

Kwansei Gakuin University
Humanities Review
Vol. 17, 2012
Nishinomiya, Japan

Assessment and Academic Writing: A Look at the Use of Rubrics in the Second Language Writing Classroom

Gavin BROOKS*

Abstract

One of the most important aspects of the job of an English teacher is giving students the feedback and corrections they need to improve as second language learners. This is especially true for written English. In writing classes the process of providing feedback to students on their writing takes-up significant amounts of time and effort both inside and outside of the classroom. In order to streamline the feedback process teachers often make use of tools, such as rubrics, to help them provide their students with feedback. Traditionally rubrics have been seen as tools that have the potential of “increased consistency of scoring, the possibility to facilitate valid judgment of complex competencies, and promotion of learning.” (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007, p.130) However, recent studies in the L1 writing classroom have shown that there are some significant problems with the last of these items, using rubrics as a means of promoting learning. This paper looks at some of the current research on the use of rubrics in the classroom and attempts to construct a clearer picture of both the benefits and drawbacks of the use of rubrics for both grading and as a teaching tool in the L2 writing classroom. It is hoped that in doing so this research will provide insight into the tools teachers in Japan are using to respond to their students’ written work and act as a starting point for further research into how to improve these tools.

* Associate Lecture of English, School of Policy Studies, Kwansei Gakuin University

Article Contents

- I. Introduction
 - II. Historical Overview of the Rubric
 - 1. Rubrics in the L1 Classroom
 - 2. Rubrics in the ESL/EFL Classroom
 - III. The Effectiveness of Rubrics in the Language Classroom
 - 1. A case for using rubrics in the L2 writing classroom
 - 2. A case against using rubrics in the L2 writing classroom
 - IV. Conclusion
 - 1. Discussion
 - 2. Final reflections
- References
Appendix #1

I. Introduction

Written English may be one of the most important skills that students will learn at university in terms of both their future academic and professional lives. While many of the students studying English at universities in Japan will never be required to use English outside of the classroom on a day to day basis they are often asked to write compositions as part of the language tests that act as gatekeepers to their future jobs or further studies. The feedback that students receive from their teachers plays an important role in the students' development as English language writers. Because of this, one of the most important questions that we need to ask ourselves as teachers of written English is: "What is the best way to respond to and guide students' writing in a way that enables them to improve in both their current and future written assignments?" This question is essential, as a large part of the language teacher's job in the writing classroom is taken up with grading and providing feedback to students. In fact, the job of evaluating students' writing and giving them feedback is so central to the English language writing class many teachers do not even question how or why this process is necessary or how it should be done: "Many of the decisions that both L1 and L2 writing teachers make in their classes revolve around assessment of students' writing . . . (and) because a culture of assessment is built into the schooling enterprise, teachers rarely ask whether they need to assess their students." (Casanave, 2007, p.113) However, a closer examination of how and why they are providing feedback to their students is an essential part of professional development and a vital experience for teachers interested in improving themselves as educators.

II. Historical Overview of Rubrics

1. Rubrics in First Language Education

Rubrics were first introduced into the L1 writing classroom as a means of assessing student writing. In the traditional view of how writing should be assessed there was an assumption that it was possible to come up with some type of objective score that could be assigned to a students’ composition and that the validity of this “‘true’ measure of student ability . . .can only be established through technical and statistical rigor” (Huot, 1996, p.550). (See Figure #1) Because of this there was a push for researchers and teachers to come up with a set of tools that allow the reader to assign a valid score to the student’s writing. One of the most commonly used of these tools is the rubric. A rubric is defined as “a scoring tool for qualitative rating of authentic or complex student work. It includes criteria for rating important dimensions of performance, as well as standards of attainment for those criteria” (Jonsson & Svingby, 2007, p.131). Rubrics have long been a part of the writing classroom in first language classrooms around the world.

**Traditional Writing Assessment
Procedures, Purposes and Assumptions**

<i>Procedure</i>	<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>
Scoring Guideline	Recognize features of writing quality	Writing quality can be defined and determined
Rater Training	Forster agreement on independent rater scores	One set of features of student writing for which raters should agree
Scores On Papers	Fix degree of writing quality for comparing writing ability and making decisions on that ability	Student ability to write can be coded and communicated numerically
Interrater Reliability	Calculate the degree of agreement between independent raters	Consistency and standardization to be maintained across time and location
Validity	Determine the assessment measures what it purports to measure	An assessment’s value is limited to distinct goals and properties in the instrument itself

Figure #1: The traditional view of writing assessment (Huot, 1966, p.551)

Rubrics were first proposed as a tool to analyze writing in 1912 when Noyes suggested the use of a rubric as a means of standardizing the evaluation of student compositions: “Our present methods of measuring compositions are controlled too much by personal opinion, which varies with the individual. What is wanted is a clear-cut, concrete standard of measurement which will mean the same thing to all people in all places and is not dependent upon the opinion of any individual” (Noyes, 1912 as cited in Turley & Gallagher, 2008, p.88). Of these scales the most famous is the Hillegas scale, which was developed in 1912 and “gave English

teachers the first reliable means of estimating objectively the quality of their pupils' written production" (Hudelson, 1923, p.164). In 1915 Thorndike improved upon Hillegas rubric for grading student compositions by "substituting new specimens for certain of the original samples and by including several examples in the steps at or near the middle of the scale" (Hudelson, 1923, p.164).

One of the key benefits of these, and other rubrics, is that they are an attempt to provide some type of inter-rater reliability. This is done as an attempt to get around "one of the most vexing dilemmas in writing assessment . . . the inconsistency with which different readers tend to evaluate the same piece of writing" (Casanave, 2007, p.124). However, it is important to note that these rubrics "were never designed to (improve student writing) directly, and any who attempt to employ them for a such a purpose are certain to be disappointed" (Hudelson, 1923, p.163). In fact the early rubrics developed by Noyes and his contemporaries were designed not for the student, but for the administrator as a means "to provide a standardized form of measurement that would allow administrators and investigators to 'measure and express the efficiency of a school system'¹⁾ so that comparisons and rankings could be made between schools across the nation (Turley & Gallagher, 2008, p.88).

However, in the early 70's, as the "process approach" method for teaching composition became popular in classrooms around the United States, rubrics had to evolve from an assessment tools into something that could be used to provide students with feedback on how well their essay met a certain set of criteria and some insight into what they can do to improve themselves as writers. (Ferris, 2009) In the field of first language composition whether or not the rubric is an effective tool in providing students with the feedback that they need to improve as writers is a topic of debate in a variety of academic journals. Researchers have come out both in support of (H. G. Andrade, 2000; H. L. Andrade, Wang, Du, & Akawi, 2009) or against (Broad, 2000; Kohn, 2006; Wilson, 2007) the use of rubrics as a means of providing students feedback about their written work. One only needs to look at the sub-title of the 2008 paper by Turley and Gallagher, "Reframing the Great Rubric Debate", to see that there are strong feelings on both sides of this issue. One of the reasons for this debate is that how writing is being taught in L1 classrooms has changed significantly over the years and teachers are not being asked to simply evaluate their students' writing but to engage in a dialogue with their students in an attempt to help them improve as writers:

1) Turley and Gallagher take this quotation from Hillegas, Milo B., (1913), A Scale for the Measurement of Quality in English Composition by Young People. *Teachers College*, 13(4), 28-50.

a relatively recent shift in writing pedagogy has not translated into a shift in writing assessment. Teachers are given much more sophisticated and progressive guidance nowadays about how to teach writing but are still told to pigeonhole the results, to quantify what can't really be quantified. Thus, the dilemma: Either our instruction and our assessment remain "out of synch" or the instruction gets worse in order that students' writing can be easily judged with the help of rubrics. (Wilson as cited in Kohn, 2006, p.14)

2. Rubrics in the ESL/EFL Classroom

Many techniques have entered the second language writing classroom by way of the first language composition classes because, as "Silva, Leki and Carson (1997: 399) point out, 'second language writing is situated at the intersection of second language studies and composition studies' . . .(and) work that has focused exclusively on L1 writing assessment contributes greatly to our understanding of both the process and the product of L2 writing assessment" (Kroll, 1998, p.222). The rubric is one of those things that has been borrowed by L2 teachers from their colleagues teaching in the L1 writing classroom. Similar to how they were used in first language classrooms, rubrics began in second language writing programs as a means of providing teachers with a standardized way to evaluate their students' writing. They were also used as a tool to facilitate the placement of students at the appropriate level. In fact, today "most, if not all writing programs have entry and exit criteria or grading rubrics to guide teachers at various levels of the program." (Ferris, 2009, p.121)

In the field of second language writing the ECP, or ESL Composition Profile (see Appendix #1), is probably one of the most recognizable rubrics and "(i)t, or its offspring, will be familiar from workshop handouts or Xeroxes left behind in faculty coffee rooms" (Haswell, 2005, p.107). This rubric was developed in 1981 using research taken from the compositions of first language students. Three researchers from Educational Testing Services (ETS) took research done in 1953 on the grades and comments on the written assignments of first-year students studying at Middlebury College, Cornell and the University of Pennsylvania to come up with a rubric that was composed of five main traits. Each of these traits was then broken up into a number of sub-traits that the researchers believed could then be used to objectively grade English compositions written by second language speakers. (Haswell, 2005) One benefit of the ESL Composition Profile (Jacob et al., 1981) is that it has been established to have a high degree of both internal and external validity, with scores given on the rubric being shown to be both consistent between raters and as being "highly correlated with (student's scores on) the TOEFL and Michigan Test Battery" (Bacha, 2001, p.374) It is no accident that this rubric was

Main Traits of Scoring Rubrics for Six Tests of ESL Writing

Test	Trait
Test in English for Education Purposes (Associated Examining Board)	<i>Content</i> <i>Organization</i> <i>Cohesion</i> <i>Vocabulary</i> <i>Grammar</i> <i>Punctuation</i> <i>Spelling</i>
Certificate in Communicative Skill in English (Royal Society of Arts/ University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate)	<i>Accuracy [of mechanics]</i> <i>Appropriacy</i> <i>Range [of expression]</i> <i>Complexity [organization and cohesion]</i>
Test of Written English (Educational Testing Service)	<i>Length</i> <i>Organization</i> <i>Evidence</i> <i>Style</i> <i>Grammar</i> <i>Sentences</i>
Michigan English Language Battery	<i>Topic development</i> <i>Sentences</i> <i>Organization/ coherence</i> <i>Vocabulary</i> <i>Mechanics</i>
Canadian Test of English for Scholars and Trainees	<i>Content</i> <i>Organization</i> <i>Language use</i>
International English Language Testing System	<i>Register</i> <i>Rhetorical organization</i> <i>Style</i> <i>Content</i>

Figure 2: Traits measured by various rubrics used in standardized ESL/EFL Tests (Haswell, 2007, p.8)

designed by researchers working for a testing organization as the ECP provides these testing services with an invaluable tool that allows them to grade a large number of student essays using multiple raters while still maintaining a high level of inter-rater reliability. Because of this, other ESL/EFL testing companies are now also using rubrics as a means of grading the writing component of their tests. While the traits may vary from test to test (see Figure 2) the underlying rationale and principles remain the same.

In most writing classrooms the teacher has no need for this type of inter-rater reliability and is more likely to be interested in the pedagogical value of the rubric and the benefits of students accessing the rubrics to improve the quality of their writing. However, the debate about the pedagogical effectiveness of rubrics that is being played out in first language classrooms and research journals is only just

reaching the field of second language writing. While rubrics are mentioned in both texts and journals devoted to the study of second language writing (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Ferris, 1995; Hyland, 2010) they are usually mentioned in passing as one of a number of possible assessment tools with very little time given to the analysis of their effectiveness as tools for rating and improving student writing. For example, a look at the issues of the *Journal of Second Language Writing* over a 4 year period, from 2008 to 2011, reveals only 9 original research articles that even mention rubrics and, in all of these articles, rubrics are used unquestioningly as a tool for evaluating students' written work. In fact, a further search of this journal reveals only 2 articles from 1992 to 2011 that actually question the effectiveness of rubrics (Paulus, 1999; Weigle, 2007). One of these, Weigle, simply mentions the current controversy that exists in first language writing about the use of rubrics before dismissing the issue without providing any sources or evidence for her position: "while holistic scales are faster and more efficient, analytic scales tend to be somewhat more reliable than holistic scales, and certainly provide more useful feedback to students, as scores on different aspects of writing can tell students where their respective strengths and weaknesses are." (2007, p.203).

This view is changing and second language researchers such as Haswell (1998, 2005) are beginning to ask if rubrics are the best tools for language teachers to use as a means of improving their students' ability to write. However, as with the use of rubrics in first language composition, this is not the type of question that allows researchers to come down either in favor or against the use of rubrics in the classroom. In their article "On the Uses of Rubrics", Turley and Gallagher (2008) point out that, "instead of declaring all rubrics 'good' or 'bad,' we need to examine what they do, why, and in whose interest" (p. 92). They propose a 4 point heuristic to analyze the value of rubrics (or any pedagogical tool):

1. What is the tool for?
2. In what context is it used?
3. Who decides?
4. What ideological agenda drives those decisions? (Turley & Gallagher, 2008, p.87)

It is these 4 questions that provide a starting point for the evaluation of the effectiveness of rubrics in English language writing classes at Japanese universities.

III. The Effectiveness of Rubrics in the Language Classroom

1. A case for using rubrics in the L2 writing classroom

While they might have their downside, rubrics can be useful tools in the language classroom. Along with setting relevant tasks, setting a clear topic and prompts, helping students to choose the appropriate rhetorical modes and giving students adequate time to complete the writing task; setting an appropriate scoring criteria and the need to attain valid and reliable scores are essential elements of a successful English writing program (Jacobs et al., 1981). Rubrics can help teachers to achieve this goal as they set clear criteria for both the students and the teacher when it comes to grading written work.

Furthermore, rubrics also make it possible to evaluate components within written assignment, such as rhetorical structures, grammatical accuracy and the ability to stay on topic. This is especially important for second language writers as the level of the various skills essential to writing can vary significantly from student to student. In the L2 writing classroom we are much more likely to see “varying levels of proficiency/skill in different aspects of the product (and) products can vary widely across genres” (Kroll, 1998, p.224). Because second language writers are more likely to show varying levels of performance on the different traits “if we do not score for these traits and report the scores, much information is lost” (Hamp-Lyons, 1995, p.760). Rubrics make it easier for the teacher to record a score for each of these traits, or sub-traits, so that students are able to receive feedback on, and improve, the areas that require attention.

Another advantage of rubrics in the second language classroom is that they help the teacher or evaluator focus on more than just the sentence level structures found in the written assignment. In a 1993 study that involved six graders evaluating six samples of student writing Sweedler-Brown found that when a holistic scale was used to grade two sets of essays, one set that had the grammatical and spelling errors already corrected by the researcher and one set that had not been corrected, those essays that had poor mechanics consistently got lower scores, regardless of the proficiency of the rhetorical structures used in the essay. However, she found that graders who used a rubric to evaluate the essays were shown to focus more on “the high quality of the essays’ organization and paragraph development (and) were not distorted by the different qualities of the sentence-level features in the original and corrected essays” (Sweedler-Brown, 1993, p.11). The ability to focus on and encourage students to improve their discourse and rhetorical skills is essential if we want our students to become better writers of English as a second language.

2. A case against using rubrics in the classroom

While there are many positive things to be said for using rubrics in the classroom the use of rubrics in the second language writing class is not without problems. Recently a number of researchers have begun to raise “significant concerns about the consequences of writing assessment and the ways in which assessment practices sometimes seem to be antithetical to teaching practices” (Kroll, 1998, p.222). For example, Haswell (2005) notes that one of the big issues with rubrics are that they do not solve the problems involved with holistically grading an essay that they were designed to address. Rather, a rubric with five traits would simply be asking “the rater to perform the holistic (rating) five times” (Haswell, 2005, p.107). Also, while the rubric may succeed in grading how well the writer has met the criteria set out by the rubric, it does not do a good job of taking individuality into account and rubrics will often penalize the use of creativity, humor, or clever writing. These are often things that second language writing teachers are trying to encourage in their students. With second language learners the problem of tailoring their writing to meet the criteria laid out in the rubric is often compounded by the fact that second language students are often not aware of the different genres that the rubrics may have been developed to evaluate, genres that first language speakers are exposed to from an early age. As such, second language writers will often answer an essay question in a different way than a native speaker would, and subsequently receive a lower score on a rubric that is designed for, or by, L1 writers. However, as “(t)here is no single written standard that can be said to represent the ‘ideal’ written product in English . . . we cannot easily establish procedures for evaluating ESL writing in terms of adherence to some model of native-speaker writing.” (Kroll, 1990, p.141)

Another problem, for both L1 and L2 speakers, is that they may not know how to use the rubrics to improve their writing. Because rubrics are usually designed as a way of rating students those students are often not provided with adequate training on how to use the rubric to improve their writing skills. This problem is further compounded in the field of second language writing as many of the rubrics being used are based on rubrics that were designed for first language speakers and are often incomprehensible to L2 learners as they may contain information about traits or metaskills that the L2 writer is unable to understand.

IV. Conclusion

1. Discussion

So what can language teachers do? Should we be incorporating rubrics into our writing classes? Well, as I have already stated, this is not a simple yes/no answer.

Rubrics can provide both teachers and students with a valuable tool for improving students' second language writing. However, there are some steps we should be taking to make sure that the rubrics we use are providing our students with the support they need to develop as English language writers. To begin with, it is important that the rubrics we use in the classroom are developed for the type of assignment we are asking the students to perform. Many teachers take a one-size fits all approach to grading rubrics, often using a modified version of the same rubric to grade a wide variety of assignments or making use of one of the standardized writing rubrics that can be found in language teaching books. This approach can often lead to confusion on the part of both the rater and the students as the rubric may not be designed to evaluate the traits that the teacher is hoping to see in his or her students' compositions. Teachers need to take into account "the purpose of the essay task, whether for diagnosis, development or promotion . . . in deciding which scale is chosen. Revisiting the value of these scales is necessary for teachers to continue to be aware of their relevance" (Bacha, 2001, p.371). In fact, the most effective rubrics are those that are "developed on-site for a specific purpose with a specific group of writers and with the involvement of the readers who will make judgments in [that] context" (Hamp Lyons 1991 c:248)." (Kroll, 1998, p.228) However, "the downside of this sort of procedure is that for a thorough analytic judgment, each writing assignment would need to be scored on a specifically created assessment instrument" (Kroll, 1998, p.228) the creation of which can be a time consuming process.

Another issue with the use of rubrics in the second language classroom is their accessibility to the students. If the students are unable to comprehend the categories and or sub-categories contained in the rubric they will not be able to use it in any meaningful way to improve their writing abilities. Even when students are able to understand the rubric they may not understand how it relates to their composition, or be unaware of how to use the information provided by the rubric to improve their writing. The solution to this problem goes beyond just teaching students how to read the rubric. As they are stakeholders in the writing and assessment process the most effective rubric is one that has been "created with (the) students and reflects their values, goals, and language" (Turley & Gallagher, 2008, p.90). While this can also take up time it is an essential part of the process of using rubrics in the classroom as it is the only way to ensure that both the students and the teacher understand the nature of the assessment and it ensures a solution that links together the concerns of the various "stakeholders" in the assessment process.

2. Final Reflections

While the analysis of the use rubrics in the second language classroom is still

in its infancy I believe that it will become more important in the future. Similarly to what is happening now in the field of first language writing, both teachers and researchers working in the field of L2 composition will, in the near future, be forced to look at the tools they are using to assess their students and decide if these tools are doing the job for which they were designed. This should not be viewed as a negative trend as “rating process research can help us learn more about and improve writing teachers’ everyday feedback practices” (Connor-Linton, 1995, p.765). Which in turn will enable us to better help our students reach their full potential as second language writers.

Appendix #1: Example of ESL Composition Rubric

ESL COMPOSITION PROFILE			
STUDENT	DATE	TOPIC	
	SCORE	LEVEL	CRITERIA
CONTENT	30-27		EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development of thesis • relevant to assigned topic
	26-22		GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail
	21-17		FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic
	16-13		VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR not enough to evaluate
ORGANIZATION	20-18		EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly stated/supported • succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive
	17-14		GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy • loosely organized but main ideas stand out • limited support • logical but incomplete sequencing
	13-10		FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development
	9-7		VERY POOR: does not communicate • no organization • OR not enough to evaluate
VOCABULARY	20-18		EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register
	17-14		GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage <i>but meaning not obscured</i>
	13-10		FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>
	9-7		VERY POOR: essentially translation • little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR not enough to evaluate
LANGUAGE USE	25-22		EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions
	21-18		GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions <i>but meaning seldom obscured</i>
	17-11		FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/complex constructions • frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>
	10-5		VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR not enough to evaluate
MECHANICS	5		EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
	4		GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing <i>but meaning not obscured</i>
	3		FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • poor handwriting • <i>meaning confused or obscured</i>
	2		VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • handwriting illegible • OR not enough to evaluate
	TOTAL SCORE	READER	COMMENTS

References

- Andrade, H. G. (2000). Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning. *Educational Leadership*, 57(5), 13–19.
- Andrade, H. L., Wang, X., Du, Y., & Akawi, R. L. (2009). Rubric-Referenced Self-Assessment and Self-Efficacy for Writing. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 102(4), 287–302.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191–205.
- Bacha, N. (2001). Writing evaluation: what can analytic versus holistic essay scoring tell us? *System*, 29, 371–383.
- Broad, B. (2000). Pulling Your Hair out: “Crises of Standardization in Communal Writing Assessment.” *Research in the Teaching of English*, 35(2), 213–260.
- Broad, B., & Boyd, M. (2005). Rhetorical Writing Assessment The Practice and Theory of Complementarity. *Journal of Writing Assessment*, 2(1), 7–20.
- Casanave, Christine Pearson. *Controversies in Second Language Writing: Dilemmas and Decisions in Research and Instruction*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2003.
- Clary, R. M., Brzuszek, R. F., & Fulford, C. T. (2011). Measuring Creativity: A Case Study Probing Rubric Effectiveness for Evaluation of Project-Based Learning Solutions. *Creative Education*, 2(4), 333–340.
- Connor-Linton, J. (1995). Looking behind the curtain: What do L2 composition ratings really mean? *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(4), 762–765.
- Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 33–53.
- Ferris, D. (2009). *Response To Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (1995). Rating Nonnative Writing: The Trouble with Holistic Scoring. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(4), 759–762
- Haswell, R. (1998). Rubrics, prototypes, and exemplars: Categorization theory and systems of writing placement. *Assessing Writing*, 5(2), 231–268.
- Haswell, R. (2005). Researching Teacher Evaluation of Second Language Writing. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Second Language Writing Research: Perspectives on the Process of Knowledge Construction* (pp.105–120). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hudelson, E. (1923). The development and comparative values of composition scales. *The English Journal*, 12(3), 163–168.
- Huot, B. (1996). Toward a new theory of writing assessment. *College Composition and Communication*, 47(4), 549–566.
- Hyland, K. (2010). *Teaching and Researching Writing* (2nd Edition). Harlow: Pearson ESL.
- Jonsson, A., & Svingby, G. (2007). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. *Educational Research Review*, 2, 130–144.
- Kohn, A. (2006). *The trouble with rubrics*. *English Journal*, 95(4), 12–15.
- Kroll, B. (1990). What does time buy? ESL student performance on home versus class compositions. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the*

- Classroom* (pp.140–154). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kroll, B. (1998). Assessing writing abilities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 219–242.
- Paulus, T. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265–289.
- Sweedler-Brown, C. O. (1993). ESL essay evaluation: The influence of sentence-level and rhetorical features. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2(1), 3–17.
- Turley, E., & Gallagher, C. (2008). On the uses of rubrics: Reframing the great rubric debate. *English Journal*, 97(4), 87–92.
- Weigle, S. (2007). Teaching writing teachers about assessment. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 194–209.
- Wilson, M. (2007). Why I Won't Be Using Rubrics to Respond to Students' Writing. *The English Journal*, 96(4), 62–66.