The Effectiveness of Genre-Based L2 Writing Instruction on Korean Middle School Students’ Writing Ability

Hye Jeong Bae
(International Graduate School of English)


This study aims to examine the effectiveness of genre-based in-class L2 writing instruction on Korean middle school students’ writing ability and their perception change toward L2 writing. The research was conducted with 595 middle school students in the third grade from two co-ed schools in Gwangju Metropolitan City, Korea. Five sessions of writing instruction using a diary genre over five weeks were provided to an experimental group, while no explicit writing instruction was provided to a control group. The experimental group was exposed to 13 writing sample texts, analyzed and identified the characteristics of the target genre, and then constructed a diary text in collaboration with their peers. Following the treatment, both groups were required to write a diary entry in 40 minutes and the students’ writings were rated on content, organization, and language use. The results showed that only the experimental group, provided with explicit genre-based L2 writing instruction, showed statistically significant improvement in each category in the post-test. In addition, a set of questionnaires and interview data revealed that the participants’ attitudes and perceptions toward L2 writing were positively affected.

I. INTRODUCTION

English is being taught in schools around the world as a second language (SL) or a foreign language (FL). Among the four language skills, the role of writing is increasing in academic and professional settings (Kroll, 2003; Long & Richards, 2003). In 2008, the Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology announced its plan to phase in a new English testing system, the National English Ability Test (NEAT), starting in 2012. As the government, from 2016, plans to replace the current college entrance exam with NEAT, which includes speaking and writing unlike the current College Scholastic Ability
Test, attention is being drawn to the skills of speaking and writing. However, writing is not a skill easily mastered, particularly for second or foreign language learners. Many researchers have highlighted the difficulty of leaning to write in a second language (e.g., Hadley, 1993; Richards & Renandya, 2002; Rivers, 1981; Williams, 2005). Simply being exposed to an English learning environment does not guarantee writing improvement; therefore, explicit instruction is needed, especially for novice writers learning English as a foreign or second language (EFL/ESL) (Broughton, Brumfit, Flavell, Hill, & Pincas, 1980; Rivers, 1981; Yang & Sohn, 2009).

A number of ESL/EFL approaches to teaching writing have been suggested. However, three major approaches to teaching writing have widely been advocated and used in the past few decades. In the 1960s, a product-based writing approach prevailed in which the primary concern was producing error-free texts with linguistically correct forms by imitating exemplars (Badger & White, 2000; Nordin & Mohammad, 2006; Pincas, 1982). Although the product approach was considered effective in that learners’ writing proficiency along with their linguistic awareness improved by emphasizing correct use of vocabulary, grammar, and punctuation, it was criticized for neglecting the process of writing. Opponents of product-orientated teaching affirmed that linguistic skills could be developed only by learners themselves through the actual process of writing (Badger & White, 2000). Thus, the process-oriented approach advocated by Zamel (1987) in the mid-1970s began to replace the product approach, and it focused on the various stages of writing rather than on the final outcome (Badger & White, 2000; Hyland, 2003; Nordin & Mohammad, 2006). Process approaches were helpful to understand the stages of writing, but they were problematic because they were being applied in all cases regardless of different purposes, audiences, and contexts (Badger & White, 2000). In the 1980s, genre-based approaches appeared to overcome the shortcoming of more process-orientated approaches. Through genre-based instruction, learners were able to understand how to construct various types of writing for different purposes in social contexts (Badger & White, 2000; Hyland, 2007). The positive effects of genre-based writing instruction have been widely discussed (e.g., Hyland, 2002b, 2003; Hyon, 2001; Myskow & Gordon, 2010; Reppen, 2002; Swales, 1990; Yasuda, 2011).

English writing instruction in Korea, however, has been rare in classroom because it has been affected by many constraints; for example, the College Scholastic Ability Test, little time allotted for writing, and underdeveloped teaching skills (Kim, 2007; Kwon, Yoshida, Watanabe, Negishi, & Naganuma, 2004; Park 2007; Yang & Sohn, 2009). Recently, though, more research on L2 writing instruction has been attempted. Several studies examined genre-based writing instruction (e.g., Lee, 2006; Park, 2007; Shin & Lim, 2011) as well as process-based instruction (e.g., Kim, 2000; Lee & Hong, 2001; Park, 2001) and reported positive results. For secondary school students in Korea, however, writing
instruction following a genre-based methodology might prove appropriate for improving their writing proficiency (Lee, 2006; Park, 2007). Considering that writing instruction has been rare in English classrooms and the role of writing is increasing, more studies on teaching L2 writing at the secondary school level should be done in order to facilitate in-class writing instruction in Korea.

Based on the rationale presented above, this study aims to examine the effectiveness of genre-based L2 writing instruction on Korean middle school students’ writing ability and their perception change toward L2 writing. The specific research questions to be answered in this study are as follows:

1. How significantly do L2 writing composition scores differ between two groups: 1) with explicit genre-based in-class writing instruction and 2) without dedicated writing instruction?
2. How does genre-based writing instruction affect students’ attitudes and perceptions toward L2 writing?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. The Need for Writing Instruction in English Classrooms in Korea

In secondary English classrooms in Korea, relatively little attention, compared to other skills, has focused on teaching writing. According to Yang and Sohn (2009), secondary school English teachers in Korea rarely provide writing instruction in class, and the average time period for teaching writing each week is thirty-three minutes. They teach English and evaluate students’ English proficiency focusing on reading, listening, speaking, and writing relative to class time periods.

Reasons why writing instruction is rare have been noted by several researchers. First, the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT) may be one reason (Kwon et al., 2004; Park 2007). In a tri-national comparative study conducted by Kwon et al. (2004), high school students’ English proficiency in Korea, Japan, and China was compared; Korean high school students ranked lowest in writing among the three countries, while scores in reading and listening were highest. Kwon et al. (2004) stated that the CSAT and the national curriculum emphasizing listening and reading have powerfully influenced secondary school English education, thus resulting in Korean students’ low-ranking writing performance. Another reason for the absence of writing instruction is the lack of time allotted to teaching writing. Kim (2007) claimed that few chances to write and insufficient exposure to writing instruction might cause English language learners to
experience difficulties in writing. This idea is in accordance with Yang and Sohn’s (2009)
study. As shown in the results of their study, more than 80% of English teachers who
responded to the questionnaire noted a lack of time for teaching writing. Underdeveloped
教學 skills may also result in a lack of writing instruction. As Park (2007) pointed out,
there are not many secondary teachers of English with writing training or understanding.
Interestingly, according to Yang and Sohn (2009), 88% of English teachers in Gyeonggi
province were shown not to have participated in any professional training for teaching
writing, while 8% of them participated once a year and 4% more than four times a year.

Writing skills, unlike listening and speaking skills, cannot be acquired merely through
 exposure to English. There are four abilities underlying writing proficiency: grammatical
competence; sociolinguistic competence; strategic competence; and discourse competence
(Canale & Swain, 1980). These four competencies intersect to affect learners’ writing
proficiency and require explicit instruction to improve. The need for writing instruction to
improve writing proficiency has been emphasized by many researchers (Broughton et
al., 1980; Rivers, 1981; Yang & Sohn, 2009). A teaching and learning context without
systematic writing instruction can be improved by suitable, explicit writing instruction.

2. Effects of Genre-based Writing Instruction

The notion of genre has been variously defined by many researchers (e.g., Hyland,
2003; Martin, 1992; Swales, 1990). To synthesize the definitions, genre can be regarded as
a communicative process that negotiates meanings for achieving purposes in social
contexts. As noted by Badger and White (2000), the genre approach can be seen as an
extension of the product approach because it views writing as primarily linguistic;
however, it is different from the product approach in that a greater emphasis is placed on
the social context in which writing is produced. In other words, linguistic knowledge, in
the genre approach, is used as a means of achieving particular social purposes relative to
situation (Badger & White, 2000). Genre-based approaches have been widely supported
by researchers because students benefit from studying a variety of different types of
written texts. Different types of writing, or genres, such as recipes, law reports, or letters of
apology, are made and used to achieve different purposes through a particular structure and
grammatical forms (Badger & White, 2000). In short, genre-based writing instruction
enables students to explicitly understand “how target texts are structured and why they are
written in the ways they are” (Hyland, 2007, p. 151), which process-based approaches
neglected to offer.

Previous empirical studies have generally reported on the positive effects of genre-based
instruction for teaching writing (e.g., Hyon, 2001; Myskow & Gordon, 2010; Lee, 2006;
reported on the long-term effects of an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) genre-based intervention by interviewing eight adult non-native speakers at the tertiary education level who had taken a genre-based reading course. She revealed that genre knowledge acquired through explicit instruction positively facilitated some students’ L2 writing as well as reading. In Korea, Park (2007) investigated the effect of genre-based writing instruction on Korean high school students’ writing development in English. The targeted genres were diary and argumentative essay. The students were explicitly provided with the linguistic and structural features of the two genres over nine sessions of instruction. The results showed that the instruction was effective in increasing students’ scores in post-writing, improving students’ language control, and enhancing their abilities to structure their ideas. Moreover, the students expressed deep satisfaction with instruction and became more confident.

Despite the many studies noting the positive effects of genre teaching (e.g., Hyland, 2002b, 2003; Hyon, 2001; Myskow & Gordon, 2010; Park, 2007; Reppen, 2002; Swales, 1990; Yasuda, 2011), concerns remain. Freedman (as cited in Hyon, 2001) pointed out the possible danger of explicit genre instruction when teachers are not well informed about the target texts. Others noted the limiting effect on learner’s creative thoughts by having them depend so heavily on the teacher’s choice of model texts and explicit teaching of particular genres, thus resulting in passive learners (Badger & White, 2000; Caudery, 1995). However, as Hyland (2002b) argued, knowing how to apply genre knowledge with regard to a particular audience, communicative purpose, and social context is much more important than just knowing how to write grammatically correct sentences. To summarize, if writing instruction based on genre is carefully planned and well designed, it may promote L2 writing proficiency.

3. Implementation of Genre-based Writing Instruction

In genre-based pedagogies, there are three schools of genre defined by Hyon (1996): New Rhetoric, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), and Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). Each of these conceptualizes and analyzes genre differently. The New Rhetoric Group views genre as “typical expressions of rhetorical action” (Hyland, 2002b, p. 17). That is, genre is a socially accepted strategy that includes a typical discourse form and “has evolved for responding to a recurring type of rhetorical situation” (Coe & Freedman, as cited in Hyland, 2002a, p. 114). From this perspective, New Rhetoricians put less emphasis on form than the actions in which the form is used to perform (Hyland, 2002b; Paltridge, 2001). From the ESP perspective, genre is regarded as a communicative event participated in by a particular discourse community whose members share communicative purposes (Swales, 1990). These purposes establish the rationale of a genre, and this
rationale influences both the rhetorical features of the discourse and the content and style. The ESP school, largely based on Swales’ (1990) work, has inspired pedagogical applications in academic contexts (Hyland, 2002a). The final view, based on the theoretical framework of M.A.K. Halliday’s (1994) Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), known as the “Sydney School,” sees that accomplishing communicative purpose is central to genre in accordance with form, function, and context (Hyland, 2002b). As Martin (1992) argued, genres are culturally purposeful activities that language users bring to achieve goals. SFL theory emphasizes the relationship between language and its social function and shows how language choice is made for users to express meanings (Cheng, 2008). This emphasis on the close relationship between language, function, and meaning underpins genre instruction. Therefore, to practitioners of genre-based writing, grammar is seen as resources for making meanings rather than generating linguistic forms. Also, the social purposes of genres and the schematic structures to serve them are stressed (Hyland, 2002a). To define genre, among the three perspectives, the researcher draws on SFL as the cornerstone of genre-based instruction for this study, which sees language as a resource for making meaning in a particular context of use rather than as a set of fixed rules and structures (Halliday, 1994).

A genre approach based on SFL can be implemented through the teaching-learning cycle recommended by Feez (1998). In this cycle, five stages are actualized by a teacher and students together (as illustrated in Figure 1): (1) building the context; (2) modeling and deconstructing the text; (3) joint construction of the text; (4) independent construction of the text; and (5) linking related texts. During the first stage, the teacher establishes the purpose and social contexts where the target text is used. During the second stage, the teacher presents exemplary target texts and analyzes the key structures and linguistic features of the genre by introducing activities to practice the language features. In the third stage, the students create a target text with the teacher or their peers together following the steps of the writing process. During the fourth stage, students create texts individually by themselves. In the final stage, the use of the target genre is compared to other situations or with other genres in the same situation.
As shown in the teaching-learning cycle (Feez, 1998), genre-based pedagogy is underpinned by the belief that explicit instruction enables learning to be best accomplished (Feez, 1995; Hyland, 2002b). Studies have shown that EFL writing should be explicitly taught in order for learners to be more proficient L2 users. Implementation of genre-based writing teaching in English classrooms could be effective in improving Korean learners’ writing proficiency.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

The participants of this study were 595 middle school students in the third grade from two different middle schools in Gwangju Metropolitan City, Korea. The two co-ed schools were chosen by convenience sampling, and all third grade students from both schools were involved in this study. In school A, there are 323 students grouped into eight classes. They have English classes four times a week, and the levels are mixed. In school B, there are 277 students grouped into seven classes. The students take English classes four times a week and are level-differentiated according to final examination English test scores in the first semester: advanced, intermediate, and low-level. Among the 600 students from the two schools, five students from school A were excluded because they did not take the post-test. Accordingly, 595 students were included for data analysis.
The students of school A, the experimental group, were given explicit in-class genre-based writing instruction by their English teacher, who had eight years' teaching experience in public middle school. The students of school B, the control group, followed their usual English lessons without any dedicated writing instruction. Lessons were given from four different English teachers by the students' English proficiency. According to the background information of students of both groups collected from the pre-questionnaire, their previous English writing experience had been limited to writing for translation or grammar practice, and 29 out of 595 students had experienced writing passages longer than one paragraph in English in private institutes. Personal time spent on writing practice, excluding regular English class writing, was not over one hour a week on average. With respect to living experience in an English speaking country, 18 students (five from the experimental group and 13 from the control group) have resided abroad for no more than six months. Therefore, time spent on outside class writing practice and overseas experiences were not considered variables.

2. Target Genre

1) Diary Genre

Genres, such as novel, diary entry, postcard, textbook passage, are communicative processes that negotiate meanings for achieving purposes in social contexts. According to Hyland (2007, p. 156), the most common three principles of sequencing genres are:

- determining the most critical skills or functions relevant to students’ immediate needs;
- following the sequence of a genre set in a real world series of interactions; and
- grading genres by perceived increasing levels of difficulty.

Based on these principles, a diary entry was used as the instruction genre for this study. Middle school students do not need to be prepared for college entrance or job interviews in the near future; instead, they may encounter cases of recounting past experiences to family, friends, or teachers. Also, this genre is considered likely to be the most familiar to the participants based on prior educational experiences.

2) Recount Text Type

Text types, such as narrative, recount, persuasive, informative, are methods of development that help writers construct the genre. According to the English K-6 Syllabus
(Board of Studies, 2007), informed by SFL and seeking to develop students' writing competence through a genre approach, factual recount text types are used "to record a series of events in sequence in which they occurred" (p. 70). Recount is the major text type found in the diary genre in which events that happened earlier in the day are recorded and evaluated. The general features of a recount text type are described in Table 1. As can be seen, recount text type is used to report past occurrences or experiences. Recounts include four elements: an orientation, a series of events, personal comments, and a reorientation. Common grammatical features of recounts include use of action verbs, past tense, and time connectives.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Purpose</th>
<th>General Features of Recount (Board of Studies, 1998, p. 287)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recounts ‘tell what happened’. The purpose of a factual recount is to document a series of events and evaluate their significance in some way. The purpose of the literary or story recount is to tell a sequence of events so that it entertains. The story recount has expressions of attitude and feeling, usually made by the narrator about the events.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Structure**
- Recounts are organized to include:
  - an orientation providing information about ‘who’, ‘where’ and ‘when’;
  - a record of events usually recounted in chronological order;
  - personal comments and/or evaluative remarks, which are interspersed throughout the record of events;
  - a reorientation, which ‘rounds off’ the sequence of events.

**Grammar**
- Common grammatical patterns of a recount include:
  - use of nouns and pronouns to identify people, animals or things involved;
  - use of action verbs to refer to events;
  - use of past tense to locate events in relation to speaker’s or writer’s time;
  - use of conjunctions and time connectives to sequence the events;
  - use of adverbs and adverbial phrases to indicate place and time;
  - use of adjectives to describe nouns.

3. Materials

1) Teaching Materials (Writing Samples)

   Over the course of five instructional writing sessions, the participants in the experimental group were exposed to 13 writing sample diary texts. Among the 13 passages,
five were selected from Web-based sources providing diary passages. The remaining passages were selected from current middle school English textbooks. All sample texts were in the form of the diary genre, and the text type was mainly personal recount.

2) Questionnaire

A set of questionnaires developed by the researcher was administered at the beginning and the end of the experiment, respectively. The pre-questionnaire was administered to both groups and the post-questionnaire was administered to only the experimental group to identify if the writing instruction influenced the participants attitudes and perceptions toward L2 writing. In the questionnaires, a five-point Likert scale (1=Not at all; 5= Very much) was used.

The pre-questionnaire contained 11 questions asking about the participants' preferences and confidence in L2 writing, L2 writing experience, feedback on L2 writing, and future writing course content selection. On the post-questionnaire, the participants' thoughts about genre-based writing instruction such as satisfaction level, confidence of writing, and willingness to take another genre-based class were examined.

3) Interview

Following the five writing instruction sessions with the experimental group, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a selection of students and the teacher. Six students were chosen for the interview according to their English proficiency level: two each from the advanced, intermediate, and low level. They were asked six questions about the treatment and their perception toward L2 writing. The interviews lasted 60 minutes.

For the interview with the teacher, who provided the writing instruction, she was also asked six questions regarding genre-based teaching. During the 30-minute interview, she evaluated the effectiveness of genre-based writing instruction based on her experience, comparing the genre approach to previous teaching experiences.

4. Procedure

1) Pre- and Post-tests

The paper-based writing task on the pre- and post-tests was writing a diary entry. On the pre-test, participants were required to write a diary entry about the most memorable (happy, sad, terrifying, or embarrassing) day they had during summer vacation. The minimum length of the task was set at 30 words. On the post-test, participants were required to write
a diary entry about the most memorable (happy, sad, terrifying, or embarrassing) event they had recently experienced. Although the writing task questions were slightly different, both the pre- and post-test were designed to have the students write mainly using the recount text type.

2) Analytic Scoring Rubric

The students' pre- and post-tests were assessed based on an analytic scoring rubric modified by the researcher from Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, and Hughey (1981), Weigle (2002), Park (2007), and Shin and Lim (2011). Students' writings were rated on content, organization, and language use, features that were addressed during writing instruction. The scoring rubric for this study used a five-point scale; thus, the criteria assigned a score from one (not intelligible due to less than 30 words) to five (very explicit and clear) for each category. However, for lengths of zero words, a zero point was given in each category.

In order to prevent rater bias on the pre- and post-test, all test papers were randomized regardless of test order (pre vs. post) and group (control vs. experimental). In addition, two independent raters, one being the researcher, participated in scoring. The first rater, the researcher of this study, has eight and a half years' teaching experience in secondary schools in Korea. The second rater, a native speaker of English, has eight years' teaching experience at the elementary and secondary level. He is currently teaching English in a two-year college in Gyeonggi province, Korea as a full time ESL adjunct professor. To increase inter-rater reliability, the two raters practice scored 20 writing samples. During the practice session, each rater independently scored his or her writing samples using the criteria of content, organization, and language use. They then compared their scores, discussed reasons for different scores given, and then reached a consensus. After the practice session, both raters independently scored 120 student submissions, about 10% of the total number of test papers using the analytic scoring rubric. Scores from both were compared and the inter-rater reliability (the Pearson Product Moment Correlation) was 0.91. Thus, the researcher determined that this correlation coefficient was acceptable for this study and then singly graded the remaining submissions. In order to meet intra-rater reliability, the researcher scored 120 students' submissions again one month after the first grading. The intra-rater reliability calculations showed 97% agreement.

3) Experiment Procedure

During the first week of September, 2011, the participants completed the pre-test in 40 minutes. While they were completing the pre-test, they were not permitted to use any kind
of dictionary. The pre-questionnaire was conducted the following week. Five minutes was given to complete the questionnaire.

The experiment was conducted from October 10, 2011 to November 11, 2011. Genre-based writing instruction was administered once a week for 45 minutes over five weeks. Lesson plans and materials developed by the researcher for instruction were provided to the teacher.

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Building the context</td>
<td>The purpose, the generic structure, and the linguistic features of diary genre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Modeling and deconstructing the text</td>
<td>Modeling and deconstructing sample diary texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Group writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joint construction of the text</td>
<td>Process writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Independent construction of the text</td>
<td>Peer feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows how five sessions of genre-based writing instruction was conducted. The first session was building the context stage, in which the teacher delivered a lecture on the purpose, the generic structure, and the linguistic features of diary genre. During the second and third sessions, the teacher and the students analyzed sample diary texts and identified the characteristics of the target genre. In the joint construction of the text stage, the participants wrote a diary text in collaboration with the teacher and their peers. While they were constructing a new text, they followed the steps of process writing and engaged in peer feedback.

The control group did not receive any formal explicit genre-based writing instruction. Instead they took regular English classes four times a week in which all four skills are integrated. Their English class focused on writing skills was conducted at the end of the unit; in other words, the participants were asked to complete sentences for grammar review or wrote a short passage related to the unit topic without any specific guidelines.

Following the five-week treatment, the participants took the post-test. For the experimental group, the post-test was conducted in the final stage of writing instruction. They were given 40 minutes to write a new diary entry using recount text type. The post-questionnaire followed to examine changes in perception toward writing. Interviews with the participants, and later the teacher, followed the post-test.
5. Data Analysis

In order to test the effect of the treatment on the participants' writing ability, an analysis of variance with repeated measures (Repeated Measures ANOVA) was performed. The within-subject variable was Time (pre vs. post), and the between-subjects variable was Group (control vs. experimental). The individual time spent outside of classroom on improving writing was not considered because there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups. Second, for comparing the self-confidence level in L2 writing between both groups, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The dependent variable was Self-confidence Scores, and the independent variable was Group. The alpha level was set at 0.05 for both repeated measures ANOVA and one-way ANOVA.

IV. RESULTS

1. Genre-based in-class Writing Instruction and English Writing Ability

The participants took two writing tests before and after the treatment. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics for writing test scores at the time of pre and post.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>3.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>3.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>3.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>3.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>4.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>4.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presents the complete source table for repeated measures ANOVA. As can be seen, a statistically significant main effect was identified for Time (pre vs. post). In other words, the writing test scores in the post-test were significantly higher than those in the pre-test, whereas no significant difference was found in the test scores between groups.
As presented in Table 4 and Figure 2, the interaction between Time and Group was found to be significant. In order to determine which of the means were significantly different from others, a post-hoc test was performed. The results from the pairwise comparisons are presented in Table 5 and Table 6.

**TABLE 4**
ANOVA with Repeated Measures by Writing Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>65375.711</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65375.711</td>
<td>2573.593</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>26.568</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.568</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>15063.688</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>25.403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>377.708</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>377.708</td>
<td>67.725</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time X Group</td>
<td>356.290</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>356.290</td>
<td>63.885</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3307.203</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>5.577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2**
Estimated Marginal Means of Writing Test Scores

![Graph showing the estimated marginal means of writing test scores](image)

As presented in Table 4 and Figure 2, the interaction between Time and Group was found to be significant. In order to determine which of the means were significantly different from others, a post-hoc test was performed. The results from the pairwise comparisons are presented in Table 5 and Table 6.

**TABLE 5**
Post-hoc Test: Pairwise Comparisons by Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>(I) Group</th>
<th>(J) Group</th>
<th>MD (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>1.397</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>-.797</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0125 (= .05/4)
As shown in Table 5, the writing test scores between groups differed on the post-test as well as the pre-test. The control group outperformed the experimental group on the pre-test while the experimental group outperformed the control group on the post-test. However, there were four pairwise comparisons by Time and Group, and the significance level should be adjusted to 0.0125(=0.05/4) according to the Bonferroni Adjustment. Therefore, the difference of test scores between groups was statistically significant only on the pre-test. In other words, the control group performed statistically better than the experimental group in writing before the treatment.

**TABLE 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>(I) Time</th>
<th>(J) Time</th>
<th>MD (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2.226</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .0125 (=.05/4)

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>-9.715</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>-.443</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>-10.448</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>-.544</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>-9.356</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .017 (=.05/3)

Table 6 shows that the test scores of the experimental group statistically significantly improved on the post-test while no statistically significant difference on the test scores was found in the control group. In order to analyze improvements in each category between the pre- and post-test, a paired samples t-test was employed. There were three pairwise
comparisons for each category and the significance level was adjusted to $0.017(=0.05/3)$ according to the Bonferroni Adjustment. As can be seen in Table 7, the experimental group achieved statistically significant gains in each category on the writing test after explicit genre-based instruction. Therefore, it can be concluded that explicit in-class genre-based writing instruction was effective in improving the participants L2 writing ability.

2. Genre-based in-class Writing Instruction and Perceptions toward Writing

1) Satisfaction Level in Genre-based Instruction

On the post-survey questionnaire administered to the experimental group, the participants were asked to what degree they were satisfied with genre-based writing instruction, and their responses were collected on a five-point Likert scale ($1=$ Not at all; $5=$ Very much). Table 8 and Table 9 present the descriptive statistics and frequencies for satisfaction level of genre-based instruction.

<p>| TABLE 8 |
| Descriptive Statistics for Satisfaction Level of Instruction |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TABLE 9 |
| Frequencies for Satisfaction Level of Instruction |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(1.3%)</td>
<td>(8.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As reported in Table 9, about 98% of the participants were satisfied with the instruction. Among the 318 participants, 188 respondents (59.1%) answered that they were willing to take more writing class with different genres. With respect to reasons for their positive responses, multiple responses were analyzed. The main reasons are: “Because I want to improve my English writing ability,” and “I want to know how to write other genres.”
2) Self-confidence in L2 Writing

On the pre-survey questionnaire, the participants in each group were asked how confident they were in writing English, and their responses were collected on a five-point Likert scale (1= Not at all; 5= Very much). Table 10 reports descriptive statistics for self-confidence level in English writing of both groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the one-way ANOVA for self-confidence levels in English writing in Table 11 suggests that there was no statistically significant difference among the groups, F=.937, p=.333.

Increased self-confidence of the experimental group after the treatment was measured on a five-point Likert scale (1= Not at all; 5= Very much) on the post-survey questionnaire. Table 12 shows frequencies of the students’ responses to increased levels of self-confidence in English writing following writing instruction. As can be seen, about 92% of the students experienced an increase in self-confidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Increased Self-confidence in L2 Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Perceptions toward L2 Writing

In order to identify the changes in the participants’ perceptions toward English writing, two questions were asked: 1) what they think is most important in English writing; and 2) what they think is most difficult about writing in English. The participants were given five multiple choices: coming up with content relevant to the topic; connecting sentences logically; writing appropriate words and expressions; writing grammatically correct sentences; and writing without spelling or punctuation errors.

With respect to the first question, on the pre-survey questionnaire, writing grammatically correct sentences (55%) was followed by writing appropriate words and expressions (32.6%) as most important in English writing. However, their responses changed following the treatment. On the post-survey questionnaire, they selected coming up with content relevant to the topic (46.9%) as most important in English writing followed by writing appropriate correct sentences (32.9%).

With respect to the second question, no change was found in the participants’ perception on the difficulties of writing regardless of the effects of writing instruction. On both the pre- and post-survey questionnaires, they responded that writing grammatically correct sentences is most difficult followed by writing appropriate words and expressions.

3. Interview Data

1) Interview with the Students

The researcher arranged a group interview with six participants from the experimental group. They were chosen randomly based on their English proficiency test scores. The interview lasted for one hour. Below are the collected outcomes of the interviews, including quotes from the participants. Korean was the medium of the interviews and the quotes were translated into English by the researcher.

(1) Writing Instruction and the Effects of Peer Feedback

The students generally were content with genre-based writing instruction. Most enjoyed the peer feedback sessions, which enabled them to revise their first drafts. They also appeared satisfied learning how to write a diary entry more systematically.

“I have never revised the text I wrote once I finished first draft. However, while exchanging feedback from my peers with teacher’s help, I was able to write more correctly and revise my first draft based on the feedback.” (Moon, B. M./ intermediate)

“I have never thought about how to write a diary entry. All I did was just writing down
whatever came to my mind. Through this class, I've got to know the generic structure consisting of diary genre. Also, I really enjoyed feedback session.” (Cha, S. J. / intermediate)

“I preferred diary writing class to normal English classes. Through group writing, I learned about how to collaborate with my peers in order to write a whole text as a group. Also, I liked exchanging ideas and thoughts with my group members.” (Yoon, S. K. / low)

“Getting to know the elements of diary genre and peer feedback was good.” (J. S. K. / low)

“During peer feedback session, I got to know what was missing in my writing. While analyzing sample diary texts, I learned how to write a text with a natural flow.” (Kim, G. E. / advanced)

“It was helpful to learn how to organize sentences for diary writing and the usage of sensory or emotional adjectives to make text more alive.” (Lee, H. M. / advanced)

As described, the students seemed to like peer feedback most in genre-based writing instruction because they were able to exchange their ideas.

(2) Writing Instruction and Increased Self-confidence

Similar to the results of the survey questionnaire, it was revealed that the participants' confidence in writing increased following the treatment, and the participants expressed expectations of further improvements with additional instruction.

“I'm still not good at writing, but I became interested in writing. I'd like to learn writing more.” (Moon)

“I feel I had more confidence in writing than before. Thanks to feedback session, I think I will be able to write better.” (Cha)

“I think my writing has improved after studying genre-based writing.” (Yoon)

“I used to feel awkward whenever trying writing in English without knowing any specific reason. Now, I think I will be able to write on easy topics.” (J. S. K.)

“Before receiving instruction, I didn't like writing because my vocabulary size was not that big and I didn't know how to put adjectives effectively. However, now I'm willing to write in English and I feel my writing ability has improved.” (Kim)

The data suggest that those who had difficulty in writing in English gained self-confidence with instruction. In addition, many respondents appeared willing to participate in further instruction.

(3) Writing Instruction and Perception Change

The participants had negative attitudes toward writing before because they consider writing in English to be difficult and unnecessary. However, by the end of the treatment,
their perceptions changed. As they became more confident in writing through instruction, they showed positive attitudes toward writing and willingness to learn more on a regular basis.

“I used to be afraid of writing in English and I experienced writing only in private institutes. After this class, I found a lot of interest in writing and my prejudice against writing was broken.” (Moon)

“I used to think writing just difficult, but I don’t think any more in that way.” (Cha)

“I didn’t have any confidence and knowledge about writing before, but now I think I will be able to write well.” (Yoon)

“I realized that I had to learn a lot of words to write well.” (JSK)

“I didn’t know any necessity of writing before, but now I think it would be good to write for building up my vocabulary.” (Kim)

“Whenever I had to write, I didn’t know what to do before. But, now I come up with the best way to write better in my mind.” (Lee)

“Learning writing on a regular basis (once a week) would be helpful for improving my English ability.” (Moon, Yoon, Kim)

“I’d like to receive more in-depth writing instruction. Also, if I learn “revising” more, I will be able to write better texts.” (Lee)

It appears that genre-based writing instruction has positively affected the participants’ perceptions toward L2 writing, helping them discover a reason for why they have to learn to write and the way they can improve their writing ability.

2) Interview with the Instructor

The interview with the instructor followed the same procedures as with the participants. Interview questions were semi-structured so that the instructor could freely express her opinions about the treatment. The interview lasted 30 minutes. Presented below are the outcomes of the interview, including quotes from the teacher.

(1) Absence of Explicit Writing Instruction

Although the instructor had never provided explicit in-class writing instruction prior to the treatment, she had tried to have her students create sentences in English using grammatical key points from the textbook.

“I had my students complete sentences after grammar lessons or rearrange scrambled sentences as homework. During class time, I was trying to have my students write sentences in
English even if it is a single sentence. For example, my students have recently learned relative pronoun ‘whose’ in the textbook, and I showed a couple of celebrities’ pictures for the students to create sentences describing the pictures using relative pronoun ‘whose’.”

She noted a problem with the current crop of writing textbooks. She considered the writing section of her class's English textbook to be neither appropriate nor sufficient in terms of coverage to effectively improve the students’ writing skills.

“I think writing section in the textbook is no more than just checking grammar lessons, thus preventing the students from writing their own ideas or thoughts freely about something.”

Overall, it was made clear that explicit in-class writing instruction had not been attempted before starting this study, and that it would be necessary to substantially improve the writing section of the regular school textbook.

(2) Positive Effects of Explicit Writing Instruction

With respect to the question asking of the effectiveness of genre-based writing instruction, the instructor noted that it was helpful for her students’ writing improvement.

“At the beginning, I was not sure whether my students would like the new method or not because this teaching-learning method was different from what I had been doing so far. Also, it was not easy for me to use teaching materials that I didn’t make. However, as I modify teaching materials for my students and adapt in my class, I found the students follow my lessons better than I expected. In addition, I became to know that writing instruction was helpful to my students and found possibility of continuous writing instruction on a regular basis.”

Moreover, she claimed to notice a perception change toward writing through the treatment.

“After genre-based instruction, those who thought that good writing is nothing but writing grammatically correct changed such perception. They realized the importance of other elements which could enrich their writing such as utilizing adjective/adverb, peer feedback, and revising.”

Although she had difficulty adapting genre-based writing instruction to suit her learners’ needs and their language levels, she recognized that explicit writing instruction is necessary not only to improve her students’ writing ability but also to alter their negative perceptions toward English writing.
(3) Writing Instruction and Subsequent Practical Problems

While the teacher noted the advantages of genre-based instruction, she raised a question related to a practical issue: evaluation after instruction.

“I think genre-based instruction is good because students will ultimately be able to create their own text through being exposed to and analyzing good sample texts, and then practicing genre features repeatedly. What I worry is scoring students’ texts because it costs a lot of time and effort. I wonder if I would be able to continue writing instruction without scoring one by one.”

As an alternative, she considered peer feedback to be valuable in the classroom.

“I found that my students preferred my comments or evaluation of their own work to peer feedback. They tend not to trust their peers’ comments. Even though they said that peer feedback was good and helpful, they had more satisfaction about their writing revised and improved through the process of peer feedback rather than peer feedback in itself. However, I think peer feedback is necessary for writing instruction so that they can self-check what is missing in their writing.”

The interview with the instructor demonstrated that any attempt to implement broadly a genre-based pedagogy must consider teachers’ burdens in terms of offering feedback and evaluation of student writing.

V. DISCUSSION

1. Effects of Treatment on L2 Writing Ability

The first research question was to examine how significantly L2 writing composition scores differ between two groups: 1) with explicit genre-based in-class writing instruction and 2) without dedicated instruction. As presented in the results from the statistical data analysis, only the experimental group showed statistically significant improvements on writing performance following the treatment. This result indicates that explicit in-class genre-based writing instruction was effective in improving the participants L2 writing ability, and it also supports the findings of previous research (e.g., Hyon, 2001; Lee, 2006; Myskow & Gordon, 2010; Park, 2007; Shin & Lim, 2011; Yasuda, 2011).

The experimental group’s significant increase in writing test scores is noticeable. Although the control group outperformed the experimental group on the pretest, the
control group did not show any improvement on the posttest. Considering that the students of the control group did not receive explicit L2 writing instruction during the treatment period, this result was expected. It may suggest that teaching writing explicitly is essential to improve learners’ writing ability (Broughton et al., 1980; Cheng, 2008; Rivers, 1981; Shin & Lim, 2011; Yang & Sohn, 2009; Yasuda, 2011). As Yasuda (2011) stated, “a deliberate effort to teach and expand these (linguistic) resources explicitly is meaningful in FL instructional contexts both in terms of second language acquisition and writing development” (p. 125) because EFL writers are less likely to incidentally learn writing due to limited exposure to English writing. This explanation is in line with Hyland’s (2007) claim that “by making explicit what is to be learnt” (p. 149) through genre-based approaches, writing pedagogy could be effective. Overall, it is believed that explicit instruction contributes positively to the development of learners’ writing ability.

2. Effects of Treatment on Perception toward L2 Writing

The second research question attempted to uncover how genre-based writing instruction affects students’ attitudes and perceptions toward writing. As can be seen in the results from the pre- and post-survey questionnaires and interviews, the participants’ perceptions changed in several ways.

With respect to satisfaction with the treatment, 207 out of 318 respondents (65%), who scored four or five on a five-point Likert scale, were found to be quite satisfied with writing instruction. Many expressed a desire to continue writing instruction on a regular basis in order to improve their writing ability. On the other hand, 30 students (9.5%) responded that the treatment was not satisfying. As for the reasons for dissatisfaction, multiple responses were volunteered. The most selected reason was “I couldn’t generally understand the instructions because teacher’s explanation was difficult to follow.” Other reasons were “I was not motivated to learn English writing,” “I didn’t like the joint construction stage (group writing),” and “I couldn’t get used to the writing instruction which was different from how I had been taught previously.”

From the responses presented above, it can be implied that the role of the teacher is critical to the success of the instruction. The teacher needs to be not only skillful enough to deliver the instruction but also inspiring so as to motivate them to write and ensure smooth peer group work. According to Dörnyei and Murphy (2003), the success of classroom learning is largely dependent on the extent of the students’ relations with each other and in addition the role of the teacher and classroom environment.

Regarding increased self-confidence, as shown in Table 12 in the previous chapter, 92% of the participants’ self-confidence in English writing was enhanced. Once again, this result is in line with previous research findings (e.g., Lee, 2006; Park, 2007), thus
suggesting that genre-based writing instruction has a positive influence on increasing students’ self-confidence in L2 writing.

With regard to perceptions toward L2 writing, the results of the pre- and post-survey questionnaires and the interviews indicate that explicit in-class writing instruction changes learners’ perceptions toward writing. Before the treatment, the students thought that composing grammatically correct sentences was most important in writing. This perception may have resulted from previous experience of writing instruction in Korea in which the focus of writing is completing sentences or correcting grammatical errors as a means of checking grammatical competence (Yang & Sohn, 2009). However, the participants came to believe that finding content relevant to the topic is more important after they received explicit genre-based writing instruction. This perception change appears the result of genre-based teaching. Genre teaching includes explicit presentation of grammatical patterns to construct texts, but grammar itself is considered a supportive role to be integrated into texts and contexts, not a discrete point to be taught (Hyland, 2007).

It is interesting to note that many of the participants (pre-survey: 53.5%, post-survey: 41.1%) agreed that extensive reading along with writing a diary would be helpful in improving their writing ability. Many researchers have proposed that extensive reading should be integrated with writing instruction (e.g., Brown, 2007; Dörnyei & Murphy, 2003; Grabe, 1991, 2003; Hirvela, 2004; Hyland, 2003; Hyon, 2001). For example, Hyland (2003) noted that “extensive reading can furnish a great deal of tacit knowledge of conventional features of written texts, including grammar, vocabulary, organizational patterns, interactional devices, and so on” (p. 17). Also, Brown (2007) stated that connecting reading and writing reinforces writing skills. By reading relevant types of target text, students will gain insight into topic selection and other features of “good” writing.

From these results presented above, it appears that the participants who received explicit writing instruction treatment were generally affected positively in terms of self-confidence and perception toward writing.

VI. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The present study was designed to examine the effectiveness of genre-based writing instruction on Korean middle school students’ L2 writing ability and their perception toward English writing. Statistical results showed that the participants’ L2 writing performance statistically significantly improved after receiving five sessions of explicit in-class genre-based writing instruction. Additionally, the results from the questionnaires and the interview data demonstrated that L2 writing instruction positively affected learners’
self-confidence and their perception toward writing.

The findings provide insights into English writing instruction in Korean middle school classrooms. First, explicit L2 writing instruction should be implemented in middle school English classrooms. As the results of the present study show, explicit in-class genre-based writing instruction is effective in improving learners' writing ability. As Reppen (2002) pointed out, simply having students write a lot does not guarantee development or improvement of their writing ability. Rather, systematic and explicit instruction on how students should construct texts to meet different purposes, audiences, and contexts is necessary. In particular, Korean EFL learners, who have little L2 writing experience may benefit from genre instruction. According to Hyland (2002b), genre-based teaching for novice writers is more appropriate than process-based approaches. Therefore, it can be concluded that explicit writing instruction should be incorporated into the middle school English curriculum. For example, Korean middle school students in the third grade have English class four times a week. Most current English textbooks consist of 12 units, and one unit is generally taught for eight hours. When each unit is finished, time for explicit writing instruction using the genre approach should be allotted once a month. Each teaching and learning cycle would follow the four stages suggested by Feez (1998): building the context; modeling and deconstructing; joint construction; and individual construction. The genre the students would learn could be chosen from among the topics of each unit, and one genre may be covered for four hours. If genre-based writing instruction is conducted in this way, students will be able to explore and write several different genres each year.

In addition, the results from the set of questionnaires and the interview with the participants and teacher suggest that perception toward L2 writing impacts learning. Learners' perceptions that L2 writing is difficult, fearful, and unnecessary, and that writing grammatically perfect sentences is central to writing, hindered them from developing their writing ability. However, providing purposeful and systematic instruction using a genre approach changed their perception; writing was seen as more enjoyable and not overly difficult. Students' self-confidence in L2 writing is also expected to increase as they continue practicing writing various kinds of genres.

Although explicit L2 writing instruction using the genre approach provides desirable results in terms of writing proficiency improvement and increases in self-confidence, it requires more skill on the part of the teacher in order to draw maximum benefits. As some researchers (e.g., Park, 2007; Yang & Sohn, 2009) have suggested, it is necessary to develop various training programs and train English teachers to become confident in teaching writing.

There are a few limitations on this study to be addressed in future research. Although the effectiveness of writing instruction on learners' writing ability was examined, the
duration of the treatment may not have been long enough to determine the prolonged effects of genre writing. In this study, only five intact classes were carried out over a five week period. In order to elaborate on this research, longer-term treatments need to be implemented. Another limitation is that only one genre was introduced in the experiment. The participants expressed their interest in learning different genres on a regular basis. Other than diary genre, various genres such as e-mail, application letters, or novels, depending on the students’ immediate needs, can be introduced and taught. Furthermore, among the results from the questionnaires, the participants’ responses to feedback are notable. Sixty-nine percent of the students responded that they want to get feedback on their writing, and 75.2% of the respondents preferred teacher’s feedback to their peers’. Several studies have examined students’ preferences on teacher feedback over peer feedback (e.g., Nelson & Carson, 1998; Tsui & Ng, 2000). However, in this research, formal feedback from the teacher to individual students was not given due to the large size of the sample. In future replication studies, researchers are recommended to take these issues into consideration.
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**APPENDIX A**

Lesson Plan (1) – Building the Context for Writing a Diary Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>By the end of the lesson, the learners will be able to identify the context in which diary genre is used.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Objectives | 1. Learners will be able to tell the features of diary genre  
2. Learners will be able to differentiate the recount text type for diary genre from other texts |
| Aids | PowerPoint file, Worksheets, computer |
| Stage | Procedure | Interaction | Time |
| Motivating | -Present pictures of “The diary of Ann Frank” and let the T ↔ Ss students identify what the genre is.  
-Have them guess the content of the text from the title. | 5’ |
| Activating | -Ask the students whether they keep a diary or not and T ↔ Ss share their writing experience.  
-Elicit the purpose and the content of diary writing.  
• It can help you make important personal discoveries through reflecting on events in daily life. | 5’ |
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• It’s a stress reliever.
• It's a way to keep memories alive.
• It can make you a better writer.
  • Day and Date of the entry, a suitable descriptive heading, Things you did and feelings you had during the day.
  • Ask the students how they construct the text.
  
(tense, order...)

Context building - Have the students read the sample text and fill out the activity worksheet.

Presenting the features of diary genre - Present the general features of recount text for diary genre with an example.

Differentiating diary genre from others - Give two different types of text and have the students differentiate the recount text from the other.

Wrapping-up - Review the features of diary writing.

  • Orientation-Events-Reorientation format
  • The first person point of view
  • Use of action verb
  • Past tense
  • Chronological order
  • Time connectives (Examples: first, then, minutes later, later that evening, in the early hours of the morning...)
  • Reflective comments at the end
A Sample Text
I’ve just had the worst day ever! It all began at morning break. This horrible boy came over and pushed me for no reason. When I pushed him back I was the one who got into trouble. I was given a nasty note from Ms Thomas to take home to mum. Later when mum read the note she blamed me – she wouldn’t even listen to my side of things. It’s not fair. Now I’m grounded for a month and all I did was stick up for myself. Still I have learned one thing today – violence won’t solve my problems but telling tales just might!

[Source:www.learninglive.co.uk/.../2Au_worst%20mistake]

Worksheet (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the text about?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the purpose of the text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the setting of the text (e.g., in a textbook, a newspaper, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the tone of the text (e.g., formal, informal, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is the author of the text?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is his/her age? Gender? Social status?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Source: Fig. 7. A context analysis of a reading text, p. 51, Paltridge, 2001]

Worksheet (2) – Identifying the features of recount text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I’ve just had the worst day ever! It all began at morning break. This horrible boy came over and pushed me for no reason. When I pushed him back, I was the one who got into trouble. I was given a nasty note from Ms. Thomas to take home to mom. Later when mum read the note, she blamed me – she wouldn’t even listen to my side of things. It’s not fair. Now I’m grounded for a month and all I did was stick up for myself. Still I have learned one thing today – violence won’t solve my problems at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* _______ : past tense
* action verbs
* _______ : adjectives
* adverbs and adverbial phrases
* conjunctions and time connectives
# APPENDIX C

The Scoring Rubric for a Diary Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | is relevant to assigned topic  
documents events explicitly and clearly  
evaluates their significance |
| 4     | is relevant to topic, but lacks minor supporting detail  
states most events  
includes some evaluation of the events |
| 3     | is a bit off topic  
has rough events  
contains little or weak evaluation |
| 2     | is inadequate development of topic  
does not state recognizable events  
has no or confused evaluation |
| 1     | under 30 words |

**CONTENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | shows clearly  
orientation giving all necessary background information  
events sequenced in chronological order  
reoriention ending with personal comment  
is cohesive between sentences |
| 4     | shows  
orientation giving most necessary background information  
events arranged chronologically  
reoriention giving some personal comment  
is mostly cohesive between sentences |
| 3     | shows  
orientation including only partial information  
events sequenced largely in chronological order  
reoriention presenting weak personal comment  
is somewhat cohesive between sentences |
| 2     | shows  
orientation missing important background information  
events arranged in random order or  
reoriention having inadequate or no personal comment  
presents disconnected ideas |
| 1     | under 30 words |
5  • is clearly written with few errors; errors do not interfere with comprehension
   • includes accurate pronouns and verb tenses
   • shows effective use of conjunctions and time connectives
   • includes at least 5 sensory or emotional adjectives or adverbs

4  • is clearly written with few errors; errors do not interfere with comprehension
   • includes relatively accurate pronouns and verb tenses
   • shows generally effective use of conjunctions and time connectives
   • includes at least 3 sensory or emotional adjectives or adverbs, but repetitive

3  • is generally clearly written with few errors; at most a few errors interfere
   with comprehension
   • includes several errors of pronouns and verb tenses
   • shows generally effective but rare use of conjunctions and time connectives
   • includes rare use of sensory or emotional adjective and adverbs

2  • is not clearly written with many errors; does not communicate
   • includes frequent errors of pronouns and verb tenses
   • shows inappropriate and seldom use of conjunctions and time connectives
   • includes no use of sensory or emotional adjectives and adverbs

1  • under 30 words


---

**APPENDIX D**

**A Sample Diary**

**<Pre-test>**

**Time for my news**

I had been the 14 hospital during summer vacation.

...you know why I did that? For that I want to have more time my dream quickly.

I try to be stud. What is your dream? Science? Scientist.

My dream is to be a doctor.

Doctors are people who know about who we are by a doctor.

If you want to achieve your dream, why don't you do about the job.

---

**<Post-test>**

**Title: Happy Birthday to my mom**

Last weekend, it was my mother's birthday, so I've planned everything special with my sister.

First, we wrote her a surprise letter and prepared it back.

Then we went to bakery to buy a soft and smooth congratulatory cake, where we took it and asked the clerk to bring it and go away quickly.

We were very happy and honored, so we promised that we won't go there again.

After we arrived home, we prepared a surprise party.

When we opened the door, we were surprised and happy.

Suddenly, I said, "Happy birthday, mom, you should thank me", as if I repeated it phrase.

Thanks to it, I realized that it is important to remember the anniversary and congratulate someone, because we laughed so much delighted.

Sometime, I'd do it to see everyone's face.
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