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Process approach to writing has been dominantly popular in second language writing classrooms over the last two decades. However, its privileged status as a single paradigm for writing research and pedagogy has been challenged recently. Unlike process approach whose focus is on the writer’s cognitive dealing with rhetorical problems, the new paradigm stresses that writing is a social artifact. The present study examined whether or not process approach has a legitimate place in the classroom through examining two college students’ writing processes. The verbal protocol of the students’ writing processes revealed that they approached writing tasks differently. While one student examined her writing at both global and local level, the other student seemed to focus on generating ideas and text, ignorant of higher-level writing skills. Furthermore, the examination of their products identified the fact that the difference in the processes was reflected in the products. The study concludes with the suggestion that process approach still possess many strong points for second language research and pedagogy, indicating that the problem does not lie in the complete replacement of the old paradigm with the new one, but in the integration of the new paradigm into the existing one.

1. INTRODUCTION

We have observed the prevalence of process approach to second language writing research and pedagogy in the last two decades. The reason for this prevalence may be attributed to the co-occurrence of emerging second language writing as a legitimate area of inquiry and the introduction of the view of writing as process rather than product in first language writing research in 1970s. During the era of audio-lingualism, the role of writing was marginalized to the degree that it was subordinate to oral language skills, and not much attention was given to its research and pedagogy. Zamel (1976) was one of those who noticed the importance of second
language writing and the need for applying the findings of first language writing studies to second language writing research and pedagogy. Since then, there has been the flourish of second language writing studies, providing us with invaluable insights to the nature of second language writing and its pedagogy.

However, the wind has changed recently. This year, we have observed the entire volume of *Journal of Second Language Writing* Vol. 12 No. 1 was devoted to the articulation of the new paradigm which is likely to draw more attention from second language writing researchers and practitioners. As a matter of fact, the debate over process writing instruction as a sole paradigm for teaching students second language writing began almost two decades ago (Hamp-Lyons, 1986; Horowitz, 1986a, 1986b; Liebman-Klein, 1986). In the debate, Horowitz denounced the prevalence of the process view of writing at the time and insisted that it not take into account actual writing situations students encounter in various academic settings. He attempted to find the reason for this failure from its rigidity in accepting different perspectives, particularly social ones. In response to Horowitz's criticism against process approach in academic settings, Liebman-Klein maintained that writing should not be seen in a dichotomous way between process and product. Moreover, she stressed the point that process approach was as helpful to developing academic writing abilities as product approach. Although the debate between Liebman-Klein and Horowitz began with heat, thanks to the effort from Hamp-Lyons (1986), two scholars seemed to reach a resolution that each view has legitimate points in explaining second language writing and applying the understanding to its pedagogy.

The recent issue of *Journal of Second Language Writing* seemed to dramatically open the era of post-process writing research and pedagogy. Matsuda (2003) noted that the proponents of process approach were criticized for their rigid attitude in accepting the multiplicity of writing, oversimplifying such a characteristic of writing, and reducing it to an individual level. Atkinson (2003) pointed out that individualistic and cognitivist approach to writing was the main reason for the decline of process approach. Particularly, he noticed the lack of social characteristics in process approach and described the reason for its decline as "Process writing, its strongest guiding force over the last part of the 20th century, was resolutely asocial in any theoretical sense, although not especially structuralist" (p. 4). Atkinson proposed that second language writing should be defined in terms of writing as social activities and from post-cognitivist's perspectives, literacy as an ideological arena, and composition as a cultural activity in the new paradigm.

Although English writing instruction in Korea still heavily emphasizes grammatical knowledge to write individual sentences correctly, the shift from product to process writing instruction seems to have gained undisputable popularity among many second language writing instructors. The introduction of process approach to the classroom is largely thanks to writing instruction materials published abroad. However, time has arrived to examine whether or not it
actually contributes to the development of students’ second language writing abilities. It is no
doubt that the exploration of new insights in the area will surely extend the horizons of our
understanding and improving the understanding of the previous paradigm.

II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED STUDIES

1. Process Writing Studies

Process writing instruction is based on the notion that, if we identify what writers actually
think and do, in order to deal with problems they face during writing, we can help them write
more effectively by providing instruction about ways to deal with the problems. Emig (1971)
first introduced the composing-aloud method of writing research and showed what twelfth
graders were thinking and doing during composing. Since then, we observed the shift of writing
instruction paradigm from product to process. Murray (1981) precisely defined writing from the
process perspective as “a significant kind of thinking in which the symbols of language assume
a purpose of their own and instruct the writer during the composing” (p. 3). His explanation
clearly points out writing as process for exploring and clarifying meaning.

This process view of writing is largely based on the cognitivists’ view of writing, in which
there are two elements of writing, thinking and process (Johns, 1990). The cognitive theory of
writing considers writing process to be basically a process of cognitive problem-solving (Flower
& Hayes, 1981). In their view, writing tasks consist of solving a complex set of problems that
requires a writer to exploit his or her cognitive strategies. Flower and Hayes listed four
characteristics of writing:

1. The process of writing is best understood as a set of distinctive thinking process which
   writers orchestrate or organize the act of composing.
2. The writing processes have a hierarchical, highly embedded organization in which any
given process can be embedded within any other.
3. The act of composing itself is a goal-directed thinking process guided by the writer’s own
growing network of goals.
4. Writers create their own goals in two key ways: by generating both high-level goals and
   supporting sub-goals which embody the writer’s developing sense of purpose, and then, at
times, by changing major goals, even establishing entirely new ones based on what has
been learned in the act of writing. (p. 366)
The first characteristic indicates that cognitive process in writing is quite unique and different from other kinds of cognitive process in other areas. The second characteristic implies that writing includes different levels of plans and writers go through non-linear and recursive process of writing. The third characteristic states that every writing behaviors are directed to setting and achieving goals related to developing text. The last characteristic indicates that sub-goals in writing should fit in with the higher goals. Therefore, the sub-goals need to be frequently modified to reach the higher goals, or even the higher goals need to be changed as the situation of writing changes.

Flower and Hayes (1977) also noticed that not only were many writing problems actually thinking problems, but also poor writers were usually poor thinkers. Such writers usually have a limited repertory of thinking techniques available to them. When the writers meet a block, their limited repertory makes them unable to change tactics to meet the situation effectively. Further, Flower and Hayes (1977, 1980) maintained that the problems of a writer's limited repertory and inadequate thinking techniques can be solved by teaching heuristics in three stages to deal with rhetorical problems. The first stage of heuristics is planning, in which the writers are asked to set a goal as well as to decide the direction of writing. In the second stage, the writers are asked to develop ideas without the consideration of writing them first, and then to summarize the ideas in a simple form like a cue word or a tree diagram. As they proceed in writing, they need to read their own writing from an editorial perspective. Finally, they construct text for audience. In constructing text, the writers need to consider what goals they can share with the readers and what possible miscommunication between them can occur. They also need to develop and test their rhetorical strategies to deal with problems they may face as they are learning the heuristics.

Writing process studies were proven to provide us with invaluable insights to the nature of writing as well as information about teaching students writing. In her pioneering research of writing process, Emig (1971) explored eight twelfth graders' writing process by using a case study method. The students were asked to compose aloud while writing three essays. Extensive interviews with one of the students showed that twelfth graders composed in both reflexive and extensive mode. Whereas reflexive writing concerned the writer's feelings and personal experience, extensive writing focused on information to be conveyed to the reader. The style was more formal, and much less time was spent on planning and drafting in the extensive mode than in the reflexive one. Perl (1979) examined five unskilled college writers' writing process in her study. The study showed that the students exhibited consistent behavioral patterns and stylistic or syntactic concerns, that they used little planning and prewriting, that they had little sense of audience, and that they were unable to explain stylistic changes. It was obvious from the study that they had not yet internalized all of the conventions that would make them fluent writers, nor had they learned how to judge their writing objectively.
The cognitive writing theory by Flower and Hayes was criticized largely for two reasons (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). First, regardless of the differences in each writer’s writing abilities, all writers are regarded as going through a single writing process. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) proposed a writing process model that presents two different writing processes depending upon the writer’s writing abilities development. In their model, less skilled writers are more likely to employ the knowledge-telling process of writing in which their cognitive strategy use is limited to searching for and evaluating appropriate information to the topic. In contrast to the knowledge-telling model, they proposed the knowledge-transformation model to account for a skilled writer’s writing process. In the model, writing tasks leads to the analysis of the problem and goal setting. Once writing-related problems and goals are identified, the problems are solved in either the content or rhetorical problem space, and the solution of a problem raises another problem in another area.

The second criticism against Flower and Hayes’ cognitive writing theory is that it is deficient in the consideration of social characteristics of writing as a complete writing model. In response to such criticism, Flower et al. (1990) elaborated the relationship between task environment and writing process found in Flower and Hayes’ model (1981). In the study, they analyzed academic writing task of reading to write and examined students’ view on writing in the context of a particular writing task. They noted that teacher perspective, student perspective, students in the process of writing, and the written text all together created a complex set of factors surrounding students’ writing process. Consequently, it was proposed in the study that writing should be seen as the interaction between cognition and context, thus adding the social elements to their original theory of writing.

2. Studies of Second Language Writing Process

Soon after process approach came out and was circulated among first language writing researchers and instructors, second language writing researchers have begun to pay attention to the process of second language writing and have been advocating that findings from first language writing studies should be applied to second language writing research and pedagogy. Zamel (1976) is one of those who felt the necessity of introducing findings of first language writing research to second language writing research and pedagogy. He described such necessity as follows:

What we have failed to realize is that by the time our students are ready to write compositions, that is, create and express their thoughts and ideas in the second language, they need the same kind of instruction that students in English classrooms need. (p. 68)
Concerning the nature of second language writing and its process, Silva (1990) mentioned that the writing should be considered as an interactive process between the writer and the text as well as between the reader and the text in context. Susser (1994) also proposed that the meaning of process should be widened as writing itself, its pedagogy and a theory or theories of writing, thus implying that process approach should be regarded as a comprehensive research and pedagogical paradigm.

In her review of second language writing process studies, Kraples (1990) identified two major themes among the studies. First, many of them focused on differentiating composing process of fluent second language writers from that of unskilled writers, which carries a pedagogical implication that the instruction of fluent writers’ composing process should be included in second language writing curricula. Secondly, second language writers’ composing process was compared to that of first language writers, to find that the two processes were very similar. This discovery led second language writing researchers to claim that findings from first language writing should be readily introduced to second language writing research and pedagogy.

Zamel (1983) examined the composing process of six advanced ESL learners. The study revealed that, regardless of their differences in writing ability, all six ESL writers went through a nonlinear process of writing. They recursively returned to the point where a problem was recognized. In the study, unsuccessful writers were more concerned with local errors such as grammar and spelling than successful writers, so they paused more frequently to solve mechanical problems. Therefore, they spent a large amount of time on finishing the first draft, and little revision occurred during their composing process. On the contrary, skilled writers were more concerned with global problems of writing related to creating meaning. They usually delayed solving local problems until global problems were solved.

The features of beginning and advanced ESL writers were compared to each other (Raimes, 1987). The advanced ESL writers more frequently used such strategies as planning, rehearsing, rescanning, revising, and editing than the beginning ESL writers. Their heightened awareness of writing enables them not only to use various writing options, but also to meet the reader’s expectation of correctness. On the contrary, the beginning writers spent less time on writing and revising. They focused heavily on local problems, so they did editing throughout the whole writing process. This study, however, showed that there was not a close relationship between English language proficiency and writing abilities. The suggested reason for this was that English learning background and first language writing instruction played bigger roles in deciding the level of English writing abilities.

In addition to studying the composing process of second language writers alone, Raimes (1985) compared unskilled ESL writers’ composing process with that of unskilled English-speaking college writers in Perl’s study (1979). In the study, not only did the inexperienced
writers demonstrate poor writing behaviors, regardless of whether writing had done in their first or second language, but they also displayed many common features in their writing behaviors. First, there was little consideration of audience and purpose for both groups. Second, the unskilled ESL writers decided what to write quite early, without clear planning. Third, their re-reading of what had been written was usually limited to one or two preceding sentences rather than to the whole text. Fourth, both groups utilized the strategy of voicing out possible ideas and strategies in order to progress writing. Finally, both groups paused frequently to correct local writing problems rather than global ones.

Despite similarities between first and second language writing process, Silva (1993) maintained that equal attention needed to be paid to the differences to appreciate the distinct nature of second language writing.

This focus does not represent an attempt to ignore, deny, or trivialize the many important similarities between L1 and L2 writing: it stems from the belief that understanding these differences is crucial to comprehending and addressing ESL writer’s special needs. (p. 660)

He claimed that second language writers experienced more difficulties throughout the whole composing process. Second language writers did less planning and reviewing than first language writers, whereas second language writers were more laborious in transcribing. With regard to the quality of a written product, second language writers were less fluent and accurate than first language writers. Second language writers were also shown to be limited in reader awareness, the understanding of textual features, and syntactic and lexical complexity. His finding confirmed what Taylor (1981) mentioned as qualitative differences between first and second language writing.

Wang and Wen’s study of Chinese college students’ use of their first language during English writing (2002) showed the direction to which future second language writing process studies have to move. In the study, Chinese college students’ use of their mother tongue during English writing was examined in terms of writing activities, writing genres, and English proficiency levels. Results showed that students used their native language the most in process controlling activities to control writing procedures and word and time limits, followed by idea organizing, idea generating, task examining, and text generating. Concerning writing genres, students used more their native language in narrative writing than in argumentative writing. Finally, students with lower English proficiency more relied on using Chinese than those with high English proficiency. Overall, Wang and Wen’s study showed the need for the combination of qualitative and quantitative research method as well as the focus on a specific area of second language
writing process in order to enhance our understanding of second language writing process and pedagogy.

3. Emergence of a New Paradigm

As the term, post-process, suggests, any firm successor of process approach has not emerged yet. This can be explained in terms of the development of a new theory. It is not common for a new theory to come into the stage immediately after the decline of the old one. Instead, the emergence of a new theory is usually signaled by a large volume of criticism against the old theory, and attempts to replace it with a new one follow later. Genre approach, which provides explanations of the ways language functions in social contexts, looks a strong candidate to succeed process approach. However, it is not clear at the present time that it can entirely replace process approach as a single paradigm for directing writing research and pedagogy. Therefore, we had better listen to process approach critics' words first, and, then, explore the alternative possibility for writing research and pedagogy.

The post-process advocates pointed out that the most noticeable reason for the criticism against process approach was its immoderate adherence to the cognitivist's view of writing. Atkinson (2003) criticized this view of writing for assuming a single invariant writing process, apart from the social contexts where writing practices are situated. Instead of this narrow view of writing, he suggested that writing should be in a wider perspective that includes views looking at writing as social activities. His criticism against process approach as well as the need for the inclusion of social perspectives in a writing theory are clearly summarized in the following statement:

Literacy as an ideological arena refers to a growing understanding over the past two decades that reading and writing are not the decontextualized, information-centered, impersonal activities they were once thought to be, but rather that they actively construct, and are centrally implicated within power relations, society, culture, and, indeed, individuality itself. (p. 6)

Hayland (2003) criticized process approach from both theoretical and pedagogical viewpoints. First, it is assumed in the theory that writing is "a decontextualized skill by foregrounding the writer as an isolated individual struggling to express personal meanings" (p. 18). Second, process approach disempowers and marginalizes the teacher in the classroom. Since it is a model of learning based on the learner's freedom and personal expression, there is little room for the teacher to intervene during the course of his or her students' writing process. Third, its
inductive orientation makes obscure what should be learned in the classroom (Hasan, 1996). Hasan maintained that this manner of providing students with instruction eventually not only deprives them of opportunities to receive explicit instruction of the structure of the target text types, but also advantages only culturally mainstreamed students who are familiar with the target text types. Last, Hayland (2003) pointed out that process approach alienated students from their social realities, thus resulting in being deprived of an appropriate linguistic and rhetorical tools to gain access to the powerful genre of mainstream culture. Overall, process approach has been criticized for not offering students opportunities to gain necessary linguistic and rhetorical means to meet social demands of writing by explicit instruction.

Genre approach was regarded as a more satisfying model to deal with the problems to which process approach fails to provide an answer (Hayland, 2003). Genre refers to abstract, socially recognized ways of using language depending on the contexts of language use. Discourse community, which creates similar situations of language use and require a group of people to use similar text types within them, is a helpful concept to understand genre. Genre approach presumes the socially situated nature of genre and helps illuminate what writers and readers bring to texts within a genre, implying inter-community diversity and intra-community homogeneity. Therefore, students need to identify the structural patterns of a certain genre as well as the options and restrictions imposed on it. Pedagogically, genre approach stresses the importance of product so that the focus of instruction is on grammatical and linguistic choices available in a genre.

It is obvious that genre approach successfully deals with the problems which process approach is unable to answer. However, we should be cautious about the same rigidity once found in process approach. Even though writing is a socially situated activity and the understanding of its social context is critically important in producing effective text, it is strongly doubtful that we can ignore the cognitive side of writing in a wholesale fashion. In addition, the effectiveness of adherence to product by genre approach is the question process approach proponents once raised when they began to develop process approach. Instead of this rigid attitude from both schools, it seems more desired to take conciliatory actions from both schools. In this light, Matsuda (2003) proposed the need for a comprehensive theory that accommodates every valid view of writing in the following statement:

Instead of rejecting them altogether, he acknowledged the contributions of each theory of process had made to the betterment of writing instruction, and suggested the need for a broader conception of writing, one that one understands writing processes are historically dynamic—not psychic states, cognitive routines, or neutral social relationships. (p. 72)
In conclusion, process and genre approach should be understood as in the complementary relationship to each other. Each view has valid points which undeniably contributes to broaden and deepen our understanding of writing.

III. METHOD

This study explores whether or not process writing instruction is helpful for developing second language learners' writing abilities. For the purpose, two college students' writing behaviors and their written products were examined to study how the writing behaviors were related to the products. It is assumed in the study that, if a student shows writing behaviors that characterize proficient writers and manages to produce a skillful piece of writing, process writing instruction can be said to have a legitimate place in second language writing classrooms. However, if it is not the case, for example, poor writing behaviors but a satisfying product, the principles underlying process writing instruction should be re-examined and the substitution of process writing instruction in the classroom seems inevitable.

1. Subjects

Two female college students participated in the study. Student A was a college junior who was in her early 30s. She had earned a bachelor's degree in fine arts a few years ago and transferred to her present college to get her second bachelor's degree in English. At the interview with her after the writing, she revealed that her average TOEIC score was over 900 points. The interview with her native instructors also confirmed that she had shown excellent English abilities in his English conversation class. Student B was also a college junior and in her early 20s. At the interview with her, she said that she had taken TOEIC tests a few times and the average score was near 900 points. Her Korean instructor also made a positive comment on Student B. Student A and B attended different colleges.

2. Procedure

As the first step to collect the protocol data of the subjects' writing behaviors, they were given the brief instruction on composing-aloud method of writing research. Particularly, they were asked to pay special attention not to stop talking during writing. Then, they were assigned their writing topics. Before the topic was assigned, the author consulted with each student about what writing topic, they felt, enabled them to produce text without difficulty. Student A was assigned
"family value," and Student B "friendship." Each student was given forty-five minutes to complete their writing. While they were writing, the author videotaped their writing behaviors expressed in oral and written language. The use of a video camera, instead of using a tape recorder, enabled the author to examine whether or not their verbally expressed writing behaviors were actually put into words.

After their writings had completed, the videotapes and manuscripts went through analysis. The interviews with two students were conducted to elicit more explanation of their writing processes in reference to their written works. The recorded videotapes were transcribed and analyzed according to the coding scheme described in the following part. Finally, their written works were evaluated by two native-speaking instructors, based on the scoring guidelines of the Test of Written English provided by Educational Testing Services (2003), and went through text analysis. The author believes the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in this study will help to improve our understanding of second language writing and its process and ultimately to decide whether or not process writing instruction helps our students improve their writing skills in English.

3. Coding Scheme

The coding scheme used in Wang and Wen's study (2002) was employed with modification in the present study. In their study, five categories were used to group Chinese students' writing behaviors in English. The categories included task-examining, idea-generating, idea-organizing, text-generating activities, and process-controlling. The task-examining category includes writing behaviors that analyze writing prompts or comments on the task. The idea-generating category includes planning and evaluating the content. The idea-organizing category includes planning and evaluating the organization. The text-generating category includes producing and reviewing the text. And the process-controlling category includes controlling the writing procedures, word and time limits, and other constraints in writing.

Wang and Wen's coding scheme was modified to represent the protocol of the present study more properly. The present study imported the categories of task-examining, idea-generating, and text-generating activities from Wang and Wen's study. However, the author found a problem in putting planning and evaluating activities into the idea-generating and idea-organizing category. Besides, since the author recognized the importance of evaluating the text both at the local and global level in the protocol, the global and local text evaluation categories were added to the coding scheme of the present study. Finally, since there was no occurrence of the process-controlling categories in the protocol, it was deleted in the study.

The definition of each category was slightly different from Wang and Wen's study. The
task-examining category represents writing behaviors that analyze the assignment and context of writing. The global text evaluation category represents evaluating the text at the global level, focusing on the overall content and organization. The local text evaluation category represents evaluating the text at the local level, mainly focusing on the content and mechanics of the immediately preceding part. The idea-generation category represents generating ideas for the overall content and the following sentences. And the text generation category represents transforming ideas into languages, focusing on word choice and correct grammar use. Coding was done by two experts in second language instruction and inter-rater reliability between the coders was .94. Table 1 summarizes the definition of each category with its example. Italicized letters indicates the part was spoken in Korean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composing Activities</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Examination: analyzing the assignment and context</td>
<td>Uhm in a family, the most important thing in a family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Text Evaluation: evaluating the text at the global level</td>
<td>Since the topic of writing is family value, have to focus on this point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Text Evaluation: as evaluating the text at the local level</td>
<td>I think it's OK to delete this. I will try it simply with once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Generation: generating ideas for the overall content and the following sentences</td>
<td>Uh it was interesting first. It was so excited to go abroad for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Generation: transforming ideas into Languages</td>
<td>I have done such a thing, when I went to Australia, Have you ever been Australia with my family?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. RESULT

1. Analysis of Process

The number of generated words in the protocol by Student A and B were similar, 1447 and 1312 words respectively. This can be interpreted as they were equally successful at generating the protocol. If there had been large difference in the number of the generated words in the protocol, it might have indicated the failure of collecting the data properly. However, two students' writing processes were strikingly different from each other. While Student A was concerned for both global and local levels of writing in a balanced manner, Student B seemed to mainly focus on the local level of writing. Two students’ writing behaviors are summarized in Table 2.
Student A’s writing process was more similar to that of skilled writers manifested in many studies of second language writing process studies. Instead of exclusively focusing on generating ideas and languages, she constantly examined what had been written so far at both local and global level. For such evaluation purposes, 30 words were generated for the global text evaluation and 416 words for the local text evaluation. However, these figures are misleading. The task examination category is concerned about the relevance of certain writing behaviors to the main topic. Therefore, if we include the number of words included in the task examination category, it turned out that 273 words were generated to evaluate the writing at the global level. At the interview with her after the writing, she said that one of the most difficult things was keeping the overall topic of family value in mind throughout the whole writing process. It should be also noted that less than half of the protocol, 624 out of 1447 words, were used for generating the text. This can be interpreted as either her linguistic competence enabled her to produce the text without much difficulty or as she produced only a short piece of writing. For Student A, the latter seemed to be the case. Eventually, she seemed to have too many thoughts about developing text to progress her writing fluently.

Another important point is that only 28.75 percent of the entire protocol were generated for evaluating the text at the local level. This can be interpreted in two ways. First, the lack of confidence of her writing and linguistic skills made her examine writing at the local level constantly. Another possible explanation of such high occurrence of the local text evaluation behaviors is that she approached the text generation task only on a tentative basis and regarded it as incomplete until she examined its adequacy. The videotape and protocol clearly show her tendency to generate text without much concern for grammar and words at first, but she paused frequently to examine and re-read the preceding part throughout the whole writing process. She constantly examined whether or not local parts fitted into the overall content and organization.

Unlike Student A, Student B showed little concern for the global level of writing as presented in no occurrence of the global text evaluation as well as few incidents of the task examination writing behaviors. Instead, almost all of her writing process was involved in generating ideas and text. That is, 82.01 and 16.15 percent of the protocol were engaged in generating text and
ideas respectively. Compared with Student A, such high portion of text and idea generation behaviors may explain the prolificacy of her writing. She also hardly examined the writing at the local level as presented in 1.52 percent of the protocol for this category. It seemed that what she did during composing was constantly producing the text without few interruptions. In process writing proponents’ terms, Student B did not explore and clarify her intended meaning, but transcribed what she had already had in her mind into words (Perl, 1979). Consequently, her writing behaviors could be seen as showing typical characteristics of inexperienced writers found in both first and second language writing process studies.

2. Analysis of Products

The most striking difference between two students’ writings was their length. While Student A wrote only 121 words for forty-five minutes, Student B produced more than three times of Student A’s production. This can be explained in terms of their writing behavior patterns. Although Student A was quick to put her idea into words, she constantly re-read and examined what she had written. Her writing behaviors undoubtedly seemed to contributed to the slow progress. The interview with Student A revealed the reason that she was not completely sure of the correctness of language use and the adequacy of the content in relation to the preceding sentences. In contrast, Student B seemed to write without pause and progressed as quickly as she could. Her writing behaviors seemed to be very similar to those of unskilled writers with regard to little planning and revision. The interview with her revealed that she was confident of her English proficiency and her English knowledge helped her proceed writing without much interruption. However, when asked about writing organization, she showed little understanding.

Both scorers of two students’ writings gave both writings four points out of perfect six points, using the scoring guidelines of Test of Written English provided by Educational Testing Services (2003). According to the guidelines, when the writer usually demonstrates minimal competence at both rhetorical and syntactic level, he or she is given four points. However, the reason behind giving the same score to both writings was different. The major reason why Student A was given four points was the incompleteness of text she produced. Both scorers agreed on that, if she had produced more complete text, she would have been given higher points. They said that Student A’s writing was better in terms of organization and coherence. In contrast, Student B was given the merit to produce a lengthy text by both scorers. In addition to producing more complete text, both raters agreed on that there was not any serious problem in understanding Student B’s writing and included some good points in it.

Although the assigned topics were expected to draw similar approaches from both students, their approaches looked clearly different. While student A’s writing was done in an expository
style, Student B’s writing was done in a narrative one. Student B’s little understanding of writing genres might lead her to take the different approach from Student A. The interview with Student B confirmed that she lacked the understanding of different writing genres and all of her writing had been done without the clear understanding of organization. Ironically, her ignorance of English writing conventions and different writing genres led her to write freely and produce more text. In contrast, Student A seemed to have the understanding of writing conventions involving a paragraph as well as the ways to organize writing for the reader’s clear comprehension. However, it seemed that Student A was not cognitively ready for dealing with rhetorical problems simultaneously and effectively. Further, it was obvious that focusing on one problem prevented her from dealing with another problem effectively. That is, Student A’s writing abilities were not fully developed to deal with different writing problems simultaneously and effectively. The slow writing pace could be evidence for her underdeveloped writing abilities.

Finally, the difference in ways to develop text between two writers was noticeable. Student A seemed to have some understanding of the five paragraph essay format. As the starting point of her writing, she introduced the story of her travel to Australia as a supporting example for her argument. Then, she began to develop her point in connection with the example. Although her writing was not complete, Student A’s way of developing text seemed to follow the principles of western rhetoric quite well. In contrast to Student A’s way of developing text, Student B’s way seemed complicated and difficult to understand. Instead of focusing on a single aspect of the writing topic, she introduced several topics, including process of becoming friends, honesty as a necessary quality for friendship, friendship in hard times, and others. Although all of the ideas presented in the writing have some relationship with the central topic in some ways, the lack of transition and organization in the writing makes it difficult for the reader to understand what the writer intended to express. This loose organization and multi-topics can be explained in terms that either she had not developed a clear idea of what she wanted to express, or she did not possess the proper understanding of text development.

V. DISCUSSION

The current study seems to confirm the validity of both product and process writing instruction in second language writing classrooms. Student A, who showed the characteristics of more skilled writers, produced better writing in terms of its organization and coherence. In contrast, Student B, who showed the characteristics of an inexperienced writer, successfully managed to produce longer text than Student A. As a matter of fact, product and process have
been regarded as being in the complementary relationship with each other in second language writing instruction (Chaudron, 1987; Connor, 1987). As Raimes (1991) claimed, it seems that the complexity of second language writing cannot be explained by any single theory of writing. Instead, a variety of theories may need to be developed to highlight the diverse nature of second language writing. In this sense, both product and process seem to have legitimate places for second language writing research and pedagogy.

If the last two decades are the period when process approach enjoyed its privileged status as a sole paradigm of second language writing research and pedagogy, it seems that the continuation of such privileged status will be not possible in the future. The decline of process approach does not come from the emergence of a more persuasive writing theory, but from the recognition that a single theory or instructional paradigm is far short of accounting for the complexity of second language writing and its pedagogy. Although genre approaches have emerged as an alternative solution to process approach, it also certainly has limitations in taking the complexity into account (Badger & White, 2000). The present state of process approach is not that the critical weakness threatening its validity is found, but that its problems emerge onto surface. Therefore, instead of the total replacement of process approach as an invalid approach, we have to find ways to integrate new perspectives of second language writing into the existing paradigm, thus building a more comprehensive set of second language writing research and pedagogy paradigms.

Pedagogically, this study bears important implications. First, the results of the present study clearly present the need for proper instruction on written discourse rules and conventions in English. As suggested in Student B’s writing, Korean students do not seem to possess such critical knowledge in using language for communication purpose, suggesting the need for explicit instruction for the knowledge. Second, there is a need to provide students with proper instruction of cognitive strategy use during composing. In the study, although Student A seemed to understand that simple generation of ideas and languages cannot lead to successful writing and writing should be examined at both local and global levels, her understanding of such facts was not fully realized in actual words. In contrast, she seemed to suffer a hard time in producing text. In response to such disparity between the understanding and actual writing, the instructor needs to build a bridge which connects the understanding of second language writing and its process to actual writing practices. Training of effective cognitive strategy use during composing surely improves not only students’ abilities to deal with rhetorical problems but also the overall quality of their writings. In these regards, both process and genre approach have legitimate places for the development of students’ writing abilities.

In conclusion, the current study maintains that process approach still have a place for contributing to the field. There are two reasons behind this argument. First, although there has
been a large volume of process second language writing studies, the question is whether or not we are in the position that we have it that we reach a reasonable degree of understanding the process. The answer is definitely not clear. As Silva (1993) proposed the need for new theories of second language writing which helped us identify and understand the distinctive nature of second language writing, blind pursuit to the recent writing study trend moving toward genre approach without the reasonable understanding of writing process may blur our understanding of second language writing that has the distinct nature from the first language writing. Second, writing cannot be understood from a single perspective. As Hamp-Lyons (1986) acknowledged, the view of writing as process helps us understand the cognitive and affective sides of writing, but probably not social ones. Therefore, what we need is an integrated view of second language writing in which there is a place for the view looking at writing as process, along with the one that emphasizes its social aspects.
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**APPENDIX A**

Student 1's written product

Write about your family value for 45 minutes. Do you think what is the most important in a family? Why do you think so? Do you have any evidence or experience to support your idea?

Have you ever been isolated from your family? Once I have been Australia for a back-packed trip for about six months. At first, I was so excited thinking of my first time to go abroad when I boarded on the plane to Australia. However, from the moment I left Korea to the time when I got back home, it was the most hurtful thing that I couldn't see my dear family. To tell the truth, I didn't expect I would miss my family as that much.

Then what make me miss them so eagerly? There are for sure something important and undescrivable in them. What on earth can they be? I think love for each other can the one of them.

**APPENDIX B**

Student 2's written product

What do you think is friendship? What is the most important in friendship? Why do you think so? Explain your point with some evidence.

That concept is too difficult to define with some sentences. But I'm going to express my own thought, which is the most important thing in friendship. When people meet somebody whom they didn't know before, they are easily excited with new faces. Also they usually meet new people with great curiosity about their age, names ... etc.

After they know new names, they start to find out other's characteristic and judge if new people can get along with themselves.

When they pick some common things out from new people, they can meet each other under the name of friends. Of course, it is the first step to be friends. Though we can't see the procedure to be real
fellows, that procedure is essential. We can't say how many steps are in being fellows however there are.
Passing the first step, people have a time to talk with their friends and they can know their friends' frank side.
What I believe the most important condition in fellowship is the frankness. In may case I hate someone who are not frank. I don't care other things of my friends except honesty. Because I am a kind of frank people, I hope my friends are frank too.
Surely everybody likes to keep his own secret and I can understand that fact.
What I expect from my friend is not to hide their emotions or situations.
I don't want to be their neighbors who can congratulate them when they are happy and get a great success. When they fall in a great disappointment, I want to be some shelter where they can rest and feel comfortable.
It's true that I dream friend's happiness but there can be a painful time, too.
Because it is a life.
I can share their joy also grief.
So, the necessary thing to keep sincere friendship is honesty. Whom we can say our hard story to, it is a really good friend to use.
When I am happy and successful, everybody can say that he/she is my friend. But if I were poor or ugly many of them would deny to my friends.
The very person who remained while other left me, are my real fellow.
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