“Grandparents for the Next Generation”: Building on Alister Cumming’s History of L2 Writing in Canada

Christin Wright-Taylor and Joel Heng Hartse

Paul Kei Matsuda has written about the divide between US composition and applied linguistics, which he attributes to an institutionalization of the division of labour between applied linguistics and composition in the early 1960s. Therefore, when language concerns resurfaced in composition in the early 2000s, this division of labour led to a “lack of a community of knowledgeable peers who [could] ensure intellectual accountability” among compositionists. Did this same divide occur in a Canadian context, or has the field of second language writing developed differently in Canada? The goal of this article is to construct a history of L2 writing scholarship in a Canadian context to better understand the current situatedness of L2 writing in Canadian higher education.

To this end, the paper extends the work of Alister Cumming, who narrates the evolution of L2 writing scholarship in Canada. Using data from Cumming’s “Studies of Second-Language Writing in Canada: Three Generations,” this article reports findings from archival research that traces the publication history of key knowledge-workers (identified by Cumming) from the 1980s to the 2000s. These findings tell a story about how L2 writing developed as a field in Canada and the ways in which it was influenced by fields like education and applied linguistics. Ultimately, these findings contribute to the broader narrative of how L2 writing has professionalized in Canadian higher education. By investigating the historic formation of L2 writing in Canada, scholars, writing instructors, and writing program administrators can draw on historic relations to create writing pedagogy that best meets the needs of an increasingly linguistically diverse writing classroom.

Paul Kei Matsuda a écrit sur le clivage entre la composition et la linguistique appliquée aux États-Unis, un clivage qu’il attribue à l’institutionnalisation de la répartition du travail entre la linguistique appliquée et la composition au début des années 1960. Ainsi, lorsque les préoccupations linguistiques ont refait surface dans le domaine de la composition au début des années 2000, cette répartition du travail a mené à « l’absence d’une communauté de pairs bien informés qui assurent [potentiellement] la responsabilité intellectuelle » parmi les spécialistes de la composition ». Ce même clivage a-t-il eu lieu dans le contexte canadien, ou le domaine de l’écriture en langue seconde (L2) a-t-il évolué différemment au Canada? L’objectif de cet article est d’établir un historique de la recherche sur l’écriture en L2 dans un contexte canadien afin de mieux comprendre la situation actuelle de l’écriture en L2 dans l’enseignement supérieur canadien.
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In the context of higher education in the United States, second language (L2) writing has been recognised as a “subfield of second language studies” (Matsuda, 2003, p. 15) for some time. It is generally acknowledged to have its origins in two fields which Matsuda argues have engaged in a “disciplinary division of labor” (1999, p. 699) since roughly the 1960s: “ESL” (rooted in applied linguistics, a field primarily understood as being concerned with teaching English to university students for whom it is not a first language), and composition, a field primarily understood as concerned with teaching writing to university students. Matsuda (2003) argues that L2 writing began to develop more robustly in the 1990s, and it is clear that certain developments (Tony Silva’s supervision of many PhD graduates in L2 writing at Purdue, the establishment of the Journal of Second Language Writing in 1992, and the Symposium on Second Language Writing in 1998) solidified L2 writing as a significant area of scholarly activity in its own right, whether or not it could (or can) be seen as rising to the level of a “discipline” in the same way its putative parents, applied linguistics and composition, are.

The locus of the disciplinary accoutrements of L2 writing which rose to prominence in the 1990s is arguably the United States, despite there being a handful of prominent L2 writing scholars based in other contexts – the Canadian scholar Alister Cumming among them. Indeed, in 2009, at the Symposium on Second Language Writing in Tempe, Arizona, Terry Santos noted that the two most prolific supervisors of doctoral graduates specializing in L2 writing to that point were Tony Silva at Purdue University and Alister Cumming at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto. Beyond this statement, however, there had been little understanding of how second language writing has developed in the Canadian context until Cumming (2016, reprinted in this issue) published his own history of L2 writing in Canada, which this paper aims to supplement and enhance.

Debates about the disciplinary status of L2 writing have re-arisen in recent years. In her paper “The Disciplinary Identity of Second Language Writing,” Terese Thonus (2020) argues for the disciplinary nature
of L2 writing. For Thonus, articulating L2 writing as an academic “discipline-in-formation” (p. 9) is important for supporting the work of “researchers, practitioners, graduate students, and above all, multilingual writers” (p. 1). However, Paul Kei Matsuda (2021) disagrees. Matsuda takes up Thonus’s premise and argues, instead, that L2 writing should not become an academic discipline, primarily because such a discipline would not be able to suitably sustain the work of said researchers, practitioners, graduate students, and multilingual writers. Matsuda does not disparage L2 writing scholarship; rather, it seems he seeks to protect it from the kind of overextension that would cause L2 writing to crumble. Instead, Matsuda urges L2 writing scholars and teachers to work toward gaining institutional recognition (p. 1).

This article takes an historical approach, picking up the conversation between Thonus and Matsuda and applying it to a Canadian context. We agree with Matsuda (2021) that the disciplinary status of L2 writing has significant implications for those who teach, research, and publish in L2 writing, and with Thonus (2020) that the disciplinary parentage of L2 writing scholarship has implications for the disciplinariness of L2 writing itself. However, this parentage is not as clear in Canada as it is in the United States, and the extent to which a Canadian L2 writing can be said to “exist” (Heng Hartse, 2021), as a field, a discipline, or whatever else, will remain unclear unless we can undertake historical research—a kind of excavation—to trace the history of this type of scholarly work in a Canadian context. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify where and how L2 writing has evolved in a Canadian context if we are to understand whether L2 writing is a discipline or an intellectual formation in Canadian higher education.

Understanding how L2 writing has evolved in Canada is an important first step to distinguishing whether it is, or can become, a discipline. Fred D’Agostino (2012) writes that one of the three elements that support a discipline is “an accepted narrative of the discipline’s development and legitimacy” (p. 336). In other words, to establish whether a line of scholarship is a discipline requires establishing a common narrative of how that discipline has evolved. While this article does not aim to decisively settle the question of L2 writing’s status as a discipline in the Canadian context (or others), we do seek to contribute to the discussion by fleshing out the narrative of L2 writing’s development in a Canadian context.

To that end, this article traces the publication histories of those identified as important Canadian contributors to L2 writing from the 1980s through the 2010s, building on Cumming’s “Studies of Second-Language Writing in Canada: Three Generations.” In his article, Cumming narrates a history of scholars based in Canada (either as faculty members or doctoral students) who have contributed to L2 writing scholarship through those four decades. An exploration of who these scholars are, where they studied and/or worked, and where they published will help to clarify the lineage of L2 writing in Canada and reveal what this lineage might mean for the current situatedness of L2 writing in Canadian higher education.

**Terminology**

We can hardly begin to discuss the history of L2 writing in Canada without running into problems of terminology. A slurry of terms and acronyms drifts across this field and its genealogy: applied linguistics, TESOL (and TESL, TEAL, and so on), second language acquisition (SLA), second language studies (SLS), rhetoric and composition, discourse and writing studies. At some point in the literature, each of these terms has been used to name fields which influenced, shaped, or ushered L2 writing to its current state. However, not all these terms are equally relevant in both a US and a Canadian context, and definitions are not always agreed upon.

Let’s begin with a definition for the term *second language writing*, sometimes styled L2 writing or SLW for short. Joel Heng Hartse (2021) offers a three-part definition of second language writing as “a practice,” or something that students do when producing texts in a language other than their first; a “skill that is taught” to students as a particular area of English language pedagogy; and a “field of research” that
produces scholarship about the teaching and learning of L2 writing. When students who speak multiple languages write in English, they are practicing L2 writing. When writing teachers craft writing assignments that account for the linguistic and cultural capital that their students bring to a composed text, they are teaching L2 writing. When researchers produce scholarship about, say, multilingual students’ composing processes, or the teaching of a particular academic genre to those students, they are, in theory, building the field of L2 writing. For the purposes of this research, we are concerned with the third prong of Heng Hartse’s definition. While Canada very clearly has many practitioners of the first two definitions—multilingual students learning to write, and instructors teaching them—the question of the field’s “intellectual formation,” to use Matsuda’s term (2021, p. 1), hinges on this third definition, and is what this paper is concerned with.

Further up the family tree, we find the limbs that have preceded L2 writing. In the United States, Matsuda (1999) shows that L2 writing exists at the nexus of “ESL” (as typified by scholars associated with the TESOL International Association) and “composition” (as typified by those associated with the Conference on College Communication and Composition). Thonus (2020) similarly writes that L2 writing has its roots in rhetoric and composition and applied linguistics. However, the label “rhetoric and composition” does not easily translate to a Canadian context. As Graves & Graves (2006) have pointed out, the decentralized nature of writing instruction in Canada has been deeply influenced by a British bellestristic model of English education, pushing “composition” outside of a faculty home. Clary-Lemon (2009) builds on Graves and Graves’ (2006) research to show how the lack of an institutional home for writing instruction has led to the decentralized nature of rhetoric and composition in Canada. As a result of this decentralization, many scholars and practitioners of writing instruction in Canada do not readily use the term “rhetoric and composition” to describe what they do. The term “writing studies” may be a suitable for a Canadian context; however, even that term can be broad and unwieldy, encompassing multiple synonyms such as composition studies, rhetoric, rhetorical & culture, rhetorical theory, texts and technologies, writing history and theory, or poetics, rhetorics, & technologies (Moxley, n.d.). For the purposes of this research, this article uses Wetherbee Phelps’s (2014) terms to distinguish between the study and practice of teaching writing: “rhetoric and composition” in the United States and “discourse and writing” in Canada (p. 5), the latter of which can be seen in the names of organizations like CASDW-ACR, the Canadian Association for the Study of Discourse and Writing / l’Association canadienne de rédactologie, and the journal now known as Discourse and Writing/Rédactologie.

The other parent for L2 writing in Canada, applied linguistics, appears to have a much more stable definition across time and geography. Cook (2003) refers to applied linguistics as “the academic discipline concerned with the relation of knowledge about language to decision making in the real world” (p. 5). The Canadian and American approaches to this field seem to line up more than those dealing with writing; compare, for example, the flagship US professional organization AAAL (the American Association of Applied Linguistics) with the Canadian ACLA-CAAL (Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics / L’Association canadienne de linguistique appliquée). Some Canadian universities directly reference this discipline in their doctoral programs—Carleton University’s program in applied linguistics and discourse studies, for example—while other applied linguists in Canada are likely to be based in faculties or departments of education and in programs focused on English language teaching. When speaking of the applied study of language acquisition in both the United States and Canada, then, this article uses the term “applied linguistics,” which we understand to include sub-fields often referred to in North America as ESL/EFL, TESOL, TESL, TEAL, and the like.

This discussion of terminology hints at the potential for a slightly different evolution of L2 writing in Canada versus the United States. Terms are slippery because they do not define a homogenous history across borders. Though we could dismiss these differences as inconvenient idiosyncrasies, in reality they hold significant implications for the disciplinary nature of L2 writing in Canada. Writing in a US context, Matsuda (2021) argues that L2 writing is not a discipline and should not become a discipline primarily...
because L2 writing scholars and teachers will not have institutional homes or adequate professionalization, but that L2 writing can still be considered an “intellectual formation” and should still seek to find institutional recognition through targeted strategies. In light of this assertion, the question remains: If this is the case for L2 writing in the United States, then how does the history of L2 writing impact its disciplinary status in Canada? Discerning the answer is not simple, because L2 writing in Canada developed from a slightly different locus. Locating and identifying this locus in Canada has important implications for L2 writing specialists practicing and studying in Canada.

**Methodology**

This paper identifies the key scholars named by Cumming (2016), sorts them by decade, and compiles a publication history from each decade for that scholar, noting their institution and department. The publication history was compiled by cross-referencing Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and, where available, faculty webpages. To appropriately scope the research for this article, the publication history excludes books, book chapters, opinion pieces, book reviews, or conference talks, favouring instead original research published as articles in peer-reviewed journals. In addition, the publication history focusses primarily on first authors identified by Cumming. Student authors who were listed as second authors often didn’t appear again in further publication searches and so have been delimited from these findings. It should also be noted that many of these scholars have publication histories which may go beyond the decade in which Cumming identified them as key contributors to L2 writing scholarship in Canada, but only their publications from the relevant decades as defined by Cumming are included.

The scholars’ publication histories are listed as citations in the Appendix organized by author and decade; within each decade the citations are listed in chronological order. Were this article to place all the citations simply in the References, the chronological order of the publications would be scattered. The Appendix thus preserves the narrative of when and where these scholars were publishing their research during that time.

Once the publication histories were listed for each decade, the journals were filtered into a table. From there, the “About” and “Aims and Scope” sections of the journal websites were read to identify with which disciplines the journals most closely aligned. In cases where the journals are multidisciplinary, they are categorized as such. In the few instances where the journals did not provide enough information online to align with a discipline, the journals are categorized as “undetermined.” After identifying the related disciplines of each journal, these journals were grouped according to their respective disciplines in the table. It is therefore possible to identify which disciplines the scholars were publishing in across time, and in which disciplines these scholars were finding a home for their work. In addition, it is important to note that while Cumming (2016) may have highlighted only a select few publications that are obviously identifiable as “L2 writing scholarship” for each of the scholars included, all of their publications from that decade are included here so as to flesh out their own disciplinary situatedness.

A final note about inclusion criteria: this research does not chart the publication histories of scholars who were trained in Canada but have gone on to pursue academic careers outside of Canada; for example, if a scholar did their doctoral training in Canada but was later a professor in another country, the work they did in subsequent decades is not included here. That is not to say that these scholars’ publications are not worth narrating, nor that they are not contributing to L2 writing scholarship since leaving Canada. Rather, the exclusion of these scholars was a matter of practicality since the number of scholars working internationally is substantial enough to support a separate article. These scholars earned their training in Canada under Canadian mentors and are contributing to the scholarship of L2 writing by publishing widely, including in North American journals. Though they may be located outside of Canada, their
research is still contributing to the work of L2 writing scholarship broadly and should be counted as a part of the narrative of how L2 writing has evolved in Canada. Further research is needed to narrate the publication histories of these scholars who have studied in Canadian higher education and are taking their training across borders. Future research can better understand the contributions of L2 writing scholarship in Canada by including these international scholars. However, for the purposes of scope, this article will focus primarily on scholars who have published while working in Canadian institutions.

Table 1 illustrates the search and categorization process.

Table 1
Data Aggregation, Search, and Categorization Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Scanning and Selection Stage</th>
<th>Pulled scholar names from Cumming article. Organized by decade.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Aggregation Stage</td>
<td>Cross-referenced Google Scholar and ResearchGate to build publication history for each scholar by decade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinement Stage</td>
<td>Searched journal websites for disciplinary affiliation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Categorization Stage</td>
<td>Grouped journals by discipline for each scholar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

1980s: “The Grandparents for the Next Generation”

In his article, Cumming (2016)\(^1\) traces the foundations of L2 scholarship from two separate branches: (a) what he calls “L1” writing, or what would now be recognized as discourse and writing, and (b) studies in language acquisition and bilingualism. According to Cumming, discourse and writing scholarship in Canada came out of four different fields: rhetoric, applied linguistics, cognitive science, and systemic-functional linguistics. Cumming writes of these L2 writing ancestors, “Their studies of, ideas about, and graduate-level courses on writing in English as a first language (L1) established the intellectual foundations and research orientations for a subsequent generation of scholars to focus later on parallel studies of L2 writing” (p. 3). In other words, the work Canadian scholars were doing in discourse and writing during those early days created the foundation from which L2 writing would grow. In reflecting on the legacy of these discourse and writing scholars, Cumming writes, “That so many of these English L1 writing researchers worked and published in pairs … makes me think of them fondly as ‘grandparents’ for the next generation of L2 writing researchers” (p. 3). And it was these discourse and writing “grandparents,” publishing at the same time as language acquisition and bilingualism scholars, who turned the soil for the generation of L2 writing scholars working in the 1980s (see Figure 1).

1980s: Canada’s Early Systematic Study of L2 Writing

Cumming identifies the following scholars as contributors to L2 writing during the 1980s: Joe Belanger, Bernard A. Mohan, Margaret Yau, and Cumming himself. Citations for each scholar for this decade are listed in chronological order in the Appendix. Table 2 lists the journals by discipline in which they published during the 1980s.

---

\(^1\) References to this original article will henceforth be to the version reproduced in this issue.
Figure 1

L2 Writing Ancestry Prior to and During the 1980s

Table 2

1980s Scholars and Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar/Institution</th>
<th>Applied Linguistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Belanger (University of British Columbia)</td>
<td>• TESL Canada Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• English Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Alberta Journal of Education Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highway One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alister Cumming (OISE, University of Toronto)</td>
<td>• Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TESL Canada Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Canadian Modern Language Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Centre for Applied Language Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interlanguage Studies Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard A. Mohan (University of British Columbia)</td>
<td>• TESOL Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Language Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret S.S. Yau (OISE, University of Toronto Ph.D. Student)</td>
<td>• TESL Canada Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dissertation, OISE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on these findings, the scholars contributing to L2 writing scholarship during the 1980s were working primarily at OISE and the University of British Columbia. Notably, although they were all situated in education departments, their disciplinary sub-specialities, at least as evidenced by the venues they published in, were various: Belanger’s work appears more associated with K–12 English education (and not strictly in the ESL sense), while Cumming’s seems more clearly rooted in applied linguistics with a foray into literacy. Mohan’s published work deals with academic discourse in school settings from a systemic-functional linguistics perspective. Although Cumming notes that discourse and writing, or “L1 composition,” may have been influential before the 1980s, the work produced by these scholars does not have a clear association with areas like composition or writing and discourse studies. (This may in part be because the organization now known as CASDW had not yet adopted the term nor a broader orientation to its field of study—it was founded in 1982 as CATTW, the Canadian Association of Teachers of Technical Writing. For more on this, see Wright-Taylor, 2023.)

1990s: L2 Writing Begins to Broaden in Canada

Cumming identifies the following scholars as contributors to Canadian L2 writing during the 1990s: Margaret Early, Pat Currie, Mehdi Riazi, Ling Shi, Susan Parks, Mary Maguire, Donald Qi, and again Cumming himself. Citations for each scholar for this decade are listed in chronological order in the Appendix. Table 3 lists the journals by discipline in which they published during the 1990s.

Based on these findings, the scholars contributing to L2 writing scholarship in the 1990s were still working in slightly more varied departments. OISE still has a strong representation here, likely because Cumming was also located there. But we also see that these scholars were situated in language and linguistics departments. Consequently, the publications reside heavily in applied linguistics; however, Cumming and Maguire also continue to publish in education journals. The founding of the Journal of Second Language Writing in 1992 is an important event in the story of L2 writing’s disciplinarity, and Cumming’s and others’ (such as Shi and Qi, both OISE doctoral students at the time) publications in early issues of the journal established a Canadian presence from its early days.

2000s: The Field Begins to Formalize in Canada

Cumming identifies the following scholars as contributors to L2 writing during the 2000s: Ling Shi, Ryuko Kubota, Guillaume Gentil, Jérémie Séror, Khaled Barkaoui, and Brian Morgan. (Kubota joined UBC in 2009, so because the majority of her publication contributions in a Canadian context occurred in the 2010s, Kubota’s publication history has been included in Table 5.)

Cumming notes that many of these scholars were immigrants to Canada. Shi and Kubota, for example, both did PhDs at OISE in the 1990s, had their first professorial appointments elsewhere, and then returned to Canada, both ending up at the University of British Columbia; only Gentil did doctoral training outside of Canada. Citations for each scholar for this decade are listed in chronological order in the Appendix. Table 4 lists the journals by discipline in which they published during the 2000s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Early</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>English in Australia, Language Arts, Prospect, TESL Canada Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary H. Maguire</td>
<td>McGill University</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Parks</td>
<td>Université Laval</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ling Shi</td>
<td>OISE, University of Toronto</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>Journal of Second Language Writing, TESL Canada Journal, System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Qi</td>
<td>OISE, University of Toronto</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>Canadian Modern Language Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on these findings, the scholars contributing to L2 writing scholarship in the 2000s were still primarily located in education and linguistics departments. The University of Ottawa, Carleton University, and York University contribute institutional homes for these scholars, providing them the foundation from which to publish in a wider range of disciplines. While applied linguistics and education are still the
primary publication fields during this decade, it appears that these scholars broadened their publications to include multidisciplinary and writing-focused journals. Gentil and Séror’s research, and Séror’s institutional affiliation with OLBI, bring the role of French into greater prominence in Canadian L2 writing scholarship here; notably, Gentil would later become co-editor of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* from 2014 to 2017, the first Canadian scholar in the position.

### 2010s: L2 Writing Continues to Grow in Canada

Cumming identifies the following scholars, in addition to himself, as contributors to L2 writing during the 2010s: Merrill Swain, Jim Cummins, Margaret Early, Rahat Naqvi, Seung Won Jun, Eunice Eunhee Jang, Choongil Yoon, Paula Kristmanson, Heike Neumann, and Rob Simon. Citations for each scholar for this decade are listed in chronological order in the Appendix. Table 5 lists the journals by discipline in which they published during the 2010s.

By the 2010s, it appears that scholars contributing to L2 writing are located exclusively in education units, though with a variety of specializations, and their publication histories are centralized primarily in applied linguistics and education journals. During this decade there are also a few cross-disciplinary publications in discourse and writing, health sciences, and psychology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010s Scholars and Journals</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Education**<br>- TESL Canada Journal<br>- TESOL Quarterly |

<p>| <strong>Jim Cummins</strong>&lt;br&gt;OISE, University of Toronto&lt;br&gt;Department of Curriculum, Teaching, &amp; Learning | <strong>Applied Linguistics</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Australian Review of Applied Linguistics&lt;br&gt;- Bilingual and Multilingual Education&lt;br&gt;- Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics&lt;br&gt;- Cahiers internationaux de sociolinguistique&lt;br&gt;- Computer Assisted Language Learning&lt;br&gt;- Journal of Language and Literacy Education&lt;br&gt;- Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education&lt;br&gt;- Journal of Multilingual Education Research&lt;br&gt;- Language Assessment Quarterly&lt;br&gt;- Linguistics and Education&lt;br&gt;- Scottish Languages Review&lt;br&gt;- TESL Canada Journal&lt;br&gt;- TESOL in Context&lt;br&gt;- TESOL Quarterly |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Discourse and Writing</th>
<th>Multidisciplinary</th>
<th>Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Matters: The Journal of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Writing and Pedagogy</td>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
<td>Language and Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education as Social Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Educational Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council for Curriculum and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Reading Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revista Padres y Maestros/Journal of Parents and Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology, Pedagogy and Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multidisciplinary</th>
<th>Multidisciplinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
<td>Journal of multilingual and multicultural development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Margaret Early</th>
<th>Paula Kristmanson</th>
<th>Ryuko Kubota</th>
<th>Eunice Eunhee Jang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia Faculty of Education Department of Language and Literacy Education (LLED)</td>
<td>University of New Brunswick Faculty of Education</td>
<td>University of British Columbia Faculty of Education Department of Language and Literacy Education (LLED)</td>
<td>OISE, University of Trononto Department of Applied Psychology and Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Education</td>
<td>Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development</td>
<td>TESOL Quarterly</td>
<td>Annual Review of Applied Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Language Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language Assessment Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language and Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Language Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TESL Canada Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy &amp; Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Matters: The Journal of Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Educational Computing Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Research Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Multidisciplinary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy &amp; Practice</td>
<td>Reading Research Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Matters: The Journal of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Educational Computing Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidisciplinary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Research Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discussion and Conclusion

What do these results indicate about the disciplinarity of L2 writing in Canada? If L2 writing in the United States grew out of composition and applied linguistics, that heritage is not present to the same degree in Canada. Tracing the publication histories of the early knowledge-workers identified by Cumming appears to reveal the following: while L2 writing in Canada may have originally drawn on applied linguistics and L1 writing/discourse and writing in the 1980s, it quickly shifted toward a lineage more firmly rooted in applied linguistics and education.

We do not claim that these scholars would understand their disciplinary identity as primarily “L2 writing scholars”; in some cases, like those of Cumming, Shi, and Gentil, they seem to have been closely associated with L2 writing, while others, like Early and Cummins, may primarily focus on K–12 ESL and/or literacy but have published work that has considerable overlap with or important implications for L2 writing. Regardless of their own self-identification or publication histories, Cumming identifies them as important contributors, and in the course of their work and research they have contributed to the evolution and growth of L2 writing scholarship in Canada. Tracking their overall publication history and situating them in specific departments in Canadian universities creates new insight into which disciplinary homes provided the foundation for L2 writing scholarship to grow. According to the findings above, scholars contributing to L2 writing scholarship across the decades have done so primarily from the disciplines of applied linguistics and education. This is a different story than the history of L2 writing in the United States.

Future research may explore the following research question: How might this different locus of scholarship have influenced the disciplinarity of L2 writing in Canada?

The initial history sketched by Cumming has been further developed in this research; however, there is room for more research to continue clarifying the narrative of L2 writing’s development in Canada. For example, Cumming’s article relates the substantial contributions of OISE to L2 writing scholarship, but future research might seek to supplement this initial history with contributions from other institutions during these decades. As mentioned earlier, there is also room to add to this narrative by tracking the publication histories and contributions of scholars who completed their doctorates in Canada and have gone on to publish L2 writing scholarship at international universities, scholars such as Wataru Suzuki, Mehdi Riazi, and others. In addition, more research is needed to trace the lineage of former L2 writing scholars. Where have their Ph.D. students gone on to find jobs? Are these Ph.D. students mentoring new scholars in L2 writing? Have they been able to secure academic jobs and continue to contribute to L2 writing scholarship in Canada or internationally? Finally, where does L2 writing fit into professional associations and academic journals in Canada? Research questions such as these provide opportunities to build a robust narrative of the evolution of L2 writing in Canadian higher education.

Tracing the publication histories of these early L2 writing scholars contributes to an accepted narrative of the development of L2 writing in a Canadian context. Understanding the distinct history of L2
writing in Canada has implications for its disciplinarity in Canadian higher education. Whether L2 writing in Canadian higher education can be seen as a discipline-in-formation, in Thonus’s terms, or as an intellectual formation, in Matsuda’s, depends on establishing a coherent history of how L2 writing grew up in Canada and what academic lineage formed it. Regardless of the disciplinarity of L2 writing in Canada, establishing an agreed-upon history will go a long way toward helping researchers, graduate students, teachers, and multilingual students do what Matsuda urges all of us working in L2 writing to do: gain institutional recognition. In other words, the better L2 writing scholars understand their story, the better they can tell it.
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Appendix: Publication Histories by Decade and Scholar

1980s Publication Histories

**Joe Belanger**


**Alister Cumming**


**Bernard A. Mohan**


**Margaret S. S. Yau**


1990s Publication Histories

Alister Cumming


*Pat Currie*


*Margaret Early*


*Mary H. Maguire*


**Susan Parks**


**Mehdi Riazi**


**Ling Shi**


**Donald Shuguang Qi**


**2000s Publication Histories**

**Khaled Barkaoui**


**Guillaume Gentil**


**Brian Morgan**


**Jérémie Séror**


**Ling Shi**


2010s Publication Histories

Alister Cumming


**Jim Cummins**


**Margaret Early**


**Eunice Eunhee Jang**


**Seung Won Jun**


**Paula Kristmanson**


**Ryuko Kubota**


**Heike Neumann**


**Rahat Naqvi**


**Merrill Swain**


**Rob Simon**


**Choongil Yoon**


