CHAPTER 10

LIMINAL SPACE AS A GENERATIVE SITE OF STRUGGLE: WRITING TRANSFER AND L2 STUDENTS

Gita DasBender

The question of whether writing knowledge garnered in one learning situation can be successfully carried into new situations continues to be a vexing one; yet sustained inquiries into the efficacy of transfer practices, such as those recently conducted by participants in Elon University's Research Seminar on Critical Transitions, reveal that "transfer does occur, contrary to suggestions reflected in prior research" (*Elon Statement on Writing Transfer,* 2015). This is hopeful news for the future of transfer studies. And as the larger conversation on writing transfer continues to shape undergraduate education, such positive predictions in transfer scholarship can have a healthy impact on writing transfer research of multilingual students, particularly second language (L2) learners, and of contributing to the field's growing understanding of how—and under what conditions—writing transfer happens for L2 learners. Indeed, the case studies of L2 learners presented in this chapter not only reflect some of the working principles articulated in the *Elon Statement* but also demonstrate how useful these principles may be in informing emergent L2 transfer studies. There is sufficient evidence in the findings of this study that L2 students' socio-cultural background, the prior writing knowledge they carry from L1 settings, and the extent of their metacognitive awareness of linguistic and rhetorical differences in writing can not only foster or disrupt writing transfer, but also play a critical role in their development as multilingual writers in a US educational context.

The essential belief that the goal of education is the transfer of learning from one setting to another still undergirds our view of education and general knowledge acquisition. Bransford and Schwartz point out that because of this entrenched belief,

> most educators want learning activities to have positive effects
> that extend beyond the exact conditions of initial learning.
> They are hopeful that students will show evidence of transfer
> in a variety of situations: from one problem to another within

> a course, from one course to another, from one school year to the next, and from their years in school to their years in the workplace. (1999, p. 61)

Common sense dictates that the structured learning which occurs within formal, institutionalized settings can hardly be considered valuable if what is learned is not retained, reformulated, and reused in other, new settings. Perkins and Salomon (1994) make it clear that educational goals cannot be met without transfer of learning. At the same time, they also emphasize that there is ample evidence to support the fact that not all learning experiences necessarily lead to transfer. The authors sound a cautionary note when they remind us that "transfer . . . cannot be taken for granted" (1994, p. 3). Likewise, more recent studies on writing transfer based on L1 composition not only tend to reinforce the view that transfer is not necessarily inevitable, but as Moore (2012) points out, also "suggest that transfer is limited and students do not expect their writing in FYC, or even in classes in their majors, to transfer to other coursework or to professional contexts." In her examination of the pertinent questions and state of writing-related transfer research, Moore reviews the contexts within which transfer is studied in the United States and concludes that these contexts are limited to certain geographical areas, indicating that transfer research needs to be more wide-spread.

With the rapid growth and influx of students with diverse language histories and literacy backgrounds and whose learning experiences may not follow the more predictable trajectories of US educated native and non-native English speakers, established views of transfer, whether promising or problematic, need to be re-examined to provide a deeper sense of how transfer functions for multilingual learners in a writing class. To understand the challenges confronted by international students in first year composition classes, this article focuses on two case studies that emerged from data collected for a research study conducted in a six-credit writing course designed for multilingual students taught in the writing program of a mid-sized private university in northeastern United States.

L2 WRITING TRANSFER

The complexities involved in studying, understanding, and drawing firm conclusions about transfer issues of L2 writers are readily seen in studies conducted in the past decade or so. In her comparative review of studies on how first language (L1) and L2 writers learn about genres, Tardy notes that both groups "writing and reading in both their first and second languages often face difficulty transferring knowledge developed in one domain to another" (2006, p. 95).

While Tardy would like to see genre-based instructional approaches where students learn methods of genre analysis that would serve as tools in future writing settings, she also finds no evidence in the empirical research she investigates that such tools would have a positive impact on later learning (2006, p. 97). She calls for "a stronger research base in the influences of instruction (of various types) on learners' subsequent generic practices" (2006, p. 97). In their exploratory study of the effects of intensive writing training in L1 for Japanese high school students, Kobayashi and Rinnert (2008) find that such intensive instruction in L1 appears to have a positive effect on text construction in both L1 and L2. However, despite student gains in metacognitive awareness and improved writing choices, the authors are uncertain about the precise causes of such improvement and call for further study in that area. In their observations they indicate that because of several factors, including a small sample size and subjects' lack of experience in university writing, the findings, which show "relatively strong evidence for transferability of writing competence across languages," (2008, p. 20) cannot be generalized beyond the context of the specific study.

Other research on L2 writing transfer such as James' (2008) study of the impact of perceptions of task similarity or difference on L2 learning transfer indicates that successful transfer of outcomes from a writing course depends not so much on objective views of task similarity or difference as on self-determined student perceptions. James' finding that "perceived task similarity had a positive impact on the scores on the writing task" (2008, p. 94) has important implications as it points to the likelihood that writing transfer for L2 learners is greater if students perceive similarities in writing-based activities across a variety of courses that employ writing tasks. And yet in a 2009 study in which James follows up on the effect of perceived task similarity on writing transfer, data reveals that students who were asked to look for task similarities did not demonstrate any more evidence of learning transfer than those who were not asked to look for task similarities. This finding, among others, leads James to conclude that while transfer of learning outcomes from an ESL writing course to a substantially different writing task did occur for certain students, many students were constrained by their perception of task dissimilarity. The study's focus on identifying task similarity before the task was completed was not sufficient to overcome students' views that the writing task was inherently different and as a result did little to promote writing transfer (James, 2009, p. 79).

In examining scholarship that considers transfer issues in relation to the intersections of genre acquisition, language, and writing, Bawarshi and Reiff's claim that "genres situate and distribute cognition [and] frame social identities" (2010, p. 95) is particularly meaningful for L2 students who bring different learner identities and academic habits and practices to the classroom and require

teachers to be more attentive to how prior experiences shape writing produced in new contexts (Hyland, 2007). As Johns (2011) considers the role and value of Genre-based Writing Instruction (GBWI), she discusses approaches to genre pedagogy that promote high road transfer. Drawing upon comments made by professionals in L2 contexts she notes that while it is indeed valuable to focus initially on textual structures (especially when working with beginner or novice writers), writing instruction must then "move towards an integration of theories and practices that value analysis of context, complex writing processes, and intertextuality" (Johns, 2011, p. 64). The implication of Johns' claim is that for successful writing transfer to occur, L2 writing students need not only to understand the temporal and shifting nature of texts but also be willing to use knowledge from prior settings as they begin to recognize the situated nature of all writing tasks and are therefore able to meet their demands in future settings.

While Johns succeeds in laying out the enormous potential of GBWI, she ends with the concern that "there has not been sufficient concern about, or research on L2 novice students, and the GBWI that is appropriate for them" (2011, p. 66), pointing to the larger need for studies that demonstrate a positive relationship between writing transfer and Genre-based Writing Instruction. Gentil (2011) sounds a similar note in his study of the potential benefits of a biliteracy approach to genre research as he examines how multilingual writers develop genre expertise across languages. He emphasizes the importance of learning and transferring common underlying proficiencies (CUPs) from an L1 or "stronger language" to L2 in order to develop genre competence, but he also warns that such learning does not guarantee that "transfer of genre expertise across languages will necessarily occur or be successful" (2011, p. 20).

In an attempt to theorize L2 writing transfer, DePalma and Ringer (2011) propose "adaptive transfer" as a useful construct that might help account for the ways L2 writers not only reuse, but reshape, and reconstitute prior writing knowledge in new learning contexts. They define adaptive transfer as "the conscious or intuitive process of applying or reshaping learned writing knowledge in new and potentially unfamiliar writing situations" (2011, p. 135). In promoting adaptive transfer as a critical, dynamic model of writing, the authors emphasize how such a model "views individuals as the locus of transfer" (2011, p. 142) since it values the agency of L2 writers as they not only use learned writing knowledge but transform such knowledge based on the demands of the new rhetorical contexts. L2 writers thus become "potential contributors" rather than "passive recipients of the knowledge and conventions of a discourse of power" (DePalma & Ringer, 2011, p. 142). As much as adaptive transfer appears to be promising as a multidimensional, multidisciplinary framework for studying writing transfer, Grujicuc-Alatriste (2013) questions several aspects

of the framework, particularly how the breadth of its scope affects applicability across various writing situations; how its relationship to writing and language socialization remains largely unexplored; and whether "reshaping" of writing knowledge is just another form of genre instantiation (Swales, 1990) that cannot be simplified and thus requires further examination. A concern about the lack of practical methodological and pedagogical tools for the implementing adaptive transfer is also noted.

The L2 transfer research studies referenced here display awareness of concerns about small size, context, and generalizability of findings; there are a variety of limitations on transfer, and often claims about evidence of transfer are followed by caveats about constraints. Even theoretical frameworks that are useful for understanding transfer, such as the one proposed by DePalma and Ringer, reveal limitations in terms of application. If we are to agree that all learning is situational and occurs within highly specific contexts, and that the learning of writing is a situated activity (Lave & Wenger, 1991), then it becomes a bit clearer as to why scholars attempting to understand writing transfer processes tend to express ambivalence about and point to the limitations of positive findings of transfer. It is not that transfer is an illusory or slippery concept, something that is impossible to achieve, but that to recognize instances of transfer in particular research contexts is also to recognize the attendant limitations of such contexts. It is important, then, to reflect upon why it is that definitive claims about transfer are often conditional, especially for L2 learners. Perhaps it is because such a view relies upon the understanding that any claim about successful transfer is highly situational, context- dependent, and therefore unsuited to broader generalizations about transfer.

THRESHOLD CONCEPTS, TROUBLESOME KNOWLEDGE, AND LIMINALITY

To approach and to seek to understand writing transfer as a binary, as something that either occurs or does not, is to subscribe to a reductive and ultimately unproductive view of transfer. What might be a more fruitful approach is to understand *what happens* when transfer is attempted, both from an instructional and learning perspective. Meyer and Land's recent theoretical approach to learning processes introduces the basic notion that learners negotiate disciplinary knowledge in the form of specific, foundational ideas known as "threshold concepts" that are "'conceptual gateways' or 'portals' that lead to a previously inaccessible, and perhaps 'troublesome,' way of understanding something" (2005, p. 373). Threshold concepts are constitutive of a dramatic turning-point, a crucial transformative moment in the understanding of complex discipline-specific ideas and ways of thinking which are essential for progress and continuity of learning. They

represent not only a conscious, active, and conceptual way of understanding disciplinary knowledge but also the process that learners undergo on their way to gaining such knowledge (see also Adler-Kassner, Clark, Robertson, Taczak & Yancey, this volume). Such a transformative view of learning as represented in the notion of threshold concepts has particular relevance for L2 students for whom developing a writerly identity in relation to the English language may represent the crossing of cultural, rhetorical, and linguistic thresholds.

While boundary-crossing itself is a landmark of learning, research in threshold concepts also focuses on the attendant notion of what David Perkins (1999) calls "troublesome knowledge," knowledge that is "alien," difficult to comprehend, and often intellectually at odds with what is already known. Recognizing the challenges inherent in the social construction of knowledge, Perkins points out that "different kinds of knowledge—inert, ritual, conceptually difficult, and foreign—are likely to prove troublesome for learners in different ways" (1999, p. 8), and as learners navigate and grapple with these difficulties, they occupy and pass through a state of "liminality"—"a suspended state in which understanding approximates to a kind of mimicry or lack of authenticity" (Meyer & Land, 2003, p. 10). In short, threshold concept theorists contend that learners often not only have trouble reconciling new knowledge with previously held beliefs and ideas as they struggle to grasp foundational concepts within a discipline but also that this struggle happens during the "liminal" stage—a period of disorientation essential to a growing awareness of learning—that leads to disciplinary identity formation and participation. As they pass through or occupy the liminal space, the transformation in the learner's identity that occurs as a result of a shift in language and thinking (Land, Rattray & Vivian, 2014, p. 2) is particularly relevant for language learners who are just beginning to engage with new linguistic forms and genres of writing.

As such, in negotiating the new and unfamiliar terrain of college writing courses, multilingual students—who generally come from very diverse cultural, linguistic, and educational backgrounds—inevitably encounter difficulties that affect their learning experience in such settings. Whether they are visa-bearing international students for whom English is a foreign or second language, or US-educated English language learners (often known as generation 1.5 students), college writing courses are challenging spaces where language proficiency and literacy experiences are foregrounded and become an explicit part of the classroom experience. Here L2 students encounter tasks that not only demand general fluency and command of the English language but also a basic knowledge of rhetorical strategies and writing conventions with which they may not be fully familiar. As a result, the setting, the context, the tasks, and the overall goals of the writing course may all appear to be distinct from those encountered in other learning

environments. Further, given the wide range of contextual factors such as institutional setting, placement policies, curricular goals, course materials, and pedagogical approaches, L2 writers' particular experiences in an L2 writing course are bound to vary but they would nevertheless be expected to work toward achieving specific writing goals and outcomes as determined by a first year writing program. For many L2 students who have little or no background in text-based critical, analytical writing, adjusting to the academic expectations of a writing course—even one that is designed with non-native speakers in mind—may appear conceptually troublesome and may thrust them into a liminal space where they struggle with new and unfamiliar writing skills and knowledge.

L2 Students and Writing Difficulty

To understand how international students navigate the challenges of a first year writing course, I conducted a research study in a six-credit linked course designed for multilingual students that I taught in the first year writing program of a mid-sized private university in the northeastern part of the United States. The course, designed for underprepared L2 students, links a first year writing course with a reading and writing lab so that students have additional time in class to work on their writing skills. With Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, in the fall semester of 2012 I collected data in the form of one brief literacy history narrative and responses to three focused reflective writing prompts. The literacy history narrative was assigned early in the semester and required students to reflect upon their English language experiences, specifically related to reading and writing, and to their sense of self as users of English. This is an assignment that is normally included in the linked course syllabus because it provides crucial information about my students' prior language and writing experiences and how they describe the identity or persona they adopt—whether consciously or unconsciously—when they write in English. The task conforms to the imperative articulated in one of the transfer principles of the *Elon Statement on Writing Transfer* that "Prior knowledge is a complex construct that can benefit or hinder writing transfer. Yet understanding and exploring that complexity is central to investigating transfer" (2015, p. 4) as it allows both the students to develop an awareness of this "prior knowledge" and instructors to determine its benefits and limitations for future instruction.

Participants in the study also responded to three focused reflective writing prompts, each written after the completion of formal essay assignments that were required for the course. In these responses participants reflected upon the difficulties they faced as they completed the formal essay assignments, discussed the particular strategies they employed to overcome these difficulties, and described

their perceptions about what they were learning about writing and becoming a writer. Instructors may recognize elements of these reflective prompts in what is often taught as "meta-writing" where students submit a short reflective passage on their essay writing experience—particularly the process—at the end of an essay assignment. The prompts used in my study are a more elaborate version as they not only include questions that guide the students through the meta-writing process but also require detailed responses for each question. While they were particularly useful for the research study, the prompts are regularly integrated into the L2 course syllabus. The prompts also actively enact two principles from the *Elon Statement on Writing Transfer*. The first principle addresses the value of meta-awareness for transfer and states that "Students' meta-awareness often plays a key role in transfer, and reflective writing promotes preparation for transfer and transfer-focused thinking" (*Elon Statement on Writing Transfer*, 2015, p. 5) The second principle is particularly relevant to metacognition of multilingual students as it emphasizes that "The importance of meta-cognition of available identities, situational awareness, audience awareness, etc., become even more critical in writing transfer between languages because of the need to negotiate language-based differences and to develop awareness about the ways language operates in written communication across languages" (*Elon Statement on Writing Transfer*, 2015, p. 5).

The study allowed me to pose questions related to writing difficulties that I hoped would reveal students' perceptions of the writing processes they participated in within the context of a college level writing course. A total of 10 subjects, all visa-bearing international student who were native Chinese speakers, had completed the program's online directed self-placement survey and placed themselves into the linked Core English 1201 (3 credits) and Reading and Writing Workshop 0180 (3 non-counting credits) for L2 writers. The reflective writing prompts were integrated into the syllabus to encourage the practice of meta-cognitive activities and help build students' ability to reflect upon their learning experience in the course.

In order to select two subjects whose reflective responses I would examine closely for the purposes of this article, I had to look carefully at the data I had collected that term. All students who participated in the study were able to write reflectively but many produced responses that were short, repetitive, and lacking in detailed descriptions of the difficulties they encountered as L2 writers. These students, who comprised the majority in the course, had less than a year's training in English, were in the early stages of English language acquisition, and had no prior experience in composing critical, analytical essays in English. While they did progress during the semester and were gradually able to generate several pages of competent writing for each of the three formal written assign-

ments, because of linguistic constraints they struggled to describe the complex experiences and processes in the reflective writing prompts. I considered these students to be in a pre-liminal stage of their development as English language learners and worthy of a separate investigative study as a sub-set of L2 writers who are in the earliest stages of language learning but are nevertheless enrolled in credit-bearing college writing courses. Ultimately, I selected two of the most competent writers in the class—Shiyu and Ming (both pseudonyms)—as subjects for this article because they possessed sufficient language skills to produce reflective writing that was both meaningful and that responded thoroughly to the prompts given as part of the research project. They also serve as models of typical but slightly advanced and highly motivated international L2 learners who are better prepared, both rhetorically and linguistically, for the demands of college writing courses.

The literacy history narrative, assigned during the first week of classes, was an in-class writing task designed to elicit general information about students' English background and specific details about their writing experiences. Because these details provide a crucial backdrop for their writing performance in the course, students were informed that the narratives would be used during the semester to guide me in individual instruction and feedback on writing assignments. Also, since we are required to use Blackboard®, a web-based course management system, students had access to all the formal and informal writing assignments posted on Blackboard's Discussion Board, including the literacy history narrative and the reflective writing prompts.

Literacy History Narrative Prompt

Please write a carefully organized essay about your experiences with *writing in English*. Respond to the questions below as you compose your essay.

1. What types of formal or informal writing are you most used to or familiar with? For how long have you been doing this kind of writing?
2. What does academic writing mean to you? What kinds of writing do you associate with it?
3. Have you ever written about non-fiction texts? If yes, please describe the kinds of writing you have done.
4. What kinds of writing do you find most difficult? Why? Please include any other information about your experiences as a multilingual user of English such as your English language background, the age (or grade) you started learning English, how much experience you have with reading and writing in English, and how you would describe your identity as a reader, writer, thinker, and speaker in English.

The reflective writing prompts were designed as a set of questions and also administered in the form of in-class writing three times during the term. The first prompt was assigned after students completed the first formal writing assignment (Essay 1), an analytical essay for which students had to analyze and develop their own idea in response to one self-selected text from three assigned readings. The second prompt was completed after Essay 2, an image analysis essay that also required integration of ideas from two assigned readings; and the third prompt was completed after the research assignment (Essay 3), the third and final writing assignment that required students to come to an understanding of a historical or political issue by examining at least three textual sources that represented the issue from different, possibly conflicting perspectives.

Reflective Writing Prompt 1

- What did you struggle with the most as you wrote Essay 1? Describe each problem in detail.
- Address each of the problems you stated above and explain the strategies you used to overcome each of these difficulties.
- How have your perceptions about academic writing changed since the start of the semester?
- What are you learning and realizing about writing and being a writer?

Reflective Writing Prompt 2

- What did you struggle with the most as you wrote Essay 2?
- Address each of the problems you stated above and explain the strategies you used to overcome each of these difficulties.
- How have your perceptions about academic writing changed since you wrote Essay 2?
- What are you learning and realizing about writing and being a writer?

Reflective Writing Prompt 3

- What was the most difficult aspect of writing this essay?
- What are your strengths now as a writer and what do you still need to work on and improve?
- What have you learned in this course about writing and being a writer? Consider how your thinking about issues such as reading, revision, self-review, audience, and developing ideas has changed since you've started writing in this class. How you have changed as a writer since the beginning of the semester?

"The Most Tangled Part . . ."—The Case of Shiyu

A cheerful, bespectacled 18-year old in a petite frame, Shiyu is an Accounting major who grew up in Shenzhen, China, and came to the United States in the spring of 2012 to study toward an undergraduate degree in Business Management. In her literacy history narrative she writes that she started learning English from the age of 6 at grammar school where she only learnt "basic alphabets and some simple greeting sentences." In middle school she began reading "articles" and writing short essays, and it was not until her freshman year at high school that she had "experiences with writing longer essays related to certain topics." The type of English writing she is most familiar with, she notes, is the formal "MLA pattern paper" which she learned to write when she worked on a research paper on Shakespeare's marriage in a non-credit bearing ESL Advanced Writing course during her first semester at the university. She also wrote a "book critique essay" in a Microeconomics class she took the following summer. Interestingly, while she claims she is familiar with this type of "formal" writing, she makes it clear that she did not engage in any formal academic writing before arriving in the US. She states, "E-mails, texts, letters are playing a significant role in my daily life. I have been engaged in these informal writings since I started short writing essays." She believes that even though she has been learning English for over a decade, "The most challenging writing to me is academic writing. It is mostly due to the language barrier." She then explains that she believes academic writing is "formal writing based on various of researches, surveys, and other kinds of ways to express academics' feelings and idea toward the world" and that "usually, research papers are associated with it." In the short time that she has spent in an academic setting in the US, she has not only learned to associate academic writing with research papers but also feels that her language skills are inadequate for this type of writing as she lacks the requisite "vocabulary, grammar, as well as slangs." Here it seems as if Shiyu associates the word "slang" either with idiomatic English or general fluency, neither of which she sees herself possessing. She concludes with a realistic appraisal of what lies ahead in the writing course noting how she will face "a ton of difficulties while learning a new language, such as English."

In the first reflective writing prompt, Shiyu identifies two aspects of writing with which she struggles the most while attempting textual analysis in Essay 1. The first is difficulty with the analysis itself. Shiyu believes that she wasn't able to analyze the text in "the proper way" as she had "many good quotes but only dropped the direct long quotes without paraphrasing or giving contexts" and "didn't explain some of the author's ideas from the quotes." As she grapples with the multi-layered task of examining the text while also responsibly integrating

source material into her writing, she works on revising the draft by returning to "every quote presented in my essay so as to find the relationships among them." She notes that the most important strategy she used was "to narrow down all the long, repeated quotes and use my own words to explain them." The second area of difficulty, Shiyu writes, is "critical thinking and explore my own ideas" because she was "simply restating part of the author's main ideas but not connecting the ideas with my own experiences." She associates critical thinking with her "experiences" and perhaps with a personal approach to the text which is separate from the "author's ideas."

Textual analysis, which not only involves discussion of the ideas of the text but also integration of the material (in the form of quotations and paraphrase), is new to Shiyu both conceptually and as a practical skill. Yet, its obviously visual component makes it a manageable difficulty and she demonstrates a growing understanding of how to engage with the quotations she has selected for her essay. The difficulty with critical thinking, a far more abstract and sophisticated act, is harder for Shiyu to express and to overcome. Yet she writes about the "significance" of critical thinking in this way: "Sublimation [sic] the ideas you learnt from the text is a key step to improve our writing." By using the word "sublimation,"—a synonym for modification—Shiyu seems to be saying that critical thinking may have something to do with working toward transformed ideas and not repetition. This becomes clear when she notes that her "insights about academic writing have changed. Academic writing is not only about the summarizing the academic texts, like a book review; but also a stage to give yourself an opportunity to show how you benefit from them and what is your own thinking of different values." The metaphor of writing as a "stage" which hints at the performative aspects of composing fits neatly into Shiyu's growing belief that she needs to demonstrate her own agency as a writer in her essays. She wraps up her reflective essay by stating that "Perhaps the big difference between writing and being a writer is that everyone can write randomly without thinking; while as a writer, we need to demonstrate our critical thinking ideas in a logical way. This transformation depends on how hard we try to think." Shiyu seems to be coming to grips with issues of writerly identity not commonly seen among novice L2 writers. To her, the moment of transformation—when one crosses a threshold and becomes an academic "writer"—occurs as one engages intensely with the text as a critical thinker. In the development of this identity is also the conscious recognition, and hence transformed understanding, of writing and thinking as complementary and constitutive acts. For novice L2 learners, focused critical reading holds promise as a threshold concept especially if L2 learners have little or no experience reading lengthy, complex texts and hence find troublesome the intellectual processes necessary for critical engagement with such readings.

In her second reflective writing assignment Shiyu explains that "the most tangled part" of writing the second essay (which required her to analyze an advertisement through the theoretical lens of two published texts), was to "seek the main problematic idea in the printed ad that I used then to connect with the two articles." The dual—and complex—task of analyzing the image and developing linkages with the ideas of the articles that discuss complex approaches to interpreting images was clearly quite complicated for Shiyu. But she notes that she "still accomplished the task by overcoming these difficulties." After receiving instructor feedback she "pick[ed] the correct ideas from the advertising . . . listed all the ideas that can be revealed in the commercial and remain the primary ideas by crossing out the secondary ones." Relying on a strategy she learned while writing Essay 1, she reviews the two readings once again "to select the important quotes which would be a great evidence to support my views." In this response Shiyu emphasizes that "by practicing writing" in the course, she has a "clearer notion of academic writing after completing Essay 2." What she has really learned to do well in the second assignment is "the development on combining ideas with different quotations." One of the working principles in the Elon University *Statement on Writing Transfer* states that "Any social context provides affordances and constraints that impact use of prior knowledge, skills, strategies, and dispositions, and writing transfer successes and challenges cannot be understood outside of learners' social-cultural spaces." In Shiyu's case, her Chinese educational background and prior writing experiences, which she notes had not sufficiently prepared her for the type of analytical writing required in first year writing courses in the US, appears not to have any significant impact on her current writing. The vast differences between L1 and L2 writing (Silva, 1993), between Chinese school writing and those practiced in US academic settings (Sullivan, Zhang & Zheng, 2012) in particular, may have acted as constraints and prevented Shiyu from re-engaging any prior writing knowledge and adapting such knowledge for new rhetorical purposes. Predictably, and in a sign of positive near transfer, it is the new learning she encounters in the writing course, specifically academic discourse and analytical writing, that acts as an affordance; she relies on newly-learned strategies from the first writing assignment for the more complex analytical work of the second writing assignment. She explains that her developing sense of a "good writer"—perhaps an implied "English" writer—is related not only to "critical analysis, but also is concerning the ideas (either new ideas or critical ones) and how to find proofs from outside," skills she had not been taught in the Chinese setting. Shiyu notes a growing awareness of the importance of process—another approach to writing that is new to her—claiming that "revision and self-review are the most beneficial step to rethink essays."

At the end of the semester, looking back at her learning experience in this linked course for L2 writers, Shiyu discusses the difficulties she faced as she wrote the research assignment where students were expected to produce at least six pages of writing. The assignment required students to examine a historical event (or issue) of their choice by searching for and evaluating competing narratives that not only allowed them to see the event from multiple perspectives but also gave them the opportunity to develop a more nuanced understanding of their topic. As she explains, "The main purpose of writing this paper is to identify the China and Taiwan issue and give different perspectives on this topic in order to find the best solution." Reflecting back on class discussions on how awareness of audience is critical to both developing and executing the research project, Shiyu starts out by noting that as she developed the assignment, she was very aware of the "potential reader" of her essay and "what they would learn from it." She notes that the notion of addressing an audience that might actually be affected by the writing was "new knowledge that I would never think of before writing my essay." As she notes in her literacy narrative, although Shiyu was familiar with basic genre types (such as emails, texts, and letters) that require a keen sense of a readership, she had no prior formal instruction in audience awareness, either in L1 or L2. Once she realizes the importance of audience, she pays close attention to the effect of her ideas, and especially her own political views, on a future reader. The purpose of her essay, she claims, is to give her audience "an overall view of understanding the relation between China and Taiwan and provide with my own bias that either unification or independence is not practical on the current situation so maintaining the status quo would be the best option to resolve this issue for the time being."

Given that she had taken on a rather complex topic, Shiyu admits that she encountered "diverse difficulties" in writing the essay. For instance, she claims that she struggled with "narrowing down the topic and coming up with proper questions." She also had trouble "finding the right sources" since "there are thousands of books, articles, journals, and news relative to the topic but selecting quotes and analyzing them can be a challenge." Commenting on her struggle with the process of synthesizing source material while also developing a point of view, she notes the complexities inherent in the intellectual work required "to collect one side of sources as an evidence to support one perspective, and then connect all the sources with its analysis to develop a standpoint." The difficulties here are both procedural and conceptual, and like any novice writer, Shiyu finds it hard to separate the two. While she mentions the importance of "editing the information in a clear and brief way" she associates editing with effective use of sources as she tends to use "more quotes than the explanation or understanding towards that quote." She finds this heavy reliance on source

materials to be problematic as "it is easier to be convinced by other people's idea and replace ourselves." She is highly aware of the difficulty she has juggling with sources, but in her articulation of the idea that excessive use of source material has the potential to displace the writerly self, there is an indication of her growing understanding of a key concept in writing—effective use and integration of evidence. She concludes with a remarkably insightful comment on the effect of excessive dependence on sources: "there will be no individual thinking and ideas but only interpretations and those kinds of writing cannot be regarded as academic writing." Implicit in the final sentence is Shiyu's transformed view of academic writing where she recognizes the centrality of the writerly self in formal discourse, the one that is not only present in the text as a thinking self but who also responsibly pulls together and reconciles other competing voices.

While Shiyu doesn't provide details about the particular strategies she employs to address these issues, she emphasizes that she eventually overcame those difficulties "by trying hundreds of ways, such as send an email to the author of a book which is my first source, or interview my friend who is a Taiwanese to understand the second perception better." She finds the subject of the research essay to be so compelling that she reads an entire book on China-Taiwan relations and takes the initiative to write an email to the author inquiring further into the conclusions he draws in the book. Besides reflecting her control and agency as a writer, the decision also indicates her commitment to the pursuit of knowledge, and she sums that up by saying: "for my research essay, I find it really interesting that I can't stop writing."

Reflecting on her overall growth as a writer over the course of the semester, Shiyu compares her experience in an Advanced ESL writing course with what she has learned in the first year writing class. She notes that the non-credit bearing ESL writing course she had taken during the first semester was "not very useful" because though she wrote a paper on the "marriage of Shakespeare" and learned how to "do research using primary and secondary sources," she "did not get much information neither on how to better use quotes to support my idea nor how to do deeper analysis." In the college writing course she learned to "summarize the essay in a brief and proper way, deeply analyze and support with proper quotes, better develop connections between two texts, and use both in-text citation and work cited in a proficient way." She concludes by saying that it was only after she started studying at the university that she "began writing more in English like a *real writer* (my emphasis) who can express his/her idea of life, people, and what is happening around them in a skillful manner." She notes that at the end of the course she finds that she is "more confident and passionate in writing in English," a testament to her attention to the power of language and its singular place in her growth as a writer.

Several important points emerge in Shiyu's case that shed light on L2 transfer issues, particularly for novice L2 writers. There is no indication in her self-report that her prior English writing experiences—both in China and in an ESL course in the US—have any significant bearing, positive or negative, on the writing she does for the college writing course. The differences in types of discourse, that is, between informal writing such as emails, texts, letters and the more formal analytic college writing, seems to have naturally eliminated the possibility of any re-engagement of prior knowledge. If there was any occurrence of "adaptive transfer," (DePalma & Ringer, 2011) any reliance on and application of prior writing knowledge, Shiyu makes no mention of it perhaps because the reflective writing prompts did not require participants to focus explicitly on whether—and to what extent—they were drawing upon previously learned genres to complete their writing assignments. However, there is some evidence of near transfer as Shiyu notes in her reflective writing that she successfully applies analytical skills learned in Essay 1 to the more complex writing requirements of Essay 2 demonstrating transfer of skills between similar contexts. The degree to which her heightened sense of audience, her developing identity as a "real writer," and her newly acquired writing knowledge will be re-activated in new writing situations will depend upon Shiyu's metacognitive strength in recalling prior knowledge and ability to reflect upon the demands of the situation when faced with dissimilar tasks, and upon genre-based, transfer-focused writing instruction (Johns, 2011). Furthermore, questions of far (or high road) transfer of L2 learners may be better addressed by longitudinal studies of L2 writing.

"The Understanding Has Been Changed"—The Case of Ming

Ming is a tall, quietly dignified twenty-year old from Beijing who is an undeclared Business major studying toward a degree in Business Management. He arrived in the US in the spring of 2012 and enrolled in three ESL courses before taking College English for L2 writers in the fall of 2012. He writes that he started learning English in grammar school and was introduced to non-fiction writing in middle school when his "Chinese teacher gave us an article in newspaper and then she told us to write our opinions about the air pollution." He explains, "This is my first non-fiction text that I've done and my point of view is that people shouldn't make money by destroying the environment because the Earth is the only place that people can live on. If human damaged the only living place, we would be homeless." In high school Ming was introduced to the research paper and was "taught to structure and how to write academic essay based on non-fiction readings." He states that he considers himself "as a reader and part of thinker in English because I cannot express myself properly sometimes."

He attributes his lack of proficiency to a lackadaisical attitude toward learning and shares that he was a "naughty boy" in school who "didn't want rules to block me and prefer to finish the things in one step because it's quicker." Noting the trouble he has had organizing his writing Ming states that it is "hard for me to write response to an article or a point of view. The ideas just come out my mind and I don't know how to arrange the structure of the essay and divide ideas into different parts." Showing an awareness of his tendency to repeat himself and his inability to develop ideas he states "what's more, I may separate the same idea into different paragraphs."

In the first reflective essay Ming writes about the difficulties he confronts in Essay 1 and how he "struggled to do the thesis and connect the next paragraph fluently." He has a "thesis" in the first paragraph "but the paragraph after the introduction is about the article. It took me a lot of time to solve this problem." He has trouble transitioning from general ideas that he calls his "thesis" to textual analysis and in his words, "Transferring sentences didn't seem perfect." To solve this problem he "tried to find the connections between the thesis and essay." He then notes a second problem "which about how to do textual analysis and add my opinions" and to address this he "started the textual analysis first and added my personal opinion and express like agree or against the ideas that author came up and why I agree or disagree." From Ming's standpoint, "textual analysis" cannot include his "opinion" and so he tackles these as related but separate tasks.

Ming's biggest problem, he notes, has to do with "building the structure." He worries that, as a result of his inability to clearly organize his thoughts, "Different ideas may be put in the same paragraph and the ideas are not organized logically." At the same time, he is concerned that this lack of proper organization has another effect: "the ideas of the essay don't go deeper, but like the electrocardiogram. The ideas which should be put together are separated into different parts and some of the ideas come up suddenly. The whole essay doesn't seem like a whole without logic and transition sentences." Here Ming expresses what he perceived to be the most troublesome aspect of writing in English, his ability to fluidly and logically organize his thoughts while also maintaining a depth and integrity of ideas that "go deeper and deeper rather than move horizontal which means adding materials." A good writer is one who knows how to "organize the article well and each paragraph connects perfectly. The different ideas won't come out suddenly the ideas should be prepared before they come up." As he concludes his first reflective essay, he focuses on a developing writing skill. He states "In this semester, I feel free to write because I learn how to use quotations. When I use the quotes, I should add them in sentences and add some context. Do the contexts before giving the quotations and explain the importance of the

quotation and how I connect my ideas and the quotations. And my essays are more substantial than before."

In his second reflective essay, Ming reiterates the same struggles and successes he noted earlier, emphasizing the difficulty with organization and his growing ability to integrate source material into his writing. He writes that although he spent "much time" on the second formal writing assignment, he still had trouble balancing the different parts of his essay. He notes, "Organizing the structure is the biggest problem that I have now. I use too many pages to explain Berger's essay without connect the advertisement that I choose. It's like I use Berger's essay to explain Berger's ideas." As he contemplates on revision strategies he notes, "I need to use Berger's ideas to explain the problems which hide in the publicity. Analyze image first, find the details in the essay and then use Berger's ideas to explain the problems in the advertisement. Use his ideas like reference. Don't let his ideas take over the essay." Ming realizes that Berger's ideas are central to his analysis of the advertisement but he "did spend much time on analyzing Berger's ideas, which is the reason why my essay has less voice from myself." He arrives at a new understanding, it seems, of the importance of authorial voice in a piece of writing, and reminds himself that "Berger's idea is the supporter" and that as a writer, Ming should not "let him to take over the essay." He ends the reflective piece by emphasizing that he has learned "how to use the sources and analyze the references in the article" and that "using quotation is the way to make the essay strong." He also values the importance of close reading so that he can "understand the deep ideas of the articles."

For the last formal writing assignment of the course, the research essay, Ming chose "to interpret the Diaoyu Islands issue. The territory conflicts between China and Japan. And figure out the reasons why both China and Japan want to take these islands and why America was involved in this issue." In his third reflective essay he explains that he selected this topic so that he could find out "what will America get during this issue?" and enlighten his audience who he believes are "the people who argue about the complicated historical issue and those don't get the deeper meaning—game playing among America, China and Japan." He states, "I hope that my audiences could learn something from essay, which is to watch a same thing through different angle rather than make decision in haste." Working with a topic that is both politically sensitive and complicated, Ming invariably comes up against the same trouble spot he has been struggling with from the beginning of the term—how to organize his ideas and create a satisfactory structure for his essay. He writes, that "the most difficult aspect of writing the research paper is organizing the structure of the essay. I need to write with history order because it makes easier for readers to understand the historical documents that both China and Japan provide. The methodic

[sic] structure helps the readers to reach author's goal of writing gradually." But while he is concerned about pulling the source materials together, Ming also displays an awareness of the effect that a chronological ordering and discussion of the source material will have on his audience. He writes that a "well-organized structure give people clear sense of the ideas . . . Otherwise, the ideas may not go deeper and the whole essay is like adding material. For instance, if there are historical documents in the essay, the history details will be written in history order. If the history details weren't placed in history order, readers might feel confused about the progressing of the events." What is clear here is that as Ming reflects upon what seems to be troublesome—thoughtful analysis of textual material and organization of ideas—he simultaneously considers writing strategies that will help him overcome it.

Ming also highlights another recurring writing trouble-spot—improving "connections between ideas" so that "the ideas go deeper naturally." He notes that he still struggles to do this well because he writes "a little bit more paragraphs on the same idea and paraphrase other authors' ideas sometimes. I may focus more on my own ideas rather than others' idea." Summing this up in pithy note-to-self statements, he writes, "Don't let the quotation take over the whole. Use the quotations like reference." He elaborates on the usefulness of this newly-found skill: "Using the quotations properly is the first thing that I learn in this course. In high school, the quotations in my essay don't connect the ideas fluently. What I know is to use the quotations to support the ideas. However, I don't know anything about how to use the quotations, which is the reason why the quotations appear suddenly. Now, I know how to make quotations link glibly." In a commentary on what he believes he has learned in the course he focuses on the importance of reading and critical thinking skills. He writes, "This course teaches me to think critically and many writing skills, such as, connecting the ideas and quotations, organizing the essay structure and transition sentences, making the ideas go deeper. Before taking this class, I may only mention the surface meaning of the article rather than deep meaning. For instance, I even don't know there are hidden ideas which may transform people in the ads. I can think critically after taking this course. The understanding has been changed. Writing is not all about personal opinions, it includes critical thinking and developing ideas."

While Ming does have some prior experience with academic writing, he repeatedly writes about his struggle with in-depth analysis and logical development and organization of ideas but he doesn't discuss whether he draws upon any prior writing knowledge, both in L1 and L2, as he approaches college writing assignments. Sullivan, Zhang, and Zheng explain that a genre of lyrical prose called *sanwen*—a stylized and expressive form of writing commonly used in

Chinese writing instruction—is characteristically understood to mean "scattered writing" since often "there is no restriction on topic or structure" (2012, p. 310). It is possible that as a novice English writer Ming instinctively falls back upon familiar discursive strategies used in Chinese lyrical prose to compose analytical essays, as a result of which his writing moves "horizontally" instead of going "deeper and deeper." The differences between a Chinese prose style based on expressive writing and the conventional text-based, critical and analytical writing valued in first year writing courses may not only account for the difficulties Ming faces but also reflect troublesome knowledge that possibly interferes with writing required in the new setting. In hindsight it is clear that a greater focus on culture-specific rhetorical knowledge, both in the literacy narrative as well as the reflective writing assignments, might have allowed Ming to be more aware of the differences in discourse patterns between Chinese prose and western prose styles and provided more flexibility in the writing process.

DISCUSSION

Although like many international students who come with a strong English literacy background Shiyu and Ming are relatively fluent in English, they are also novice writers who find themselves adapting to a new and unfamiliar learning environment—the college English writing course. In this struggle to adapt, they find themselves in a liminal state where confusion and disequilibrium reigns. In large part, their status as novice L2 writers whose cultural background and prior writing experiences may not have sufficiently prepared them for the kinds of writing expected in first year writing contribute to this disorientation. But the context of the disorientation—the influence of different rhetorical traditions upon the different types of writing instruction experienced in China and in the US (Sullivan, Zhang & Zheng, 2012, p. 323)—if purposefully integrated into L2 writing instruction can help diminish the confusion students experience when faced with new writing tasks. When consciously invoked, conversations about differences in rhetorical traditions can help bring these differences to light, allow L2 students to make appropriate writerly choices, and effectively situate them in the new writing context.

While Ming and Shiyu do find themselves caught between rhetorical traditions, as they develop as writers they are able to productively negotiate writerly difficulties and demonstrate their ability to proceed along the liminal spectrum. They directly address the difficulties they face, and in their reiteration of positive outcomes and emphasis on strategies used to overcome these difficulties, there is also a sense of accomplishment and growth that outweighs the struggle they face as L2 writers. If they entered the course at a pre-liminal stage in terms of

understanding what it means to compose in English, given the evidence of their deepened perspectives on writing and becoming writers, at the end of the term they seem to be poised at the intersection of the liminal and post-liminal spheres in their writing development. Undoubtedly, their reflective writing responses allow us to get an intimate glimpse into this process; it is in the articulation of the difficulties and attempts to overcome them that Shiyu and Ming show the most promise. In their engagement with the meta-writing tasks about their writing difficulties there is evidence of a two-fold process: of looking backward at what was new and troublesome and of looking forward at a deeper awareness of writing processes and at strategies for resolving them. Thus in the reflective writing we see them as learners occupying a liminal space where they struggle to make sense of new writing knowledge as they identify trouble spots and stumbling blocks, but which also opens up a generative space that is expansive, dynamic, and potentially productive.

Nevertheless, while teacher-initiated metacognitive tasks can encourage introspection and evaluation of their growth as writers, without external structures that create possibilities for reflection it is questionable whether L2 (and even L1) students would be motivated enough to seek out opportunities that would help build meta-awareness—and meta-knowledge—of their troublesome journey in first year writing courses. Novice L2 writers, in particular, need to be guided through the various stages of liminality in they continue on this journey, and in Shiyu and Ming's reflective responses we see evidence of the slow but steady progress L2 writers are capable of making. With continued support and creation of opportunities for acts of metacognition, they will continue to develop as writers in general education courses and in courses in the major and across the disciplines. To achieve this, there needs to be continuity from one course to another in the form of curricular structures and instructional materials that allow for expression of L2 writing knowledge development through metacognitive tasks. One way of implementing this would be to administer focused writing prompts at the beginning of the semester when students reflect upon skills, abilities, and prior writing knowledge they bring to the course. This would serve a dual purpose; it would not only provide instructors with critical information about L2 students' self-perception as related to writing abilities but also allow students to recall how prior writing situations and experiences have shaped their development as writers. Bereiter's observation that "the potential for transfer is not usually thought of as residing in the learner but rather in whatever has been learned" (1995, p. 21) is a critique of the traditional—and largely pessimist—view of transfer that fails to take into account the critical role of learner dispositions, the ability of the learner "to seek out and to create situations similar to those in which reflective discourse was experienced initially" (1995, p. 31).

Seen through the lens of this dispositional approach to transfer, metacognitive language—both situationally created and self-generated—has the potential to serve as a tool and as a vehicle for expressions of growth in writing knowledge. One can only hope, as does Bereiter, that such growth "reappears" (1995, p. 33) in other learning contexts.

Small learning achievements often represent big steps for L2 learners, and reflection on these milestones in writing knowledge development may also have an impact on the perceived self-efficacy—defined by Bandura as "self-referent judgments arrived at through cognitive processing of diverse sources of efficacy information" (1986, p. 362)—of L2 writers and help build confidence in their ability to take on the challenges inherent in new writing situations. By the end of the first year writing course, Shiyu says she "can't stop writing" and Ming notes that he can now "think critically," statements reflective of both pride and high achievement. If in future learning contexts they are provided with tasks that explicitly address and continue to build their understanding of areas they identify as trouble spots, such as textual analysis, critical reading and thinking, organization of ideas, integration of sources, sense of audience, writerly identity in English, and the genre of academic writing (across disciplinary contexts), they may be able to sustain and deepen their transformed view of writing when they encounter new writing situations and come closer to mastering what could potentially be understood as threshold concepts for L2 writers.

Currently there is ongoing effort in the field of composition studies to identify and investigate concepts that have "threshold" features and that carry disciplinary value (see Adler Kassner et al., this volume, and Adler-Kassner & Wardle, 2015). In their brief overview of literature anchored in foundational concepts related to writing, Adler-Kassner, Majewski, and Koshnik (2012) propose that this literature—mainly on genre studies and situated learning theory—points to evidence that there are "several interrelated threshold concepts such as genre, purpose, audience, and situated practice that are consistently invoked in the literature on and teaching of writing." As writing scholars continue to work toward establishing what constitutes significant thresholds in the teaching and practice of writing, it is useful to remember that "*ways of thinking and practising*" also constitutes a crucial threshold function" (Meyer & Land, 2003, p. 9) and enable students to arrive at a transformed understanding of writing and what it means to be a writer. Thus, metacognitive activities that are intentionally built into course design and understood to represent a "*form of engagement*" within a larger "*framework of engagement*" (Meyer & Land, 2005, p. 57) not only give L2 students an opportunity to see themselves as participants in a community of practice but also establish authentic possibilities for "ways of thinking and practising"—that is, mindful recall of writing-related concepts and subsequent

text production based on the understanding of these concepts—when they encounter writing-based tasks in new learning contexts.

As growing writers, the difficulties that L2 students face are linguistic, rhetorical, stylistic, and genre-bound, and often reflect a double bind as they struggle to find language that adequately represents the ideas they want to express. In particular, the struggle involved in the conceptual work required of L2 writers as they try to articulate their writing problems is often connected with their ability to find language that adequately expresses these concerns. But this troublesome articulation has the potential to lead to greater understanding once the thought is written and the idea established in words. As Meyer and Land point out, "Language itself, as used within any academic discipline, can be another source of conceptual troublesomeness" (2003, p. 11). For language learners, writing problems are deeply intertwined with language problems since "language *is* the content" (Reimann, 2002, as cited in Meyer & Land, 2003). Given this view of the troublesome nature of language, it would be important to keep in mind the ideological implications of establishing threshold concepts in L2 writing as practiced in North America, for a transformed view of writing—a sociocultural act—may appear to promote a "privileged and dominant view and therefore a contestable way of understanding something" (Meyer & Land, p. 3). From a contrastive rhetoric perspective, contrastive rhetoric being the examination of differences and similarities in English writing, both ESL and EFL, across language, cultures, and contexts (Connor, 2002), writing is a social activity both embedded in and the result of specific cultural norms and conventions. However, as Connor explains, since "the teaching of norms invokes the dangers of perpetuating established power hierarchies" (2002, p. 505), critics of contrastive rhetoric have noted the ideological problems that arise from teaching L2 learners the western conventions of writing that cater to native English speakers' expectations. Given the differences in genre, purpose, goals, norms, and expectations of writing across cultures, L2 writing instructors may well be aware of their pedagogical goals and learning outcomes for the particular population they are teaching. But regardless of the larger intentions and political implications of curricular goals and outcomes, a stronger focus on metacognitive tasks about writing development can help L2 writers articulate their struggles and successes and build their capacity for self-reflection.

Significant variations across institutions in L2 curricular goals, instructional materials, writing tasks, instructor preparation, student ability, and the unpredictable nature and outcomes of the process of learning itself, calls for L2 writing transfer to be understood from a situated learning perspective—through the lens of what may be called a situated approach to transfer—as a process that entails troublesome negotiation of writing knowledge in particular learning

contexts, and not as an inevitable learning outcome that is generalizable across all contexts and learning situations. Further, connected to this situational view of transfer, it would be useful for instructors to evaluate their own understanding of the threshold concept "variation in student learning" (Meyer, 2012. p. 9) which involves knowledge of "*differentiated mechanisms of production of learning outcomes*" (author's emphasis) (p. 9). As Meyer explains, the way that students engage with the content and context of disciplinary knowledge varies from individual to individual, and yet instructors struggle to grasp this very fundamental pedagogical concept. This concept takes on a greater significance when we consider the variety and differences in the literacy history, personal background, and prior writing experiences of L2 students and serves to remind us how crucial it is that all writing instructors attend to the differences not only between L1 and L2 learners but among L2 as well.

As Meyer has remarked, "Provoking and *managing* (author's emphasis) a state of liminality is in itself a useful pedagogic strategy" (2012, p. 12). With the increasing presence in college courses of multilingual writers who bring with them a range of abilities and experiences, there is a need for studies that look more closely at accounts of learning in the liminal space where the struggles and triumphs—the signs and evidence of learning as a recursive as well as progressive activity—is most evident. This will open up the possibility of imagining liminal spaces inhabited by L2 students as not merely sites of struggle, characterized solely by disorientation or confusion, but as generative spaces where troublesome knowledge coexists with emergent understandings and one that should be valued as a productive phase of L2 writing transfer.

REFERENCES

Adler-Kassner, L., Majewski, J. & Koshnick, D. (2012). The value of troublesome knowledge: Transfer and threshold concepts in writing and history. In *Composition Forum*, *26*. Retrieved from http://compositionforum.com/issue/26/troublesome-knowledge-threshold.php.

Adler-Kassner, L. & Wardle, E. (Eds.). (2015). *Naming what we know: Threshold concepts in writing studies*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.

Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *The Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4*(3), 359–373.

Bawarshi, A. & Reiff, M. J. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. Fort Collins, CO: The WAC Clearinghouse/Parlor Press. Available at http://wac.colostate.edu/books/bawarshi_reiff/.

Bereiter, C. (1995). A dispositional view of transfer. In A. McKeough, J. Lupart & A. Marini (Eds.), *Teaching for transfer: Fostering generalization in learning* (pp. 21–34). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bransford, J. D. & Schwartz, D. L. (1999). Rethinking transfer: A simple proposal with multiple implications. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 61–100.

Connor, U. (2002). New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 493–510.

DePalma, M. & Ringer, J. M. (2011). Toward a theory of adaptive transfer: Expanding disciplinary discussions of "transfer" in second language writing and composition studies. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20,* 134–147.

Elon Statement on Writing Transfer. (2015). Retrieved from http://www.centerfor engagedlearning.org/elon-statement-on-writing-transfer/.

Gentil, G. (2011). A biliteracy agenda for genre research. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20,* 6–23.

Grujicuc-Alatriste, L. (2013). A response to DePalma and Ringer's article "Toward a theory of adaptive transfer: Expanding disciplinary discussions of 'transfer' in second-language writing and composition studies." *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22,* 460–464.

Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16,* 148–164.

James, M. A. (2008). The influence of perceptions of task similarity/difference on learning transfer in second language writing. *Written Communication, 25,* 76–103.

James, M. A. (2009). "Far" transfer of learning outcomes from an ESL writing course: Can the gap be bridged? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18,* 69–84.

Johns, A. M. (2011). The future of genre in second language writing: Fundamental, but contested, instructional design. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20,* 56–68.

Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (2008). Task response and text construction across L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17,* 7–29.

Land, R., Cousin, G., Meyer, J. H. & Davies, P. (2005). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (3): Implications for course design and evaluation. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving student learning—equality and diversity* (pp. 53–64). Oxford, UK: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Land, R., Rattray, J. & Vivian, P. (2014). Learning in the liminal space: a semiotic approach to threshold concepts. *Higher Education, 67*(2), 199–217.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Meyer, J. H. F. (2012). "Variation in student learning" as a threshold concept. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 26*(3), 8–13.

Meyer, J. H. F. & Land, R. (2003). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge 1—linkages to ways of thinking and practising. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving student learning—ten years on* (pp. 1–16). Oxford, UK: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Meyer, J. H. F. & Land, R. (2005). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2): Epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and learning. *Higher Education, 49,* 373–388.

Meyer, J. H. F. & Land, R. (2006). *Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: An introduction.* In J. H. F. Meyer & R. Land (Eds.), *Overcoming barriers to student understanding* (pp. 3–18). London: Routledge.

Moore, J. L. (2012). Mapping the questions: The state of writing-related transfer research. *Composition Forum*, *26*. Retrieved from http://compositionforum.com /issue/26/map-questions-transfer-research.php.

Perkins, D. N. (1999). The many faces of constructivism. *Educational Leadership*, *57*(3), 6–11.

Perkins, D. N. (2006). Constructivism and troublesome knowledge. In J. H. F. Meyer & R. Land (Eds.), *Overcoming barriers to student understanding* (pp. 33–47). London: Routledge.

Perkins, D. N. & Salomon, G. (1994). Transfer of learning. In T. Husen & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of education* (Vol. 11) (2nd ed.) (pp. 6452–6457). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(4), 657–677.

Sullivan, P., Zhang, Y. & Zheng, F. (2012). College writing in China and America: A modest and humble conversation, with writing samples. *College Composition and Communication, 64*(2), 306–331.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tardy, C. M. (2006). Researching first and second language genre learning: A comparative review and a look ahead. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15,* 79–101.