Conclusions

Preparing this book and doing the research have refined my understanding of the process of writing but also of the attitudes students have towards writing in both L1 and L2. When launching the whole project, I was well aware of the fact that writing is a neglected language skill and that neither students nor teachers enjoy it. But it was the analysis of the results that helped me better understand the major institutional and contextual factors behind that problem. Submitting the present book, I would like to come back to the core concepts underlying the issues investigated. Concerning the concept of bilingualism, it is hoped that the present study has shown that advanced EFL learners may be successfully treated as bilinguals, namely those who are fluent in the two languages, who "live their lives with more than one language" (Grosjean 2010, p. 20), and who are multilinguistically aware.

With regard to students' attitudes towards writing in the foreign language, the present work aimed to answer the following question: why should they matter to teachers? Can students be helped to become better EFL writers? Researching students' writing practices and their attitudes towards writing allowed me to observe intriguing tendencies. In general, it transpired that students beginning their university education have a more positive attitude towards writing than older students. Writing instructors should further develop, or at least strive to maintain, students' positive approach towards writing. This can be done by an interesting and original choice of teaching techniques, topics and materials, which will not only keep the students interested in writing but also allow them to perceive it as a way of putting their thoughts down on paper and sharing them with a concrete reader, rather than as a tool to display the knowledge without much reflection.

Concerning the relationship between students' writing practices and their perception of their skill in the two languages, it follows that if they tend to produce texts which are usually based on ready-made formats in one language, while writing practice in the other language includes more interesting activities, especially the ones undertaken for pleasure, and makes attempts at various genres, writing poetry for instance, the difference in the perception of the writing process in the two languages will be noticeable. In this case, one language would be likely to be associated with freedom and creativity, while the other with fixed writing guidelines and the need to meet set criteria. Also the instructor's feedback concerning the

students' writing products is of great importance. Positive feedback is motivating for the students and helps them develop a more positive approach towards writing practice. Conversely, with negative feedback, students become more and more discouraged towards writing and they are not willing to experiment in their writing, as all their attempts at producing a decent paper meet with negative evaluation. Last but not least, the analysis of the students' writing practices outside school allowed for observing that there exists a relationship between the students' attitude towards writing and the frequency of out-of-school writing. This relates not only to homework assignments, but also to activities such as keeping a journal, a blog, or writing short stories.

As for writing in L2, another question that the study addressed was: should teachers refer to other languages and writing experience in the language different than the one being studied? Should students be helped by drawing on the knowledge they already possess or shall we rather stick to the language taught? Will this cause chaos and mistakes due to mixing the languages and the rules governing writing in these languages or would it make writing easier for the students? It transpired that teachers do not refer to their students' experience gained in a different language; it was true both for Polish and English teachers. However, the analysis of the questionnaires demonstrated that the extent of the recourse students make to a language different than the one in which they are writing depends on their level of proficiency. In other words, the higher the level of English, the fewer the references made to Polish in writing in English. On the other hand, the higher the level of English, the more frequently are references made to that language in writing in Polish.

It was also found that the students are most likely to turn to L2, L3 or Ln when searching for ideas or planning the composition. Hence the significant role played by the language in which the knowledge is stored, as indicated by Marian and Neisser (2000), who observed that bilinguals are more likely to retrieve events which occurred in a particular language if the same language is also used in the retrieval process. By the same token, other languages are consulted in vocabulary searches, e.g., when the writing process falters as a result of insufficient lexical resources to convey the intended message. Should teachers encourage students to refer to the ideas arrived at in other languages? Should teachers encourage students to brainstorm in any language they know in order to trigger more interesting and more diverse ideas? Or should teachers stick to only one language at the expense of students' ideas and engagement?

As it is known from other studies (e.g., Zamel, 1983), good writers tend to turn to L1 when they are searching for a lexical item that escaped them in the foreign language in order not to lose the very concept. If we treat writing as a way of expressing ourselves and not simply as mere language practice, allowing for the use of any other language seems reasonable as long as it enhances both the content and the writing process. Chapter 5 showed that what the students resorted to in the process of writing was not simply switching between languages. Rather, it was switching discourses or even worlds, as recourse to other languages concerned global aspects such as trying to fill in the gaps in knowledge with the competence

already possessed, even if it was gained through the channel of a different language. This clearly shows that it is not only transfer of language but also transfer of experience that takes place and is unavoidable in the writing process. As opposed to a rather negative effect of Polish on compositions written in English, relying on the knowledge developed in L2 and later applying it in L1 writing proved to help the students produce successful pieces of writing. Hence the question that arises is not if but how teachers should encourage students to make use of experience. The role of writing instructors should be to make use of the already existing knowledge of the students, at the same time drawing their attention to areas which may be problematic, as they may trigger unwanted transfer.

The need for advocating real-life tasks assigned in teaching the writing skill arose upon discovering that most of the instances when the students referred to Polish when composing the English letter was the direct result of the instructions to the task which were formulated in Polish. Such practice is present in the case of the examinations in foreign languages at every level of education, starting from primary school and finishing with high school exams. Although the student is required to produce a text in the foreign language, the instructions to the task are always provided in Polish. The probable reason for such routine is requiring the student to provide the key lexical items that will be later used in the text. However, it often elicits incorrect expressions, which has a great impact on the understanding of the whole text. Bearing in mind that learning a foreign language should be as practical as possible, since its main goal is to help students communicate in this language, why should they be provided with instructions they are not likely to encounter in real life?

Another clash that appears is the relationship between written school performance and real life needs. The task the students were asked to perform for the purpose of the present study was one that can happen in real life, where they would have all possible resources at their disposal, from publications presenting the appropriate letter format to the internet, which makes possible the collection of detailed information concerning the post advertised. This is not to claim, however, that teaching the right letter format is unnecessary, as it can always be found on the internet. Yet the students should be allowed to develop and display behaviours they would be expected to show in real life. In this case, answering the job advert without giving them the possibility to collect all the necessary information concerning the company they are applying for, or verifying their educational experience by going through their certificates, etc. does not create a situation which they may face in real life. The same concerns the use of computers, especially when performing such tasks.

One further aspect closely tied with real life needs is creating an atmosphere in which the students would feel the urge to write a given composition. Language instructors should try to make the purpose of writing the letter as realistic as possible; that is why, apart from being allowed to browse information concerning the company, to review their certificates and to use computers, the students should be given a chance to have their letters read by "their future employer", which could be their classmates. This would almost create a real life need, in which the

composition is not written to the language instructor as the sole audience. Moreover, allowing the students to read their classmates' letters provides them with an opportunity to learn from and advise one another. This transfers the responsibility from the teacher as the only person entitled to comment on the compositions onto the students themselves, which may prove beneficial in the future.

A positive attitude towards writing in a foreign language often relates to the opportunity to construct a new language identity. Switching to L2 may be helpful when addressing private issues by creating a kind of protective shield, behind which the writer can hide. For this reason, opinions can be voiced more freely and topics can be raised which may be embarrassing, which allow for adopting a more objective viewpoint instead of being torn by emotions, which are much more vivid in L1. This is what Pavlenko refers to as "greater emotionality and intimacy of the L1" (2006, p. 21), which may result in "feeling naked". This happens because L2 words are felt to be more neutral, they are therefore perceived as safer. As Pavlenko puts it, the foreign language offers

> new, 'clean' words, devoid of anxieties and taboos, freeing them from self-censorship, from prohibitions and loyalties of their native culture, and allowing them to gain full control over their words, stories, and plots. (Pavlenko, 2006, p. 20).

In other words, L2 creates opportunities for language learners which they cannot find in their mother tongue. It has to be admitted, though, that the respondents reported feeling more relaxed in their foreign language when communicating with another non-native speaker, or when writing for personal purposes.

Chapter 6 has shown that a foreign language can act as a mask: when it is put on, the writer may become a different person. And although this may seem artificial, especially at the beginning, this artificiality may create opportunities for EFL learners, who will be less afraid to express themselves. When doing that in a foreign language, learners are free to adopt a new persona, different from the identity constructed in L1, especially since in L2 they are free from all the traditions and history which belongs in the L1 world.

The opportunity to start over, to become a "tabula rasa", as it were, should be underlined by instructors when teaching EFL writing. It should be the role of the teachers to show the students that with the change of the language they get a chance to become different writers: free of all negative writing experiences in L1, eager to experiment with L2, and not afraid to develop their ideas. Also journal writing should prove a beneficial idea, as it will help develop fluency while creating "a protective shield" behind which the students can hide their true self. Even if the content of their entries includes elements from everyday life, the change of the language will help them take some distance.

The present book is hoped to have contributed a research study on learner identity in L2 writing by bridging the gap between works on early and late bilinguals. Most of the studies on bilingual writers concentrate on investigating their identities in the process of creating texts in L2, while those on advanced EFL learners focus very often on academic writing. Besides, they do not always involve advanced students of English. Concerning such a sensitive construct as student

writer identity, which seems to be gaining in significance especially in the case of advanced EFL learners, it is of utmost importance that such respondents be interviewed. It has been shown in many studies (e.g., Fukada et al., 2011; Takahashi, 2013) that intermediate students of English, despite voicing opinions concerning writing in the foreign language, do not experience the nuances which seem to create great opportunities for those for whom the foreign language does not pose any linguistic problems, in contrast to those intermediate EFL learners who find writing in L2 more difficult than in L1 due to the limited proficiency in the former system. This, in turn, does not allow for experiencing freedom when creating in the foreign language (e.g., Cozart & Jensen, 2014; Kupatadze, 2014). Hence, it is of vital importance to select study participants whose L2 proficiency will not limit their writing skills but which will allow them to experience transformations of self in the act of writing.

Yang believes that "to write well in English as a non-first language or L2, a learner needs to reconfigure his or her identities to include "an English self" (Shen, 1989; cited in Yang, 2013, p. 11). However, the picture that arises from the present study is that advanced EFL writers are usually much more comfortable with the identities they have created in L2 and very often find it problematic to write in L1. Their comments are in accordance with what has been already found in the behaviours and feelings of bilinguals, e.g., concerning their preference to express emotions in L2, as they feel safer in this language (Pavlenko, 2006). However, it needs to be taken into consideration when conducting similar research that transformations of self may be particularly observable and are better commented on by those learners who are fond of writing and who write much on their own for pleasure, which was confirmed in the present study. Those who limit themselves to school writing practices may neither experience nor observe those transformations of self. Hence, a more careful selection of participants is recommended which would take into account students' writing practices outside school to a greater extent.

In this place some may ask why the present research made use of such a formal genre as a letter of application instead of one that would allow for more freedom, such as a narrative, which is believed to provide a deepening understanding of "how people organize and make sense of their lives" (Journet, 2012, p. 15). I decided on the formal letter consciously and purposefully. My ultimate goal was to observe the actual writing process of writing in L1 and L2 and whether the students' beliefs about writing are realized in their actual texts. What is more, a letter of application is an example of a real-life task, which is likely to be performed both in Polish and in English, and which is regularly practised at school. Therefore, the results of the present research should prove beneficial for writing instructors in their regular teaching practice. It was only when interviewing the study participants about their texts that the concept of self appeared. Hence, when planning a similar research project in the future, I would certainly select a genre which would allow for freer writing practice, such as narrative or autobiographical narrative. Still, it remains unknown whether any text analysis would allow for observing any instances of transformations of self. Of course, one may doubt whether analyzing students'

comments on metaphors which arose from the earlier interviews is a reliable research methodology, as it was based on the subjective opinions of the study participants, for which no attempts were made to trace visible instances of changes in the learner self in their texts, which would confirm the students' subjective feelings. But why should writing instructors ignore the students' subjective comments? Why should those opinions not be as important as what is observable in their texts? That is why, the question that arises is: is it really possible to trace instances of identity transformation in actual texts? We can trace digressions (Salski, 2012) or patterns of thought (Duszak, 1994), but can we observe something that is so subjective and so individual as one's identity in a text? I believe that what we can do is to compare texts written in two languages and look for comments which will justify their author's choices. Hence, the most important to consider for those who would like to conduct research in the field of identity is the question of appropriate methodology. My suggestion for a similar research project would be to adopt an even more longitudinal study, e.g., as the one adopted by Canagarajah (2015), in which the respondents will be working on a few texts, and which will incorporate, just like the present study did, interviews with the participants in order to provide them with the opportunity to comment and clarify the issues that they will have raised in their texts.

The research has shown that the foreign language creates the opportunity to construct a new identity by escaping negative classroom practices, by hiding behind the shield of a language which is not native, and hence achieving greater freedom. And although some of the respondents doubt that the change in their behaviour when performing in L2 could be called a change in their identity, some believe that identity is changed the moment the language changes. Therefore, as it has been acknowledged in bilingual studies to date, it is possible to say that also learner identity changes together with the language.

To sum up, it is hoped that the present book will contribute to a better understanding of the complexity not only of the process of learning a foreign language, but also of writing in this language. And although the research results, especially concerning Chaps. 5 and 6, may only be valid for advanced EFL learners with preference to write in the foreign language, it is believed that they will help writing instructors approach the skill from a more complex angle, being more considerate of all the experience and feelings one brings to EFL classes. Writing is much more than simply practising what has been learned so far: it creates a chance to express and organize one's thoughts and emotions, to get involved in an interaction with a reader, or simply to play with the language. Hence, a good language instructor should not only show the students how to produce correct compositions but also how to find pleasure in writing and how to understand oneself better through writing. May the outcomes of the present research be summarized in Brooke's words:

> Being a writer involves taking a stance towards experience, towards reading, towards writing. It involves taking on a particular identity, a way of being a certain person in the social world. (…) modeling a writer's identity, modeling a particular stance towards written language and experience, is a powerful method of bringing students to understand

themselves as writers. It seems a way of instilling in them the motivation to write, to see themselves as writers and readers, to act as writers in their world. A writer's identity, I would argue, is what composition courses should be fostering, for it is in a writer's stance towards experience that written language, both writing and reading, moves from being just a "skill" to being a way of acting in the world. (Brooke, 1988, p. 38)

I hope that the present book will make a modest step in the direction of changing the instructors' attitude towards writing, especially in the foreign language classes. I also hope that they will take this unique opportunity to help their students not only become better writers but, most importantly, understand what kind of people they are and who they would like to be by helping them explore the self they feel most comfortable with.

Appendix A—Questionnaire on Beliefs About Writing (October 2012) (Pilot Study)

University of Lodz

October 2012

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please complete the following questionnaire, which is part of the study on structuring written texts in Polish and English. The main purpose of the study is to improve the teaching of writing skills in a foreign language. The questionnaire is not a test, which means that there are no "good" and "bad" answers. Please give us honest answers, otherwise the questionnaire will not serve its purpose. Participation in the study is anonymous. As some of the participants may be asked to participate in the further study, we would like you to provide us with your name or a nickname; hence, please remember the given nickname.

Thank you very much for your help!

Ola Majchrzak i Łukasz Salski

1. Surname / pseudonym …………………………………………………………….
2. Sex   F/M
3. How long have you been learning English? …………………………………..
4. What was your result from your school-leaving exam (matura exam)?
   in Polish …..
   in English ....

5. What kind of texts have you written so far?
   in Polish? ....
   ....
   ....
   in English? ....
   ....
   ....
6. Have you ever written texts outside the school curriculum? If yes, what kind of texts? In what
   circumstances?
   in Polish …..
   ....
   ....
   in English …..
   ....
   ....
7. Have you written anything in foreign languages? If yes, in which languages?
   …………………………………………………………………..
   What kind of texts?
   ....
8. How would you assess your experience in writing? How much have you written so far?

   in Polish

very little	not much	so-so	much	very much

   in English

very little	not much	so-so	much	very much

9. Do you think that you have received sufficient and helpful feedback concerning your texts?

   in Polish

almost never	seldom	sometimes	usually	always

   in English

almost never	seldom	sometimes	usually	always

10. Do you like writing? Is it pleasant for you?

   in Polish

almost never	seldom	sometimes	usually	always

   in English

almost never	seldom	sometimes	usually	always

11. What kind of texts do you write most eagerly?
    in Polish? ....
    ....

    in English? ....
    ....
12. How do the stages of your writing process look like, starting from choosing a topic and finishing
    with submitting your work? Do they differ depending on the language you are writing in (Polish vs.
    English)? ....
    ....
    ....
    ....
    ....
    ....
    ....
    ....

13. Does your writing process depend on the amount of time you have? In other words, do you write an essay in a similar or in a different way during an exam and when you have unlimited time?
....
....
....
....

14. How does writing in L1 differ from writing in L2 in your opinion?
....
....
....
....

15. In which language do you find it easier to write? Why?
....
....
....
....

16. What is most difficult in the process of writing for you:
in Polish? ....
....
....
in English? ....
....
....

17. Have your English teachers referred to writing in Polish when teaching writing (have they compared texts of the same genre? have they asked you to pay attention to the differences and similarities between these texts?)
....
....
....
....

18. Have (and how) your teachers encouraged you to write
in Polish? ....
....
in English? ....
....
....

Thank you very much for your help!

Appendix B—Questionnaire on Beliefs About Writing (October 2013)

University of Lodz

October 2013

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in the questionnaire, which is a part of the study on structuring written texts in Polish and English. The main purpose of the study is to improve the teaching of writing skills in a foreign language. The questionnaire is not a test, which means that there are no `good" or `bad" answers. Please provide sincere answers, otherwise the questionnaire will not serve its purpose. Since the study will have its continuation, please provide your name.

Thank you very much for your help!

Ola Majchrzak

1. Group: …………………………………………………..

2. Name and surname: ……………………………………………………………………………

3. Sex: Female / Male

4. Age: ……………………….

5. How long have you been learning English? ………………………………………………………

6. How would you assess you English competence: (choose **one** answer)

A1-A2	B1	B2	C1	C2
basic user	independent user (basic matura exam)	independent user (advanced matura exam)	proficient user, e.g. CAE exam	proficient user, e.g. CPE exam

7. What is your attitude towards writing? (choose **one** answer)

I like writing very much.	I like writing.	I only write what is necessary for school.	I don't like writing.

8. How often do you write texts outside school? (choose **one** answer)

every day	a few times a week	once a week	once a month	never

9. Which language do you write in outside school? (choose **one** answer)

in Polish	in English	in Polish and in English	other answer

………
………………………………………………….

10. How would you assess your writing experience? (choose **one** answer for every language)

in Polish:

considerable	some	little	very little

in English:

considerable	some	little	very little

11. When writing a text, how often do you concentrate on: (choose **one** out of four options per every category):

in Polish?

content	always	often	rarely	never
coherence	always	often	rarely	never
lexical variety	always	often	rarely	never
linguistic accuracy	always	often	rarely	never
genre accuracy	always	often	rarely	never

other answer
………
………………………………………………….

in English?

content	always	often	rarely	never
coherence	always	often	rarely	never
lexical variety	always	often	rarely	never
linguistic accuracy	always	often	rarely	never
genre accuracy	always	often	rarely	never
other answer				

………

……………………………………………………

in English:

considerable	some	little	very little

11. When writing a text, how often do you concentrate on: (choose **one** out of four options per every category):

in Polish?

content	always	often	rarely	never
coherence	always	often	rarely	never
lexical variety	always	often	rarely	never
linguistic accuracy	always	often	rarely	never
genre accuracy	always	often	rarely	never
other answer				

………

……………………………………………………

in English?

content	always	often	rarely	never
coherence	always	often	rarely	never
lexical variety	always	often	rarely	never
linguistic accuracy	always	often	rarely	never
genre accuracy	always	often	rarely	never
other answer				

………

……………………………………………………

12. Which language do you find it easier to write in? (choose **one** answer)

Polish is easier	English is easier	both are easy	both are difficult	other answer

………

……………………………………………………

Why?...
....

13. When writing a text, how difficult is it for you to (choose **one** out of four options per every category):

in Polish:

express ideas clearly	very difficult	difficult	easy	very easy
choose proper arguments	very difficult	difficult	easy	very easy
select appropriate vocabulary	very difficult	difficult	easy	very easy
be linguistically accurate	very difficult	difficult	easy	very easy
be genre accurate	very difficult	difficult	easy	very easy
other answer				

………

……………………………………………………

in English:

express ideas clearly	very difficult	difficult	easy	very easy
choose proper arguments	very difficult	difficult	easy	very easy
select appropriate vocabulary	very difficult	difficult	easy	very easy
be linguistically accurate	very difficult	difficult	easy	very easy
be genre accurate	very difficult	difficult	easy	very easy

  other answer

……

…………………………………………………………

14. **While writing in English,** how much do you think in Polish? (choose **one** answer)

<25%	25%-50%	51%-75%	>75%

15. How often do you refer to Polish **when writing in English**? (choose **one** out of four options per every category):

analyzing the topic	always	often	rarely	never
planning the paper	always	often	rarely	never
brainstorming for ideas	always	often	rarely	never
taking notes	always	often	rarely	never
looking for appropriate words	always	often	rarely	never
structuring sentences	always	often	rarely	never
proofreading the paper	always	often	rarely	never
other answer				

……

……

16. Does your use of the Polish language **when writing in English** depend on the genre? (choose **one** answer)

yes	no	other answer

……

…………………………………………………..

Why?...

……

…………………………………………………

17. **While writing in Polish,** how much do you think in English? (choose **one** answer)

<25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	>76%

18. How often do you refer to English **when writing in Polish**? (choose **one** out of four options per every category):

analyzing the topic	always	often	rarely	never
planning the paper	always	often	rarely	never
brainstorming for ideas	always	often	rarely	never
taking notes	always	often	rarely	never
looking for appropriate words	always	often	rarely	never
structuring sentences	always	often	rarely	never
proofreading the paper	always	often	rarely	never

other answer

………

……

19. Does your use of the English language **when writing in Polish** depend on the genre? (choose **one** answer)

yes	no	other answer

………

………………………………………………

Why?...

………

………………………………………………

20. Did your English teachers refer to writing in Polish when teaching composition (comparing genres etc.)? (choose **one** answer)

yes, often	only sometimes	no, never	other answer

………

………………………………………………

21. Did your Polish teachers refer to writing in English when teaching writing (comparing genres etc.)? (choose **one** answer)

yes, often	only sometimes	no, never	other answer

………

………………………………………………

22. What did your teachers concentrate on when assessing your papers? (choose **one** out of four options per every category):

in Polish:

content	always	often	rarely	never
coherence	always	often	rarely	never
lexical variety	always	often	rarely	never
linguistic accuracy	always	often	rarely	never
genre accuracy	always	often	rarely	never

other answer

………

………………………………………………

in English?

content	always	often	rarely	never
coherence	always	often	rarely	never
lexical variety	always	often	rarely	never
linguistic accuracy	always	often	rarely	never
genre accuracy	always	often	rarely	never

other answer

………

………………………………………………

23. If you were to start writing a journal, which language would you prefer to write your journal in? (choose **one** answer)

in Polish	in English	no difference	other answer

……
………………………………………………………

Why?...
....

Thank you very much for your help!

Appendix C—Mini-questionnaire on Opinions About Writing in Polish and English (May 2014)

University of Lodz

May 2014

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please fill in the questionnaire, which is a part of the study on structuring written texts in Polish and English. Please provide sincere answers, otherwise the questionnaire will not serve its purpose. Since the study will have its continuation, please provide your name.

Thank you very much for your help!

Ola Majchrzak

Name: …..

1. What does good writing mean to you?

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Give 5 words that describe writing in English:

   …………………………………………………………………..………………………

   ……………………………………………

3. Give 5 words that describe writing in Polish:

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………..

4. In comparison to writing in Polish, writing in English feels

   more……………………………….

   ……………..………………………………………………………………………

   and less

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………… .

5. Are the processes of writing in Polish and English rather similar or different? In what ways?

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………..

6. In general, is it easier to write in Polish or in English to you? Why?

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

7. If you could choose, in which language would you like to write your diary? Why?

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

   ………………………………………………………………………………………

Appendix D—Questionnaire (Writing a Letter of Application in Polish) (May 2014)

University of Lodz

November 2014

QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 1

You are looking for a job because this year you have finished your studies. You have found such an advertisement on the Internet:

Galileusz is looking for teachers or people who can teach English at a secondary school level in Lodz. We are only interested in people with exceptional abilities in communicating knowledge, who are easy-going, like young people, and have great knowledge in their field.

Please send your letter of application in Polish to:

Galileusz
ul. Ziębia 3A
87-812 Wloclawek

Please respond to the above advert.

Appendix E—Questionnaire (Questions Concerning the Letter Written in Polish) (May 2014)

QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 2

1. Was writing the letter in Part 1 difficult for you? Why?
2. What was most difficult for you when writing the letter in Part 1? Why?
3. What did you focus on mostly when writing the letter in Part 1?
4. Have you ever written a similar letter to the one in Part 1? In which language? In what situation?
5. Where do you usually look for information concerning writing such letters?
6. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix F—Interview Form (Concerning the Polish Letter) (May 2014)

General questions

What is your attitude towards writing? (Question 7)
What has influenced your attitude towards writing?
What, how often, and in which language do you write?
What is your experience connected with writing in Polish and English? (Question 10)
What instructions from your teachers have you received most often?

Questions concerning the questionnaire

What does it mean that it is easier to write in English?
Question 11—Why do you concentrate on content more often when you write in Polish?
Question 11—Why do you concentrate on lexical variety, coherence, and genre accuracy more often when you write in English?
Question 13—Why do you find it more difficult to express your ideas clearly and select appropriate vocabulary when you write in English?
Question 13—Why is it more difficult to be linguistically and genre accurate when writing in Polish?
Question 14 and 17—Do you think in English when writing in Polish?
Question 15—When and how do you refer to Polish when writing in English?
Question 18—When and how do you refer to English when writing in Polish?
In which situations would you write your journal entries in English?

Questions concerning the letter

How do you assess the letter you wrote in Part 1? Is there anything you would like to modify if you had such a chance?
Read the letter you wrote. Is there anything you would like to comment on / change?
What did you concentrate on when you were writing the letter?
Have you ever written a letter of application in Polish? And in English?
Did you use English when you were writing this letter? If yes, how?
How would you approach writing such a letter in everyday life?

Appendix G—Questionnaire (Writing a Letter of Application in English) (May 2014)

University of Lodz

November 2014

QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 3

You are looking for a holiday job. You have found such an advertisement in the newspaper:

This year our city has been the organizer of the International Summer Camp. We need 12 helpers aged 17–29 who speak English very well and are energetic and enthusiastic about working with children aged 12–15 from around the world. We would appreciate the knowledge of the region and confirmed organizational skills as helpers may need to coordinate sports events and socio-cultural programs.

Letters of applications in English should be sent to:

Orbis Travel
Ul. Tatrzańska 55
91-098 Łódź

Respond to the advertisement above.

Appendix H—Questionnaire (Questions Concerning the Letter Written in English) (May 2014)

QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 4

1. Was writing the letter in Part 3 difficult for you? Why?
2. What was most difficult for you when writing the letter in Part 3? Why?
3. What did you focus on mostly when writing the letter in Part 3?
4. Which statement is closer to you:

    A. When writing in English I use the Polish writing style.
    B. When writing in Polish I use the English writing style.

Was this statement true in the case of the letters of applications you wrote?

5. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix I—Interview form (Concerning the English Letter) (May 2014)

Questions concerning the letter

Are you satisfied with the letter you wrote?
Is there anything you would like to modify?
What did you concentrate on when you were writing the letter?
Did you use Polish when you were writing this letter? If yes, when and how? Why?
Why did you write this letter on the basis of the one in Polish?
Writing which letter was more difficult: the one in Polish or in English? Why?
What were the differences / similarities in writing the two letters?

Final questions

What does it mean that when writing in …………… you use the writing style used in …………..?
Why do you use the writing style used in …………….?
Would the change of genre (e.g. email, journal entry, essay, research paper) have resulted in different results / answers?
Can we say that you did not have any format of an application letter either in English or in Polish coded in your memory?
In your opinion, is there a relation between the easiness of writing in a given genre and switching between the languages versus the knowledge and the language through which the knowledge was gained?

Appendix J—Questionnaire on Writing in Polish (January 2015)

University of Lodz
January 2015

QUESTIONNAIRE

Below there is a list of 25 items concerning different aspects connected with writing. For each item please mark (by circling) one of the numbers given (extreme values are given next to every item), which express how you assess writing in Polish from the perspective of yourself as a writer.

To me, writing in Polish is…

1	Easy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Difficult
2	Unsatisfying	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Satisfying
3	Boring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Interesting
4	Depressing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inspiring
5	Schematic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Creative
6	Imitative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Explorative
7	Impersonal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Personal
8	Intuitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Learned
9	Natural	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Artificial
10	Spontaneous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Forced
11	Limiting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Liberating
12	Obligatory	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Voluntary
13	Clear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Vague
14	Disturbing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relaxing
15	Organized	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Chaotic
16	Concise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wordy
17	Coherent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Incoherent
18	Unaesthetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Aesthetic
19	Literal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Metaphorical

(continued)

20	Simple	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Complex
21	A suffering	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A pleasure
22	Frustration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Happiness
23	Confinement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Freedom
24	A routine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A challenge
25	A craft	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	An art

Appendix K—Questionnaire on Writing in English (March 2015)

University of Lodz
March 2015

QUESTIONNAIRE

Below there is a list of 25 items concerning different aspects connected with writing. For each item please mark (by circling) one of the numbers given (extreme values are given next to every item), which express how you assess writing in English from the perspective of yourself as a writer.

To me, writing in English is…

1	Easy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Difficult
2	Unsatisfying	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Satisfying
3	Boring	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Interesting
4	Depressing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inspiring
5	Schematic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Creative
6	Imitative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Explorative
7	Impersonal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Personal
8	Intuitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Learned
9	Natural	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Artificial
10	Spontaneous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Forced
11	Limiting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Liberating
12	Obligatory	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Voluntary
13	Clear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Vague
14	Disturbing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Relaxing
15	Organized	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Chaotic
16	Concise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Wordy
17	Coherent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Incoherent
18	Unaesthetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Aesthetic
19	Literal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Metaphorical

(continued)

20	Simple	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Complex
21	A suffering	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A pleasure
22	Frustration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Happiness
23	Confinement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Freedom
24	A routine	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A challenge
25	A craft	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	An art

Appendix L—A Guide on How to Compose Reflections About Writing (January 2015)

University of Lodz

January 2015

<u>Reflections concerning writing—instructions</u>

When analyzing the results of the questionnaire on writing and the conversations that took place after you wrote the letters of application, I came to the conclusion that your comments on writing in both languages largely depend on how you feel in the language, what are your experiences concerning writing, and the situations you write in. All these factors make up your identity, namely the identity of the person writing in a given language.

Because not all the conversations have allowed me to touch the aspects of identity which were interesting for me, I would like you to share with me your insights on the role of identity in the writing process. I hope that your reflections will help me better understand your choices and perceptions of the writing process.

The first aspect of interest to me is

Language as a protective shield

I would like you to share with me your reflections on this subject in the context of the writer's identity. I am interested in your comments on writing in both languages.

The language you use to describe your own reflections is up to you; it is also possible to switch between the languages if you consider it necessary.

I have not set a word limit concerning your reflections. It seems to me that you will know whether the topic has been exhausted.

Please send the completed electronic entries to my email address: olaremblewska@tlen.pl by Sunday, January 18, 2015.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Arndt, V. (1987). Six writers in search of texts: A protocol-based study of L1 and L2 writing. *ELT Journal, 41,* 257–267.

Arthur, J., & Martin, P. (2006). Accomplishing lessons in post-colonial classrooms comparative perspectives from Botswana and Brunei Darussalam. *Comparative Education, 42*(2), 177–202.

Atkinson, D. (Ed.). (2011). *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition*. London/New York: Routledge.

Baaijen, V. M., Galbraith, D., & de Glopper, K. (2014). Effects of writing beliefs and planning on writing performance. *Learning and Instruction, 33,* 81–91.

Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Baker, C. (2003). Biliteracy and transliteracy in Wales: Language planning and the Welsh National Curriculum. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research and practice in multilingual settings* (pp. 71–90). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2010). Increasing bilingualism in bilingual education. In D. Morris (Ed.), *Welsh in the 21st century* (pp. 61–79). Cardiff, UK: University of Wales Press.

Baker, C. (2011/2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic imagination: Four essays*. In M. Holquist (Ed.) C. Emerson & M. Holquist (transl.). Austin/London: University of Texas Press.

Barcelos, A. M. F. (2003). Researching beliefs about SLA: A critical review. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA. New research approaches* (pp. 7–29). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Baron-Cohen, S. (2003). *The essential difference: Men, women and the extreme male brain*. Penguin/Basic Books.

Baumeister, R. F. (1997). Identity, self-concept, and self-esteem: The self lost and found. In R. Hogan & J. A. Johnson (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 681–710). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Beare, S., & Bourdages, J. S. (2007). Skilled writers' generating strategies in L1 and L2: An exploratory study. In G. Rijlaarsdam (Series Ed.), M. Torrance, L. Van Waes & D. Galbraith (Eds.), *Studies in writing Vol. 20. Writing and cognition: Research and applications* (pp. 151–161). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Belz, J. (2002). Second language play as a representation of the multicompetent self in foreign language study. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 1*(1), 13–39.

Benet-Martínez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. (2002). Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame-switching in biculturals with "oppositional" vs. "compatible" cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33,* 492–516.

Benson, P., & Nunan, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Learners' stories: Difference and diversity in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Beres, A. M. (2015). An overview of translanguaging. 20 years of 'giving advice to those who do not speak'. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts, 1*(1), 103–118.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social construction of reality: A Treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Berman, R. (1994). Learners' transfer of writing skills between languages. *TESL Canada Journal, 12*(1), 29–46.

Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London, UK: Continuum.

Block, D. (2007a). *Second language identities*. London/New York: Continuum.

Block, D. (2007b). The rise of identity in SLA research, post Firth and Wagner (1997). *The Modern Language Journal, 91,* 863–876.

Block, D. (2013). Issues in language and identity research in applied linguistics. *ELIA (Estudios delingüística inglesa aplicada), 13,* 11–46.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.

Borg, M. (2001). Teachers' beliefs. *ELT Journal, 55*(2), 186–188.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Nice, R. (transl.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. London/ Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Bowden, D. (1999). *The mythology of voice*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook.

Brooke, R. (1988). Modeling a writer's identity: Reading and imitation in the writing classroom. *College Composition and Communication, 39*(1), 23–41.

Bruner, J. (1991). Self-making and world-making. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education, 25*(1), 67–78.

Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7*(3), 398–416.

Burwitz-Melzer, E., Königs, F., & Riemer, C. (Eds.). *Identität und Fremdsprachenlernen Anmerkungen zu einer komplexen Beziehung*. Tübingen: Narr.

Buxbaum, E. (1949). The role of a second language in the formation of ego and superego. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 18,* 279–289.

Byram, M. (1990). Intercultural education and foreign language teaching. *World Studies Journal, 1*(7), 4–7.

Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *Modern Language Journal, 91,* 923–939.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 401–417.

Canagarajah, S. (2015). 'Blessed in my own way:' Pedagogical affordances for dialogical voice construction in multilingual student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 27,* 122–139.

Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing. Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Casanave, C. P. (2011). *Journal writing in second language education*. The University of Michigan Press.

Cenoz, J. (2009). *Towards multilingual education*. Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2011). Focus on multilingualism: A study of trilingual writing. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 356–369.

Cenoz, J., & Jessner, U. (2009). The study of multilingualism in educational contexts. In L. Aronin & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), *The exploration of multilingualism* (pp. 121–138). Amsterdam/ Philadephia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Centeno-Cortés, B., & Jiménez Jiménez, A. (2004). Problem-solving tasks in a foreign language: The importance of the L1 in private verbal thinking. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 14,* 7–35.

Chelala, S. (1981). *The composing process of two Spanish speakers and the coherence of their texts: A case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York University.

Chen, S. X., Benet-Martínez, V., & Bond, M. H. (2008). Bicultural identity, bilingualism, and psychological adjustment in multicultural societies: Immigration-based and globalization-based acculturation. *Journal of Personality, 76,* 803–838.

Chen, S. X., & Bond, M. H. (2010). Two languages, two personalities? Examining language effects on the expression of personality in a bilingual context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*(11), 1514–1528.

Cheng, T.-P. (2013). Codeswitching and participant orientations in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 97*(4), 869–886.

Chiang, Y., & Schmida, M. (1999). Language identity and language ownership: Linguistic conflicts of first-year writing students. In L. Harklau, K. Losey, & M. Siegel (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to U.S.-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 81–96). Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.

Chłopek, Z. (2011). *Nabywanie języków trzecich i kolejnych oraz wielojęzyczność. Aspekty psycholingwistyczne (i inne)*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Ciepiela, K. (2013). *EFL teacher identity: From mental representation to situated performance*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Cohen, A. D., & Brooks-Carson, A. (2001). Research on direct versus translated writing: Students' strategies and their results. *The Modern Language Journal, 85,* 169–188.

Combs, A. W. (1962). *Perceiving, behaving, becoming: A new focus for education*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Connor, U. (1999). Learning to write academic prose in a second language: A literacy autobiography. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 29–42). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Connor, U., Davis, K. W., & De Rycker, T. (1995). Correctness and clarity in applying for overseas jobs: A cross-cultural analysis of US and Flemish applications. *Text, 15*(4), 457–475.

Cook, V. (2008). Multi-competence: Black hole or wormhole for second language acquisition research? In Z. H. Han (Ed.), *Understanding second language process* (pp. 16–26). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cook, V. J. (1991). The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument and multi-competence. *Second Language Research, 7*(2), 103–117.

Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multi-competence. *Language Learning, 42*(4), 557–591.

Cook, V. J. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33,* 185–209.

Cook, V. J. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(3), 402–423.

Cook, V. J. (Ed.). (2003). *Effects of the second language on the first*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Costino, K., & Hyon, S. (2011). Sidestepping our *scare words*: Genre as a possible bridge between L1 and L2 compositionists. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20,* 24–44.

Council of Europe http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/Division_EN.asp.

Cozart, S., & Jensen, T. (2014). *Opportunities and challenges of writing in a second language*. Paper presented at Conference on Writing Research Across Borders. Paris, France, 19-22.02.2014.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 103–115.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2015). Translanguaging and identity in educational settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 35,* 20–35.

Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. *Language Learning, 39*(1), 81–141.

Cummins, G. S. (1994). Coming to voice. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry* (pp. 48–60). National Council of Teachers of English.

Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 89,* 585–592.

Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 5. Bilingual Education* (pp. 65–75). Boston: Springer Science + Business Media.

Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1999). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. In R. Harré & L. van Langehove (Eds.), *Positioning theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

De Angelis, G., & Jessner, U. (2012). Writing across languages in a bilingual context: A dynamic systems Theory approach. In R. Manchón (Ed.), *L2 writing development: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 47–68). Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

de Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic systems theory approach to second language learning. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 10*(1), 7–21.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2004). Blistering barnacles! What language do multilinguals swear in?! *Estudios de Sociolinguistica, 5*(1), 83–105.

Dewaele, J.-M. (2004). The emotional force of swearwords and taboo words in the speech of multilinguals. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 25*(2&3), 204–222.

Dewaele, J.-M., & Pavlenko, A. (2003). Productivity and lexical diversity in native and non-native speech: A study of cross-cultural effects. In V. J. Cook (Ed.), *Effects of the second language on the first* (pp. 120–141). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Learning, 31* (3), 117–135.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Duszak, A. (1994). Academic discourse and intellectual styles. *Journal of Pragmatics, 21,* 291–313.

Edwards, J. (2010). *Language diversity in the classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Edwards, J. (2013). Bilingualism and multilingualism: Some central concepts. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism* (pp. 5–25). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Elbow, P. (1994). What do we mean when we talk about voice in texts? In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry* (pp. 1–35). National Council of Teachers of English.

Epstein, E. (1915). *La pensée et la polyglossie: Essai psychologique et didactique*. Payot.

Ernest, P. (1989). The knowledge, beliefs and attitudes of the mathematics teacher: A model. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 15,* 13–34.

Fisher, L. D., & van Belle, G. (1993). *Biostatistics. A methodology for the health sciences*. New York: Wiley.

Ford, C., Fox, B., & Thompson, S. (2003). Social interaction and grammar. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The new psychology of language vol. 2* (pp. 119–144). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Franceschini, R. (2011). Multilingualism and multicompetence: A conceptual view. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(3), 344–355.

Friedlander, A. (1990). Composing in English: Effects of a first language on writing in English as a second language. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 109–125). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fukada, Y., Fukuda, T., Falout, J., & Murphey, T. (2011). Increasing motivation with possible selves. In A. Stewart (Ed.), *JALT 2010 conference proceedings* (pp. 337–349). Tokyo: JALT.

Fulwiler, T. (1994). Claiming my voice. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry* (pp. 36–47). National Council of Teachers of English.

Fulwiler, T. (Ed.). (1987). *The journal book*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Gale, X. L. (1994). Conversing across cultural boundaries: Rewriting 'self'. *Journal of Advanced Composition, 14,* 455–462.

Galloway, N. (2013). Global English and English Language Teaching (ELT)—Bridging the gap between theory and practice in a Japanese context. *System, 41,* 786–803.

García, O. (2014). Countering the dual: Transglossia, dynamic bilingual and translanguaging in education. In R. Rubdy & L. Alsagoff (Eds.), *The global-local interface, language choice and hybridity* (pp. 100–118). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In A. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson, & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.), *Multilingual education for social justice: Globalising the local* (pp. 140–158). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

García, O., Homonoff Woodley, H., Flores, N., & Chu, H. (2012). Latino emergent bilingual youth in high schools: Transcaring strategies for academic success. *Urban Education, 48*(6), 798–827.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism, and education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books Inc.

Gaskill, W. H. (1986). *Revising in Spanish and English: A process oriented study of composition*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of California, Los Angeles.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *Introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Gibson, W. (1969). *Persona: A style study for readers and writers*. New York: Random House.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Gleick, J. (1987). *Chaos: Making a new science*. Viking Penguin.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. London & New York: Longman.

Graham, R. (1999). The self as writer: Assumptions and identities in the writing workshop. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 43*(4), 358–364.

Graham, S., Schwartz, S. S., & MacArthur, C. A. (1993). Knowledge of writing and the composing process, attitude toward writing, and self-efficacy for students with and without learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 26,* 237–249.

Granger, C. A. (2004). *Silence in second language acquisition: A psychoanalytic reading*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Gravelle, M. (1996). *Supporting bilingual learners in schools*. Stoke-on Trent, UK: Trentham Books.

Greenson, R. (1950). The mother tongue and the mother. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 31,* 18–23.

Grosjean, F. (1985). The bilingual as a competent but specific speaker-hearer. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 6*(6), 467–477.

Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual. Life and reality*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Gunnarson, T., Housen, A., van de Weijer, J., & Källkvist, M. (2015). Multilingual students' self-reported use of their language repertoires when writing in English. *Apples—Journal of Applied Language Studies, 9*(1), 1–21.

Guo, Ch J, & Liu, F. (1997). The influence of mother tongue in foreign language writing. *Modern Foreign Language, 4,* 30–38.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher, 75*(5), 5–12.

Halasek, K. (1999). *A pedagogy of possibility: Bakhtinian perspectives on composition studies*. Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across languages. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(1), 43–60.

Hall, S. (1995). Fantasy, identity, and politics. In E. Carter, J. Donald, & J. Squires (Eds.), *Cultural remix: Theories of politics and the popular* (pp. 63–69). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hall, K. J., Cheng, A., & Carlson, M. T. (2006). Reconceptualising multi-competence as a theory of language knowledge. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(2), 220–240.

Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behaviour*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hawthorne, S. (2008). Students' beliefs about barriers to engagement with writing in secondary school English: A focus group study. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 31*(1), 30–42.

Hemmi, Ch. (2014). Dual identities perceived by bilinguals. In S. Mercer & M. Williams (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on the self in SLA* (pp. 75–91). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism. Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Multilingual Matters.

Hirvela, A., & Belcher, D. (2001). Coming back to voice: The multiple voices and identities of mature multilingual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10,* 83–106.

Holland, D., & Lave, J. (Eds.). (2001). *History in person: Enduring struggles, contentious practice, intimate identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Holland, D., Skinner, D., Lachiotte, W., & Cain, C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hosmer, D. W., & Lemeshow, S. (1989). *Applied logistic regression*. New York: Wiley.

Huang, W. (2011). The EFL learner identity development: A perspective of metaphor. *International Journal of Innovative Interdisciplinary Research, 1,* 1–13.

Huston, N. (2002). *Losing North: Musings on land, tongue and self*. McArthur & Company.

Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity. The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(1/2), 3–33.

James, C., Scholfield, P., & Ypsiladis, G. (1994). Cross-cultural correspondence. *World Englishes, 13*(3), 325–340.

Javier, R. A. (2007). *The bilingual mind. Thinking, feeling and speaking in two languages*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 200–207.

Jenkins, S., & Hinds, J. (1987). Business letter writing: English, French and Japanese. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(2), 327–349.

Jespersen, O. (1922). *Language: Its nature, development and origin*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Jones, S., & Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), *Writing in real time* (pp. 34–57). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Journet, D. (2012). Narrative turns in writing studies research. In L. Nickoson & M. P. Sherida (Eds.), *Writing studies research in practice. Methods and methodologies* (pp. 13–24). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolingusitic realism: The English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kalaja, P., & Barcelos, A. M. F. (2003). Introduction. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA. New research approaches* (pp. 1–4). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Källkvist, M. (2013). Languaging in translation tasks used in a university setting: Particular potential for student agency? *The Modern Language Journal, 97*(1), 217–238.

Källkvist, M. (2013b). The engaging nature of translation: A nexus analysis of student-teacher interaction. In N. Tsagari & G. Flores (Eds.) *Translation in language teaching and assessment* (pp. 115–134). Newcastle upon Tyne. Cambridge Scholars.

Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning, 16*(1), 1–20.

Kear, D. J., Coffman, G. A., McKenna, M. C., & Ambrosio, A. L. (2000). Measuring attitude toward writing: A new tool for teachers. *The Reading Teacher, 54*(1), 10–23.

Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (2000). *Foreign language and mother tongue*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kemp, Ch. (2009). Defining multilingualism. In L. Aronin & B. Hufeisen (Eds.), *The exploration of multilingualism* (pp. 11–26). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Klaus, C. H. (1994). The chameleon "I": On voice and personality in the personal essay. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry* (pp. 111–129). National Council of Teachers of English.

Knutson, E. M. (2006). Thinking in English, writing in French. *The French Review, 80*(1), 88–109.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2013). L1/L2/L3 writing development: Longitudinal case study of a Japanese multicompetent write. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*(1), 4–33.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2012). Understanding L2 writing development from a multicompetence perspective: Dynamic repertoires of knowledge and text construction. In R. Manchón (Ed.), *L2 writing development: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 101–134). Boston/Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (1992). Effects of first language on second language writing: Translation versus direct composition. *Language Learning, 42,* 183–215.

Koven, M. (2006). Feeling in two languages: A comparative analysis of a bilingual's affective displays in French and Portuguese. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression and representation* (pp. 84–117). New York, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C., & Lam, W. S. E. (1999). Textual identities: The importance of being non-native. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 57–72). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2007). Three fundamental concepts in SLA and their relevance in multilingual contexts. *Modern Language Journal, 91,* 905–920.

Krapels, A. (1990). An overview of second language writing process research. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 37–56). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Krapf, E. (1955). The choice of language in polyglot psychoanalysis. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 24,* 343–357.

Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of L1-L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(1), 69–100.

Kupatadze, K. (2014). *Opportunities and challenges of writing in a second language*. Paper presented at Conference on Writing Research Across Borders. Paris, France, 19–22.02.2014.

Kuziak, M., & Rzepczyński, S. (2008). *Jak pisać?*. Bielsko-Biała: Park.

LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114,* 395–412.

Lantolf, J., & Genung, P. (2003). 'I'd rather switch than fight': An activity theoretic study of power, success, and failure in a foreign language classroom. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 175–196). London: Continuum.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2002). Language acquisition and language use from a chaos/complexity theory perspective. In C. Kramsch (Ed.), *Language acquisition and language socialization* (pp. 33–46). London: Continuum.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2015). Saying what we mean: Making a case for 'language acquisition' to become 'language development'. *Language Teaching, 48*(4), 491–505.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). Chaos/complexity science and second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 18*(2), 141–165.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008). Research methodology on language development from a complex theory perspective. *Modern Language Journal, 92,* 200–213.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.

Lasley, T. J. (1980). Preservice teacher beliefs about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 31*(4), 38–41.

Lay, N. (1982). Composing processes of adult ESL learners: A case study. *TESOL Quarterly, 16,* 406–407.

Lay, N. (1983). Native language and the composing process. In B. Kwalick, M. Silver, & V. Slaughter (Eds.), *Selected papers from the 1982 conference "New York Writes"* (pp. 17–21). New York: City University of New York, The Instructional Resource Center.

Lee, I. (2013). Becoming a writing teacher: Using identity as an analytic lens to understand EFL writing teachers' development. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22,* 330–345.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice, 18*(7), 641–654.

Li, X. (2003). *Beyond cultural identity: Product and processes in ESL writing*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Li, X. (2007). Identities and beliefs in ESL writing: From product to processes. *TESL Canada Journal, 25*(1), 41–64.

Lin, A. M. Y. (1999). Doing-English-lessons in the reproduction or transformation of social worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 393–412.

Lin, A. M. Y., & Martin, P. (Eds.). (2005). *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in education policy and practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lonka, K. (2003). Helping doctoral students to finish their theses. In L. Björk, G. Bräuer, L. Rienecker, G. Ruhmann & P. Stray Jørgensen (Eds.), *Teaching academic writing across Europe* (pp. 113–131). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer University Press.

Lonka, K., Chow, A., Keskinen, J., Hakkarainen, K., Sandström, N., & Pyhältö, K. (2014). How to measure Ph.D. students' conceptions of academic writing—and are they related to well-being? *Journal of Writing Research, 5*(3), 245–269.

Maier, P. (1992). Politeness strategies in business letters by native and non-native English Speakers. *English for Specific Purposes, 11*(3), 189–205.

Majchrzak, O. (2012). Wpływ języka drugiego na redagowanie listów formalnych w języku ojczystym – elementy strukturalne listu. *Rozprawy Humanistyczne*. Włocławek: Wydawnictwo Państwowej Wyższej Szkoły Zawodowej we Włocławku, pp. 159–179.

Manchón, R., Roca de Larios, J., & Murphy, L. (2000). An approximation to the study of backtracking in L2 writing. *Learning and Instruction, 10,* 13–35.

Marian, V., & Neisser, U. (2000). Language-dependent recall of autobiographical memories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 129*(3), 361–368.

Markus, H. R., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist, 41,* 954–969.

Mateos, M., Cuevas, I., Martin, E., Martin, A., Echeita, G., & Luna, M. (2010). Reading to write and argumentation: The role of epistemological, reading and writing beliefs. *Journal of Research in Reading, 34,* 281–297.

Mathews, G. (2000). *Global culture/individual identity: Searching for a home in the cultural supermarket*. London: Routledge.

Matsumoto, K. (1995). Research paper writing strategies of professional Japanese EFL writers. *TESL Canada Journal, 13*(1), 17–27.

McArthur, T. (Ed.). (1992). *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCarthey, S. J., & Mkhize, D. (2013). Teachers' orientations towards writing. *Journal of Writing Research, 5*(1), 1–33.

Melketo, T. A. (2012). Exploring tensions between English teachers' beliefs and practices in teaching writing. *The International HETL Review, 2,* 98–114.

Mercer, S., & Williams, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Multiple perspectives on the self in SLA*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Miyahara, M. (2015). *Emerging self-identities and emotion in foreign language learning. A narrative-oriented approach*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Mohanty, A. (1994). *Bilingualism in a multilingual society: Psychosocial and pedagogical implications*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). (2004). *Beliefs about the teaching of writing*. http://www.ncte.org/positions/statements/writingbeliefs.

Neely, M. E. (2014). Epistemological and writing beliefs in a first-year college writing course: Exploring shifts across a semester and relationships with argument quality. *Journal of Writing Research, 6*(2), 141–170.

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19,* 317–328.

Nicholas, H., & Starks, D. (2014). *Language education and applied linguistics: Bridging the two fields*. London/New York: Routledge.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England: Longman.

Norton, B., & McKinney, C. (2011). An identity approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 73–94). London/New York: Routledge.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching, 44*(4), 412–446.

Oi, K., & Horne, B. (2014). *Comparison of Japanese secondary-level English teachers' beliefs and Korean secondary-level English teachers' beliefs about teaching EFL writing in their respective countries*. Paper presented at *Conference on Writing Research*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 27–29.08.2014.

Olulade, O. A., Jamal, N. I., Koo, D. S., Perfetti, C. A., LaSasso, C., & Eden, G. F. (2015). Neuroanatomical evidence in support of the bilingual advantage theory. *Cerebral Cortex*, 1–9.

Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2013). 'She doesn't know who I am': The case of a refugee L2 writer in a high school English language Arts classroom. In L. C. de Oliveira & T. Silva (Eds.), *L2 writing in secondary classrooms: Student experiences, academic issues, and teacher education* (pp. 9–26). New York/London: Routledge.

Otsuji, E., & Pennycook, A. (2010). Metrolingualism: Fixity, fluidity and language in flux. *International Journal of Multilingualism, 7*(3), 240–254.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(3), 307–332.

Palmquist, M., & Young, R. (1992). The notion of giftedness and student expectations about writing. *Written Communication, 9*, 137–168.

Panayiotou, A. (2004). Switching codes, switching code: Bilinguals' emotional responses in English and Greek. *Journal of Multilingualism and Multicultural Development, 25*(2&3), 124–139.

Park, M. S. (2013). Code-switching and translanguaging: Potential functions in multilingual classrooms. *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, *13*(2), 50–52.

Pavlenko, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Bilingual minds: emotional experience, expression and representation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A. (2001). 'How am I to become a woman in an American vein?' Transformations of gender performance in second language learning. In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, second language learning, and gender* (pp. 133–174). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pavlenko, A. (2005). *Emotions and multilingualism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pavlenko, A. (2006). Bilingual selves. In A. Pavlenko (Ed.), *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression and representation* (pp. 1–33). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, A. (2008). Emotion and emotion-laden words in the bilingual lexicon. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *11*(2), 147–164.

Pavlenko, A. (2014). *The bilingual mind and what it tells us about language and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Peirce, B. N. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 29,* 9–31.

Pennington, M., & So, S. (1993). Comparing writing process and product across two languages: A study of 6 Singaporean University student writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2,* 41–63.

Petric, B. (2002). Students' attitudes towards writing and the development of academic writing skills. *The Writing Center Journal, 22*(2), 9–27.

Piller, I., & Takahashi, K. (2006). A passion for English: Desire and the language market. In Pavlenko (Ed.), *Bilingual minds: Emotional experience, expression, and representation* (pp. 59–83). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Precht, K. (1998). A Cross-cultural comparison of letters of recommendation. *English for Specific Purposes, 17*(3), 241–265.

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL writers do as they write: A study of classroom composing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(2), 229–258.

Ramanathan, V., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). Audience and voice in current L1 composition texts: Some implications for ESL student writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*(1), 21–34.

Ramirez-Esparza, N., Gosling, S. D., Benet-Martinez, V., Potter, P., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2006). Do bilinguals have two personalities? A special case of cultural frame switching. *Journal of Personality Research, 40,* 99–120.

Reyes, I. (2004). Functions of code-switching in schoolchildren's conversations. *Bilingual Research Journal, 28*(1), 77–98.

Riley, P. (1997). 'BATS' and 'BALLS': Beliefs about talk and beliefs about language learning. *Mélanges CRAPEL, 23,* 125–153.

Riley, P. (1994). Aspects of learner discourse: Why listening to learners is so important. In E. Esch (Ed.), *Self-access and the adult language learner* (pp. 7–18). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching.

Roca de Larios, J., Murphy, L., & Manchón, R. M. (1999). The use of restructuring strategies in ESL writing: A study of Spanish learners of English as a foreign language. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 13–44.

Rubdy, R., & Saraceni, M. (Eds.). (2006). *English in the world: Global rules, global roles*. London: Continuum.

Sagasta Errasti, M. P. (2003). Acquiring writing skills in a third language: The positive effects of bilingualism. *The International Journal of Bilingualism, 7*(1), 27–42.

Salski, Ł. (2014). Demistyfying academic writing. In W. Szubko-Sitarek, Ł. Salski & P. Stalmaszczyk (Eds.), *Language learning, discourse and communication* (pp. 37–46). Heidelberg: Springer.

Salski, Ł. (2012). *Contrastive rhetoric and teaching English composition skills*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Salski, Ł., & Szubko-Sitarek, W. (2015). B.A. thesis writing process and pre-service teachers' beliefs on teaching writing. In M. Pawlak (Ed.), *Classroom-oriented research: Reconciling theory and practice*. Heidelberg/New York: Springer, forthcoming.

Sander, F. (1934). Seelische Struktur und Sprache: Strukturpsychologisches zum Zweitsprachenproblem. *Neue Psychologische Studien, 12,* 59.

Sanders-Reio, J., Alexander, P. A., Reio, T. G., Jr., & Newman, I. (2014). Do students' beliefs about writing relate to their self-efficacy, apprehension, and performance? *Learning and Instruction, 33,* 1–11.

Schlenker, B. R. (1986). Self-identification: Toward an integration of the private and public self. In R. Baumeister (Ed.), *Public self and private self* (pp. 21–62). New York: Springer.

Schoonen, R., Van Gelderen, A., De Glopper, K., Hulstijn, J., Simis, A., Snellings, P., & Stevenson, M. (2003). First language and second language writing: The role of linguistic knowledge, speed of processing and metacognitive knowledge. *Language Learning, 53,* 165–202.

Seidlhofer, B. (2007). Common property: English as a lingua franca in Europe. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 137–153). New York: Springer.

Shen, F. (1989). The classroom and the wider culture: Identity as a key to learning English composition. *College Composition and Communication, 40*(4), 459–466.

Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York: Routledge.

Skibniewski, L. (1988). The writing processes of advanced foreign language learners in their native and foreign languages: Evidence from thinking aloud and behavior protocols. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia, 21,* 177–186.

Skibniewski, L., & Skibniewska, M. (1986). Experimental study: The writing processes of intermediate/advanced foreign language learners in their foreign and native languages. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia, 19,* 143–163.

Srivastava, S., John, O. P., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2003). Development of personality in early and middle adulthood: Set like plaster or persistent change? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84,* 1041–1053.

Sung, C. C. M. (2014). English as a lingua franca and global identities: Perspectives from four second language learners of English in Hong Kong. *Linguistics and Education, 26,* 31–39.

Takahashi, C. K. (2013). Ideal L2 self and university English learners: An interview study. *The Language Teacher, 37*(6), 3–8.

Thiery, C. (1978). True bilingualism and second language learning. In D. Gerver & H. Sinaiko (Eds.), *Language interpretation and communication* (pp. 145–153). New York: Plenum Press.

Toohey, K. (2000). *Learning English at school: Identity, social relations and classroom practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Tsai, J. L., Knutson, B., & Fung, H. H. (2006). Cultural variation in affect valuation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90,* 288–307.

Upton, T. A., & Connor, U. (2001). Using computerised corpus analysis to investigate the textlinguistic discourse moves of a genre. *English for Specific Purposes, 20,* 313–329.

Uzawa, K. (1996). Second language learners' processes of L1 writing, L2 writing and translation from L1 into L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5,* 271–294.

Uzawa, K., & Cumming, A. (1989). Writing strategies in Japanese as a foreign language: Lowering or keeping up the standards. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 46*(1), 178–194.

Valdés, G. (2005). Bilingualism, heritage language learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(3), 410–426.

van Weijen, D., van den Bergh, H., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Sanders, T. (2009). L1 use during L2 writing: An empirical study of a complex phenomenon. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18,* 235–250.

Velasco, P., & Garcia, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(1), 6–23.

Veltkamp, G. M., Recio, G., Jacobs, A. M., & Conrad, M. (2012). Is personality modulated by language? *International Journal of Bilingualism, 17*(4), 496–504.

Viete, R. (2011). Crafting new possibilities for self: The ethics of teaching creative writing in EFL. In P. Le Ha & B. Baurain (Eds.), *Voices, identities, negotiations and conflicts. Writing Academic English Across Cultures* (pp. 3–22). Bingley: Emerald.

Vignoles, V. L., Schwartz, S. J., & Luyckx, K. (2011). Introduction: Toward an integrative view of identity. In V. L. Vignoles, S. J. Schwartz, & K. Luyckx (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 1–27). New York: Springer.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wan, W. (2014). Constructing and developing ESL students' beliefs about writing through metaphor: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 23,* 53–73.

Wang, L. (2003). Switching to first language among writers with differing second-language proficiency. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 347–375.

Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: An exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(3), 225–246.

Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Wei, L. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics, 43*(5), 1222–1235.

Wei, L., & Wu, C.-J. (2009). Polite Chinese children revisited: Creativity and the use of codeswitching in the Chinese complementary school classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(2), 193–212.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems.* The Hague: Mouton.

Whalen, K., & Menard, N. (1995). L1 and L2 writers' strategic and linguistic knowledge: A model of multiple-level discourse processing. *Language Learning, 45*(3), 381–418.

White, M. J., & Bruning, R. (2005). Implicit writing beliefs and their relation to writing quality. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 30,* 166–189.

Wierzbicka, A. (2004). Preface: Bilingual lives, bilingual experience. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 25*(2&3), 94–104.

Wierzbicka, A. (1998). 'Sadness' and 'anger' in Russian: The non-universality of the so-called 'basic human emotions'. In A. Athanasiadou & E. Tabakowska (Eds.), *Speaking of emotions: Conceptualisation and expression* (pp. 3–28). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis, & C. Baker (Eds.), *The language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 39–78). Llangefni, UK: CAI.

Williams, C. (2002). Extending bilingualism in the educational system. *Education and lifelong learning committee ELL-06-02.*

Williams, C. (2003). Defnyddio trawsieithu I ddatblygu llyhrennedd deuol [Using translanguaging to develop dual literacy]. In G. Roberts & C. Williams (Eds.), *Addysg Gymraeg – Addysg Gymreig* (pp. 288–312). Bangor, UK: School of Education.

Williams, C. (1994). *Arfarniad o ddulliau dysgu ac addysgu yng nghyd-destun addysg uwchradd ddwyieithog* [*An evaluation of teaching and learning methods in the context of bilingual secondary education*] Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Wales, Bangor, UK.

Wolfe, M. L. (2008). Different cultures—Different discourses? Rhetorical patterns of business letters by English and Russian speakers. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout & W. V. Rozycki (Eds.), *Contrastive rhetoric. Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 87–121). Amsterdam / Philadephia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Wolfersberger, M. (2003). L1 to L2 writing process and strategy transfer: A look at lower proficiency writers. *TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language, 7*(2), 1–15.

Woodall, B. (2002). Language-switching: Using the first language while writing in a second language. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(1), 7–28.

Woods, D. (2003). The social construction of beliefs in the language classroom. In A. Barcelos & P. Kalaja (Eds.), *New approaches to research on beliefs about SLA* (pp. 199–227). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

Woodworth, M. K. (1994). Teaching voice. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry* (pp. 145–158). National Council of Teachers of English.

Woolf, Virginia. (1953). *The common reader*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Yancey, K. B. (1994). Introduction: Definition, intersection, and difference—Mapping the landscape of voice. In K. B. Yancey (Ed.), *Voices on voice: Perspectives, definitions, inquiry*. National Council of Teachers of English.

Yang, S. (2013). *Autobiographical writing and identity in EFL education*. New York: Routledge.

Yasuda, S., Oi, K., & Itatsu, Y. (2014). Nihonno koutoukyouikuniokeru eigoraitingsidou no Jittai chousa (Issues in Teaching and Learning EFL Writing in Higher Education in Japan), *JABAET Journal, 18*.

Yau, M. S. S. (1987). Two approaches to improving the writing performance of ESL students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, OISE.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly, 17,* 165–187.

Zaśko-Zielińska, M., Majewska-Tworek, A., & Piekot, T. (2008). *Sztuka pisania. Przewodnik po tekstach użytkowych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Zentella, A. C. (1997). *Growing up bilingual*. Maiden, MA: Blackwell.