

University EFL Learners' Prior Experience of Writing Instruction in L1 and L2*

Yuah Vicky Chon** (University of Essex)

Hae-Dong Kim (Hankuk University of Foreign Studies)

Chon, Yuah Vicky & Kim, Hae-Dong. (2005). University EFL learners' prior experience of writing instruction in L1 and L2. *English Teaching*, 60(1), 97-124.

The study aims to identify differences of previous instruction learners have received with regard to their perception of assigning importance and difficulty to aspects of process writing in both languages, Korean (L1) and English (L2). Data were collected through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews from 162 students in seven English composition classes at two universities. The analysis of the data revealed that while students in general had a weak perception of having been instructed with the process approach, they had received formal instruction with the process approach more in L2 than L1 writing. Students used writing strategies (e.g., planning, revising) with reliance on teacher feedback significantly more in L2 than L1 compositions. With regard to importance in the aspects of writing, word choice, grammar, and imitation of particular styles of writing were more important in L2 than L1 compositions. However, differences were found only with grammar and imitation of particular styles of writing. Difficulties that students had with aspects of writing were vocabulary and grammar for L2 writing. The results of the study lead to instructional implications for EFL (English as a foreign language) writing teachers for enhancing the quality of L2 composition.

I. INTRODUCTION

L2 (second language) writing lacks a tidy body of conclusive theory and research on which to base a straight-forward description of learning and teaching, despite its history as a discipline. In connection, Cumming and Riazi (2000) observed that the field currently lacks a coherent understanding of "how people actually learn to write in a second language" (p. 57) and how teaching contributes to this learning. Influenced by the process movement since the late 20th century, L2 writing teachers in Korean university contexts

* We would like to thank three anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions on the earlier version of this paper.

** The first author is Yuah Vicky Chon, and the second author is Hae-Dong Kim.

have been adopting process approaches¹ to writing which focus on the pedagogy of particular attention to procedures for solving problems, discovering ideas and expressing them in recursive phases of writing in prewriting, drafting, incorporating teacher feedback to revising. However, what often gets overlooked is that there may be implicit and explicit distinctions between prior writing experience and composing processes and strategies to be taught. For instance, prior experience of L1 (first language) and L2 writing in background knowledge and strategic proficiency may show up to influence, assist or hinder L2 writing processes and strategies to be learnt.

In consideration of this aspect, this study aims i) to investigate student writers' background in previous writing instruction they have received on writing L1 and L2 compositions, and ii) to examine writing strategies with regard to feedback, and their perception toward importance of aspects in writing and difficulties in academic compositions of L1 and L2. The results of the study may provide pedagogical implications for instruction of writing in EFL (English as a foreign language) contexts by deepening knowledge of the students' previous experiences in a number of aspects of composing. As such to the researchers' knowledge, there have been lack of research in previous studies that report on comparing aspects of writing concerned with both L1 and L2 writing as a within-subjects study.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Writing as a Process

The paradigm shift from the product-oriented to process-oriented theory has been widely recognized in the field of teaching writing over the last three decades. The influence of the paradigm shift in L1 composition research and teaching theory has opened up new developments in ESL (English as a second language)/EFL composition and teaching over the last two decades, and most of the pedagogy has been drawn from research in L1 composition where it was recognized that the linear paradigm had failed to take into account of what writers actually do in their writing processes. Until well into the 1970s, the teaching of the second language writing had focused mostly on the features of L2 written text or the *product* – orthography, sentence-level structure, and discourse level structure – and the way L2 text deviated from the L1 norm (Matsuda, 2003).

By the late 1970s and 1980s, however, the interests in second language composition

¹ The process approach has recently been challenged by post-era paradigms as in the social constructionist view of writing where it is thought that the audience or the discourse community largely determines the language of writing. However, process approach still seems to prevail in most EFL writing classrooms in the Korean university contexts.

research began to shift from textual features to the *process* of writing itself, with researchers investigating the processes underlying the production of written discourse (e.g., Emig, 1971; Flower & Hayes, 1981). Rather than the view of writing as a reproduction of previously learned syntactic or discourse structures, the process-based approach emphasized the view of writing as a process of developing organization as well as meaning. The writing-as-a-process approach freed instruction from the three-or-five-paragraph model, simplistic assumption about the organization and ordering of information, the assumption that each student should be working alone, and the linear composition model based on outlining, writing, and editing. The process approach encouraged self-discovery of the writer who finds meaning by writing on topics of personal importance, emphasized invention and pre-writing tasks, and multiple drafting with feedback – both from teachers and peers – between drafts, and the notion of individual and recursive processes of writing (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996).

2. Learners' Previous Experience of Writing Instruction

Second language writing became an important instructional issue in the mid 20th century. By the early 1990s, the focus of teaching writing which had historically been on international ESL writers at higher institutions in North America (Matusuda & De Pew, 2002) extended to addressing various groups of L2 writers in a wide range of contexts including resident ESL students, and L2 writing in EFL, non-English dominant contexts (Brock & Walters, 1993; Leki, 2001). More importantly one of the fastest growing, yet traditionally underrepresented areas of research in second language writing has been on understanding students' previous literary backgrounds (Carson, 1992; Liebman, 1992), for instance, in research on transition from high school to college (Harklau, 2001; Hartman & Tarone, 1999; Leki, 2001; Tarone et al., 1993).

There have been a number of studies dealing with effect of learners' previous L1 and/or instructions on the aspects or quality of present L2 writing. English writing teachers and researchers in the field have raised awareness on the importance of obtaining knowledge about the students' first language educational and literacy background (Johns, 1997; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001, 2002; Liebman, 1992; McKay, 1993), have gained knowledge of students' L2 writing practice and activities of similar educational backgrounds (Brown & Yamashita, 1995; Gosden, 1996), and have looked at the influence of types of instruction on the writing process (Akyel & Kamisli, 1996). Roca and Murphy (2001) identify the role played by previous literacy and educational experience to shape the L2 writer's composing behavior, and recognize the socially mediated nature of the transfer of skills across languages. Sasaki and Hirose (1996) found that skilled Japanese university EFL students paid more attention to overall organization in their essays than their less skilled counterparts. The authors claim that these differences in planning procedures might

have arisen from the subjects' previous writing experience; the more skilled writers reported having practiced L2 free compositions beyond paragraph level and summarized L1 texts on a regular basis at school while the less-skilled lacked practice in those skills.

The description of certain attitudes towards revision has also been analyzed in relation to certain types of instruction (Porte, 1996, 1997; Sengupta, 2000). In a study aimed at analyzing the revision behavior of a group of EFL Spanish university students, Porte found that the vast majority of the changes the subjects made were at surface level and focused basically on words. Their learning experience and feedback received over the years had seemingly led them to conclude that revision for meaning was not high on the teacher's perceived priorities.

In studies that have been conducted in Korean contexts, some of the literature expand on pedagogical implications by explaining issues such as paradigm shifts from the product to process approach and its efficacies (Bollen, 2003; Kyung-Suk Chang, 1998; Hoyeol Ryu, 2003). Other studies examine variables across product and process essays (Jin-wan Kim, 1997), or compare characteristics of L1 and L2 essays (Jaehyuk Kim, 1995). There are few articles or dissertations published that relate to investigating and comparing L1 and L2 writing processes, previous experience in writing instruction and writing tasks, and how it may contribute to establishing a basis in instructing students to write in a foreign language.

Eunpyo Lee (1998) presents strategies for teaching college English writing as implications of her three-year research on 194 Korean university students enrolled in English composition classes. She suggests effective ways to teach English writing and among them are what method of English writing plays an important role for students to enhance writing ability, and what mode of error correction feedback (e.g., written or tape recorded) these students prefer from their teacher. She found that particularly for the entry level students, creative writing approach did not seem to help them acquire better English and the students instead performed better with controlled writing (i.e., a writing method where students are asked to practice grammatical patterns and to apply those in the next writing tasks), current-traditional rhetoric (i.e., an approach that pays attention to elements such as topic sentences, supporting sentences, transitions and paragraph organization), and process writing (i.e., procedure of writing that consists of writing rough drafts and revisions). The central educational implication of the study is that writing class for the ESL/EFL students should be strengthened through an emphasis on correctness of composition structure and the teacher's comments and corrections. The teacher's role in a writing class is to help students develop strategies, for instance, in finding topics, generating ideas and information, and planning structure and procedure.

While research on second language writing is lacking compared to other skills of English language teaching in the Korean context, the studies mentioned thus far have called for attention to research on students' experience in writing and instruction to lay the context of the studies. The studies that deal with comparisons of L1 and L2 writing

experience and instruction are also lacking in the most recent renowned journal related to writing in a second language (the *Journal of Second Language Writing*, established in 1992). Studies of such kind may contribute to helping instructors and researchers develop an eye to ascertain the bidirectional influence of previous writing experience from L1 to L2 and vice versa. In the field of second language writing, there have been few studies that take on a comparative view of literary background of second/foreign language writers' in L1 and L2. The present study attempts to focus on that area by aiming to answer the following research questions. All questions were asked for Korean (L1) and English (L2):

- 1) What was the context of their previous writing classes? *When, where*, for what *purpose, genres, topics* and *audiences* have the students written?
- 2) How were writing strategies (i.e., *planning, drafting, revising* and *editing*) employed with regard to feedback in the students' past writing experiences?
- 3) How important were the various aspects of writing (e.g., spelling, grammar, vocabulary, organization, content, planning, revising) in the process writing classes?
- 4) What is recognized as the most difficult aspect of the writing process?
- 5) What are some instructional implications for teachers and students of writing in Korean university contexts?

III. METHOD

1. Subjects and Setting

1) Learners-Subjects

The current study was conducted in two stages each at the beginning of two consecutive semesters with students in two universities in Seoul, Korea. Study I was conducted in one university (hereafter university 'A'), and study II was conducted with inclusion of a second university (hereafter university 'B') for wider selection of subjects. A possible difference in subjects lies in their general language proficiency where the students of university A are slightly higher than B. However, it was believed that the difference was negligible according to one of the researchers' teaching experience in both. English writing courses were chosen for data collection since they provided the ideal context where students would have the optimum possibility of relating to and answering questions about writing processes as they were already enrolled in writing courses. These courses offer instruction in academic writing from paragraphs to essays following the process approach. The teachers at both universities were four native speakers of English in the writing courses. All of them had MA degrees in TESOL with minimum 3 years teaching experience in Korean universities. Therefore, it was believed that the teachers were well aware of the process

approach, and thus the teacher variable could not contaminate the purpose of the present study. The medium of classroom language was English only.

A total of 54 students from university A participated in Study I. They were from three sections of a writing course, *Intermediate English Composition* (hereafter with 'A' for distinction of the same title of course in university 'B'), an elective course open to all non-English majors in the university. One native teacher taught two sections and another did one section. The chosen students were from three groups of majors in liberal arts ($n = 18$ students, 33%), business ($n = 16$, 30%), and science ($n = 20$, 37%). There were equal numbers of 27 males and 27 females. The mean age of the subjects was about 24. The students ranged from ages 20-21 ($n = 10$, 28%), 22-23 ($n = 14$, 26%), 24-25 ($n = 14$, 26%), to over 26 ($n = 16$, 30%). With the range of years in learning English, the students had learnt it for some less than 7 years ($n = 11$, 20%), some 8-9 years ($n = 13$, 24%), some 10-11 years ($n = 14$, 36%), and some over 12 years ($n = 13$, 24%).

The subjects in study II consisted of 108 students from universities A and B. Of the seven section writing courses, 44 subjects were from three writing course sections of university A and 64 subjects were from four writing course sections of university B. In university A, data was collected from the same course as in study I, *Intermediate English Composition (A)*, but with different students and additionally in a course, *Writing about Literature*. This additional course was taught by the same participating teacher. In university B, data was collected from *Elementary English Composition* and *Intermediate English Composition (B)*. *Elementary English Composition* is a course primarily for sophomores, and *Intermediate English Composition (B)*, an elective course, is offered to juniors and seniors. Each course was taught by a different native English teacher. The students taking the latter had taken the former writing course. Their majors were liberal arts ($n = 67$, 62%), business ($n = 14$, 13%), science ($n = 16$, 15%), and social science ($n = 11$, 10%). There were 36 males and 72 females. The mean age was about 22. The students ranged from ages 17-20 ($n = 35$, 32%), 21-24 ($n = 61$, 57%) to 25-27 ($n = 12$, 11%).

In all levels at both universities, the students ranged from sophomores to seniors who had taken two semesters of general freshman English courses, requisite for all students. In sum, the students at both universities shared a similar educational context with having learnt English for a mean of ten years.

2) Reasons for Taking a Writing Course

A further background question, the reason for taking the writing course was assessed via a questionnaire in study II. The subjects were asked to mark a 7-point Likert scale on eight items representing instrumental and integrative motivation. Table 1 presents the results of the factor analysis on the items, the mean score and the standard deviation of each item.

As the results show, two factors were identified. They indicate that the respondents had

two aspects of instrumental and integrative motivation. The mean score of the four integrative items was 5.79 (SD = .93) and that of the four instrumental items was 5.61 (SD = .86). The correlation between the two motivations was calculated as $r = .61$, indicating a modestly high level of relationship between the two constructs.

TABLE 1
Motivation for Taking a Writing Course

Items	Type of motivation	factor	factor	Mean	SD
Learning English will allow me to be more at ease with people who speak English.	intgrtv	.74	.26	5.83	1.18
I will be able to participate more freely in the activities of other cultural people.	intgrtv	.72	.35	5.75	1.30
Learning English will allow me to meet and talk with more varied people.	intgrtv	.72	.14	6.13	.98
Learning English will enable me to better understand and appreciate other countries' art and literature.	intgrtv	.79	.09	5.50	1.19
Learning English will someday be useful in getting a good job.	instrmnt	.29	.74	6.27	.99
Learning English will make me a more knowledgeable person, about my major-study, person.	instrmnt	.11	.74	5.71	1.26
Other people will respect me more if I have knowledge of English.	instrmnt	.28	.62	4.58	1.51
I'll need English to get a good exam result such as on TOEFL or TOEIC.	instrmnt	.21	.64	5.85	1.19
Eigenvalue		44.76	12.64		

Note: intgrtv= integrative motivation, instrmnt= instrumental motivation, SD = standard deviation

In comparison with previous studies, conducted within the context of general English courses at universities in Korea, the pattern of the results is almost identical. For example, the results from the subjects of Dongsu Chong and HaeDong Kim's (2001) study show the correlation between the two integrative and instrumental motivations as $r = .59$. In the study of Hae-Dong Kim (2003), the mean score for integrative items was 5.62 and for instrumental items was 5.38, and these results, showing slight higher score of integrative items with means score of over 5, are also similar to those in the present study. Owing to the similarity of the results with those from the previous studies, it may be concluded that the learner-subjects of the present study are not very different from other university students in general English courses.

2. Data Collection Instruments

The instruments used for collection of data on students' experience of writing L1 and L2

were two *questionnaires* and semi-structured *interviews*.

1) Learner Questionnaire

The questionnaire was constructed based on the research questions. It aimed to gather information about L1 and L2 writing instruction the students might have received, the contexts of them (e.g., where, why of instruction), to what extent students' writing tasks were process-oriented, what the important aspects of writing had been (e.g., spelling, grammar, vocabulary, organization, content, planning, revising) in their writing classes, and to see what aspects of writing were difficult for them. The format of the questions in study I was multiple-choice where students could choose as many responses as relevant to their experience, and Likert scale questions were used in study II. Several open-ended questions were also asked together in each questionnaire to complement answers from the multiple choice questions to encourage freedom and detail of what the students could remember about their past writing experience, and not to impose researcher bias.

All questions were made in Korean (L1) so as to make them easily comprehensible for the students. Questionnaires of study I and II were all together 11 pages long and were respectively administered by the classroom teachers at the beginning of two different semesters during one of the regular classroom sessions. Therefore, it was hardly possible for the learners' experience of a new writing course to influence the learners' responses. It took the students 15-20 minutes to complete the questionnaires in both surveys. The response rate was 100%. It was stressed that the learners should answer the questions related to their past experience by excluding that from the current writing course.

2) Learner Interview

Semi-structured interviews were conducted only in study I with ten students from the classes to triangulate responses from the questionnaires. The students were randomly chosen from one of the writing courses with permission from the course teacher and the arrangement of dates and times for meeting were contacted by email by one researcher for reasons of clarity and because it was the students' preferred means of communication. The interviews were held in the office of one of the course teacher and it took 15 minutes for each interview. The interviews were conducted in Korean. The interviews were recorded, although not for detailed transcription, on digital voice recorders and the researcher simultaneously took notes. The semi-structured interviews, in parallel with the questionnaire questions, asked about prior writing instruction in Korean and English compositions and their experience of writing them.

3) Data Analysis

All responses that could be quantified were analyzed using *SPSS for Windows*. Qualitative responses elicited by the questionnaire and learners' interviews were tallied according to the keywords or phrases of the short answers that students wrote. The students' descriptive answers have the limit of reporting what they wish to report and perhaps leave out on any significant information that needs to be known about previous L1 and L2 writing experience, or on any other important aspects of writing. It was believed, however, that what the students reported was what they most easily remembered as being the most important or influential part of their writing experience and instruction. In reporting the descriptive results, missing responses are excluded in analysis.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Students' Previous Writing Experience of L1 and L2

Research question one was: With regard to Korean (L1) and English (L2), what was the context of the students' previous writing courses? *When, where, for what purpose, genres, topics and audiences* have the students written?

1) Context of Previous Courses

Findings on the context from students' past writing courses were made by both studies I and II. Table 2, which are some results of study I, shows the learners' responses in the questionnaire about the time and location of experience of instruction for writing. The learners were asked to choose as many items that were relevant to their experience.

TABLE 2
Experience of Formal Instruction for Writing

Items: where and when	<i>English Writing Only</i>	<i>Korean Writing Only</i>	Experience of Both	No experience
At middle/high school	2 (4%)	13 (24%)	4 (7%)	35 (65%)
At a private institute	1 (2%)	9 (17%)	4 (7%)	40 (74%)
By private tutoring	0 (0%)	5 (10%)	0 (0%)	49 (90%)
At university	10 (19%)	7 (13%)	4 (7%)	33 (61%)

Contrary to our initial expectation, over half of the students answered that they had never experienced true formal instruction for L1 or L2 writing in each institution: the classrooms of middle school, high school, private institute and university. They seemed to

be aware that there exists a certain form of guided formal instruction for L1 or L2 writing other than the type of instruction the students may have received.

In the process of constructing the questionnaire, it was checked in informal interviews to see what ‘formal instruction’² in writing may mean to them. In what the researchers had defined in mind and what the students described as *formal* instruction in writing were related. ‘Formal instruction’ could be defined for both students and researchers as being associated with the idea of having personalized attention from the teacher on checking drafts to comment on individual writing problems, receive constructive feedback, and be led through the process of writing (e.g., brainstorming – collecting of drafts – checking of mistakes and inappropriateness). Among the institutions, the number of students who had had more experience of formal instruction for L2 than for L1 writing was greater only in the case of university level.

In study II, as indicated in Table 3, this was again corroborated when subjects were asked to mark a 7-point Likert scale on the same question for when and where they had received formal instruction on writing L1 and L2. Results showed that there were statistically significant differences at university and also at middle/high school levels between the experience of formal writing in L1 and L2.

TABLE 3
Experience of Formal Instruction in Writing

Items: When and Where	<i>English writing</i>			<i>Korean writing</i>			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank		
University	4.98	1.31	1	3.88	1.46	2	-6.57	.00*
Middle/High School	2.61	1.42	2	4.08	1.39	1	9.02	.00*
Institute	2.49	1.72	3	2.84	1.79	3	2.13	.04
Private Lesson	2.02	1.56	4	2.22	1.77	4	1.23	.22

Note: SD = standard deviation, * = statistically significant ($p < .05$)

This pattern of results reflected that for middle/high school levels, there had clearly been more writing instruction in L1 over L2, and that there is more instruction on writing L2 during university. In other words, formal instruction on English compositions starts only after entering university and mirrors the current educational context in Korea. The learners’ qualitative comments gave further explanation of these quantitative results.

In the results of study I, a total of twenty-seven (50%) out of fifty-four respondents who considered themselves to have received formal instruction wrote a descriptive answer about their experience of Korean composition instruction. When asked questions about the context of their writing experiences in Korean, most of the students seemed to be reminded of the instruction they had received in high school preparing for their *nonsool*, the

² This term is not to be confused with how it refers to grammar teaching (Ellis, 1994). This term is context-specific and was derived from a Korean phrase.

college-board essay exams. Students reported almost equally their experience of having received writing instruction at *hagwon*, private institutes, and in their regular high school classes. In fact, one student reported in an interview that it had been the high-achieving students that had been eligible for *nonsool* preparatory writing instruction at her school. Some others put responses about writing instruction they had received in their college core freshman Korean courses. In study II, the responses were confirmed when students made comments that other than to prepare for the college-board exam, there had hardly been any formal instruction for Korean writing and that it had been short-term training. A few of the respondents actually reported that any formal writing instruction had started only after university entrance.

As for formal instruction on English writing, some students ($n = 12, 23\%$) in study I answered that they had received instruction on L2 writing. It was found in both studies I and II that if there had been any formal instruction for English writing, some had received it during a voluntary summer school program abroad, by attending domestic private institutes or preparatory classes (e.g., for TOEFL) during vacations, or by having taken a course at the university. Many students reported that formal instruction for English compositions had started only after the university entrance. One student reported: *'I never had the chance to learn English compositions separately. For Suneung (Korean college-board exam), the curriculum was based on English comprehension, and that is why in college I have been having a difficult time getting a grasp of grammar and the basics of English composition.'* As such and for most students, English writing instruction rarely seemed to have occurred in Korean high schools leaving one possibly without sense of control in a productive skill such as writing. In fact, in the interview, some students denied strongly having received any L2 formal writing instruction in high school, not to mention the experience of having written an English essay for a classroom writing task. The students seemed to realize that there had been a shortage of English teachers in the high schools, who consequently had no time to teach L2 writing and to mark drafts of essays. Also contributing to this, as the researchers see, is the prominence of the exam-oriented system in Korean high schools, and non-assessment of L2 essays on the Korean college-board exams.

As for the purpose, as indicated in study I, the purpose of receiving instruction for L1 was primarily because it had been a part of the curriculum, while others perceived it to be more closely related to preparing for the college-board exam. Table 4 of study II further indicates significant differences between the purposes of writing instruction in L1 and L2, and confirms the results of study I that instruction in Korean writing was conducted as a part of the students' curriculum in order to prepare them for the university entrance essay exams, while English instruction has arisen from students' intention to learn writing English composition.

As for the topic of L1 essays, descriptive answers of study I indicated that it was often

related to current events and issues in newspaper editorials or articles. For instance, some topics were designed to test students' knowledge in recognizing an important theme in a piece of Korean classical, old literature as was reported in one student interview. As for the kind of genres the students had to write in, most of them reported that they had been taught to write 'persuasive essays', ranging in topics from current events to classical Korean literature to support their position or arguments.

TABLE 4
Objective of Writing Instruction

Items	<i>English writing</i>			<i>Korean writing</i>			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Mean	SD	rank	Mean	SD	rank		
Writing was a part of the curriculum	4.41	1.79	1	5.29	1.48	1	3.94	.00*
Wanted to learn how to write compositions	3.70	1.81	2	2.91	1.63	3	-4.25	.00*
To prepare for university entrance exams	2.79	1.87	3	4.57	1.83	2	7.26	.00*

Note: SD = standard deviation, * = statistically significant ($p < .05$)

Student interviews describe that they were asked to express their opinions through persuasive essays after recognizing the argument from a given reading passage. Most students reported that they had perceived the evaluator of the essays or the professors at the university to which they were applying as their audience. A small number of students responded about their writing experience received in their college freshman Korean courses. Overall, it can be seen that if students *did* perceive they had received instruction in writing Korean essays, the primary goal had been to prepare for the college-board exams, and had taken L1 writing classes as a part of the school curriculum. Much of the instruction received at school had been complemented by the instruction at private institutes to prepare for the university entrance exams.

As for English writing, while the description of the type of essays varies, they were predominantly essays for academic purposes, such as expository essays. The audience which was also not well-specified were principally teachers, classmates, and rarely families. The lack of information about audience specification may reflect students' lack of audience awareness or the lack of reference to audience in their writing classes. The qualitative answers were not full or descriptive as they had been for Korean writing. As such, whereas this kind of observation in EFL classes is clearly essential, EFL and ESL teachers are becoming increasingly aware of the importance of obtaining knowledge about the first language (L1) educational background and specific needs of their students in order to prepare them to deal effectively with the difficulties they may encounter at the university level (e.g., Johns, 1997; Kobayahsi & Rinnert, 2002; McKay, 1993).

2) Experience of Process Writing

The subjects in studies I and II were asked to respond to what extent they had received instruction with the process approach. Question item in questionnaire of study I was 'Did you learn to write by going through the process of *planning-drafting-revising-editing* when writing an essay?' and in study II the students were asked to mark a 7-point Likert scale as to the extent of 'I was taught to go through the process of *planning-drafting-revising-editing*'. Table 5 shows the learners' responses about the experience of process writing from study I.

TABLE 5
Experience of Process Writing

	Always	most of the time	sometimes	Rarely	never (including no response)	Z	p
English (L2) writing	10 (18%)	9 (17%)	3 (6%)	0 (0%)	32 (59%)	0.49	.62
Korean (L1) writing	3 (5%)	12 (22%)	8 (15%)	2 (4%)	29 (54%)		

The results from the questionnaire suggest that not many students had been taught to use the process approach in writing. In the case of the Korean composition classes, 15 subjects (27%) reported frequent learning of the process approach. In English composition classes, 19 subjects (35%) reported frequent use. Although the non-parametric Wilcoxon test proved to show no statistically significant difference in the responses of experience between L1 and L2 writing, the results show that the learners had slightly more frequent experience of process writing in English than Korean. This was also evident in study II when the subjects were asked to mark a 7-point Likert scale from '1 = never' to '7 = always' ($n = 108$, English mean = 5.78, Korean mean = 4.69). There was also a statistically significant difference in the responses of experience between L1 and L2 writing toward process writing when the paired t -test was conducted ($t = -5.72, p < 0.05$). Further results of study II showed the students to report more for having received formal writing instruction in L2 (English) than L1 (Korean) writing, and the difference was significant with the paired t -test ($n = 101, t = -6.15, p < 0.05$). Since the students' perception towards formal writing instruction is related to their experience of having been taught more with the process approach, it can be claimed that the extent of having received formal instruction and their association with the process approach are related thus more in L2 writing.

The descriptive answers from questionnaires and interviews of studies I and II further demonstrated that the students tend to formally follow the procedures of process writing in English compositions while they do so to a lesser extent in writing Korean compositions. In study I, twenty-five students (46%) out of fifty-four responded about Korean

compositions on how well they followed the procedures of writing as they had been taught.

Most of them said they followed the process approach in general; however, many also confessed to not spending as much time as they wanted to on the brainstorming and planning stages, and realized the lack of systematic writing procedures. The students in study II commented that time spent on revising and receiving feedback was also not enough compared to the time they spent on planning, which includes brainstorming, and selecting a topic. However, the explanation from a majority of the students implied that the processes of writing had been taught to them in theory, and not practiced. The following are some explanations from them which were originally in Korean: (Student 1)- *What I learnt in my Korean writing classes in middle/high school went only as far as learning about the concepts of the writing process, and they were not practiced in the writing curriculum itself. The assessment of writing also did not include consideration about each process of writing and writing was assessed only for the completed pieces of writing.* (Student 2)- *I learnt the basic proponents of writing in the Korean school textbooks and was examined by multiple choice or open-ended questions. Elements such as grammar, or the stages of the writing process were learnt for instance by memorization. The school did not seem to regard writing as important. More instruction and practice about the stages of formal writing have been learnt in English rather than Korean.*

In the case of L2 writing, twenty-one students (39%) of study I responded about how well they followed the procedures of process approach in writing English compositions as they had been taught. The students said that they generally followed the process approach when writing compositions in English. If not completely followed, the students said that they *tried* to follow the process approach, or some said they brainstormed and planned mentally before starting to write. Some others said that they thought of the process approach as the ideal way of writing, but that in reality they simply started writing before extensive planning due to, for instance, time constraints of an assignment deadline. Others describe that particularly when writing in English, the process approach was needed to be able to produce compositions that would abide by the strict paragraph and essay structures of English compositions, and that process writing actually facilitated the writing process so it became less complicated and approachable. Another student said that an outline was essential when writing in a second language because he often encountered a writer's block where he or she couldn't think of what had to be said without an outline to follow. It seems that an outline becomes a scaffold; the existence of a structure to follow will release a part of the subject's cognitive load so that the leisure may be spent for refining supporting ideas, improving organization, solving word choice problems, or leaving a time gap for revision.

Student-explanations from study II were very much alike as collected in study I. One student explained that due to less freedom in the ability to express oneself in L2, he needed to follow the process as much as possible. Another student made the comparison that he found himself following the process approach more strictly when writing English

compositions. This is not only due to English being the second language where the learner would find it more efficient to follow the process approach, but it is also due to instruction on English compositions that is taught with more attention to process approach as seen previously.

In sum, what can be said in comparison of the approaches in the two languages is that the students conformed more to process approach when writing in English. The lack of perception about the process approach in Korean essays seems to stem from insufficient practice in the classrooms and the background of the exam-oriented system. In parallel with what has been reported so far, Krapels (1990) notes that the question of how L2 students have learned or acquired writing as a language skill is important to L2 writing process research. Although it may be possible to discover how learners were previously taught English, it is very difficult to know how these learners were actually taught writing, or indeed whether they were actually 'taught' writing at all. Also when we can see the positive effects of first language writing, including L1 writing ability, expertise, and writing strategies on second language writing to be transferring (Cumming, 1989; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996), a student's L1 composing skill needs some sort of assessment (Zamel, 1983). L2 writing process research does not typically include comparable data on the subjects' level of L1 writing. Without such information, any conclusion on L2 composing competence is tentative because research thus far hints that L1 composing competence somehow affects L2 composing (Krapels, 1990).

2. Use of Writing Strategies and Feedback

Research question two was: With regard to L1 and L2, how were writing strategies (i.e., *planning*, *drafting*, *revising* and *editing*) employed with regard to feedback in students' past writing experiences?

Table 6 from study II shows the extent to students' use of writing strategies in *planning*, *drafting*, *revising* and *editing* with feedback. It seems that 'planning and drafting by student him/herself' is the most common strategy used in both L1 and L2 writing. Although differences of the items were not significant between L1 and L2, it seemed that students had been left to do planning and drafting on their own more in L2 than L1.

This seems pedagogically inappropriate when we realize that students may be more at loss in planning and drafting for English compositions, for instance, in thinking of a writing topic, refining ideas, trying to find the right L2 key word, or if outlining in L2. It has been noted by Hyland (2002) that students need realistic strategies for generating plans, researching topic information, rough drafting and gradually refining both content and form. When this is followed, teachers can offer students training in composition strategies which can be transferred across situations, helping them to brainstorm, draft in stages and to separate rhetorical revising from grammatical editing to accommodate their restricted

communicative resources. At each of these stages, feedback is seen as valuable to guide the students through this process.

TABLE 6
Writing Strategies and Feedback

Items	English writing			Korean writing			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank		
Planning and drafting by student him/herself	5.20	1.41	1	4.99	1.42	1	-1.35	.18
Revising and editing with teacher feedback	4.83	1.46	2	3.97	1.65	3	-4.71	.00*
Revising and editing by student him/herself	3.96	1.53	3	4.20	1.55	2	1.14	.26
Planning and drafting with teacher feedback	3.91	1.62	4	2.96	1.40	4	-5.46	.00*
Revising and editing with peer feedback	3.10	1.52	5	2.45	1.18	6	-4.13	.00*
Planning and drafting with peer feedback	2.99	1.43	6	2.66	1.32	5	-2.21	.03*

Note: SD = standard deviation, * = statistically significant ($p < .05$)

In connection, significant differences were reported between writing of L1 and L2 in 'planning and drafting with teacher feedback/peer feedback' both scoring higher on L2. This implies that if there was any feedback in the planning and drafting stages, it was given by teacher or peers more in L2 writing classrooms. With regard to revising and editing, there were significant differences between L1 and L2 in 'revising and editing with teacher feedback' scoring higher for L2 writing which validates that students receive more feedback in L2 than in L1 writing from the teacher, and in parallel 'revising and editing by him/herself' was lower in L2 writing. It may well be that students' writing in L2 need the contribution of teacher feedback since uncertainties in various aspects of writing are bound to arise. There were also significant differences between L1 and L2 in 'revising and editing with peer feedback' where it scored higher on L2, but with the scale not reaching mid-point on both, this implies that peer feedback was not a prominent aspect of their past writing process. This may be due to the characteristic of Korean students coming from 'collectivist' cultures who are more interested in group solidarity than individual achievement (Ferris, 2003).

3. Importance of Aspects of Writing

Research question three was: With regard to L1 and L2, how important were the various aspects of writing in the students' process writing classes?

The learners were asked in study II to mark two sets of questions in the questionnaire according to their personal importance for L1 and L2. The first question was more on sentence-level, organization, and content aspects met in writing while the second was related to writing strategies. They were asked; "How would you say each of the following aspects of *spelling, grammar, vocabulary, organization, content, word choice, and imitation of particular styles of writing OR planning, revising, peer feedback, teacher's feedback and correction* was important in your composition class?" They were asked to rate a Likert scale from 1-7, ranging from 'not important' to 'extremely important'. Table 7 presents the quantitative results.

TABLE 7
Importance in Aspects of Writing I

Items	English writing			Korean writing			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank		
Content	6.42	.75	1(1)	6.44	.67	1(1)	.12	.91
Organization	6.38	.62	2(2)	6.40	.74	2(2)	.13	.90
Word choice	6.00	.97	3(4)	5.93	1.00	4(4)	-1.01	.31
Vocabulary	5.94	1.00	4(6)	5.95	1.01	3(3)	.10	.92
Grammar	5.87	1.04	5(8)	5.51	1.16	6(8)	-3.66	.00*
Spelling	5.34	1.25	6(9)	5.52	1.29	5(7)	1.50	.14
Imitation of particular Styles of writing	4.39	1.58	7(10)	4.14	1.46	7(10)	-5.15	.00*

Note: SD = standard deviation, * = statistically significant ($p < .05$), () indicates rank when the aspects are ranked over all of aspects I & II.

As the results show, all the items on average scored higher than mid-point of the scale regardless for both L1 and L2 which demonstrates the perceived importance of these aspects in writing in both languages. Content was regarded as the most important aspect for both L1 and L2 writing, and was followed by the aspect of organization in both languages. Word choice for L2 and vocabulary for L1 were marked as next important which points out the overall importance of lexical knowledge (e.g., word meaning, register, derivatives and collocations) in a productive task such as writing.

Grammar was ranked 5th most important in L2 writing whereas it ranked 6th in L1 writing. The results of the paired *t*-test showed that interestingly *grammar* and *imitation of particular styles writing* were the only aspects of writing that showed significant differences of importance between L1 and L2, scoring higher on L2. This implies that the learners believed the two aspects to be more important in L2 than in L1 writing. For instance, when a student writes in L1 the application of grammar knowledge may have become proceduralized and the writer is unaware of it while in L2 one will try to retrieve rules learnt in their past schooling. Furthermore, with respect to *imitation of particular styles of writing*, it may be that students are not accustomed to seeing the rhetorical structures of

English writing (e.g., ‘top-heavy’ English compositions as compared to ‘bottom-heavy’ Korean compositions in terms of organization), or how connecting words and phrases (e.g., last but not the least, as a whole, nevertheless, in spite of) are used between paragraphs or sentences. It can be claimed that the availability of sample compositions would be helpful here.

The second set of items judged for their importance in writing comprised *planning*, *revising*, *teacher feedback*, and *peer feedback*. As Table 8 shows, the order of importance for all aspects was consistent in L2 and L1. Planning was regarded as the most important aspect for both L2 and L1 which was followed by aspects of revising, teacher feedback and correction, and finally by peer feedback. There were more noticeable findings with the paired *t*-test. With the exception of peer feedback, the items showed significant differences in the degree of importance between L1 and L2, scoring higher in L2.

TABLE 8
Importance of Aspects of Writing II

Items	English writing			Korean writing			<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Mean	SD	Rank	Mean	SD	Rank		
Planning	6.10	.88	1(3)	5.79	1.16	1(5)	-2.87	.01*
Revising	5.96	.89	2(5)	5.67	1.12	2(6)	-2.66	.01*
Teacher feedback and correction	5.91	.99	3(7)	5.10	1.46	3(9)	-2.16	.03*
Peer feedback	4.24	1.43	4(11)	3.96	1.40	4(11)	-1.84	.07

Note: SD = standard deviation, * = statistically significant ($p < .05$) () indicates rank when the aspects are ranked over all of aspects I & II.

This indicates that *planning* and *revising* in English writing can be more difficult, while the contribution of *teacher feedback* may be more crucial in L2 writing for Korean university level students. On this matter, Ferris (2003) documents that teachers should give feedback about a variety of issues, including ideas, organization, grammar, mechanics, vocabulary, and style depending upon the needs of the individual student, the developmental stage of the text, the specifications of the particular assignments, and the overall expectations of the writing course.

The respondents of study II provided descriptive answers as to what they had considered to be important in L1 and L2 writing processes, and they were tallied according to key aspects of writing mentioned. For Korean writing, 98 respondents wrote descriptive answers, and the order of frequency of those aspects being mentioned were *planning* (50 responses, 43%), *revising* (29, 25%), *teacher feedback* (12, 10%), *content* (11, 10%), *imitation of particular style of writing* (6, 5%), *organization* (4, 3%), *vocabulary* (2, 2%), *spelling* (1, 1%), *research on writing topic* (1, 1%), and *grammar* (0). There was no mentioning of peer feedback. In comparison to the quantitative results, the first three aspects, planning, revising, and teacher feedback appeared again to be important. For

assigning importance on planning, the common explanation was that it saved time, made writing easier, could revise less, and enabled one to produce abundant ideas. A noticeable comment for teacher feedback was that this had been rare in Korean writing, and that it would lead to low potentials for improvement when one did not receive individualized comments on writing problems.

For English writing, 103 respondents wrote descriptive answers, and the order of frequency in those aspects being mentioned were *planning* (40 responses, 34%), *revising* (19, 16%), *teacher feedback* (19, 16%), *imitation of particular styles of writing* (10, 9%), *content* (9, 8%), *organization* (8, 7%), *vocabulary* (4, 4%), *peer feedback* (3, 3%), *spelling* (2, 2%), and *grammar* (2, 2%). As in Korean writing, the descriptive results parallel the quantitative results of English writing where the first three aspects, planning, revising, and teacher feedback appeared to be important. Comments on planning were similar to what had been made for Korean writing, and there were 14 comments about their reliance on teacher feedback for reasons that it was a crucial component of writing, that one could not complete writing without them, and that students were less confident in grammar and organization as compared to Korean. With the writing aspect in imitation of sample essays, students reported that they used the Internet to look at native-written essays and to learn from them, to compare the way they had written to what a native speaker would write, and to use exemplary sentences from books and dictionaries. However, with the use of the Internet, we know that organizations provided by the Internet literature often do not abide by the organization of essays so that students using them would have to be selective in the type of writing they use as references. In connection, it has been suggested that teachers can make effective use of our students' view of learning to write through reading. At an early stage, they may depend on imitation of the texts they read; however, with careful guidance, for example, changing the nature of writing tasks from controlled to less controlled, the degree of dependence on imitation should be lessened (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002).

4. Difficult Aspects of Writing

Research question four was: With regard to L1 and L2, what is recognized as the most difficult aspect of the writing process?

Students were asked in questionnaire of study II on what they had considered to be the most difficult part of the writing process in L1 and L2. An important revelation in findings was that what the students had considered to be *important* in the aspects of writing was related to what they had considered *difficult* in L1 writing, but not in the L2 writing processes. The subjects were asked to produce only descriptive answers, and for analysis they were tallied according to frequency of key words mentioned on writing. For Korean writing, there were 77 out of 108 students who wrote comments. As for the order of

frequency in difficulty, they ranged from *organization* (24 responses, 34%), *vocabulary* (22, 31%), *content* (13, 19%), *grammar* (6, 9%), *following the process of writing* (3, 4%) to *spelling* (2, 3%). *Organization*, *vocabulary*, and *content* were ranked as the first three in parallel with the quantitative results for Korean writing on importance in aspects of writing (as indicated in Tables 7 & 8 in parentheses).

There were hardly any comments made for organization, and there were ample explanations for why vocabulary had been difficult. The explanation, which stemmed from self-asserted expectations and pressures from evaluators, were that there was the need to use vocabulary of high sophisticated levels especially for adjectives, to be able to use as many words as possible of words which stem from Chinese characters and meaning, and to use exotic and creative expressions. It can be claimed that in L1 writing, students' vocabulary problems are more related to making choices of appropriate vocabulary rather than on solving knowledge gap problems. For content of Korean compositions, there was the general problem of the need to use well-explained, valid supporting ideas for writing an argument, to make content interesting and creative for readers to read, difficulty in finding material for research and also the lack of background/common knowledge which makes it hard to write informative/interesting essays. It was interesting to note that one student reported on his tendency to use translated English expressions in Korean essays. He did not give an example, but some influence of second to the first language (rather than from the first to the second e.g., Konglish) could be seen.

For English writing, all 108 subjects responded. As for the order of frequency in difficulty, they ranged from *vocabulary* (67 responses, 62%), *grammar* (29, 27%), *organization* (7, 6%), *spelling* (2, 2%), *content* (2, 2%), to *following the process of writing* (1, 1%). Whereas vocabulary had ranked only sixth and grammar eighth in the importance in aspects of writing (as indicated in Table 7 & 8 in parentheses), the aspects ranked first and second respectively in their degree of difficulty. The explanation for vocabulary problems of L2 were that one could not write on a wanted topic when there was lack of lexical knowledge, that there was a need to avoid repeating the same words, and that selection of appropriate vocabulary was made difficult due to subtle differences in L2 synonym words. Another reported problem arose when there were discrepancies or subtle differences between the words a student knew and how they are actually used in context of writing.

Difficulties further occurred with retrieving the commonest and easiest expressions in L2 which can sometimes occur due to lack of collocation knowledge (e.g., cannot connect word after word, don't know what verb and prepositions to use together), unfamiliarity with spoken and written English, and difficulty in knowing and remembering idiomatic phrases. Several respondents also commented on a sentiment of uncertainty as to the appropriateness of the word one had retrieved even while using it. One student commented that due to multiple meanings of a word (i.e., polysemy) it was hard to decide on which

word to use in certain situations. One student went extreme to say that trying to translate a Korean thought would often be inappropriate to equally show the same meaning. The description is brief, but the student's comment may imply that she realizes the differences of L1 and L2 schemata and culture-specific concepts that need to be explained when writing.

For difficulties in grammar, the students confessed problems even when writing content-easy essays, tense in grammar especially when sentences had to be made longer, use of articles, and confusion arising from their knowledge of Korean sentence structures. Between writing of L1 and L2, it can be seen that the percentage of comments mentioned for aspects of difficulty were greater in L1 writing for *organization* (L1=34%, L2=6%), *content* (L1=19%, L2=2%) and slightly more for *spelling* (L1=3%, L2=2%). In L2 writing, it was greater for *vocabulary* (L1=31%, L2=62%), and *grammar* (L1=9%, L2=27%).

V. CONCLUSION

1. Main Research Findings

The study thus far has been an attempt to view one selected facets of knowledge about L2 writers by exploring their writing experience in L1 and L2 writing courses. The major findings of the study, obtained by the analysis of the data from questionnaires and interviews, revealed several important aspects which may provide some implications for future writing instruction in EFL classrooms.

First, although it was expected for EFL university students in Korea to have received some previous writing instruction in L1 and L2, the students had a weak perception toward having received formal writing instruction in both L1 and L2. The students overall seemed to have their own perception of what formal writing instruction should consist of, and it was closely related to following the process-oriented approach which includes the stages of writing drafts and receiving individualized teacher feedback. Even though there had been some writing instruction for writing in L1 and L2, the results revealed that the extent had been limited to a certain number of students or at particular places or institutions. Their short-term training in L1 writing had been exam-oriented, theorized rather than practiced in writing classes. The low positive responses for the experience of writing instruction implied that the type of instruction might have not been sufficient to prepare them for college-board essay exams. As for L2 writing instruction, it had been infrequent before coming to the university, and if there had been any experience of L2 writing, it had been from students' personal interest or intentions. With regard to instruction with the process approach, perception of having been taught with the approach lacked overall in both L1 and L2, while there were significant differences in the students' experience of process

writing between L1 and L2, scoring higher on L2. Descriptive answers also explained that student tend to follow the process approach more formally when writing in L2.

Second, with students' use of writing strategies in L1 and L2, independent planning and drafting (with no feedback) had been most frequent, but this seemed pedagogically inappropriate. Nonetheless, there were significant differences between L1 and L2 for receiving teacher/peer feedback at all stages of writing being more important in L2 writing. This implied that teacher feedback had been an invaluable part of their writing process more in L2 for all stages of writing in planning, drafting, revising, and editing.

Third, with regard to what the students had considered important among the aspects of writing, *content* and *organization* were rated as the most important aspects in both L1 and L2, while *planning* and *revising* seemed to be the most important writing strategies in L1 and L2. With the comparison between aspects of L1 and L2, there were significant differences in *grammar* and *imitation of particular styles of writing, planning, revising, and teacher feedback*, scoring higher on L2 writing. This implies that those aspects were more important in L2 writing which calls for more attention from the L2 writing teacher.

Fourth, as to what was considered difficult to students in L1 and L2 writing, the tallied descriptive answers showed that there were no differences in L1 writing with respect to the first three aspects considered important in aspects of writing, but differences were reported for *vocabulary* and *grammar* in L2 writing. The implication of these finding is that what are considered important in aspects of writing may not be relevant to the problems they have in L2 writing. In L2 writing, the students reported on their vocabulary knowledge gap problems whereas it had been concerned with having to use words of high sophistication level and word choice problems in L1 writing. It can also be claimed that students were not able to apply grammar knowledge when writing in L2 and that it was causing uncertainties and confusion when they were situated to produce in a language that they were primarily used to decoding (e.g., reading) rather than encoding (e.g., writing).

2. Implications of the Study

The teaching implication of this study lies in trying to alert teachers that there is overall lack of writing instruction in both L1 and L2. If it is the case that writing strategies (e.g., paraphrasing, summarizing mentally, revising plans) learnt in one language are available for use in another language (Connor, 1995; Grabe, 2003; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996), then the results of the study reveal that lack of writing skills in one language will deprive them to be transferred to another. If a writing skill has not been taught for L1 writing, then they need to be recognized and taught for L2 writing. The complementary view may be that some as teachers may be more interested in excelling students in skills of reading and speaking and relegate writing tasks to be completed as homework where students are often let alone to take care of problems in writing without proper feedback in stages of the writing process.

In extreme cases, students may try to translate word by word from L1 to L2 only to find themselves to write incoherent pieces of writing, and possibly encourage plagiarism as the researchers have seen.

The other concern is that when writing tasks are predominantly done outside the classroom, this discourages students from forming a notion of process approach of writing. When there are writing assignments, teachers or proficient student writers sometimes need to model a writing process by talking aloud while composing at the black/whiteboard or OHP, and encourage students to share their knowledge of successful L2 writing strategies. As Hoyoel Ryu (2003) has proposed, the integration of the process approach with the product-oriented approach may be an option for classroom procedures particularly when there are classroom constraints in terms of time, and course requirements.

With regard to students, this study attempts to develop critical awareness about their past and present writing experience and instruction. One way to utilize students' L1 background is, as Johns (1997) advocates, to turn the writing class into a place where students research their own literacy and develop critical awareness of what they need to learn about L2 academic writing. Such an approach can be particularly practical in EFL contexts where students tend to have more similar backgrounds. In these contexts, non-native English speaking teachers may be particularly well positioned to draw students' attention to similarities between their L1 and L2 literacy skills. In addition, the students need to be sensitized about strategy-based instruction and learning. The students' heightened awareness about *language use strategies*, such as retrieval strategies and communication strategies related to writing (Cohen, 1998; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) may decrease the amount of time needed for the development of EFL writing skills and may significantly enhance the quality of writing.

The results of the study further raise concern of writing teachers as to investigating the characteristic of feedback the students would be expecting. Since EFL Korean university students generally lacked experience of having received individualized feedback from teachers in L1 writing, their sense of what to expect in teacher feedback and utilize may be weak when they are given the chance to do so. The potential value of teacher feedback has been highlighted ever since the widespread adoption of the process (multiple-draft) approach and Ferris (2003) provides useful implications gathered from her review of studies on 'responding to student compositions'. Some are that feedback is most effective when provided in intermediate stages of writing when students can respond to feedback in subsequent revisions and may thus be more motivated to attend to teacher suggestions; that teachers should provide feedback on all aspects of writing including content, rhetorical structure, grammar and mechanics; that teacher feedback should be clear and concrete to assist, and at the same time by not 'appropriating' (taking over) student texts by being too authoritative and direct in their feedback. However, with her last guideline, Korean and other ESL/EFL students may feel that they *do* need specific directions with respect to what

they should be doing or changing in their writing.

Student quantitative and qualitative reports on their comparative writing experiences of L1 and L2 writing also enabled the researchers to see that grammar, an aspect considered both important and difficult, needs to be integrated into L2 writing instruction for increasing accuracy in the students' compositions. Grammar instruction may take the form of individualized editing and error feedback at the students' revising stages so that attention to grammar will not detract them from aims of the course: learning composing skills appropriate for academic contexts. Frodesen and Holten (2003) demonstrate how text analysis followed by text production activities can help students 'notice' certain grammatical structures used in discourse (e.g., how embedded noun clauses are created from previously mentioned information: 'the results may not be valid -> whether or not the results are valid) and heighten students' awareness of language features for later productive tasks. Productive work may range from controlled work, such as revising teacher-underlined sentences to communicative writing practice, such as summarizing a published text using reporting verbs. Ellis (1994) demonstrates that there is growing evidence to support that grammar instruction does work, providing that learners are ready to assimilate new target rules into their mental grammar.

As to students' difficulties with knowledge gap in vocabulary, this leads teachers to see that raising awareness in vocabulary learning strategies should be a part of the writing instruction. While description on taxonomy of vocabulary learning strategies is beyond the realm of this literature, metacognitive strategies (e.g., used to taking steps to efficiently plan and regulate processes of language use and learning) (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Schmitt, 1997) can be recommended. For instance, students need to make plans, notice words that need to be learnt, take steps to consolidate their lexical knowledge so that they may be accessed in transient processes of writing, and support proponents of the 'output hypothesis' (Swain, 1995) that vocabulary can be learnt through writing. When selecting words to learn, it needs to be realized that there are cost-benefit relationships in the learning of words, and the benefits will be high when one learns high frequency words prior to low frequency ones (Nation, 2001).

3. Recommendations for Future Research

As for future studies, it should be necessary to measure the effect of previous L1 and L2 writing experience on the current and future L2 writing quality within the university context in Korea. Moreover, within the cognitive approach to writing, it would be attention-grabbing to see what strategies are used by student-writers, and which ones succeed in the face of problems which may come up more often in one stage (e.g., drafting) of writing than another. As such, there needs to be more studies on what goes on in the students' writing process through research methods like think-aloud, and a number of

questions can be addressed as to what strategies group of learners may employ in accomplishing a given writing task, how they interpret prompts, plan, draft, edit and make use of sources and other students, how these strategies may differ from native or expert writers, and to see if L2 learners transfer composing strategies from L1. The findings of the future studies recommendations may provide more specific information for EFL practitioners in connection with learners' previous experience of L1 and L2 writing instruction.

REFERENCES

- Akyel, A., & Kamisli, S. (1996, September). *Composing in first and second languages: Possible effects of EFL writing instruction*. Paper presented at the Balkan Conference on English Teaching of the International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Bollen, V. L. (2003). Improving writing. *STEM Journal*, 4(1), 137-158.
- Brock, M., & Walters, L. (1993). *Teaching composition around the Pacific Rim: Politics and pedagogy*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Brown, J. D., & Yamashita, S. (1995). English language entrance exams at Japanese universities: What do we know about them? *JALT Journal*, 17(1), 7-30.
- Carson, J. (1992). Becoming biliterate: First language influences. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(1), 37-60.
- Chang, Kyung-Suk. (1998). Writing as a recursive and messy process and some implications for EFL writing classes. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 4, 1-14.
- Chong, Dong-Su; & Kim, Hae-Dong. (2001). A study for the development of a university-level general English course. *English Teaching*, 56(4), 265-292.
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Connor, U. (1995). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. *Language Learning*, 39, 81-141.
- Cumming, A., & Riazi, A. (2000). Building models of second-language writing, instruction and achievement. *Learning and Instruction*, 10(1), 55-71.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing processes of twelfth graders*. (Research Report No. 13). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Ferris, D. (2003). Responding to writing. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 119-140). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387.
- Frodesen, J., & Holten, C. (2003). Grammar and the ESL writing class. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 141-161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242-262). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Gosden, H. (1996). Verbal reports of Japanese novices' research writing practices in English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(2), 109-128.
- Harklau, L. (2001). From high school to college: Student perspectives on literacy practices. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 33(1), 33-70.
- Hartman, B., & Tarone, E. (1999). Preparation for college writing: Teachers talk about writing instruction for Southeast Asian-American students in secondary school. In L. Harklau, K. M. Losey & M. Siegal (Eds.), *Generation 1.5 meets college composition: Issues in the teaching of writing to US-educated learners of ESL* (pp. 99-118). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing*. London: Longman.
- Johns, A. M. (1997). *Text, role, and context: Developing academic literacies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Hae-Dong. (2003). Individual differences in motivation with regard to reactions to ELT materials. *English Teaching*, 58(4), 177-203.
- Kim, Jaehyuk. (1995). Sophistication levels in EFL writing. *English Teaching*, 50(3), 79-103.
- Kim, Jin-Wan. (1997). A balanced approach to second language writing: Focus on product and process variables. *English Teaching*, 52(4), 51-90.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2001). *The role of academic writing in higher education in Japan: Current status and future perspectives* (Report for the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Research Grant No. 11680263). Hiroshima: Hiroshima University, Faculty of Integrated Arts and Sciences.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2002). High school student perceptions of first language literacy instruction: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(2), 91-116.
- Krapels, A. R. (1990). An overview of second language writing process research. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 37-56). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Eunpyo. (1998). *Strategies in teaching college English writing: A case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Hannam University, Daejeon.

- Leki, I. (2001). Material, educational, and ideological challenges of teaching EFL writing at the turn of the century. *International Journal of English Studies*, 1(2), 197-209.
- Liebman, J. (1992). Toward a new contrastive rhetoric: Differences between Arabic and Japanese rhetorical instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(2), 141-165.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 15-34). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsuda, P. K., & DePew, K. E. (2002). Early second language writing: An introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(4), 201-268.
- McKay, S. L. (1993). Examining L2 composition ideology: A look at literacy education. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2(1), 65-81.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Porte, G. (1996). When writing fails: How academic context and past learning experiences shape revision. *System*, 24(1), 107-116.
- Porte, G. (1997). The etiology of poor second language writing: The influence of perceived teacher preferences on second language revision strategies. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(1), 61-78.
- Roca, J., & Murphy, L. (2001). Some steps toward a socio-cognitive interpretation of second language composition processes. *International Journal of English Studies*, 1(2), 25-45.
- Ryu, Hoyeol. (2003). Process approach to writing in the post-process era: A case study of two college students' writing process. *English Teaching*, 58(3), 123-142.
- Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning*, 46(1), 137-174.
- Schmitt, N. (1997). Vocabulary learning strategies. In N. Schmitt & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary: Description, acquisition and pedagogy* (pp. 199-226). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sengupta, S. (2000). An investigation into the effects of revision strategy instruction on L2 secondary school learners. *System*, 28(1), 97-113.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarone, E., Downing, B., Cohen, A., Gillette, S., Murie, R., & Dailey, B. (1993). The writing of Southeast Asian-American students in secondary school and university. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2(2), 149-172.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies.

TESOL Quarterly, 17(2), 165-186.

Applicable levels: tertiary education, adult education, general education
Key words: EFL writing, process writing, feedback

Yuah Vicky Chon
Dept. of Language and Linguistics
University of Essex
Wivenhoe Park, Colchester CO4 3SQ,
Essex, United Kingdom
Email: yvchun@essex.ac.uk

Hae-Dong Kim
English Language Education
Graduate School of Education
Hankuk University of Foreign Studies
130-791, 270 Imun-dong, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul
Tel: (02) 2173-3017
Email: khd@hufs.ac.kr

Received in November, 2004
Reviewed in December, 2004
Revised version received in February, 2005