The aptitude to write well is becoming increasingly one of the crucial elements that leads to college and career accomplishment for students. The significance of writing better requires students to be equipped with competent writing skills as the students are being accepted to colleges and jobs based on the quality of their writing tasks. This situation captures the complexity of the fact that writing represents higher intellectual skills when universities and jobs select candidates among many according to their writing performance, and selected candidates are the accomplished ones with better writing skills. While high quality writing practices are in greater demand for students to advance in their academic growth, lack of sufficient preparation to meet this well established demand is evident (Jeffery, Kieffer, & Matsuda, 2012).

With this in mind, linguistically and culturally different rhetorical traditions that are experienced by second language students due to their home culture intensifies the pressure of becoming better writers, and second language writers face with further challenges when compared to their native English speaker peers (Jwa, 2019). While the phenomenon of writing in the first language versus in the second language awaits further research to be defined more systematically and effectively, it is indeed vital to make a comparison on how speech develops versus writing within the second language acquisition theory.

Chomsky (1981) has advanced a theory of Universal Grammar (UG); it constitutes a mentalist claim that all human beings within the normative range have a biological endowment consisting of an “innate language faculty”
permitting children to acquire the grammar of any particular language(s). This faculty is unrelated to other cognitive abilities; it contains awareness of abstract principles that organize language and an awareness of the parameters through which those principles are instantiated in any given language. The trigger for the activity of this faculty arises from minimal exposure to a language, and from only positive evidence of the principles (thus eliminating any sort of error correction). This model has strongly influenced second language acquisition (SLA) research. However, although grammar may indeed be acquired through the “innate language faculty,” reading and writing must be taught anew in every generation…(Kaplan, 2005, p. 382).

Within the wider intellectual context of acquiring a second language, it seems clear that Chomsky’s view on universality when acquiring a language comes into play for second language acquisition theories for both linguists and language teachers regardless of the language in question. In other words, any average human being without having the need to have extra abilities can learn languages at ease, and special instruction is not needed to learn speech with proper social exposure. This is a consequence of what Chomsky regards as “universality.” To this end, learning how to read and write are obviously not part of a natural linguistic growth, but rather acquiring these skills require fundamental and systematic teaching. Not surprisingly, any average person can learn how to talk but not all can read and write. If the writing is achieved only through instruction, what differs average writing from skillful writing; and how could we define effective writing instruction from ineffective ones? Even though contrastive rhetoric refers to subdisciplines of internalizing other culturally determined writing systems and rhetorical
traditions, the necessity to deeply understand how English speakers and those who speak English as an additional language are learning to write still remains as a mysterious phenomenon to be explored. Perhaps most obviously, looking at the discipline of writing from contrastive rhetoric along with innovative writing practices could open up new avenues for further research.

This edited book will provide a foundation as to why writing as an independent discipline should be in progress, what sort of theoretical and practical implications should be in place for second language writers, and in what ways it can be possible to provide futuristic and linguistic perspectives on teaching writing to speakers of other languages. Although we encourage chapters that could address the following research topics as an initial guide, proposals related to the writing discipline from a new perspective to enrich this edited book collection are welcomed.

- How are languages different in their rhetorical traditions or practices?
- What differs one rhetorical tradition from another rhetorical tradition?
- In what ways could we compare and contrast English with other rhetorical traditions?
- What is contrastive rhetoric in regards to practicing writing with a different culturally and historically rooted rhetorical tradition?
- Through the lens of contrastive rhetoric, what struggles second language writers face?
- Is there a special formula that teaches skills to write better in a second language or is writing skills inherent?
• What is the place of writing in academic growth? Is writing being taught appropriately? If so, in what ways?

• Reflecting back on your language learning experiences (if any), is there an ideal way to write in English? If so, can this skill be only mastered by native speakers?

• How is the ideal way to teach English language writing to speakers of different languages?

• What's the art of teaching writing in the 21st century?

• In what ways identity is formed through writing?

• What is writing as a method of inquiry?
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