


1996

Strategy Use in Process Writing: A Survey of ESL Students' Strategy Use in L1 Writing and in L2 Writing

Mei-Ya Jung
Minnesota State University, Mankato

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds>

 Part of the [First and Second Language Acquisition Commons](#), and the [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jung, M. (1996). *Strategy use in process writing: A survey of ESL students' strategy use in L1 writing and in L2 writing* [Master's alternative plan paper, Minnesota State University, Mankato]. Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. <https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds/1468/>

This APP is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects at Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Pub

STRATEGY USE IN PROCESS WRITING:
A SURVEY OF ESL STUDENTS' STRATEGY USE
IN L1 WRITING AND IN L2 WRITING

A REPORT PRESENTED IN
ENGLISH 694(2),
ALTERNATE PLAN PAPER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH
MANKATO STATE UNIVERSITY
MANKATO, MINNESOTA

BY
MEI-YA ALISON JUNG
DEC. 1996

Date: December 10, 1996

This report is submitted as part of the required work in the course English 694 (2) Alternate Plan Paper at Mankato State University and has been supervised, examined and accepted by the Professor.

Under the Alternate Plan Paper for the Master of Arts degree, this report may be presented to the student examining committee as a study offered in lieu of a thesis.

Date: December 10, 1996

This Alternate Plan Paper has been examined and approved.

Examining Committee:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....iv

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|--|------|
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE..... | 5 |
| The L1 Process Approach to Composing..... | 6 |
| The L2 Process Approach to Composing..... | 9 |
| Two and Half Decades of Writing Pedagogy..... | 9 |
| The Nature of the L2 Composing Process..... | 11 |
| Evidence of Strategy Use in Process Writing by ESL Writers and NE Writers | 14 |
| III. METHODOLOGY..... | 21 |
| IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY..... | 27 |
| V. CONCLUSIONS..... | 40 |
| APPENDIX I..... | 44 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 48 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 1. The Percentage of Demographic Characteristics of Subjects (N=71) | 22 |
| 2. Questionnaire Items Related to Writing Strategies | 26 |
| 3. Frequency of Responses in Item 1: Think Through My Ideas Before Writing (%) | 28 |
| 4. Frequency of Responses in Item 2: Read Information to Support My Ideas Before Writing (%) | 29 |
| 5. Frequency of Responses in Item 3: Organize the Information I Intend to Use Before Writing (%) | 29 |
| 6. Frequency of responses in Item 4: Draft an outline of what I want to express before writing (%) | 30 |
| 7. Frequency of Responses in Item 5: Use a Dictionary to Find Vocabulary When Writing (%) | 32 |
| 8. Frequency of Responses in Item 6: Reread My Text at Least Two Times After Writing (%) | 33 |
| 9. Frequency of Responses in Item 7: Request Another Person to Review My Text After Writing (%) | 34 |
| 10. Frequency of Responses in Item 8: Revise /Polish the Order of Ideas After Writing (%) | 35 |
| 11. Frequency of Responses in Item 9: Revise /Polish the Grammar After Writing (%) | 36 |
| 12. Frequency of Responses in Item 10: Revise /Polish the Vocabulary After Writing (%) | 37 |
| 13. Frequency of Responses in Item 11: Revise /Polish the Spelling After Writing (%) | 38 |

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, an increasing number of students from different countries study in the United States. These English-as-a-second-language (ESL) students have to use English as a necessary tool to make instruction comprehensible and to express their own meaning in the academic context. Of the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), writing is generally recognized as most difficult to acquire. This paper examines the question whether students' first language (L1) writing skills may be available for them to use in the process of second language (L2) writing.

Writing is a difficult task for the ESL student because according to Cummins (1988), it is a context-reduced task. A context-reduced task is identified by reliance on linguistic clues to meaning and on knowledge of the language itself. In comparison, a context-embedded task is one where language users can actively negotiate meanings through interactions with others and receive feedback for checking whether the message has been understood. There are many situational and contextual clues around to help to understand context-embedded tasks. Writing, then, is a context-reduced task for ESL students

because there are not many contextual clues to help the students and then a certain degree of knowledge of the language is required.

To counter the natural difficulty of producing written text, a recent shift in the approach to writing instruction has proved beneficial for both L1 and L2 writers. The new approach, process writing, focuses on the act of writing rather than on linguistic and rhetorical form or on the product of writing. In the process of writing, students do planning, drafting, reviewing, revising, and publication. These activities are strategies writers may engage in in order to develop their meaning gradually. Hence, even though writing is a context-reduced task, the process writing approach helps students to explore their thoughts and to learn what these thoughts are from the act of writing itself, which is an effective way of learning to write.

Before we start describing the research questions, some basic terms need to be defined first. In this study, students who write in English as their first language are called native English (NE) writers. International students who write in English as their second or foreign language are called ESL writers. These ESL students wrote in their native language or their first language (L1) before coming to the US and write in English as their second language (L2) when studying in the US.

Most students have practiced composing in their L1 before coming to the US. Therefore, they are already accustomed to using certain writing strategies in their L1. Instructors of English for academic purposes may question whether strategies for process writing carry over from L1 to L2. They may ask lots of questions regarding the L2 writing process. What do writers do when they write in L2? What are the similarities in the process they use as they write in L1 and as they write in L2? Do they plan in L1 and also in L2? Do they draft in L1 and also in L2? Do they review in L1 and also in L2? Do they revise in L1 and also in L2? What do they do in the process of planning? What do they do in the process of drafting? What do they do in the process of reviewing? What do they do in the process of revising?

The series of questions is so important that we are eager to know the results. As an international student at Mankato State University, I have a special interest in knowing about L2 writing. This study will examine the frequency of strategy use of 71 ESL writers as they report their composing processes in L1 and L2. The following questions constitute the major four of this study:

- (1) Do ESL students plan in the L2 composition process as much as they do in L1?
- (2) Do ESL students draft in the L2 composition process as much as they do in L1?

(3) Do ESL students review in the L2 composition process as much as they do in L1?

(4) Do ESL students revise in the L2 composition process as much as they do in L1?

Some researchers have done similar studies. Chapter II will review some of these studies with a focus on the issues: (1) the L1 process approach to composing; (2) the L2 process approach to composing; (3) evidence of strategy use in process writing by ESL writers and NE writers.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Since the relationship of strategy use in L1 writing and L2 writing is the main core of this study, this chapter will examine both L1 writing processes and L2 writing processes, and then find evidence from research studies related to the relationship between the two. Part one describes the L1 process approach to composing and presents the four subprocesses: planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising (which may also be available to the student as strategies for L2 writing). First, planning involves setting goals and generating and organizing writer's ideas. Second, during drafting, NE writers experience the process of transforming thought into its graphic representation. Third, reviewing refers to rereading texts in order to catch the intended meaning. Finally, revising entails the writers changing their minds about the content and the structure of the discourse. In the second part of this chapter, the L2 process approach to composing will be discussed. This section will first describe the shift in writing instruction from a focus on linguistic and rhetorical form to a new focus on process writing, which is considered the best way to improve

the writing strategies of both NE writers and ESL writers. Next will come a description of the nature of the L2 composing process. In the final section of the chapter, we will report evidence of strategy use in process writing by ESL writers and NE writers.

The L1 Process Approach to Composing

Research studies variously describe the recursive subprocesses of L1 composing in which writers may engage (Emig, 1971; Flower & Hayes, 1981; Nold, 1979; Gould, 1980). For example, Flower and Hayes present three subprocesses of composing which are planning, translating and reviewing. These same three processes are called planning, transcribing and reviewing by Nold, and in the Gould study, they are called planning, generating and reviewing. In order to illustrate the similarities between L1 and L2 composing process, this study will use the same terms for both efforts: planning, drafting, reviewing and revising. Definitions of the terms used in the L1 and L2 composition process are offered below.

Planning: During planning, L1 writers set composing goals and generate and organize their ideas (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Nold, 1979, Gould, 1980). Generating involves gathering information to write about, whether the information is material from

external resources or is content explored within the writer's mind. Organizing is ordering content and contributes structure to a final product. In their organizing, L1 writers may delete or add content to achieve their specific purposes or to make an appropriate arrangement of the material. Setting goals entails mentally planning the individual tactics for completing a composition. In addition, planing includes such diverse "rewriting" or rehearsal activities as making notes, reading information, and drawing an outline while ideas incubate.

Drafting: Drafting (also called translating by Flower and Hayes and by Humes, transcribing by Nold, and generating by Gould) involves the process of transforming thought into its graphic representation (Humes, 1983). L1 writers deal with a heavy mental load during drafting. A number of things come about simultaneously that writers need to deal with, such as handwriting, spelling, punctuation, word choice, syntax, textual connections, purpose, organization, clarity, rhythm, euphony, and so on. The drafting process is obviously very complex. Consequently, L1 writers draft more easily as the requisite skills become more automatic. Studies have provided evidence that when basic skills become somewhat automatic, relative automaticity may also be possible for some higher level skills such as sentence variation and figures of speech (Gould, 1980).

Reviewing: Reviewing is characterized by "backward movements to read and assess whether or not the words on the page capture the original sense intended" (Perl, 1979, p. 331). L1 writers review their texts in order to proofread for the conventions of written language, to decide on a conclusion, to determine needed revisions, and so on. Some L1 writers review after every few phrases, whereas some L1 writers review after they have composed a group of sentences. L1 writing studies have shown that most writers do review regardless of their level of expertise (e.g., Atwell, 1981; Pianko, 1979).

Revising: Revising is comprised of behaviors that entails changing one's mind about the content and structure of the discourse as well as changing the actual, drafted text. This process covers a range of behaviors from simply editing (e.g., fixing spelling and punctuation, substituting synonyms) to mainly reformulating whole texts (e.g., reorganizing blocks of discourse, adding whole sections of content). Research has found that L1 writers often make more revisions while writing the first draft than they make on the draft after it is completed (Bridwell, 1980; Faigley & Witte, 1981). As writers become more experienced and competent, they view revising as a process of structuring and shaping their discourse (e.g., Sommers, 1979; Stallard, 1974) and become more concerned with audience considerations (Sommers, 1980).

The L2 Process Approach to Composing

L2 process writing also involves four subprocesses: planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising. Actually, the idea of L2 process writing has been derived and developed from the model of L1 process writing. In order to present the development of L2 process writing, it is necessary to provide a brief history of L2 writing instruction.

Two and Half Decades of Writing Pedagogy

Twenty-five years ago, second language writing instruction was characterized by an approach that focused on linguistic and rhetorical form. In the 1970s, controlled composition tasks were often used as classroom material in the teaching of writing. The traditional linguistic approach views learning to write in a second language as an exercise in habit formation. Students are asked to manipulate linguistic forms within the text (Byrd & Gallingane, 1990; Kunz, 1972; Paulston & Dykstra, 1973). However, critics of the traditional linguistic approach have pointed out that with such an approach to composition, students do not pay attention to what the sentences mean or how they relate to each other (Widdowson, 1978). Obviously, an approach in which students disregard meaning holds little promise in programs of English for academic purposes.

Another common instructional strategy of the traditional linguistic approach was to provide whole texts as rhetorical models and ask students to reproduce the rhetorical discourse patterns in their own writing. Kaplan (1966) described cross-cultural rhetorical forms. He represented the "thought pattern of English as dominantly linear in its development" (Kaplan, 1966, p. 4) to contrast the paragraph patterns of other languages and cultures. This type of analysis views writing as a matter of arrangement, of fitting sentences and paragraphs into prescribed patterns.

However, many teachers and researchers felt that the rhetorical pattern approach did not adequately foster the development of students' thought and therefore reacted against it. Rather, they developed an interest in what L2 writers actually do as they write. This focus on the process of writing was influenced by L1 composition (Emig, 1971; Zamel, 1976). The composing process was seen as "a non-linear, exploratory, and generative process whereby writers discover and reformulate their ideas as they attempt to approximate meaning" (Zamel, 1983, p. 165). In the 1980s, an increasing number of articles and materials on L2 writing processes explored the idea of using process approaches with ESL students (e.g., Cumming, 1989; Friedlander, 1990; Hall, 1990; Jones, 1982, 1985; Jones & Tetroe, 1987; Raimes, 1985, 1987; Zamel, 1982, 1983).

Instruction in process writing has not only been found to improve the writing skills of monolingual English-speaking students (Calkins, 1983; Graves, 1983; Scardamalia, 1984), but it also has been found to be useful with ESL students (Padron, 1991, 1992). Some research studies have investigated the relationship of L1 and L2 as well as sought to identify the strategies and behaviors L2 writers share and do not share with their L1 counterparts (Raimes, 1985).

The goal of this study is to find out the relationship of strategy use in L1 process writing and L2 process writing. Specially, the study aims to discover whether ESL writers use the writing strategies they have developed in their L1 when they practice L2 writing tasks. Following the general philosophy of process writing, we classify types of strategy use under four categories: planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising.

The Nature of the L2 Composing Process

Continuing the analogy to first language composition, researchers have proposed that L2 writers engage in essentially the same subprocesses as L1 writers. Silberman (1989) describes the cyclical nature of writing as consisting of a variety of activities, namely planning, drafting, conferring, revising and drafting again. Silva (1990) asserts that the most important task of writing instruction is to help students develop the

skills needed to come up with ideas, explore ways of expressing them, and examine and refine their writing. In practice, this means working on prewriting, drafting, and analyzing and rewriting techniques, including peer response.

Peregoy & Boyle (1993) indicate in detail how process writing is fundamentally a dynamic process developed through five interrelated stages: planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. During the planning stage, students choose a topic of interest and engage themselves in thinking about the ideas they want to express, often through brainstorming and oral discussion. Once they have found and explained their topic, they begin drafting.

Just as we have seen in first language drafting, this stage is very tough because there are so many elements the writers must consider at the same time, including highly abstract ideas, spelling, punctuation, and the perspective of the audience. Teachers often advise students that when they compose their first draft, they should let their ideas flow onto the paper regardless of the form and the mechanics.

After completing the first draft, students reread their papers and get ready to revise with feedback from the teacher or their peers. Revisions are aimed at making changes in the text and developing new thoughts about it. This process gives students the opportunity to reshape and restructure their work. Then, the paper is edited for correct punctuation, spelling, and

grammar. Finally, during the publishing stage, students share and present writing to one another or with parents to show that writing is valued (Carrasquillo & Rodriguez, 1996; Peregoy & Boyle, 1993).

Rather than focusing on usage, structure, or correct form, process writing takes into account the act of writing itself. While the process entails several stages, such as planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing, these stages interact together and are repeated in order to discover meaning. In the process, writers explore their thoughts and learn from the act of writing itself what these thoughts are. Teachers perceive process-oriented writing strategies as the most important type of instruction to teach ESL students (Weaver & Padron, 1994). They adapt it to influence their students' writing positively. Other research studies also have found that a process approach did indeed lead to more effective writing in the second language (Bermudez & Prater, 1990; Edelsky, 1982; Graves, 1983; Urzua, 1987).

Evidence of Strategy Use in Process Writing

by ESL writers and NE writers

Research studies have been concerned with the writing strategies ESL writers share and do not share with native speakers. A number of studies (Chelala, 1981; Krapels, 1990; Moragne e Silva, 1991; Schiller, 1989; Skibniewski, 1988; Skibniewski & Skibniewska, 1986; Whalen, 1988) presented evidence that composing process patterns or sequence of writing behaviors are similar in L1s and L2s. Broadly speaking, ESL writers, when they write in their L2, do the same planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising as they do in their L1 and as NE speakers do when they write in their L1. However, differences in the writing process across languages were also noted (e.g., Campbell, 1987; Dennett, 1985; Hall, 1990; Jones & Tetroe, 1987; Moragne e Silva, 1989; Skibniewski, 1988; Whalen, 1988; Yau, 1989). In general, L2 composing is considered to be more difficult and less effective, despite the use of effective process writing strategies.

Zamel (1983) used a case study approach and observed six advanced ESL students while they composed. She interviewed the students upon conclusion of their writing, and collected all of their written materials for the production of one essay. She found that ESL writers use planning and drafting strategies

similar to the ones used by native speakers. They explored and discovered ideas through writing just as native speakers do.

Jones and Tetroe (1987) analyzed protocols to study the L1 and L2 planning behaviors of six Spanish-speaking ESL writers. All of the subjects were preparing for graduate study. Data collecting lasted for over six months. The findings are that their planning strategies cross languages. The writers who did the most extensive planning while writing in English also used planning as a strategy when they wrote in Spanish. On the other hand, those who did only a little planning in English also did little planning in Spanish. However, the differences between languages were that "planning in a L2 requires more mental capacity than planning in a L1 does and that the quality, though not the quantity, of planning transfers from L1 to L2" (p. 56). Therefore, as described before, certain features in one's L1 writing process are carried over into one's L2 writing process. But L2 writers probably may not plan as extensively and elaborately as they do in L1 composition. Thus, related to our first research question, we may expect to find that writers plan less when writing in L2 than in L1.

Raimes' (1987) study was designed to examine three questions, one of which was to compare ESL writers' composing behaviors with what we know about native speakers' writing behaviors. Eight ESL students took part in this study. Both NE writers and ESL writers spent little time planning. They just

read and reread the assigned topic and rehearsed. "They all planned very little and when they did, they planned in a rigid way...." (p. 458). Most of the ESL students rehearsed a lot and used rehearsal for generating content as well as syntax and vocabulary, but concentrated more on meaning than on accuracy. Thus, Raimes' study would also seem to indicate that ESL writers writing in their L2 are similar to NE writers in their use of planning and drafting strategies.

Arndt (1987) reported that the strategy use of ESL students varied from L1 to L2 in the categories of rehearsing and revising word choice. In her study of L1 and L2 writing, her six Chinese-speaking subjects were all graduate-level students. Even though consistent strategies in L1 writing and L2 writing were noted in some categories, her subjects appeared different related to word choice. Arndt found that when the Chinese students wrote in Chinese, their L1, they appeared to rehearse word choices, listening to how chosen words were consistent with what they would like to mean and even developing different opinions to express intended meaning as a result of what a word brings with it. These Chinese students rehearsed far less when they wrote in their L2, but they revised word choice more in L2.

Gaskill's (1986) study focused on revising. Four Spanish-speaking subjects participated in his study. Gaskill analyzed videotapes of the students' composing and their written products. He noted that their revising processes in English

resembled those in Spanish. In addition, surface changes which affected the grammar and mechanics of a sentence or preserved the sentence original meaning dominated the L1 and L2 revisions. L1 and L2 revisions mostly occurred during the actual drafting of text. Thus, related to the second and third research questions, we may expect to find that ESL writers have not developed their revising strategies in either L1 or L2 but practice only superficial revision after the first draft has been completed.

In a study which also focused on revision strategies, Hall (1987) conducted a study of revision of four advanced ESL writers. Data was generated from videotapes and multiple drafts. Hall also interviewed the subjects and had them fill out a postwriting questionnaire. The results of this study indicated striking similarities across languages with regard both to the linguistic and discourse features of the changes and to the stages at which the changes were produced. However, some differences were noted. L2 revisions were more time consuming and numerous. Also, more revising and reviewing occurred in L2 writing. Changes were made for the semantics of words and the structures of sentences. Thus, Hall's study reported the opposite tendency of ESL writers in their revision strategy showing that they actually used the process writing strategies of reviewing and revising more frequently in their L2 than in their L1.

The act of writing in a L2 is somehow different from that of writing in a L1 but there may be a relationship between the two processes. Some studies have begun to compare differences between L1 and L2 writing process, although the differences have not yet been fully examined in L2 writing process approach. Silva (1993) examined 72 reports of empirical research studies comparing ESL writers and NE writers as well as comparing ESL students' writing in their L1 and L2. His study examined both composing process and features of written texts. As far as the composing process, he reported the findings on a basis of planning, transcribing (in this study, drafting) and, reviewing. Silva's findings are summarized below under the category headings of process writing:

Planning: ESL writers did less planning at the global and local levels in their L2 than they did when writing in their L1 and also they did less planning than NE writers did. They had more difficulty with generating material and organizing generated material and setting goals.

Drafting: ESL writers' drafting, in general, was more laborious, less fluent, and less productive. They spent more time referring back to an outline and consulting a dictionary. They were more concerned with vocabulary. Silva's findings also indicated that L2 writers wrote at a slower rate and produced fewer words of written text.

Reviewing: ESL writers reviewed and reread their written texts less.

Revising: Regarding revision, more revisions were involved in L2 writing and more difficulty was encountered. It also was found that L2 revision seemed to focus more on grammar and less on mechanics, especially spelling. Silva's study is a comprehensive look at the comparisons of process writing in L1 and L2.

Relevant studies provide information about strategy use of L1 writers and L2 writers. Many writing studies have used case study or ethnographic approaches. Although studies have found different results regarding strategy use, it is possible to form some tentative conclusions based on the literature review. First of all, prior studies indicate that ESL students plan less in L2 writing. Second, they spend more time in drafting, especially when consulting a dictionary. Third, some studies report that ESL students review a lot, although other studies fail to confirm this. Most studies claim that ESL students review and reread less when writing in L2 than in L1. Finally, ESL students revise a lot, especially on a superficial level.

In contrast to the case study or ethnographic approaches used in the studies cited above, this study is based on a survey of students and uses self-reporting of process writing behavior. Therefore, if the results of this study differ from prior studies, we may assume that differences in results may be due

to methodological differences. Chapter III will describe the methodology of the present study in greater detail.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This is a survey study in which a questionnaire is employed to examine the use of process writing strategies in L1 and L2 among international (ESL) students at Mankato State University (MSU). The questionnaire is included in Appendix I. There are five parts included in this questionnaire. The first part is about demographic characteristics of the students, such as gender, native language, nationality, major, how long they have stayed at MSU and learned English, and whether or not they have taken ESL classes. Eight items are included in this part.

The second and the third parts relate to writing strategies in learners' L1 and L2. The same eleven items are included in both part two and part three. These eleven items deal with different strategies writers may use in the process of writing, within the categories of planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising. The possible responses are set up in Likert format, anchored by "always" (5 points), "usually" (4 points), "sometimes" (3 points), "seldom" (2 points), and "never" (1 point).

Part four and part five relate to writing attitudes towards the learners' L1 and L2. The information on writers' attitudes

is not analyzed as part of the current study, but will be available for later analysis.

Data collection lasted for six months (two quarters) from January to June in 1996. After receiving approval from the Graduate Office at MSU, I proceeded with face-to-face interviews of each subject. The field work took place at one of the cafeterias, named Carkoski Commons, in the first quarter, and at a student restaurant named Stompers and in two ESL classes in the second quarter. A total of 71 respondents were included in two quarters. They are different in gender, academic status, first language, nationality, major, and ESL taking. The varieties bring the confidence of this study. See the percentage of demographic characteristics of subjects in Table 1.

Table 1. The Percentage of Demographic Characteristics of Subjects (N=71)

| <u>Gender</u> | |
|---------------|-----|
| | |
| Female | 69 |
| Male | 31 |
| | |
| Total | 100 |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| <u>Academic status</u> | |
|------------------------|-------|
| | |
| Freshman | 28.0 |
| Sophomore | 15.5 |
| Junior | 31.0 |
| Senior | 10.0 |
| Graduate | 15.5 |
| | |
| Total | 100.0 |

| L1 | |
|--------------|--------------|
| Sinhalese | 1.4 |
| Bengali | 9.9 |
| Chinese | 28.3 |
| Urdu | 7.0 |
| Arabic | 7.0 |
| Korean | 4.2 |
| Japanese | 18.4 |
| Nepal | 2.8 |
| Indonesian | 4.2 |
| Spanish | 7.0 |
| Malay | 4.2 |
| German | 1.4 |
| Tigrinior | 1.4 |
| Laos | 1.4 |
| Orometa | 1.4 |
| | |
| Total | 100.0 |

| Nationality | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| Sri Lankan | 1.4 |
| Bangladesh | 10.0 |
| Taiwanese | 16.9 |
| Pakistan | 7.0 |
| Egyptian | 2.8 |
| Korean | 4.2 |
| Japanese | 18.3 |
| Saudi Arabian | 4.2 |
| Nepali | 2.8 |
| Indonesian | 4.2 |
| Colombian | 1.4 |
| Malaysian | 4.2 |
| German | 1.4 |
| Chinese | 10.0 |
| Mexican | 4.2 |
| Eritrean | 1.4 |
| Laotian | 1.4 |
| Ethiopia | 1.4 |
| Hong Kong | 1.4 |
| Spanish | 1.4 |
| | |
| Total | 100.0 |

| Major | | | |
|-----------------------|------|------------------------|--------------|
| Accounting | 2.8 | Geography | 2.8 |
| Art | 1.4 | Interior design | 1.4 |
| Astronomy | 1.4 | International relation | 2.8 |
| Athletic training | 1.4 | Marketing | 1.4 |
| Biology | 1.4 | Mass communication | 2.8 |
| Business | 7.0 | MBA | 4.2 |
| Computer science | 26.9 | Mechanical Engineering | 9.9 |
| Economics | 2.8 | Multidisciplinary | 1.4 |
| English (ESL) | 15.6 | Nursing | 1.4 |
| Environmental science | 2.8 | Sociology | 1.4 |
| Finance | 1.4 | Undecided | 5.6 |
| | | | |
| | | Total | 100.0 |

| ESL | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| None | 22 |
| Writing | 37 |
| Listening & Speaking | 11 |
| Writing and Listening & Speaking | 30 |
| | |
| Total | 100 |

As this survey is centered on international students, I assume that the subjects can function in at least one native language. In order to decrease the cognitive distance of wording and make sure the information from subjects is based on the same standard of meaning, I have defined some terminology. Explanations are added in brackets or after the specific terminology in a sentence to assure accurate information has been recorded. The following terms are some terminology defined in this study. "Native language" means the one learners use most frequently in academic work in their countries. In case some respondents have more than one native language, I emphasize the one they use more frequently. In addition, some respondents may report that their most frequent language doesn't have a written system, since it is used as an oral mother tongue. For the sake of this study to make a comparison of writing in L1 and L2, I chose to focus on the language used for academic work. For example, if a student speaks in one language other than English, but writes in English, he/she is excluded from the pool of

qualified subjects. "Nationality" is identified by learners themselves. Only one case indicated dual nationalities, Spanish and American. Since this study deals with international students, this case is categorized into Spanish.

The four research questions stated in chapter I are related to the frequency of strategy use in process writing. The strategy use includes planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising. We would like to know whether students use those strategies as much as they do in L1 writing when they write in L2. Eleven items in the questionnaire deal with strategy use. Table 2 provides an overview of the eleven items, organized according to the category of strategy use.

Table 2. Questionnaire Items Related to Writing Strategies

| PLANNING | |
|------------------|---|
| Item 1 | Think through my ideas before writing |
| Item 2 | Read information to support my ideas before writing |
| Item 3 | Organize the information I intend to use before writing |
| Item 4 | Draft an outline of what I want to express before writing |
| DRAFTING | |
| Item 5 | Use a dictionary to find vocabulary when writing |
| REVIEWING | |
| Item 6 | Reread my text at least two times after writing |
| Item 7 | Request another person to review my text after writing |
| REVISING | |
| Item 8 | Revise/Polish the order of ideas after writing |
| Item 9 | Revise/Polish the grammar after writing |
| Item 10 | Revise/Polish the vocabulary after writing |
| Item 11 | Revise/Polish the spelling after writing |

Chapter IV presents the results of the study with an analysis of the implications for our research questions. We will discuss the results within the four categories of planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

In this chapter, we discuss the results of the survey under the four categories of process writing: planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising. We determine which strategies are used by writers and the relative frequency of strategy use as students write in L1 and L2. In addition, we describe similarities and differences in the patterns of responses for L1 and L2. We discuss the frequency of strategy use in L1 and L2 writing according to the percentage distribution of every item. For each language, the three most frequent responses are highlighted to show a band of response and to emphasize the central tendency of the response.

Planning: Planning is an important and complicated strategy which is used before writing. In the process of planning, writers are engaged in thinking through ideas, finding resources and reading information to support their ideas, organizing the available resources, and outlining the intended information. Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 are related to research question 1. We assume that if ESL students report a high frequency of planning, this

would indicate that they have enough preparation for composing. Careful planning may lead to a good text.

Table 3. Frequency of Responses in Item 1:
Think Through My Ideas Before Writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | 39.4 | 36.6 | 18.3 | 4.2 | 1.4 |
| L2 | 47.9 | 42.3 | 9.9 | 0 | 0 |

Table 3 shows that most students use the skill of thinking through their ideas very frequently in both L1 and L2 writing. About 94% of the responses indicated that they "usually", "always", and "sometimes" think through their ideas before writing when they write in L1, whereas the salient number of respondents, 100%, reported that they also "usually", "always", and "sometimes" use this skill before writing while writing in L2. It is interesting to note that no students responded that they "seldom" or "never" use this strategy in L2 writing. Even in L1 writing only a very low percent of students reported using this strategy "seldom" or "never". Obviously, these results indicate that writers do need to think through their ideas as a strategy of planning their writing regardless of which language they use to compose. This result indicates that writers appear to use thinking or planning skills in the process of writing in both languages.

Table 4. Frequency of Responses in Item 2:
Read Information to Support My Ideas Before Writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | 11.3 | 54.9 | 28.2 | 4.2 | 1.4 |
| L2 | 29.6 | 45.1 | 18.3 | 5.6 | 1.4 |

In Table 4, most students responded they tend to read information to support ideas before writing in both L1 and L2. About 94% of the students respond "always", "usually", or "sometimes" in L1, and about the same percentage, 93%, use the strategy in L2 composing. Although the total percentage of students responding "always", "usually", or "sometimes" are almost same in both languages, the percentage of students responding "always" is much higher in L2. About 30% of the respondents "always" use this strategy as they write in L2, but only 11.3% of them use it in L1 writing. Therefore, similar to item 1, the findings from item 2 show that writers do read information to support their ideas in both L1 or in L2, but the frequency of using such information differs by language. ESL students use this strategy more frequently as they write in L2 than in L1.

Table 5. Frequency of Responses in Item 3:
Organize the Information I Intend to Use Before Writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | 28.2 | 40.8 | 28.2 | 2.8 | 0 |
| L2 | 33.8 | 49.3 | 15.5 | 1.4 | 0 |

In Table 5, the strategy of organizing the information writers intend to use in their writing, the response rate to the top three frequencies in both L1 and L2 ranged from 97% to 99%. Nearly 100% of the students organize information before they compose either a L1 text or a L2 text. In other words, they plan a lot in both L1 and in L2. But still, the total percentage of students who responded "always" or "usually" for L2 is more than the total percentage responding "always" or "usually" in L1. Hence, students report organizing information in L2 more than they do in L1.

Table 6. Frequency of responses in Item 4:

Draft an outline of what I want to express before writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | 16.9 | 32.4 | 35.2 | 14.1 | 1.4 |
| L2 | 21.1 | 49.3 | 23.9 | 4.2 | 1.4 |

In Table 6, drafting an outline before writing, the total percent of students responding "always", "usually" or "sometimes" for L1 and L2 are not very different. About 94% of the students draft an outline at least "sometimes" as they write in L2 and about 85% of them do that at least "sometimes" as they write in L1. A very high percent of students reported that they rely on outlining to express their meaning. Yet, looking at the percent of students responding "usually" and "sometimes" in both

L1 and L2, about the same percent of students responded "usually" and "always" in L1, while students in L2 tended to use this skill "usually". Hence, most students do draft an outline in L1 writing and L2 writing. Writers in L1 may not need to draft an outline a lot, but they do need to use the outline as they write in L2.

In this part of the analysis, we found that students do think through their ideas, read information to support their ideas, organize the information they intended to use, and draft an outline in the process of planning. Most of the students appeared to plan a lot in both L1 writing and L2 writing. The three most frequent responses are all anchored from "always" to "sometimes" for planning in L1 writing and L2 writing. Thus, students seem to be able to carry over the strategy of planning across languages. Because, for ESL students, to write a composition in L2 is more difficult than to write in L1, they probably spend more time or encounter more difficulty in L2 planning. Thus, they plan more frequently as they write in L2.

Drafting: In the process of drafting, dictionary use is only one of several possible important strategies, and it is the strategy we focus on in this study. Research question 2 asks whether ESL students make use of strategies for process writing when they draft. A high percent of dictionary use would indicate that they do.

Table 7. Frequency of Responses in Item 5:
Use a Dictionary to Find Vocabulary When Writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | 11.3 | 15.5 | <u>19.7</u> | <u>28.2</u> | <u>25.4</u> |
| L2 | <u>21.1</u> | <u>36.6</u> | <u>25.4</u> | 12.7 | 4.2 |

Table 7 deals with using a dictionary to find vocabulary when students write in both L1 and L2. About 73% of the respondents responded "sometimes", "seldom", or "never" for dictionary use in L1 composing. However, 83% reported that they "always", "usually", or "sometimes" use this strategy as they write in L2. If we were to put two arrowheads in Table 7, they would point in opposite directions, where the arrowhead representing L1 would go from "always" to "never", and the arrowhead representing L2 would then go from "sometimes" to "always". The strikingly different frequency shown in L1 writing and L2 writing indicates great differences in dictionary use from L1 to L2. The possible reason is that ESL students are unfamiliar with L2 vocabulary. They may have lots of ideas in their mind, but can not find the right words to express them. Therefore, they need to consult a dictionary to find the right words to express their ideas.

Although there is only one item about drafting, it is very exciting to find such a great difference in this area. That is, ESL students do not use a dictionary a lot when they write in

L1, but they do need one when they write in L2. We can conclude from this information that ESL students use certain process writing strategies for drafting a lot more in L2 writing than in L1 writing.

Reviewing: Self editing and peer editing strategies are often taught in university ESL classes. Item 6 and item 7 are about editing and peer editing. They also relate to research question 3--reviewing. If ESL students reread their texts and ask another person to reread it, we assume that they are using review strategies.

Table 8. Frequency of Responses in Item 6:
Reread My Text at Least Two Times After Writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | 18.3 | 26.8 | 23.9 | 28.2 | 2.8 |
| L2 | 23.9 | 28.2 | 35.2 | 12.7 | 0 |

As Table 8 shows, 79% of the ESL students report "usually", "sometimes", or "seldom" rereading their text in L1 writing. On the other hand, about 87% of these students responded "always", "usually", or "sometimes" when writing in L2. Thus, the frequency of using this strategy is enhanced as they write in L2. This finding indicates that ESL writers pay more attention to reviewing their texts when they write in L2. We assume that they are probably not as confident in L2 as they are in L1

writing. So, they spend more time rereading their texts in order to make sure they have no errors in grammar, vocabulary, organization and meaning.

Table 9. Frequency of Responses in Item 7:

Request Another Person to Review My Text After Writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | 5.6 | 9.9 | <u>21.1</u> | <u>50.7</u> | <u>12.7</u> |
| L2 | 12.7 | <u>19.7</u> | <u>35.2</u> | <u>26.8</u> | 5.6 |

According to Table 9, 84.5% of the ESL students reported that they "sometimes", "seldom", or "never" request another person to review their texts when they write in L1, whereas 81.7% of them reported "usually", "sometimes", or "seldom" using this strategy in L2. The three most frequent responses in L1 writing fall lower in the response spectrum than those in L2 writing. If we examine the frequency of responses of "seldom" in L1 writing, we must be very surprised by that. About 51% of students reported that they do not ask someone to review their texts when they write in L1. Thus, peer editing may be not important to L1 writers, but important to L2 writers. L2 writers may need someone who is a native English speaker or native-like English speaker to review their texts and check their spelling, grammar, structure, organization, and so on.

The findings from item 6 and item 7 indicate that ESL students do self editing and peer editing in L1 writing and L2

writing. But most students responded that they review more frequently when they write in L2. Comparing the results of these two items, it seems that students do more self editing than peer editing. We see that in reviewing strategies, as in drafting and in planning, ESL students report using process writing strategies more in L2 than in L1.

Revising: Revising may include changing the order of ideas, grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. As prior studies have claimed, ESL students may revise on a superficial level or on a discourse level. Discourse level revision includes revising the order of ideas, while superficial level revision includes revising the grammar, vocabulary, and spelling. Items 8, 9, 10, and 11 deal with revising strategies. From these four items, we may answer research question 4 -- "Do ESL students revise in the L2 composition process as much as they do in L1 composition?"

Table 10. Frequency of Responses in Item 8:
Revise/Polish the Order of Ideas After Writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | 16.9 | 26.8 | 42.3 | 11.3 | 2.8 |
| L2 | 15.5 | 32.4 | 42.3 | 9.9 | 0 |

As reported in Table 10, about 86% of the respondents reported that they "always", "usually", or "sometimes" revise or polish the order of ideas as they write in L1, while 90% of

them reported using this strategy with the same frequency in L2. Students seem more similar than different in their use of this strategy for L1 and L2. Because this strategy deals with revising the structure or the organization of the text, we assume that both L1 writers and L2 writers make a lot effort to arrange the sequence of the text and make their ideas easy to understand. Therefore, there is no significant difference in revising on a discourse level in L1 writing and L2 writing.

Table 11. Frequency of Responses in Item 9:
Revise/Polish the Grammar After Writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | 18.3 | 19.7 | 32.4 | 15.5 | 14.1 |
| L2 | 25.4 | 36.6 | 25.4 | 12.7 | 0 |

In Table 11, we find that 70.4% of the ESL students "always", "usually", or "sometimes" revise the grammar after they write in L1. We also find that 87.3% of them "always", "usually", or "sometimes" use this strategy as they write in L2. Thus, a greater percent of ESL students report using this revision strategy in L2 writing. It is unexpected that a large percent of L1 writers reported revising the grammar. We may have assumed that students do not pay attention to their grammar when they write in L1 since grammar is very natural to them, but they pay more attention to L2 grammar because it is new or sometimes contradictory to their L1 grammar. However, this study provides

evidence which contradicts that assumption. We might make the hypothesis that ESL students may not care about their L1 grammar in oral production, but they may care about it in written production.

Table 12. Frequency of Responses in Item 10:
Revise/Polish the Vocabulary After Writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | 18.3 | 23.9 | 28.2 | 21.1 | 8.5 |
| L2 | 18.3 | 43.7 | 26.8 | 11.3 | 0 |

Table 12 indicates that about 73% of the ESL students report that they "usually", "sometimes", or "seldom" revise or polish vocabulary when they write in L1 and 89% of them reported to "always", "usually", or "sometimes" using this strategy when they write in L2. The percentage, 73% and 89%, and the frequency, from "usually", "sometimes", or "seldom" to "always", "usually", or "sometimes" in L1 writing and in L2 writing have big differences. ESL writers may have a lot of knowledge of their L1 vocabulary. They do not worry about vocabulary when composing. They are more confident in using L1 knowledge and vocabulary. Yet, compared to L1 vocabulary, ESL writers may have limited knowledge of L2 vocabulary. After all, ESL students learn L2s after certain years of learning L1s. Therefore, they are not confident in using the L2 vocabulary. During composing, they probably need to revise the vocabulary again and again.

They also consult a dictionary a lot, as indicated in Table 7. Consequently, from Table 12, we conclude that students put a lot more effort in revising L2 vocabulary than in revising L1 vocabulary.

Table 13. Frequency of Responses in Item 11:
Revise/Polish the Spelling After Writing (%)

| | <u>always</u> | <u>usually</u> | <u>sometimes</u> | <u>seldom</u> | <u>never</u> |
|----|---------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L1 | <u>23.9</u> | <u>19.7</u> | 16.9 | <u>21.1</u> | 16.9 |
| L2 | <u>36.6</u> | <u>33.8</u> | <u>22.5</u> | 7.0 | 0 |

According to Table 13, the three most frequent responses in L1 writing are located on "always", "usually", and "seldom" which is a total of 66 percent. These responses are discontinuous so that we think there are both proficient L1 spellers and non-proficient L1 spellers among the ESL students. As far as using this strategy in L2 writing, significantly, 93% of them reported that they "always", "usually", and "sometimes" revise or polish the spelling. Spelling actually is closely related to vocabulary. If students are not confident of vocabulary, they will not be confident of spelling. So, both Table 12 and Table 13 show that students revise the vocabulary and spelling more when they write in L2.

We would like to make a summary of revising strategies. In items 8 and 9, most ESL students appeared to revise the order of ideas and grammar as frequently in L2 writing as they do in

L1. In item 10, revision of vocabulary, ESL students report using this strategy more frequently in L2 than in L1. In item 11, some students revise the spelling very frequently and others do not when they write in L1. But, students revise the spelling very frequently when reporting to write in L2. Consequently, students may not revise L1 frequently, but when they write in L2, they definitely revise very frequently. In sum, considering the results of items 8-11, ESL students revise both on a discourse level and on a superficial level.

We have discussed the findings based on planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising. In this study, we found both similarities and differences of strategy use in process writing.

- (1) Planning: Most of students plan a lot in both languages.
- (2) Drafting: Most of students draft a lot more when they write in L2.
- (3) Reviewing: Most of students review more when they write in L2.
- (4) Revising: Varieties appeared in revising strategies. In revising on the discourse level, for the order of ideas and grammar, most students responded to use this strategy very frequently in both languages. However, most students indicated that they revised the vocabulary and spelling more frequently in L2 writing than in L1 writing.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The present study was undertaken to determine whether ESL writers use the strategies of process writing to the same extent in both L1 and L2 writing. The categories of process writing strategies were grouped together as planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising. The results of this study reveal striking similarities in planning and in revising strategies. L2 writers plan as frequently as L1 writers do. During planning in both languages, they think through their ideas, read relevant materials supporting their ideas, organize the information they want to use, and draft an outline to help them organize their ideas. Similarly, in terms of revising the order of ideas and the grammar, ESL students use this strategy a lot in both L1 writing and L2 writing. Thus, they revise very frequently.

In spite of these results, nevertheless, some differences were found in drafting, reviewing, and revising. First of all, L2 writers use a dictionary a lot more during drafting than L1 writers. This strategy shows the greatest difference in frequency of use between L1 and L2. It is easy to figure out that students consult a dictionary a lot when they write in L2 because of lack of L2 vocabulary. Self reviewing and peer

reviewing are included to refer to the reviewing strategy. Lots of students use self reviewing and peer reviewing more often in L2 writing than in L1 writing. But when ESL students write in L2, self reviewing is used more frequently than peer reviewing. Finally, L2 revising of vocabulary and spelling are found to be more frequently considered. ESL students make more efforts to revise the vocabulary and spelling when writing in L2.

The findings in this paper show both consistencies and inconsistencies when related to prior studies. First of all, lots of studies claimed that students plan less in L2 writing. Lower frequency in planning for L2 writing is not true in this study. We found that students put the same weight on L1 planning and L2 planning. They plan a lot in both languages. Second, previous studies of drafting in L2 reported that ESL students spent more time referring back to an outline and consulting a dictionary. This finding has been reinforced by this study. Third, some prior studies indicated that ESL students reviewed less; some indicated that they reviewed more. We found that in both self reviewing and peer reviewing, ESL students reviewed their texts more in L2 writing. Finally, prior studies noted that ESL writers revised more frequently in L2 than in L1, and that they revised superficially, focusing on grammar, spelling and vocabulary. This study supports the findings that L2 writers revise heavily. However, in this study, ESL writers do not focus only on the superficial level of revisions, but also on the top

level of discourse features. Thus, the findings in this study lead us to open a new eye in the L2 process approach to composing.

Why do the ESL writers in this study show such frequent strategy use? We may get a clue from a look at the percentage of students who have taken ESL writing classes (See Table 1). This table may provide a reason for the tendency of our ESL students do planning, drafting, reviewing, and revising a lot as they write in L2. Fully 66% of the students in this study have taken ESL writing classes. As we know, ESL writing classes at Mankato State University are taught according to the process approach. Therefore, a possible reason is that they learned the process writing from ESL classes. This may be a very encouraging finding for the generalizability of language study to academic work.

One limitation in this study is that we do not have within-subject data for ESL writers since it is a survey study, not a case study or ethnographic approach. We cannot speculate on how an individual may change the frequency of strategy use from L1 to L2. Our conclusions regarding frequency of strategy use is based on group tendencies of ESL students writing in their L1 and L2.

Future research may get access to ESL students' written work, such as their journals, compositions or written test scores in order to examine the relationship between the frequency of strategy use and their writing proficiency. This

will provide sufficient evidence to prove that the process approach is an effective way to teach writing in ESL classes.

APPENDIX I

Dear friend:

This is a survey about "writing skills and attitudes towards writing among international students at Mankato State University" for my thesis. The study is concerned with writing skills and attitudes towards writing in your native language compared to your writing skills and attitudes towards writing in English. This questionnaire will only take you a few minutes. Of course, it is voluntary and you can withdraw from the survey at any time. It will remain anonymous as well. The answers you give will only be used for academic purposes and are confidential. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Mary Jeanne Jernberg at the Graduate School Office, or call (507) 389-2321.

Your help and cooperation would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Alison Jung

I. Personal background

1. Sex Male Female
2. What is your native language? _____ . (If more than one, please give the one you use most frequently for academic work in your country)
3. What is your nationality? (If dual citizenship, indicate both) _____ .
4. How many years have you been learning English? ____ (yrs) ____ (mos)
5. How many years have you been at Mankato State University? ____ (yrs) ____ (mos)
6. What year are you at Mankato State University? I am a
 Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior
 Graduate student
7. What is your major? _____ . Undecided
8. Did you take an ESL class at Mankato State University?
 No Yes-- writing
 -- listening & speaking

II. Below are items about **your native language writing skills**, where native language refers to the language you use most frequently for academic work in your country. Please circle your response.

I do these things when I write for academic work in my native language:

| | always | usually | sometimes | seldom | never |
|---|--------|---------|-----------|--------|-------|
| Think through my ideas before writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Read information to support my ideas before writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Organize the information I intend to use before writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Draft an outline of what I want to express before writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Use dictionary to find vocabulary when writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Reread my text at least two times after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Request another person to review my text after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Revise/Polish the order of ideas after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Revise/Polish the grammar after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Revise /Polish the vocabulary after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Revise/Polish the spelling after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

III. Below are items about **your English writing skills**. Please circle your response.

I do these things when I write for academic work in English:

| | always | usually | sometimes | seldom | never |
|---|--------|---------|-----------|--------|-------|
| Think through my ideas before writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Read information to support my ideas before writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Organize the information I intend to use before writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Draft an outline of what I want to express before writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Use dictionary to find vocabulary when writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Reread my text at least two times after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Request another person to review my text after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Revise/Polish the order of ideas after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Revise/Polish the grammar after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Revise /Polish the vocabulary after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Revise/Polish the spelling after writing | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

IV. Below are items about **your attitudes towards your native language writing**, where native language refers to the language you use most frequently for academic work in your country. Please circle your response.

| | strongly agree | agree | uncertain | disagree | strongly disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| It's easy to express my real ideas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| It's easy to expand my ideas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| It's easy to write in great length | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| It's easy to write complicated ideas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| It's easy to complete a composition quickly | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| It's easy to choose different words to express the same meaning | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

| | strongly agree | agree | uncertain | disagree | strongly disagree |
|--|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| I feel writing is as easy as talking | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I feel comfortable writing about familiar topics | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I feel I use the appropriate grammar | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I feel I express the appropriate meaning | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I feel my composition is well-organized | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

V. Below are items about **your attitudes towards English writing**. Please circle your response.

| | strongly agree | agree | uncertain | disagree | strongly disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|
| It's easy to express my real ideas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| It's easy to expand my ideas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| It's easy to write in great length | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| It's easy to write complicated ideas | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| It's easy to complete a composition quickly | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| It's easy to choose different words to express the same meaning | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I feel writing is as easy as talking | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I feel comfortable writing about familiar topics | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I feel I use the appropriate grammar | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I feel I express the appropriate meaning | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| I feel my composition is well-organized | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

--END--

!! Thank you for your help!!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arndt, V. (1987). Six writers in search of texts: A protocol based study of L1 and L2 writing. ELT Journal, 41, 257-267.
- Atwell, M. A. (1981). The evaluation of text: The inter-relationship of reading and writing in the composing process. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Boston.
- Bermudez, A., & Prater, D. (1990). Using brainstorming and clustering with writers to develop elaboration skills. TESOL Quarterly, 24(3), 523-528.
- Bridwell, L. S. (1980). Revising strategies in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 197-222.
- Byrd, D. R. H., & Gallingane, G. (1990). Write away 2. New York: Newbury House.
- Calkins, L. (1983). Lessons from a child: On the teaching and learning of writing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Campbell, C. (1987). Writing with others' words: The use of information from a background reading text in the writing of native and non-native university composition students. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48(7), 1679A.
- Carrasquillo, A. L., & Rodriguez, V. (1996). Language Minority Students in the Mainstream Classroom. Bristol, PA: Multicultural Matters.
- Chelala, S. (1981). The composing process of two Spanish speakers and the coherence in their texts: A case study. Dissertation Abstracts International, 42(12), 5045A.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second language proficiency. Language Learning, 39(1), 81-141.
- Cummins, J. (1988). Language proficiency, bilingualism and academic achievement. In P. Richard-Amato (Ed.), Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom (pp. 382-395). New York: Longman.

- Dennett, J. (1985). Writing technical English: A comparison of the process of native English and native Japanese speakers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46(11), 3275A.
- Edelsky, C. (1982). Writing in a bilingual program: The relation of L1 and L2 texts. TESOL Quarterly, 16(2), 211-228.
- Emig, J. (1971). The composing processes of twelfth grades. Urbana, ILL.: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Faigley, L., & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. College Composition and Communication, 32, 400-414.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Communication and Communication, 32, 365-387.
- Friedlander, A. (1990). Composing in English: Effects of a first language on writing in English as a second language. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom (pp. 109-125). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gaskill, W. (1986). Revising in Spanish and English as a second language: A process oriented study of composition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Gould, J. D. (1980). Experiments on composing letters: some facts, some myths, and some observations. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), Cognitive processes in writing. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Graves, D. (1983). Writing: Teachers and children at work. Exeter, NH: Heinemann.
- Hall, C. (1987). Revision strategies in L1 and L2 writing tasks: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico.
- Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across languages. TESOL Quarterly, 24(1), 43-60.
- Humes, A. (1983). Research on the composing process. Review of Educational Research, 53, 201-216.

- Jones, C. S. (1982). Attention to rhetorical form while composing in a second language. In C. Campbell, V. Flashner, T. Hudson, & J. Lubin (Eds.), Proceedings of the Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum (Vol. 2, pp. 130-143). Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Jones, C. S. (1985). Problems with monitor use in second language composing. In M. Rose (Ed.), Studies in writer's block and other composing process problems (pp. 96-118). New York: Guilford Press.
- Jones, C. S., & Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A. Matsushashi (Ed.), Writing in real time: Modeling production processes (pp. 34-57). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. Language Learning, 16(1), 1-20.
- Krapels, A. (1990). The interaction of first and second language composing: Processes and rhetorics. Dissertation Abstracts International, 51(12), 4045A.
- Kunz, L. (1972). 26 steps: A course in controlled composition for intermediate and advanced ESL students. New York: Language Innovations.
- Moragne e Silva, M. (1989). A study of composing in a first and second language. Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education, 1(2), 132-151.
- Moragne e Silva, M. (1991). Cognitive, affective, social, and cultural aspects of composing in a first and second language: A case study of one adult writer. Dissertation Abstracts International, 52(12), 4249A.
- Nold, E. W. (1979). Revising: Toward a theory. Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Padron, Y. N. (1991). Commentary on dialogues promoting reading comprehension. In Teaching advanced skills to at-risk students: Views from research and practice (pp. 131-140). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Padron, Y. N. (1992). Instrumental programs that improve the reading comprehension of students at risk. In H. Waxman,

- J. Walker de Felix, J. Anderson, & H. P. Baptiste, Jr. (Eds.), Students at risk in at-risk schools: Improving environment for learning (pp. 222-232). Newbury, CA: Corwin.
- Paulston, C. B., & Dykstra, G. (1973). Controlled composition in English as a second language. New York: Regents.
- Peregoy, S. F. & Boyle, O. F. (1993). Reading, writing, & learning ESL: A resource book for K-8 teachers. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 317-336.
- Pianko, S. (1979). A description of the composing process of college freshman writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 13, 5-22.
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. TESOL Quarterly, 19(2), 229-258.
- Raimes, A. (1987). Language proficiency, writing ability, and composing strategies: A study of ESL college student writers. Language Learning, 37(3), 439-468.
- Scardamalia, M. (1984). Higher order abilities: Written communication. Washington DC: American Educational Research Association for the National Institute of Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 273-573).
- Schiller, J. (1989). Writing in L1--Writing in L2: Case study of the composing processes of five adult Arabic-speaking ESL writers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 50(9), 2883A.
- Silberman, A. (1989). Growing up writing: Teaching children to write, think, and learn. New York: Random House.
- Silva, T. (1990). A comparative study of the composing of selected ESL and native English speaking freshman writers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 51(10), 3397A.

- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. TESOL Quarterly, 27(4), 657-677.
- Skibniewski, L. (1988). The writing processes of advanced foreign language learners in their native and foreign language: Evidence from thinking aloud protocols. Studia Anglica Posnaniensia, 21(3), 177-186.
- Skibniewski, L., & Skibniewska, M. (1986). Experimental study: The writing process of intermediate/advanced foreign language learners in their foreign and native languages. Studia Anglica Posnaniensia, 19(3), 142-163.
- Sommers, N. (1979). The need for theory in composition research. College Composition and Communication, 30(1), 46-49.
- Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. College Composition and Communication, 31, 378-388.
- Stallard, C. (1974). An analysis of the writing behavior of good student writers. Research in the Teaching of English, 8(2), 206-218.
- Urzua, C. (1987). "You stopped too soon": Second language children composing and revising. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 279-304.
- Yau, M. (1989). A quantitative comparison of L1 and L2 writing processes. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual TESOL Convention, San Antonio, Texas.
- Whalen, K. (1988). Pilot study on the nature of difficulties in written expression in a second language: Process or product? Bulletin of the CAAL, 1(1), 51-57.
- Weaver, L. R., & Padron, Y. N. (1994). Writing instruction for limited English proficient students: A survey of teachers' perceptions. In Malave, L. (Ed.) National Association for Bilingual Education (NABE). Annual Conference Journal, NABE 92-93. See FL 022 341.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). Teaching language as communication. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. TESOL Quarterly, 10, 67-76.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 16, 195-209.

Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. TESOL Quarterly, 17, 165-187.