

Korean EFL Writers' Composing Processes: An Exploratory Study of College Students*

Jeongwan Lim
(Daegu University)

Lim, Jeongwan. (2006). Korean EFL writers' composing processes: An exploratory study of college students. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, 12(2), 127-152.

For the past 20 years the process approach to writing has been popular in second language writing classrooms. However, there have been very few studies conducted in Korea with regard to the composing processes and the effects of proficiency on writers' usage. The present study attempts to begin to fill this gap. Three groups of college students with different writing proficiency participated in the study: the advanced group, the intermediate group, and the beginning group. The verbal protocol of their writing processes revealed that they approached writing tasks differently. While the advanced writers focused on generating texts and ideas and examined their writing at both global and local levels, the other two groups of students tended to focus on evaluating text at the local level and generated fewer ideas and less text. The findings from this study are then compared to those of some major studies of the composing process as conclusions are subsequently drawn about the specific needs of Korean college writers.

[composing process/L2 writing/think-aloud protocols/writing strategy]

I. INTRODUCTION

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, research on writing in English as a second language (ESL) witnessed a paradigm shift from a product-oriented approach to a process-oriented approach (Hairston, 1982). Motivated by dissatisfaction with a

* This research was supported by the Daegu University Research Grant, 2005.

form-dominated approach that had failed to foster students' thinking and expression (Silva, 1990) and writing process research on English as the first language (Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981, 1984), the writing process movement brought the writer and the writing process to the center of attention.

Since then, Flower and Hayes' (1981) theory of cognitive processes involved in writing has greatly influenced ESL writing research by establishing a common ground for writing researchers. Extensive research (Friedlander, 1990; Leki, 1992; Perl, 1979; Raimes, 1985, 1987; Silva, 1993; Zamel, 1983) conducted within the process research paradigm has probed the nature and characteristics of L2 composing processes and factors such as L1 literacy level, L2 language competence, L2 writing skills, and the use of L1 during the composing process that influences the L2 composing process. However, the dominant focus on writers' discovering meaning and finding expressions has evoked criticism from a number of researchers who have observed ESL students' problems and difficulties in school writing, especially at the university and graduate levels (Horowitz, 1986; Reid, 1989). Therefore, the paradigm has evolved to focus on new approaches concerning genre and post-process as alternative solutions to the process approach (Atkinson, 2003; Matsuda, 2003; Ryu, 2003).

In contrast to the dominant research paradigm to writing in ESL context, relatively few studies have been carried out in English as a foreign language (EFL) context. According to Ortega (2004), the research published on L2 writing seems heavily ESL-oriented. Casanave (2003) has also claimed that many non-Western EFL settings have been apparently bypassed by the process-writing revolution. In a similar vein, there have been very few studies conducted in Korea with regard to the composing processes and the effects of proficiency on writers' usage. The present study attempts to begin to fill this gap.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Since the focus of this study is on the cognitive processes involved in writing, in this section, the researcher will discuss research that focuses on cognitive processes involved in writing and process research in second language writing.

1. Cognitive Processes in Writing

1) Planning

Planning is a generic cognitive process that is often described as "incubation" (Flower & Hayes, 1981). It encompasses various processes including interpreting the writing task, generating ideas, finding a focus, and discovering what one wants to say. In the linear stage model (Roman, 1965), planning refers to all the activities at the prewriting stage, in which the writer uses different strategies (brainstorming, free writing, making a list of key words, outlining, doing semantic mapping, and other methods) to generate and subsequently organize his or her ideas. In contrast to the linear stage model, Flower and Hayes (1981) have claimed that planning occurs not only in the prewriting stage, but is found throughout the entire composing process. Flower and Hayes (1984) define planning as a "purposeful act of representing current meaning to oneself" that involves cognitive operations such as generating information, organizing or structuring information and finally setting goals.

According to Flower and Hayes (1981), the act of generating ideas includes retrieving relevant information from long-term memory. Organizing refers to the mental activities of grouping ideas under categories and forming new concepts. Goal-setting, a major aspect of the planning process, enables the writer to build a network of goals including content goals, procedural goals, rhetorical goals, and structural goals. These goals subsequently create plans that guide text generation.

2) Composing/Translating

In Flower and Hayes' (1981) theory, the act of composing is referred to as "translating," which is essentially "the process of putting ideas into visible language"(p. 373). The process of writing/translating is characterized by embedding in a recursive way. For example, the act of writing/translating can be interrupted by reviewing which might trigger further planning and writing. In that situation, the act of writing/composing is subsumed in the initial act of translating.

The composing process often requires writers to exercise a diverse range of writing skills since the language of thought may be represented in various modes that range from non-verbal imagery or abstract knowledge networks to words in

the target language (Flower & Hayes, 1984). Apart from that, writers have to juggle a number of simultaneous constraints including demands for integrated knowledge, linguistic conventions of written text, and rhetorical problems (Flower & Hayes, 1980). Writers have to deal with all these issues while they are performing the act of writing. Consequently, novice writers and young children are often frustrated since all these constraints overload their short-term memory.

In studying sentence production, Kaufer, Hayes, and Flower (1986) observed that writers produced not whole sentences, but rather sentence parts, and the size of the sentence parts varied depending on the expertise of the writers. When sentence parts were produced, they were evaluated for appropriateness of word choice, meaning and grammatical form and were sometimes rejected either for semantic or syntactic problems. If a sentence part was accepted, the writer often started searching for the meaning or language needed in the next part of the sentence (Hayes, 1996).

In Flower and Hayes' (1981) model, translating (generating sentences and sentence parts) was the only major category used to label the sentence generating process. Yet, a number of researchers who have used the think-aloud procedure identified some subprocesses of the sentence generating process, namely, memory searching, generating pretext, and generating notes (Arndt, 1987; Witte & Cherry, 1994). When producing sentence parts, both L1 and L2 student writers were found to go through the process of memory search, often indicated by self-directed questions like "What do I want to say?" "What do I mean?" or simply "What?" Generating pretext, labeled by some researchers as transcribing pretext (Witte & Cherry, 1994) or as rehearsing (Perl, 1979; Raimes, 1985), refers to trying out words immediately before they are actually written. Participants in a foreign language context are found to rehearse both in their first language and the target language.

3) Reviewing

In the stage model that delineates writing as containing three stages of prewriting, writing and revising (Rohman, 1965), revising is considered to be an "afterthought" of the writing stage. The writers first "finish" planning and put on the paper whatever they have in mind, and finally come back to the draft to correct or change the text with which they are unhappy (Rohman, 1965). In Flower and Hayes' (1981) model, revising, referred to as "reviewing," is not the

final cleaning up operation that writers perform, but rather it is a subprocess that can occur at anytime during the composing phase. Based on the definition Flower and Hayes (1981) give for reviewing, rereading the written sentence or repeating key words of the written text should be considered as subprocesses of the reviewing process since they serve as an essential evaluating procedure. According to Witte and Cherry (1994), writers evaluate not only their texts, but also their planning and pretext (words that are rehearsed immediately before the transcribing process). When the plan, text or pretext is found unsatisfactory, writers search in their memory for solutions to improve their plans, pretext, and text. In that situation, the process of evaluating and revising interrupts any other process and triggers further planning and text generating.

Another important finding from studies on reviewing was that the amount of revision did not always guarantee the quality of the texts. Beach (1976) found that extensive revisers were better writers. Bridwell (1980), on the other hand, discovered that the more extensively revised papers written by her twelfth-grade participants received highest and lowest quality ratings. Similarly, the expert writers in Faigley and Witte's (1981) study were found to revise less frequently than the less skilled writers. These results suggest that the amount of revision is not the key variable to the success of revision. The key variable appears to be the knowledge or ability to detect the problems in the texts, the procedural strategies of how to deal with problems, and the rewriting strategies the writer uses to improve the texts (Hayes, Flower, Schriver, Stratman, & Carey, 1987).

In summary, revising is no longer thought of as an operation to clean up the mistakes or errors that writers find in their "finished" drafts. Rather it is conceived as searching for correct and appropriate ways to express what writers intend to say. When writers detect problems in the text during the text generating process, revising is initiated to improve the text. Revising, therefore, is an operation that can occur throughout the composing process.

2. The Second Language Writing Process

In the previous sections, the writing processes of planning, writing and reviewing were discussed. In the following section, the researcher will present an overview of the research on writing processes in the field of ESL and EFL.

Since the 1980s, research on the writing processes of ESL speakers has developed quickly. Earlier L2 writing process studies (Chelala 1981; Raimes,

1985, 1987; Zamel, 1982, 1983) explored all aspects of the writing processes and attempted to identify effective and ineffective writing behaviors. Later studies were more concerned with the specific behaviors and characteristics unique to L2 writers (Krapels, 1990).

Chelala (1981) examined the transfer of L1 competence to L2 writing. Her participants, two Spanish-speaking professional women, composed aloud twice in English and twice in Spanish on given topics. She found that her participants' L1 writing behaviors were different from those identified in their L2 writing processes, and that some successful strategies in L1 had not been transferred to L2 writing. She also distinguished effective behaviors from ineffective behaviors which included using the first language in prewriting and switching between the two languages during the composing processes.

Like Chelala, Jones (1982) used a composing aloud research procedure with the intention to distinguish effective from ineffective strategies. He used two student writers of equivalent proficiency. He found that one behavior critical to success was planning. The poor writer who did not plan produced a less coherent composition while the good writer who did plan related ideas successfully and produced consequently a more coherent composition. He also found that the poor writer was bound to the written text, whereas the good writer was able to let her ideas generate the text. He concluded that the lack of competence in composing, rather than the lack of L2 competence, was the source of the poor writer's difficulty in writing in English as a second language.

Interviewing eight university-level proficient ESL writers about their composing processes, Zamel (1982) found that the writing processes of her L2 writers were like those described in the L1 studies. Zamel (1983) used direct observation and retrospective interviews to investigate the L2 writing behaviors of 6 advanced university-level students. She discovered that the skilled L2 writers displayed recursiveness in their writing processes, were more concerned with ideas, and revised their essays more than unskilled writers. Until the unskilled writers who focused on the word level, the skilled writers made more discourse-level revisions. The findings in Zamel (1982, 1983) seemed to suggest, as in Jones' (1982) study, that competence in writing processes could be addressed in the classroom while downplaying the linguistic competence, a claim that has been strongly challenged in recent research.

Around the mid 1980s, many studies focused on the composing processes and strategies of less proficient L2 college writers. Pfingstag (1984) found that her

undergraduate Spanish students as a group did little planning and exhibited a narrow range of strategies. Brooks (1985) discovered that composing competence was separated from oral proficiency and that the unskilled writers suffered from a truncated writing process. Raimes (1985, 1987) found that the composing processes of her eight less advanced writers exhibited a basic pattern of recursiveness, that is, they all reread to move forward, yet the writers as a group displayed very different writing processes. Compared with Perl's (1979) unskilled writers, the students produced more content and were less concerned with errors as a group. As a result, she maintained that L2 writers differed from L1 writers in the sense that L1 writers were more concerned with editing for fear of making mistakes in grammar whereas L2 writers realized that errors were unavoidable and, therefore, were less preoccupied with editing their grammatical mistakes. It is difficult to make inferences from these two studies as to whether L1 unskilled writers are more concerned with surface errors than the L2 unskilled writers for students' attitudes toward error correction might have been influenced by writing instruction and their writing teachers' attitudes toward error correction.

The main thrust of the earlier studies in the L2 writing process research was directed at comparing L1 with L2 writing processes, and strategies of more proficient with those of less proficient L2 writers. Less attention was paid to how L2 writers managed the acts of composing behaviors, particularly, how the L1 was used in the writing process.

Later research (Cumming, 1987; Friedlander, 1990; Jones & Tetroe, 1987; Martin-Betancourt, 1986; Wang & Wen, 2002) paid more attention to the interplay between L1 and L2 and other more specific behaviors during composing processes. All these more recent studies reported similarly that the use of L1 affected text quality positively, and that it was a facilitating strategy that may ESL writers employed to smooth their production process.

Within a Korean context, Ryu (2003) investigated the use of the process approach to EFL writing and concluded that it was still useful when Korean students composed their writing in English. Therefore, he suggested that it should be integrated into the new approach to writing.

To sum up, research on the L2 writing processes has suggested that think-aloud procedure and the post-writing interview technique are effective methods to investigate the L2 composing process. The studies have explored similarities and differences in the writing process of L1 and L2 writers, effective and ineffective strategies used among L2 writers, the influence of L1 writing strategies on the L2

writing process, the influence of L2 linguistic competence and writing competence on writing quality, and the use of L1 in L2 writer's thinking process. The results have provided researcher and practitioners with rich information about the nature and characteristics of L2 writing processes.

The current study, following the previous L2 writing researchers, has used both research techniques, that is, the think-aloud procedure and the retrospective interview to collect data. The purpose of the present study is to investigate the writing processes of nine Korean college students while they perform one writing task and to determine the effects of proficiency on its use. First, the researcher analyzed the participants' processes by examining the think-aloud protocol data by using the coding scheme designed by Wang and Wen (2002) and Ryu (2003). Second, the researcher investigated the differences among three groups of writers: an advanced group, an intermediate group and a beginning group, in their composing processes. The research questions are as follows:

- 1) What are the composing processes of Korean college EFL learners?
- 2) How do the composing processes of Korean college EFL learners differ with their writing proficiency?

III. METHOD

1. Participants

Participants in this study were nine undergraduate students from a university in Seoul. Seven students were male and two students were female, ranging in age from 21 to 30 years. They were grouped into three levels in terms of their writing proficiency: advanced, intermediate, and beginning level. Their English writing proficiency was measured by their writing scores. As for their writing scores, their written works were evaluated by two native-speaking instructors, based on the scoring guidelines of the Test of Written English provided by Educational Testing Services (2003). The advanced students scored 4 to 5, whereas the intermediate group averaged 2 to 3.5 and the beginning group scored between 1 to 1.5. The advanced group of students and one participant of the intermediate group had overseas experience but the rest did not. As for their English writing experience, the advanced and intermediate group of students had one semester of

English writing class with the researcher in 2003, whereas the beginning group of students did not at all. Their characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Participants' Profile

Subjects	Age	Sex	Major	Writing score	Overseas Years
1.1	30	M	Business administration	5	7
1.2	25	M	English language & Literature	4	4
1.3	27	M	Electronic Engineering	4	1
2.1	25	M	Public Administration	3.5	1
2.2	23	M	International trade	3	N/a
2.3	21	M	North Korean Studies	2	N/a
3.1	21	F	Youth Education & Leadership	1.5	N/a
3.2	25	M	Business administration	1	N/a
3.3	27	F	English language & Literature	1	N/a

2. Writing Task

There was one writing task given to the participants:

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

Below the English prompt, examples of think-aloud protocols were given in the Korean language to help them to think aloud. These examples were "Gosh, I don't know what to say," "It's difficult to say," and "How should I say it in English?"

3. Procedures and Evaluation Instruments

This study was conducted at a university in Seoul from January 19 to 29, 2005. The data for the study were obtained by analyzing the think-aloud protocols of the participants while they performed one 45-minute writing task. They were encouraged to write in their normal way, but were instructed to verbalize all thinking while composing. Writing took place in a video-taping studio and the participants were video-taped. The resulting video-recordings were transcribed and, with the actual compositions and any notes written, were subject to protocol analysis. Right after the composing session, each participant was interviewed individually to elicit more explanation of their writing processes with reference to their written works. The whole retrospective interview lasted about one hour and

their verbal reports were tape recorded.

4. Coding Scheme

The coding scheme for this study was adapted from the studies of Wang and Wen (2002) and Ryu (2003). In Wang and Wen's (2002) study, five categories were used to group Chinese students writing behaviors in English: task-examining, idea-generating, idea-organizing, text-generating activities, and process-controlling. Instead of using idea organization and process-controlling categories, Ryu (2003) modified his coding scheme to include global and local text evaluation to group Korean students' writing behaviors.

For this study, the researcher combined those coding schemes and six categories were identified: task examination, idea generation, text generation, global text evaluation, local text evaluation, and process controlling. The task-examining category represents writing behaviors that analyze the writing prompt and context of writing. The idea-generation category means generating ideas for the overall content and the following sentences. The text-generation category refers to transforming ideas into languages, focusing on word choice and correct grammar usage. The global text evaluation category represents evaluating the text at the global level, focusing on the overall content and organization. The local text evaluation refers to evaluating text at the local level, mainly focusing on the content and mechanics of the immediately preceding part. The process controlling category represents controlling the writing procedures, word and time limits, and other constraints in writing.

Coding was done by two experts in second language instruction and inter-rater reliability between the coders was .90. Table 2 shows the definition of each category with its examples. Italicized letters indicate the parts, which were spoken in Korean.

TABLE 2
The Think-aloud Protocol Coding Scheme

Composing activities	Examples
Task examination: analyzing the assignment and context	What do you think friendship is? What is most important in friendship? Why do you think so? Explain your point with some evidence. <i>With evidence.... well...evidence....</i>
Idea generation: generating ideas for the overall content and the following Sentences	<i>Friendship should be communicating well and knowing each other well. That's right. Then, I should be saying....</i>
Text generation: producing the text	Time is the spice of friendship. Friendship is the trust from one's heart.
Global text evaluation: evaluating the text at the global level/reading the whole text	The most important things in friendship are trust and comfortable feeling. <i>Ok. Here is a topic sentence. Ok. I have a thesis. I should connect the topic sentence to 'trust.'</i>
Local text evaluation: evaluating the text at the local level/reading the previous sentence or the parts of a sentence	Between each friend? <i>Should I use 'among' or 'between'?</i> Among each friends?
Process controlling: controlling the writing procedures, word and time limit, etc.	<i>Gosh, I should write longer. Oh, I've got only 5 minutes left.</i>

IV. FINDINGS

1. The Total Writing Time and the Length of the Essays

The total writing time was calculated from the time when the participants started to read the writing prompt of the think-aloud task to the point when they indicated that they had finished. Table 3 presents each writer's total writing time and the group average. Although the participants were notified that they had 45 minutes to compose the essay, some of them wanted to continue their writing after the time. In that case, the researcher let them continue to do their work. Interestingly, the total time of the group average spent on writing for the advanced group and the beginning group was identical, which was 44 minutes and 8 seconds, whereas the intermediate group took longer time, than them, utilizing 50 minutes and 33 seconds.

TABLE 3
Writing Time and the Length of the Essays

Subjects	Total time spent (minutes)	Total utterances	Total words	Total sentences	Total paragraphs
1.1	37:45	1309	340	22	4
1.2	46:07	1923	222	19	4
1.3	47:13	1994	180	16	4
GA(advanced)	44:08	1742	271	20	4
2.1	54:57	1243	182	18	2
2.2	44:10	1049	144	18	1
2.3	50:12	1161	118	16	3
GA(Intermediate)	50:33	1151	148	18	2
3.1	42:00	1433	52	6	1
3.2	43:33	958	83	10	1
3.3	45:32	709	95	10	2
GA(Beginning)	44:08	1033	77	8.7	1.3

Note. GA means Group Average

In terms of the total think-aloud utterances, the advanced group produced an average of 1742 utterances, the intermediate group averaged 1151 utterances, and the beginning group average 1033 utterances. It shows that the more advanced group produced more utterances.

Previous studies suggest that the length of the essays correlates positively with the quality of the essays (Livingston, 1987; McCulley, 1985; Witte, 1983). When the length of the essay is compared, the advanced group produced on average 271 words for their essays, the intermediate group on average 148 words, while the beginning group wrote on average 77 words. This result provides additional evidence for the positive relationship between the length of the essay and the quality of the essay.

2. Time and Planning the Pre-writing Phase

Studies have also found that the more competent writers spent longer time periods planning their essays in pre-writing phases and their plans were more elaborate than those who were less proficient (Carey, Flower, Schriver, & Hass, 1989; Jones, 1982; Kellogg, 1988; Nelson, 1988; Spivey & King, 1987). In this section, the researcher examined the amount of time that the participants spent planning their essays and the planning processes that they went through. The pre-writing time was clocked from the moment the participants began to read the writing prompt and ended when they began to write the first word of the essay.

The advanced group spent an average of 2 minutes and 12 seconds on prewriting whereas the intermediate group took 1 minute and 50 seconds, and the beginning group took less than that, 1 minute and 35 seconds. These results show that the more advanced group of students spent more time on pre-writing and supports the findings of the previous studies (Jones, 1982; Wang & Wen, 2002).

As for the utterances of prewriting, results were similar to the prewriting activity. The advanced group had an average of 6.1%, whereas the intermediate and beginning groups had 4.2% and 3.5%, respectively. Each writer's pre-writing time and the averaged group pre-writing time are displayed in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Time Spent in the Pre-writing Phrase & Utterances of Prewriting

Subjects	Time-spent pre-writing before sentence 1 (minutes)	Utterances of Pre-writing (%)
1.1	2:11	120 (9.2)
1.2	2:04	98 (5.1)
1.3	2:20	104 (5.2)
GA(advanced)	2:12	107 (6.1)
2.1	3:47	113 (9.1)
2.2	0:25	1 (0.1)
2.3	0:37	31 (2.7)
GA(Intermediate)	1:50	48 (4.2)
3.1	1:42	75 (5.2)
3.2	0:08	6 (0.6)
3.3	2:15	27 (3.8)
GA(Beginning)	1:35	36 (3.5)

Note. GA means Group Average

Excerpt 11 and 71 below also show the different prewriting strategies made by the advanced student, subject 1.2, and the low level of student, subject 3.1. Their think-aloud protocols are provided first in Korean to deliver their original flavor as they are and translated into English right below. Italicized letters indicate that they were spoken in Korean. As shown in Excerpt 11, subject 1.2 spent time for planning organization as well as content of his writing. In Excerpt 71, on the other hand, subject 3.1 spent time mostly for thinking of content of her writing. The detailed prewriting protocols illustrate that the advanced group of students were more focused on the structure of their writing than the lower group of students were.

Excerpt 11: S1.2

...서론에서는 우정에 대한 정의, 우정에 대한 정의와 개략을 말하고, 본론에서는 우정에 중요한 점과 그 이유, 사례를 포함한 그 이유..그리고 결론에서는 우정에 대한 총체적인 나의 생각...이렇게 쓰면 될 거 같은데...삶의 중요한 요소이다...시작을 어떻게 해 볼까?

[...I should mention the definition of friendship, the definition of friendship and the overall friendship in the introduction part, and in the body part the importance of friendship and its reasons, the reasons including examples, then in the conclusion part my overall opinions about friendship...ok...this is the way I should write....is an important part of life...how can I start?]

Excerpt 71: S3.1

...우정이란 일단은 trust.. 믿음이 있어야 되고, 그 다음에 trust 믿음이 있어야 되고, 그 다음에 오래되어야 하고, 오래될 수록 좋겠고, 그 다음에 의사소통이 잘 되야 되니까... communication... conversation? ...communication이 있어야 되고...그 다음에 머 대충 이런 것들이 되는데...우정이란...나의 생각을 쓰면은...

[Friendship...first...needs trust...then... trust...trust should be in friendship...then...should be old....it is good to be older...then...it should be communicative...communication...conversation?...communication should be there...then....well...these stuff are for friendship...friendship....My opinion is...]

In terms of task examination, on the other hand, the beginning and the intermediate groups of students had more utterances than the advanced group. This might suggest that the less skilled writers seemed to examine the writing topic more than more skilled writers. Each writer's utterances of task examination are displayed in Table 5.

TABLE 5
Time Spent in the Task Examination

Subjects	Task Examination (%)
1.1	0 (0.0)
1.2	39 (2.0)
1.3	24 (1.2)
GA(advanced)	21 (1.2)
2.1	25 (2.0)
2.2	10 (1.0)
2.3	27 (2.3)
GA(Intermediate)	20.6 (1.8)
3.1	58 (4.0)
3.2	0 (0)
3.3	0 (0)
GA(Beginning)	19.3 (1.8)

Note. GA means Group Average

3. The Composing Phase

The composing process, referred to as 'translating process' by Flower and Hayes (1981), includes generating pretexts and composing. As discussed in the literature review, generating pretexts refers to the act of rehearsing what one intends to write before it is actually written down (Witte & Cherry, 1994). The results of the text generation and process controlling are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6
Idea Generation, Text Generation and Process Controlling

Subjects	Idea generation (%)	Text generation (%)	Process controlling (%)
1.1	158 (12.1)	525 (40.1)	11 (0.8)
1.2	800 (41.6)	318 (16.5)	46 (2.4)
1.3	224 (11.2)	619 (31.0)	16 (0.8)
GA(advanced)	394 (22.6)	487 (28.0)	24 (1.4)
2.1	45 (3.6)	403 (32.4)	4 (0.3)
2.2	149 (14.2)	273 (26.0)	12 (1.1)
2.3	512 (44.1)	244 (21.0)	2 (0.2)
GA(Intermediate)	235 (20.4)	306 (26.7)	6 (0.5)
3.1	101 (7.0)	236 (16.5)	19 (1.3)
3.2	246 (25.7)	124 (12.9)	3 (0.3)
3.3	105 (14.8)	137 (19.3)	1 (0.1)
GA(Beginning)	151 (15.0)	165 (16.0)	7 (0.8)

Note. GA means Group Average

In terms of idea generation, the advanced writers produced an average of 394 utterances, which made up 22.6% of their think-aloud protocols, and the intermediate writers produced 235 utterances, 20.4%, whereas the beginning group of students produced 151 utterances, 14.6%. This shows that the advanced writers spent more time on generating their ideas on text than other groups of students. As shown in Excerpt 91, subject 3.3 had difficulty in thinking of ideas and appropriate vocabulary for her ideas. In Excerpt 55, on the other hand, subject 2.2 spent time mostly for thinking of content of his writing. Underlined letters indicate that they were written on paper while composing.

Excerpt 91: S3.3

...(주제가)어렵군.... 편안함... 우정... 우정이란... 편안함... (우정을) 어떻게 생각하는가... 내가 생각하는 우정은... 한국말로도 잘 안 떠오르네... 우정이란... (아이디어가) 떠올라야 되는 데... 잘 안 떠오르네... 문제는 단어야..단어가 생각나야지...편안함이 우정에서는 가장 중요한데... 편안함... 그 다음에... 자신을 생각해 주는 마음...사랑하는 마음...
[...difficult...comfortableness...friendship...friendship is...comfortableness...what is

important in friendship....the friendship that I think of is...I can't even think of it in Korean...friendship is...I should think of the ideas for friendship but I can't...The problem is vocabulary...I can't come up with proper vocabulary...Feeling comfortable is most important in friendship...comfortableness...then...care about others....a mind to love others....]

Excerpt 55: S2.2

우정은...중요한 요소...factor ...중요한...중요한 요소이다 in our 우리의... 우리의...많은 가치들 중에서 중요한 요소이다...인생에서 우리의 삶에서...우리의 인생에서 우리의 존재. existence...우리의 존재에서 중요한 요소이다. 왜냐하면, because 우리의 삶에서 중요하다 왜냐하면, 누군가...누군가는 one doesn't livedoesn't live alone. 홀로 살아갈 수 없기 때문이다. 사람들은 홀로 살아갈 수 없기 때문이다. 왜냐하면 사람들은 홀로 살아갈 수 없기 때문이다. 사람은 그러니까 항상 관계를 맺고, 사람은 홀로 살아갈 수 없기 때문이다.

[friendship...the important factor...factor...important...important factor...in our...our...in our many values...in life...in our life...our existence in our life...existence...important factor in our existence....because...because...important in our life... because... one... one... one doesn't live....doesn't live alone....one can't live alone. humans can't live alone...because human can't live alone...humans, therefore, have a relationship with others...humans can't live alone...]

As for text generation, the advanced and intermediate groups of students produced more utterances, 28% and 26.7%, respectively, whereas the beginning group had only 16%.

With regard to process controlling, the difference in percentage appeared to be less significant. The advanced group produced 1.4% whereas the intermediate and beginning groups had 0.5% and 0.8%, respectively.

These results show that the better-performing writers produced more ideas and were also able to produce on the average more words. This is congruent with the other research findings (Jones, 1982; Wang & Wen, 2002). This suggests that they were more fluent writers than their counterparts in the other groups.

4. The Evaluating Phase

Table 7 displays the results of the analysis of the global and local text evaluation process. The total utterances of global text evaluation for the advanced group were 340, which made up 19.5% of their total processes. The intermediate group produced 96 utterances, which made up 8.3% of their total processes

whereas the beginning group had 114, which made up 11% of their total processes.

TABLE 7
Global and Local Text Evaluation

Subjects	Utterances of Global evaluation (%)	Utterances of Local text evaluation (%)
1.1	167 (12.8)	67 (2.6)
1.2	371 (19.3)	5 (0.3)
1.3	481 (24.1)	99 (4.8)
GA(advanced)	340 (19.5)	57 (2.6)
2.1	78 (6.3)	270 (19.0)
2.2	211 (20.1)	62 (5.7)
2.3	0 (0.0)	67 (5.6)
GA(Intermediate)	96.3 (8.3)	133 (10.8)
3.1	94 (6.6)	631 (51.3)
3.2	154 (16.1)	176 (18.2)
3.3	95 (13.4)	226 (30.9)
GA(Beginning)	114 (11.0)	325 (33.2)

Note. GA means Group Average

The result that the advanced group outnumbered the intermediate group by 11.2% showed that the more skilled writers used more evaluating globally than the less skilled writers. The following excerpt shows that subject 1.2 spent time for evaluating his writing globally by checking a thesis statement and a topic sentence.

Excerpt 15: S1.2

I count more on trust and... trust하고 and comfortable...and feeling of comfort..comfortness.....[comfort 지움] feeling of easyness... 아이씨 comfortness가 생각이 안 나네...일단은...일단은...easyness.. 이래 가지고 내가 믿음과 편안함으로 인해서 나는 친구를 가장 확실한 나의 친구를 찾을 수 있다....그러면... count more on trust and easyness.... If I can trust and feel comfortable with a friend...한 친구가...I can make most of its relationship. 오케이. 그러면 나온 게 내가 친구할 때 나온 게 thesis가... topic sentence 나왔지...thesis 나왔고..topic sentence를 갖다가 trust하고 easy 붙이면 되지.
[I count more on trust and... trust and comfortable...and feeling of comfort... comfortness.. [cross out comfort] feeling of easyness... Well... *I can't think of comfortness in English...Well...Let's put it as easyness...so I can find my friend with trust and comfortableness...then...count more on trust and easyness...If I can trust and feel comfortable with a friend,...A friend...I can make most of its relationship. OK... Then there is a thesis....when Iwith a friend... then there is a topic sentence...with the topic sentence, trust and easy should be together there.]*

Interestingly, however, the beginning group had a more global evaluation of 11.0% than the intermediate group did at 8.3%. The reason for this was their lack of idea generation. It was observed in their think-aloud protocols that the beginning group read their whole text to generate their ideas and it caused an increase the percentage in global evaluation. However, since the prewriting category is concerned about the relevance of certain writing behaviors to global evaluation, if the number of utterances included in the prewriting category is counted, it turns out that the discrepancy in global evaluation between the intermediate and beginning groups becomes smaller, declining from 2.7% to 2.0%.

As for local text evaluation, in contrast, the difference in percentages was strikingly reversed. The beginning writers produced an average of 539 utterances, which took up 52.2% of their total processes, whereas the intermediate group had 437 utterances, 38.1%, and the advanced group of students produced 368 utterances, 21.1%. The results show that the beginning group outnumbered the intermediate group by 14.1%, and the intermediate group outnumbered the advanced group by 7.0%, indicating that the less skilled writers engaged in more local text evaluation than the more skilled writers did. The following excerpt shows that subject 3.1 spent time mostly for evaluating her grammatical usage.

Excerpt 81: S3.1

I think the friendship is trust in... 믿음이다...친구들 간에서...믿음이다.... 믿음이 있는 것이다. 친구 간에 믿음이다...in friend? in each ...each friend? I think the friendship is in each friends...그니까 각 친구 사이에? 사이? 사이?among을 쓰나...among each friends? among은 3개 이상에서 쓰는 거 아닌가? between ... between friends...among으로 할까? 그냥 among? trust among friends...믿음인 것이다...

[I think the friendship is trust in....trust... trust between friends...trust...there is trust...trust in friends....in friend? in each...each friend? I think the friendship is in each friends. So between each friend? between? between? Should I use among? among each friends? Is among used for more than three things? between...between friends...Should I use among here? Or is among correct here? trust among friends...trust...]

As for interview results, it was observed that 8 students out of all 9 students seemed to have difficulty in utilizing proper English vocabulary for expressing their ideas. They reported that their lack of vocabulary and limited use of vocabulary were the major reasons to make their composition choppy and crude.

Their lack of vocabulary tended to make them confused with how to say in English when they compose. Therefore, their composing was frequently stopped in the middle of their idea generation and their thoughts seemed to be blocked by them.

To sum up, the advanced skilled group displayed a higher frequency of evaluation overall in the reviewing process. They read their own texts, giving evaluative comments, and making more changes to their texts than the intermediate and beginning groups did. Subsequently, they made more changes that led to changes of meaning, while the others made more changes to fix their grammatical and mechanical errors.

V. CONCLUSIONS

1. Summary of Findings

This study is a case study, which employed the think-aloud procedure and retrospective interviews to investigate the EFL composing processes of nine Korean college students. The results show that 6 composing processes were identified in their think-aloud protocols: task examination, idea generation, text generation, global and local evaluation, and process controlling. On the whole, the advanced writers' composing processes were less interrupted than the intermediate and the beginning writers, who had to search for ideas and language to write. In terms of the planning process, they used more pre-writing planning strategies. Furthermore, they seemed to be more efficient and fluent writers in that they produced longer essays and longer stretches of words in each average writing act. As for global and local evaluation, the advanced group made both global and local evaluations on their own text whereas the intermediate and beginning group of students focused more at the local level. Finally, as for process controlling, the difference in percentage appeared to be less significant.

2. Pedagogical Implications

The results of the study can provide pedagogical suggestions for teachers who teach English composition as well as for writing researchers in the fields of language teaching. First of all, the importance of writing skills, particularly planning skills, cannot be overemphasized. In this study the advanced group of

students spent more time on planning and as a result, their composition was more organized and logical. Therefore, when teaching English writing to students, planning skills should be taught in conjunction with other local techniques. Second, teaching how to generate ideas should be incorporated in lessons, especially for beginning students of English. In the study, the lack of idea generation was a significant barrier that the beginning group of students experienced when composing. Teaching writing means teaching how to think and express one's ideas; hence, it is needless to say that to teach how to think and how to expand one's ideas must be taught. Third, the importance of global text evaluation should be taught, especially for lower levels of students. Global text evaluation is directly related to planning, which was described above. As the intermediate and beginning groups of students pay more attention on local text evaluation, they should be trained to review their whole text and structure, so that they can evaluate their writing in a big picture. Finally, the order of teaching writing strategies should be made according to the proficiency level of students. As the findings of the study showed, the behaviors of the students in each level to the writing task were different. Teachers should know where the needs of their students in each level are and provide relevant instruction accordingly.

3. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

There are some limitations in the design of the study. The first limitation lies in the writing conditions. The task in this study was centered around time writing and was conducted in a video-taping studio. The time limit may have constrained the composing process, as the student writers planned less and revised less because of time pressures. Some participants also felt unnatural when they were writing in front of the cameras. Future research should look at Korean writers undertaking tasking without a time limit and in more natural writing conditions.

The second limitation is on the topic of the task. Most of the participants had difficulty in completing the task due to its general and abstract nature. Research has shown that if students are interested in the topic on which they write, they tend to be more motivated, and subsequently, produce more effective writing (Calkins, 1994; Hildenbrand, 1985). Future research could be conducted in a more naturalistic setting in which students choose their own topics. The findings from the studies conducted in this manner may provide an insight into how students typically write.

Finally, the case study is appropriate for investigating cognitive writing processes, but the limited number of participants makes it difficult to generalize the findings to a larger population. Future research on writing could use more participants to establish the causal relationship among writing processes and the quality of the text.

REFERENCES

- Arndt, V. (1987). Six writers in search of texts: A protocol study of L1 and L2 writing. *ELT Journal*, 41, 257-267.
- Atkinson, D. (2003). L2 writing in the post-process era: Introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 3-15.
- Beach, R. (1976). Self-evaluation strategies of extensive revisers and nonrevisers. *College composition and Communication*, 27(2), 160-164.
- Bridwell, L. S. (1980). Revising strategies in twelfth grade students' transactional writing. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 14, 197-122.
- Brooks, E. (1985). *Case studies of the composing processes of five "unskilled" English as a second language writers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Calkins, L. (1994). *The art of teaching writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Casanave, C. P. (2003). Looking ahead to more sociopolitically-oriented case study research in L2 writing scholarship (But should it be called "post-process"?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 87-102.
- Carey, L., Flower, L., Hayes, J. R., Schriver, K. A., & Hass, C. (1989). *Differences in writers' initial task representations* (Tech. Rep. No. 35). Carnegie Mellon University.
- Chelala, S. (1981). *The composing process of two Spanish-speakers and the coherence of their texts: A case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Cumming, A. (1987). *Decision-making and text representation in ESL writing*. Paper presented at the 21st Annual TESOL Convention, Miami, April.
- Educational Testing Services. (2003). Test of written English scoring guide. Retrieved March 1, 2004, from <http://www.ets.org/reader/osn/toefguid.html>.
- Faigley, L., & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision, *College Composition and*

- Communication*, 32, 400-414.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College Composition and Communication*, 31(1), 21-32.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1984). Images, plans, and prose: The representation of meaning in writing. *Written Communication*, 1, 120-160.
- 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 insight for the classroom* (pp. 109-125). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33(1), 76-88.
- Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy and S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and application* (pp. 1-55). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hayes, J. R., Flower, L. S., Schriver, K. A., Stratman, J., & Carey, L. (1987). Cognitive processes in revision. In S. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Advances in applied psycholinguistics: Vol. 2 Reading, writing, and language processing* (pp. 176-240). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hildenbrand, J. (1985). *Carmen: A case study of an ESL writer*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Horowitz, D. M. (1986). What professors actually acquire: Academic tasks for the ESL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 445-462.
- Jones, S. (1982). Attention to rhetorical form while composing in a second language. In C. Campbell, V. Flasher, T. Hudson, & J. Lubing (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles*.
- Jones, 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.
- Kaufer, D. S., Hayes, J. R., & Flower, L. (1986). Composing written sentences. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 20, 121-140.
- Kellogg, R. T. (1988). Attention overload and writing performance: Effects of

- rough draft and outline strategies. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 14, 355-365.
- Krapels, A. P. (1990). An overview of second language writing process research. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insight for the classroom* (pp. 37-56). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. London and Portsmouth, HN: Heinemann.
- Livingston, S. A. (1987). *The effects of time limits on the qualities of student essays*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, April.
- Martin-Betancourt, M. (1986). *The composing processes of Puerto Rican college students of English as a second language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Process and post-process: A discursive history. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 65-83.
- McCulley, G. A. (1985). Writing quality, coherence and cohesion. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 19(3), 269-282.
- Nelson, J. (1988). *Examining the practices that shape students writing: Two studies of college freshman writing across disciplines*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carnegie Mellon University.
- Ortega, L. (2004). L2 writing research in EFL contexts: Some challenges and opportunities for EFL researchers. *ALAK Newsletter*, Spring.
- Perl, S. (1979). The composing processes of unskilled college writers. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 13, 317-336.
- Pfingstag, N. (1984). Showing writing: Modeling the process. *TESOL Newsletter*, 18, 1-3.
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled writers do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 225-258.
- Raimes, A. (1987). Language proficiency, writing ability and composing strategies: A study of ESL college student writers. *Language Learning*, 37, 439-468.
- Reid, J. (1989). English as a second language composition in higher education: The expectations of the academic audience. In D. Johnson and D. Reon (Eds.) *Richness in writing: Empowering ESL students* (pp. 150-172). New York: Longman.
- Rohman, G. (1965). Pre-writing: The stage of discovery in the writing process.

- College Composition and Communication*, 16, 106-112.
- Ryu, Hoyeol. (2003). Process approach to writing in the post-process era: A case study of two college students' writing processes. *English Teaching*, 58(3), 123-142.
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insight for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 657-677.
- Spivey, N. N., & King, J. R. (1987). Readers as writers composing from sources. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 24, 7-26.
- Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: An exploratory study of 12 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, 225-246.
- Witte, S. P. (1983). Pre-text and composing. *College Composition and Communication*, 38, 397-425.
- Witte, S. P., & Cherry, R. D. (1994). Think-aloud protocols, protocol analysis, and research design: An exploration of the influence of writing task on writing processes. In P. Smagorinsky, (Ed.), *Speaking about writing: Reflections on research methodology* (pp. 21-54). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publications.
- Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 195-209.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing process of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 165-187.

APPENDIX A

Subject 1.1's Written Product

Friendship

There is a Korean saying, "One real friend is worth more than hundreds of other friends. People probably have experienced that while meeting with a lot of friends, they still feel emptiness. People may also have encountered the sadness due to the lack of friends. Whom they can share their feelings. Then What is the true definition of friendship? The meaning

of friendship, in my opinion, is having a companion who will join my journey of life. When seeking for such companion, I count more on trust and feeling of easyness. If I can trust and feel comfortable with a friend, I can make the most of its relationship.

Trust in friendship is one of most important assets in order to keep up the relationship. For example, if I have a friend who has been friends for 10 years, and if I think he or she is not trustable, then I probably wouldn't consider him as a true friend. The reason is that time doesn't provide the meaning of friendship. Therefore, no matter how long the relationship went on, the trust is the vehicle which can drive the friendship into the optimistic state.

Another important value in friendship is the feeling of easyness. It means we have feeling comfortable between friends. Let's suppose that you have a friend, and whenever you meet him or her, you feel uncomfortable. Then would it be possible to share my thoughts or other sorts of burdens? It would be very hard to keep up with the friendship. Thus, feeling comfortable between friends can lead to the better relationship.

Above all, when seeking for the true friendship, trust and comfortable feeling will the important factors to determine the relationship. Trusting someone is quite hard thing to do, but once gain the trust from someone, it will be just like gaining every thing in friendship. Also people can maximige their sharing thought when the circumstance of the feeling of easyness. Then why not go outside and try to find friends who be your real friends.

APPENDIX B

Subject 2.1's Written Product

The humanity will have met lots of people through their life. And they are lived with other people. Among many values, Friendship is important factor in our existense because one doesn't live alone. So we are always looking for friend. Even if parents gave us vitality, we will live with our friend for long time.

Then, what is the most important in friendship? There are a few things. First, there is a believing between friends. Not only friends but also every peoples do the believing consider the most important, because it is basic factor in life. Without believing, I can't exist for a while. Second, When, my friend is depressed or needing aids, I can help him with pleasure. That willingness-mind not to be forced. Third, there is altruictic-mind for friend. If I only think myself, friendship will shatter just now. I also have many friends and am efforting for our friendship. So I think that friendship is never maintained as a man's efforting. There is always needed a counterfeit. We must incise such things for making truely friend in our heart.

APPENDIX C

Subject 3.1's Written Product

I think the friendship has trust and communication and so on
 Friendship must know each friends
 Friendship spend many times with my friend.

I think the most important in friendship is trust.

If there is not trust in friendship, each friend can't depend on other friend, And They are not friends anymore.

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Jeongwan Lim
Dept. of English Education, College of Education
Daegu University
15, Naeri, Jinryang, Gyeongsan
Gyeongbuk 712-714, Korea
Tel: (053) 850-4125
Fax: (053) 850-4121
Email: jwlim@daegu.ac.kr

Received in April, 2006

Reviewed in May, 2006

Revised version received in June, 2006