such research cannot be extrapolated (Campbell 1990). In addition, the majority of both L1 and L2 studies have either set students tasks that did not involve the use of reading material or that involved the use of only one source text which fails to replicate the situation in which students usually complete tasks (Campbell 1987, 1990; Leki and Carson 1997).

Although research has compared L1 and L2 writers' performance of the same tasks in relation to the transfer of L1 processes to L2 writing and the processes followed by proficient and less proficient readers and writers, besides Campbell's (1987, 1990) study, no research has contrasted L2 writers' use of source material in writing tasks with that of L1 writers. By categorising examples of source text use within the compositions according to their type (degree of integration), function (foreground or background), location (section of essay) and type of documentation, she found that there were two significant interaction effects. The first involved all three of the student groups (less proficient non-native speakers (NNS), more proficient NNS and native speakers (NS))¹, who used more information from the source text in the final paragraph of their compositions than in the body paragraphs. Secondly, it seems that interaction occurs between the factors of type, function and section of composition because information from the background text was more frequently presented as original explanations and near copies, foregrounded, in the

¹ Campbell (1987, 1990) employed the terminology of NS and NNS to distinguish between writer groups, however, as these terms can be ambiguous, for clarity throughout this paper the expressions L1 and L2 writer will be used in place of NS and NNS respectively.

first paragraphs of the students' compositions than any other combination of factors (Campbell 1990).

On the basis of her findings, Campbell (1987) proposes, as the first of three hypotheses on writing from source texts, that the overall writing quality of a paper will improve as a student's comprehension of the source text material deepens (Campbell 1987). She further suggests that as authority over the reference material increases (as measured by a reading comprehension rating and a rating of self-confidence in understanding the text), there will be a decrease in the extent to which the background text information is simplified (Campbell 1987). Finally, it was hypothesised that source text material will more often function as background than as foreground as the quality of the writing improves (Campbell 1987). Although Campbell's (1987, 1990) results develop our understanding of students' citation behaviour since it is the only study to focus on and categorise the use of source text information in texts produced by L1 and L2 student writers, she studied the subjects' written products, and thus the processes involved in, and students' attitudes towards the incorporation of reference material are yet to be investigated.

Hyland's (2000) study also made an original contribution to the area of source text integration by undertaking a contrastive analysis of the citation behaviour of the so-called 'hard' and 'soft' disciplines, including biology, engineering, physics, sociology, philosophy and marketing. In examining the influence of the views of research associated with particular disciplines upon the reading to write context, Hyland (2000) considered citation in terms of function and type. Whilst Hyland (2000) did not provide as much detail regarding the degree to which source text information was integrated into the text (citation type) as Campbell (1987, 1990), he thoroughly explored the function of citation by analysing it in two ways: firstly, by categorising reporting verbs according to the manner in which writers showed their opinion of the reported information based on the type of activity and evaluation of the source to which the verb referred, and secondly, by employing the integral and non-integral citation dichotomy.

Based on his results, Hyland concluded that, "...the imperatives motivating citations are contextually variable and are related to community conventions of effective argument. Discoursal decisions are socially grounded, influenced by the broad enquiry patterns and knowledge structures of the disciplines" (Hyland 2000: 40). Although Hyland (2000) emphasised that the community to be addressed affects

the citation practices of writers, he also acknowledged that these practices are not necessarily fixed as individual writers may disregard convention in making a citation choice. However, Hyland's (2000) results were based solely on written products produced by academic L1 writers for publication.

The constructs employed by Campbell (1987, 1990) and Hyland (2000) contribute in part to the conceptual framework of my study. However, neither of these provides concepts for the cognitive processes involved when students incorporate source text material into their own text. In this regard, I will draw upon the model put forward by Stein (1990a) for application in the broader area of cognition of reading to write. Stein identified four categories of cognitive processing that underwrite both reading and writing:

1. Elaborating: the process through which readers/writers activate their prior knowledge into the reading to write task. Prior knowledge combines with source text propositions to create new ideas and critical perspectives.
2. Monitoring: the process through which readers and writers check back on the source text and the progress of their own text to identify processing problems.
3. Structuring: the process through which readers/writers re-organise and shape the information from the source text to create a new text.
4. Planning: central process in moving from reading to creating new text (Stein 1990a: 122).

I will employ Stein's (1990a) framework to examine the processes involved in integrating source text material, however, as this framework has not been applied in an investigation of citation behaviour, it may be necessary to modify it somewhat. In light of the fact that the processes engaged when integrating reference material into a newly created text have not been identified and that only Campbell's (1987, 1990) study has contrasted L1 and L2 writers, this study will identify how, and what processes are activated when L1 and L2 student writers incorporate information from sources into their own text so that the relevant pedagogy can be developed.

2. Methodology

To facilitate the acquisition of a more accurate working knowledge of the processes and factors involved when integrating source text material into a newly created written task and enhance the validity of this study, I conducted this research in the natural social setting of an actual academic institution and classrooms over the course of one university semester. I received the co-operation of four L1 writers of English and five Japanese L2 writers of English enrolled in a range of undergraduate subjects towards the fulfilment of a Bachelor of Arts degree. A number of participants undertook the same subjects, thereby enhancing internal reliability. Some of these subjects were related to Japan, while others had no such connection. Although the sample size is small, the aim of this study is to determine as much as possible about the actual use of source text information in tasks produced by students and not to generalise. Hence, a smaller sample size will facilitate the acquisition of more in-depth information (Long 1986: 226). Moreover, to optimise our understanding of student writers' integration of sources into text, an area in which little research exists, I employed a triangulation of ethnographic data collection procedures.

2.1 Journal Study

Diarists in this study were requested to record details of each of the tasks assigned in the class(es) under investigation, their thoughts on the class(es), the class material, their task in progress, the completed task and their reaction to the final assessment. The information documented in the journals will expand current knowledge of the decision-making that occurs throughout a student's reading to write process when engaged in integrating source text material and their attitudes towards the use of background information in their work. To enhance the accuracy of the journals and diminish the participants' dependence on their long-term memory when reporting, in addition to distributing exercise books for the diary, each diarist was also supplied with a pocket notebook to allow for notes to be made immediately so that cognitive events were not omitted, and the diary could be written more fully each evening. As a further measure to optimise the naturalness of the data, I informed the Japanese L2

participants that they could write in Japanese or English or a mixture of both, to ensure that important data was not excluded due to second language difficulties.

2.2 Interviews

To supplement the data from the journal studies, I conducted and tape-recorded semi-structured stimulated-recall interviews weekly with journal study participants during the university semester. In order to elicit the processes involved in integrating reference material into each of their written texts, in the stimulated recall interviews I focused on the written texts produced and provided by the participants, including journals, drafts, annotated drafts, the final written piece submitted to the lecturer and the relevant marks, comments and feedback. Again, as with the journal studies, I emphasised to the Japanese L2 participants that they were welcome to speak in Japanese at anytime or use a mixture of both languages.

2.3 Collection of written materials

As discussed above, students' written materials were collected, including homework, notes, drafts, final copies of assignments and returned assignments with the lecturer's comments and evaluations, to prompt interview discussion where necessary. Since each participant completed their writing tasks on computer, in order to collect their drafts I provided each student with a floppy disk and requested that they save their work with a new document name after each sitting. To assist in the evaluation of students' tasks and facilitate a deeper understanding of the context in which students were writing, I also collected class documents, such as the course outline and task outlines. However, the main purpose of the collection of written material will be to perform textual analyses, in order to examine the form in which information from the source text appears in the students' own text. More specifically, using Campbell (1987) and Hyland's (2000) frameworks outlined above, text samples will be categorised according to their type, function, location and type of documentation. Additionally, following Stein's (1990a) model discussed earlier, it is expected that compilation of all the written material will reveal valuable information about the cognitive processes activated when incorporating background information

into the written task, possibly indicating students' inclination towards use of certain strategies (Matsumoto 1994).

I also propose to have written products reviewed by a panel of raters (to be subjected to a significance test for inter-rater reliability), preferably ESL teachers to determine how successfully students integrate reference material into their own text. Furthermore, to counteract the possibility of subjective distortion by informants and observers, patterns that appear in the data will be substantiated by cross-checking evidence from the journals, interviews, and students' written materials and the class materials against each other. Moreover, it is proposed that patterns perceived by the researcher to exist in the data be confirmed by asking participants whether the pattern(s) concerned reflect their understanding of their own behaviour or performance (Freedman 1987).

3. Preliminary Findings

In the following discussion, some early observations about the processes involved when students integrate source material into a newly created text will be presented by considering the case of one Japanese L2 participant. The case of Yukiko (a pseudonym) will be analysed using the constructs developed by Campbell (1987, 1990), Hyland (2000) and Stein (1990a) outlined above.

Yukiko was a third-year student, undertaking a research project, which counted towards 50 percent of her assessment for a linguistics subject. The task outline distributed to students as part of the unit outline handout provided details about the two options for the research project: a) audio-taping a short 5 minute interaction between a child (aged between 2 and 3 years) and parent and transcribing 30 of their exchanges, or b) downloading pre-recorded and transcribed pages of adult-child discourse. Third-year students who collected their own data were required to write 2500 words instead of 3500 words. In the same outline, the lecturer itemised the elements that were to be included in the final paper in terms of content, thereby creating a checklist for students to work from. Moreover, all students were supplemented with another handout which specifically concerned the research project and gave examples of ways that students could write their aims, methodology,

literature review and analysis, in addition to guidelines for the written presentation of work.

Despite the seemingly clear and specific instructions regarding the task requirements, it was the first time that Yukiko had undertaken a task such as this and thus she was unsure about what was required in order to complete it successfully. Flower (1990) and Kantz (1990) pointed out that task representation, or in other words, how students interpret task requirements, is one aspect of the task involved in integrating reading into writing with which students struggle as they endeavour to attain literacy within the academic community. Students represent tasks when they, "...imagine a rhetorical situation – to conjure up teachers past and present, their [the teachers'] expectations and responses, texts [they] have read and written, conventions, schemes, possible language - as well as [their] own knowledge, needs and desires..." in order to determine what is required (Flower 1990: 53). While Yukiko had not completed a research project before, since she was required to write essays as part of other linguistics subjects, she felt she had an understanding of how to reference and the meaning of terms such as analysis based upon these previous experiences. Yet, the difficulty she faced was in selecting what aspect of the discourse she would analyse as the lecturer had allowed students to choose the area upon which they would focus. She reported, "I don't know what sort of things I can analyse". Thus, even though Yukiko knew what analysing required her to do, she found it challenging to decide what would be appropriate to examine.

Initially, she had decided to investigate the speech act of request with respect to children and borrowed textbooks/handbooks from the library that she thought would provide a general overview and the fundamental knowledge for the topic. However, Yukiko found that these texts were too general and not specific to her topic, which concerned children. Parallel to Flower's (1990) finding that students construct a task representation by drawing on elements from a range of schemes and options, which are limited to those that trigger a relevant memory, Yukiko did not have any previous experience in undertaking a research project and thus being unable to develop her task representation, employed the strategy of seeking the lecturer's advice. The lecturer provided other areas of children's discourse that she could investigate and names of journals that might be useful which she promptly pursued.

However, this resulted in a change in focus as she found that although there was a paucity of information published about requests with respect to children, there was

significantly more concerning parents and children particularly within the areas that the lecturer had suggested. This particular part of Yukiko's process highlights that reading also influences task representation and thereby the written product, a finding that builds upon Stein's (1990a) results, who showed that a student's comprehension during reading affects their ability to write, that the way a student represents a task influences their reading and writing behaviour, and that a student's writing goals bear upon their reading and task representation. Similarly, as Yukiko commenced writing, she realised that she had written a disproportionate amount about one child in relation to the parent as compared with the other child because there was more reference material and decided to compare only one adult and one child. Hence, through the processes of monitoring and consequently planning, as Stein (1990a) found, Yukiko's writing process influenced her representation of the task. Furthermore, analogous to Nelson's (1990) subjects who depended on the social-interactional resources in the classroom in order to define the task further, the students in Yukiko's class were able to rely upon each other in negotiating a change to the task specifications. As many struggled to find families with children under the ages of two and three years to participate in their research, they consulted with the lecturer, who agreed to extending the age group to include children up to the age of 10 years.

During her reading phase, Yukiko created a plan of the structure of her paper. Yet, interestingly, at that time she only planned two sections (the introduction and the literature review), which were the two sections with which she experienced the most difficulty writing. While still engaged in reading, she commenced writing the paper from the introduction and had intended to proceed to the literature review and then to the methodology, but she started the introduction and the methodology because she said, "I have not gathered all the articles so I'll leave the literature review until later". Nevertheless, she was determined to write the literature review before she analysed her data as she mentioned that she would have to compare her findings with what other researchers had found. Her plan for the structure of the essay continually evolved as she wrote points to be included under each section heading. The majority of these points were the authors of articles or books that she had read and thought would be applicable to that particular section. As her task evolved, this included placing source text information in both the literature review and the findings sections because she was unsure of where the reference would be most useful. Once she commenced analysing her data and utilized some of the references, she deleted them

from the literature review, or, if she found that references were not applicable in the findings she transferred them to the literature review. Thus, as Yukiko was developing her opinions and ideas in relation to the task requirements and reaching an understanding of the source material and her text, she was repeatedly monitoring the source texts and her own text, structuring the information from references to correspond with her text and planning.

Perhaps of particular interest were the processes Yukiko engaged to re-organise the source material to create her own text. Firstly, she typed into her document any information that she thought she would need, exactly as it appeared in the source text. After creating an exact copy, which is defined by Campbell (1987, 1990) as being the same as a direct quotation with the absence of quotation marks, Yukiko used the shading function of the computer to place a shaded box around the copied text to show that they were not her words. Once she had, 'paraphrased' the source text information, which by her definition, involved changing one or two words by finding a synonym or turning the sentence around, she then removed the shading. In contrast to Yukiko's definition, Campbell (1987, 1990) characterizes a paraphrase as being an extension of a near copy, which involves only slight alteration of the original source through use of synonyms or change of syntax, as more syntactic changes have been made to the original text. However, while Yukiko's conception of paraphrasing diverged from Campbell's (1987, 1990), the process of removing the shading, and thus paraphrasing, consumed a significant amount of time, as she wanted to ensure that her newly created text held the same meaning as the original text. As a result of this monitoring, some sections of source text remained shaded in her essay until the final drafts.

Finally, she added phrases such as, "according to..." and, "X says" to the paraphrased section of text. In considering the verbs that she used to report the source material in terms of Hyland's (2000) model, it would appear that she did not use verbs to communicate to her reader her evaluation of the source. Yukiko stated that she only knew a limited number of ways to introduce the ideas of others and she employed these in order to vary the vocabulary used within her text to prevent repetition. Additionally, where possible, after integrating the source information, Yukiko attempted to find another reference to combine with the first. The combination of two different sources did not necessarily mean that the two authors names would appear in parentheses following the borrowed text.

In this way, as the case of Yukiko illustrates, when students undertake reading-to-write tasks, they engage the four processes of monitoring, elaborating, structuring and planning to differing extents and for different purposes in the following four areas as identified by Stein:

1. as they attempt to balance the constraints of the task with their developing ideas and opinions;
2. as they interpret the meaning of source texts and their own texts;
3. as they bring prior knowledge into the reading process; and
4. as they apply automated processes and practised strategies. (Stein 1990a: 121)

4. Conclusion

Even based upon the early observations of Yukiko's case, the complexities involved in integrating source text material into a newly written paper are apparent. Yukiko employed a range of processes and strategies and the extent to which these were utilised seemed to vary according to whether she had previous experiences to draw upon, the strategies she utilised and her developing representation of the task. Although it is not possible to say at this stage, given that the observations made were based on the data of one Japanese L2 writer, it would seem to be highly likely that international students, whose L1 is not English, will confront greater challenges in the transition to the new target academic community than L1 writers as they are asked to perform tasks without being formally taught how to complete them (Ruiz-Funes 1999a). Certainly, Yukiko's limited options for using reporting verbs to introduce reference material illustrates this possibility. Nevertheless, it is imperative that we gain not only an understanding of how both local and overseas students integrate background reading into their texts, but also knowledge of the local, historical and personal aspects of the reading to write context that influence students' use of source material so that we may assist all students in assimilating more smoothly into the academic community.

Reference List

- Angelova, M. and A. Riazantseva (1999). 'If you don't tell me, how can I know?': A case study of four international students learning to write in the US way. Written Communication, 16, 4, 491-525.
- Britton, J., T. Burgess, N. Martin, A. McLeod, H. Rosen (1975). The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18). London: Macmillan.
- Campbell, C. (1987). Writing with others' words: Native and non-native university students' use of information from a background reading text in academic compositions. Report published for the Centre for Language Education and Research, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Campbell, C. (1990). Writing with others' words: Using background reading text in academic compositions. In. B. Kroll (ed.), Second Language Writing: Research Issues for the Classroom, (211-230). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chen, H. (2000). Contextualising citation behaviour: Chinese graduate students' thesis writing. In. K. Chanock (ed.), Sources of Confusion: Refereed Proceedings of the National Language and Academic Skills Conference Held at La Trobe University, (80-92). Melbourne: Language and Academic Skills Unit of La Trobe University.
- Flower, L. and R. Hayes (1981). A cognitive process: Theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32, 4, 365-387.
- Flower, L. (1990). Introduction: Studying cognition in context. In. L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M.J. Kantz, K. McCormick and W.C. Peck (eds.), Reading-to-Write: Exploring a Cognitive and Social Process, (3-32). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Freedman, A. (1987). Learning to write again; Discipline-specific writing at university. Carleton Papers in Applied Linguistics Studies, 4, 95-115.
- Hyland, K. (2000). Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing. Essex: Pearson Education.
- Johns, A.M. (1985). Coherence and information load: Some considerations for the academic classroom. Unpublished manuscript, San Diego State University.
- Kantz, M. (1990). Helping students use textual sources persuasively. College English, 52, 74-91.
- Leki, I and J. Carson (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. TESOL Quarterly, 28, 1, 81-101.
- Leki, I. and J. Carson (1997). Completely different worlds: EAP and the writing experiences of ESL students in university courses. TESOL Quarterly, 31, 1, 39-69.
- Long, D.R. (1986). A case for case studies. Foreign Language Annals, 19, 3, 225-229.
- Lynch, T. and I. McGrath (1993). Teaching bibliographic documentation skills. English for Specific Purposes, 12, 219-238.
- Marsella, J., T.C. Hilgers and C. McLaren (1992). How students handle writing assignments: A study of 18 responses in 6 disciplines. In. A. Herrington and C. Moran (eds.), Writing, Teaching and Learning in the Disciplines, (174-188). New York: MLA.
- Matusmoto, K. (1994). Introspection, verbal reports and second language learning strategy research. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 50, 2, 363-386.

- Nelson, J. (1990). This was an easy assignment: Examining how students interpret academic writing tasks. Research in the Teaching of English, 24, 4, 362-396.
- Ruiz-Funes, M. (1999a). The process of reading-to-write used by a skilled Spanish-as-a-foreign-language student: A case study. Foreign Language Annals, 32, 1, 45-62.
- Ruiz-Funes, M. (1999b). Writing, and reading to write in a foreign language: A critical review. Foreign Language Annals, 32, 4, 514-526.
- Smith, F. (1983). Reading like a writer. Language Arts, 60, 558-567.
- Spack, R. (1985). Literature, reading, writing and ESL: Bridging the gaps. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 4, 703-725.
- Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go?. TESOL Quarterly, 22, 1, 29-51.
- Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language: A longitudinal case study. Written Communication, 14, 1, 3-62.
- Stein, V. (1990a). Exploring the cognition of reading to write. In L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M.J. Kantz, K. McCormick and W.C. Peck (eds.), Reading to Write: Exploring a Cognitive and Social Process, (119-143). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stein, V. (1990b). Elaboration: Using what you know. In L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M.J. Kantz, K. McCormick and W.C. Peck (eds.), Reading to Write: Exploring a Cognitive and Social Process, (144-154). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 16, 195-209.