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Abstract  

The study examined how 5 adult Korean learners of English developed self-regulated learning (SRL) skills to overcome lexical problems in their English writing. Empirical studies have consistently shown that many of the greatest problems for ESL learners in writing are lexical in nature. The goal of the study was to help participants to address these problems, first through tutored assistance and then more independently by controlling their uses of strategies through planning, monitoring, and evaluation processes.

The study involved two phases: Phase 1 was exploratory in nature, in which I attempted to identify typical lexical problems Korean learners of English encounter in writing. Phase 2 included an intervention in the form of one-on-one tutoring that followed the cyclic model of SRL proposed by Zimmerman, Bonner, and Kovach (1996). I worked with 5 participants through the SRL cycle individually as they wrote and revised 3 argumentative essays. The intervention lasted for 9 weeks, focusing on developing the participants’ SRL skills in writing through the use of various strategies that were devised in Phase 1 and refined throughout Phase 2. I analyzed the participants’ difficulties and uses of strategies, self-ratings on their essays, and several measures of essay quality to examine changes in their SRL skills, self-efficacy, and writing skills.

The participants initially encountered various types of difficulties in their English writing and primarily relied on self-strategies to cope with their difficulties. Over the course of the intervention, the participants’ attention to their difficulties and uses of linguistic resources
became progressively more focused and specific. Initially, the participants frequently depended on their L1 to write their L2 essays, being chiefly occupied with the grammatical encoding of their communicative intentions. Subsequently, the participants displayed unique patterns in developing their SRL skills, which exerted a positive influence on building their self-efficacy beliefs as writers and on improving the quality of their essays.

Based on these findings, I emphasize the growing need for L2 writing teachers to incorporate language-focused, vocabulary-centered, and corpora-based instruction into their teaching practices. In turn, students require individual support and untimed writing tasks to develop SRL skills in writing.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

In this chapter, I describe my personal motivation for conducting the present study, state the research problem and context that this study attempted to investigate, and present the rationale of the study, its research questions, definition of key terms, and a brief outline of the thesis.

1.1 Motivation for the Study

The thesis study focused on using lexical knowledge to address English as a second language (ESL) learners’ difficulties during the formulation process of writing (i.e., putting thoughts into words). There were several personal reasons for my being interested in the formulation process of writing and believing that vocabulary is a key to solving various problems that second language (L2) learners encounter in this process. As described below, my personal experience as an ESL teacher, learner, and researcher provided the impetus for the present study.

First, my experience in teaching and observing L2 learners write has convinced me that learners, especially in English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts, mainly attend to the lexical-grammatical aspects of language during writing. Learners I have taught have seemed to be mostly concerned about lexical and grammatical errors in their writing rather than about how effectively they have communicated their intentions. Moreover, they prefer to get comments on such errors when receiving feedback on their writing.

Second, my experience in learning to write as a non-native speaker of English has also confirmed that a lot of my attention is devoted to language use when writing. Especially for academic writing purposes, I have discovered that my writing, in many ways, is a conscious process, in which I spend considerable time thinking about the appropriate words and their usage
to communicate my intentions most effectively in addition to attending to issues of organization, content, coherence, audience, and so forth.

Third, a research project that I had recently been involved in affirmed my strong conviction that vocabulary knowledge is essential for developing writing skills. From the fall of 2008 to spring of 2009, I had the opportunity to tutor several high-school students who were at risk for their literacy skills. This intervention was part of a three-year international collaborative research project, titled *Adolescent Literacy in Three Urban Regions (ALTUR)* (Cumming, 2012), the purpose of which was to answer the question “what factors, challenges, and contexts contribute to and constrain literacy achievement among at-risk adolescent learners with culturally diverse backgrounds?” (Cumming & Geva, 2012, p.1). I was one of eight graduate students who provided several months of tutoring to 21 adolescent students – in one of the poorest neighbourhoods of Toronto – who were struggling with literacy skills (Rowen, 2012). Strikingly, most of the students stated that their lack of sufficient vocabulary knowledge was the greatest cause of difficulty for their reading and writing practices (Jun & Watanabe, 2012; Kohls & Al-Alawi, 2012; Lin, Ramirez, Wilson, & Geva, 2012).

### 1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

Amidst the controversies surrounding product- vs. process-oriented writing in L2 writing instruction, the lexico-grammatical aspects of language have received relatively less attention compared to the emphasis given to engaging students in the iterative processes of planning, drafting, and revising their texts. Researchers, however, have begun to notice the importance of vocabulary and its integral connection to language structure in producing L2 written texts. Consequently, a growing body of research is now beginning to show the significant role of vocabulary in every aspect of L2 writing. I will use the term “lexical problems” throughout the
thesis as an umbrella term to refer to any problems that are associated with vocabulary, including but not limited to word choice, collocations, phrase/sentence structures and constructions, morphological forms, and spelling of words.

Gass and Selinker (2008) noted that vocabulary may be the most central language component L2 learners need to develop: Learners normally make many more lexical than grammatical errors in writing, and it is the former that has the potential to interfere severely with communication. Learners also seem to be concerned with their use of vocabulary in writing, as they have been found to overwhelmingly notice lexical problems while writing and making revisions (Cumming, 1990; Hanaoka, 2007). Moreover, poor L2 writers have been found to be chiefly preoccupied with vocabulary and grammar problems compared to good writers who focus on more global, text-level issues (Victori, 1999). Faced with lexical problems, learners have also expressed their need to focus on vocabulary in their writing courses (Leki & Carson, 1994).

Schoonen et al. (2003) investigated the importance of linguistic knowledge (i.e., vocabulary, grammar, and orthography knowledge), metacognitive knowledge (i.e., knowledge of texts and of reading and writing strategies), and fluency in accessing the linguistic knowledge (i.e., lexical retrieval and sentence building) in first language (L1) and L2 writing. They found that for both L1 and L2 writing, linguistic knowledge was the strongest predictor of writing performance. With respect to metacognitive knowledge and fluency, metacognitive knowledge correlated more with writing performance than did fluency for L1 writing, whereas the reverse relationship was true for L2 writing. Their study shows not only that having knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, and orthography is vital for writing, but also that in an L2 writing context
– in which learners do not have automatic access to L2 linguistic knowledge – fluency in accessing this knowledge becomes an essential factor for writing performance.

In their research synthesis study that examined the topic of lexical retrieving in writing, Manchön, Murphy, and Roca (2007) noted that L2 learners may have problems accessing and retrieving lexical information throughout their writing processes. In particular, learners’ text planning abilities at the initial stage of composing a text can be influenced by their lexical retrieving processes. In the writing stage, the formulation process can become fragmented due to learners’ lack of immediate access to lexical information and their unwarranted amount of attention to other surface-level linguistic features. Finally, lexical retrieval is paramount in the revision stages of composing, when learners have been found to attend mostly to lexical errors. In consideration of the recursive nature of the writing processes (Flower & Hayes, 1981), learners’ ability to access and retrieve lexical information during the writing processes seems paramount.

Furthermore, a look at any writing scoring rubric shows that vocabulary is one of the most important factors that raters consider when judging the quality of writing. Numerous studies have attested to the validity of vocabulary as a chief component in the construct of writing quality: Error-free lexical variation has been found to correlate significantly with writing quality (Engber, 1995); sentence-level errors, including word choice, were more related to writing quality than were rhetorical features (Sweedler-Brown, 1993); lexical variety and richness in writing were related to learners’ proficiency level (Grant & Ginther, 2000; Laufer & Nation, 1995); and learners with a higher proficiency level possessed more productive vocabulary knowledge than those with less (Laufer & Nation, 1999).
Since vocabulary is directly related to writing quality, the way in which learners use vocabulary will have far-reaching effects on their writing performance. Unfortunately, L2 learners have been found to use simple vocabulary with low lexical variation, over-using high-frequency words, but under-using academic vocabulary in their writing (Breeze, 2008). Hinkel (2003), for example, analyzed academic essays written by students with various language backgrounds and found that the non-natives used simple syntactic and lexical features significantly more than the natives did. As Hinkel noted, the findings are quite surprising, in view of the fact the non-native students in her study were undergraduate and graduate students who were considered to have a high proficiency level of English and had been pursuing their academic studies in U.S. universities, whereas the native students were newly-admitted students enrolled in first-year composition classes.

The types of problems that are visible for learners may also depend on their experience in learning to writing. Hemchua and Schmitt (2006) analyzed the writing of Thai university students with little experience in writing for lexical errors and identified “near synonyms” to be the most frequent errors found in their compositions. They discovered that the students had more difficulty with meanings than the forms of words. In Cumming’s (1989) study, expert writers also proved to be especially careful about choosing words and phrases that best matched their communicative intentions, whereas novice writers had relatively little concern for the qualities of word choice.

Cumming (1990) reanalyzed a subset of Cumming’s (1989) data with respect to the learners’ attention to writing content and language use – the two aspects of writing that the learners mostly attended to during their writing process. He found that these writing behaviors mostly involved the learners searching for appropriate words and phrases and comparing L1-L2
equivalents for words and phrases that the learners were unsure of. One of the interesting findings of this study was that the learners used their L1 not only to search for intended lexical items and then translate them into L2, but also to judge whether their use of L2 words and phrases was appropriate. In some cases, the learners back-translated from L2 to their L1 to make sure that their use of L2 wording matched their intentions.

Extensive research has been done by De Larios and his colleagues on the formulation process of L2 writing, and their studies confirm the influence vocabulary can have on the formulation process. De Larios, Marin, and Murphy (2001), for example, examined the verbal protocols of Spanish EFL learners at different L2 proficiency levels writing in their L1 and L2. Their study showed that while the total amount of time spent on the formulation process did not differ with respect to the language of composition, learners with higher language proficiency spent less time on this process than those with lower proficiency when writing in their L2. Furthermore, only the learners’ L1 writing was characterized by fluent formulation process. The two types of problems they identified were lexical searches, defined as “all those searches for words and expressions needed to express the message clearly and appropriately,” and restructuring, defined as a “search for an alternative syntactic plan once the writer predicts or anticipates that the original plan is not going to be satisfactory for a variety of linguistic, ideational, or textual reasons” (p. 516).

Similarly, De Larios, Murphy, and Manchón (1999) found that learners used reformulation strategies when they lacked the linguistic resources to formulate their communicative intentions and that this phenomenon was more characteristic of learners with lower proficiency. The study by De Larios, Manchón, and Murphy (2006) also showed that learners spent extra time addressing formulation problems when writing in their L2 than in their L1. In terms of L2
proficiency, learners with higher proficiency were engrossed in improving their expressions rather than compensating for their lack of linguistic resources.

1.3 Rationale of the Study

The previous section illustrates three points: (a) Vocabulary plays a prominent role in all aspects of writing; (b) learners face various types of lexical problems in writing; and consequently, (c) this has effects in their writing performance. Since all learners make lexical errors as part of the process of learning to write, they need to develop strategies for overcoming the lexical problems. However, just teaching strategies to learners will not guarantee that they will use them in writing. Strategy use should be integrated into and become part of learners’ writing process. Because writing requires a high level of self-regulatory behavior, it is vital for learners to learn to use strategies in the process of developing self-regulated learning (SRL) skills for writing. Furthermore, not all strategies will work for all learners. Therefore, learners need to gain control over their strategy use – through the process of constant planning, monitoring, and evaluation – to ultimately become independent writers. Developing SRL skills of appropriate strategy use should enable learners to overcome various lexical problems they encounter in writing.

Self-regulation is an important aspect of writing, largely consisting of planning, monitoring, and self-evaluating one’s behavior according to set goals (Zimmerman, 1998, 2000). Although seldom explicitly stated, most models of writing include self-regulatory behavior as part of the writing process. For example, the often-cited Flower and Hayes’s (1981) writing process model includes sub-processes that resemble those of SRL (e.g., planning, goal setting, monitoring, and evaluating). Furthermore, Bereiter and Scardamalia’s (1987) model distinguishes the “knowledge-transforming” process, in which writers engage in highly reflective
and self-regulatory behavior, from the “knowledge-telling” process, in which writers avoid complex processes and are preoccupied with generating unorganized content for writing.

In fact, writing processes involve highly self-regulatory behavior to a large extent: Normally, writers not only plan the content and organization of their compositions, but also set specific goals that will guide them throughout the writing process. While drafting, they engage in monitoring to check whether they are composing according to their plans and goals. At the revision stage, they evaluate their composition and make any necessary changes. Such self-regulatory behavior can be even more important for L2 learners than native speakers, as the former frequently lack the necessary attentional resources to attend to self-regulatory processes (Whalen & Menard, 1995). Cumming (1989), for example, found that novice writers devoted most of their attention to the surface features of language, relying on the “what next” strategy (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987) for content generation and writing down whatever came to their minds without being able to self-monitor their writing processes.

The objective of the present thesis study was to help ESL learners to develop the necessary SRL skills to overcome various lexical problems in English writing. Since learners encounter different types of lexical problems in writing, the first necessary step was to identify the difficulties associated with a specific population of learners and then devise a set of strategies tailored to the needs of these learners. Once these strategies were devised, it was important to help the learners self-regulate the strategies during their processes of writing, empowering them to address their own lexical problems. I designed my study in two phases, following the two steps just described in a systematic way. In the first phase of the study (Phase 1), I attempted to identify lexical problems that were specific to eight young adult Korean ESL learners and then devised a set of strategies based on their needs; in the second phase (Phase 2), I worked with five
of the eight learners, through one-on-one tutoring, to assist them to develop SRL skills to overcome their lexical problems in English writing. The guiding purpose of the thesis is to document and evaluate this process.

1.4 Research Questions (RQs)

I was primarily interested in answering two research questions:

**RQ1: How do Korean ESL learners address lexical problems in English writing?**

**RQ2: How do Korean ESL learners develop SRL skills to overcome lexical problems in the process of writing in English?**

I conducted two separate studies to answer the two research questions: I examined RQ1 in the first study (Phase 1), devised a set of strategies based on the Phase 1 results, and then further investigated RQ2 in the second study (Phase 2).

1.5 Definitions

Self-regulation has been defined in different, but similar ways. For example, Zimmerman (2000) defined it as “self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted to the attainment of personal goals” (p. 14); Pintrich (2000) defined the term as “an active, constructive process whereby learners set goals for their learning and then attempt to monitor, regulate, and control their cognition, motivation, and behavior, guided and constrained by their goals and the contextual features in the environment” (p. 453). For the focused purpose of the present study, I defined SRL skills as “the self-directive ability to use appropriate lexical strategies for addressing lexical problems in writing.”

The term “strategy” also needs to be defined. Cognitive psychologists have viewed strategies as “deliberate actions or sets of procedures that learners select, implement and control
to achieve desired goals and objectives in the completion of learning or performance tasks” (Manchön 2001, p. 48). In the L2 writing literature, strategy has been operationally defined in many different ways. In a broad sense, it has been used to refer to the acts of composing, such as planning, formulation, revision, etc.; in a narrow sense, it has been used to refer to specific actions learners perform during writing, such as problem-solving heuristics that learners use to cope with their difficulties (Manchön, 2001). For the purpose of the present study, I have limited my definition of strategy use to “the use of linguistic information from various linguistic tools to address lexical problems in writing.”

1.6 Organization of the Thesis

The present study views vocabulary as central to developing writing skills. Specifically, the research aimed to help the participants to overcome various lexical problems in their English writing by assisting them to develop SRL skills of appropriate lexical strategy use. Vocabulary has been measured as a construct of oral language proficiency in the L2 reading literature; hence, studies that examine the relationship between vocabulary and reading abound in the literature (August & Shanahan, 2006). In contrast, research on productive vocabulary knowledge and its relationship to writing has been under-investigated.

To inform the study, I did a comprehensive review of the literature on vocabulary and writing. In Chapter 2, I first review studies showing empirical evidence for the significance of vocabulary in developing writing skills. The studies show how an instructional focus on vocabulary can be beneficial for writing at all stages of composing. However, these studies do not clearly define the theoretical basis for why such a focus on vocabulary in writing instruction is necessary. Therefore, I continue the review by providing theoretical evidence to justify a vocabulary-focused approach to writing instruction.
The study also adopts SRL as its conceptual framework about learning. In Chapter 3, I present the theoretical framework of SRL, centering on describing the phases and levels of SRL, two factors that influence the development of SRL skills, the application of the SRL framework to L2 learning contexts, the measurement of SRL skills, and the advantages of using one-on-one tutoring to foster SRL skills.

In Chapter 4, I describe the design of the study, the participants, the instruments, and the data collection and analysis procedures in detail. Chapters 5 and 6 present the overall results for Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the study, respectively. To illustrate the influence that the intervention in Phase 2 had on the participants’ development of SRL skills, two case studies are presented in Chapter 7. Finally, Chapter 8 presents a summary of the findings, discussion of the findings with respect to theory, pedagogical implications that can be drawn from the study, several limitations of study with suggestions for further research, and the conclusion of the study.
Chapter 2. Significance of Vocabulary for L2 Writing

In this chapter, I argue for the central role of vocabulary in generating texts and for the integration of vocabulary into L2 writing instruction. First, I examine empirical research on the relationship between vocabulary and writing. Next, I examine Jiang’s (2000) lexical development and Levelt’s (1989, 1993) language production models and the manners in which cohesion and coherence in a text are established through the use of vocabulary. The two models and the concepts of cohesion and coherence provide support for the centrality of vocabulary in producing sentences, in connecting sentences, and in creating meaningful texts, respectively. The chapter ends with a brief review of research on the uses of L1 in L2 writing.

2.1 Empirical Evidence

There is a growing body of empirical evidence suggesting not only that writing can enhance vocabulary learning, but also that vocabulary instruction can be beneficial for writing. I would like to examine this bidirectional relationship between vocabulary and writing, arguing for the significant role vocabulary plays in developing writing skills. First, I review literature on using writing to enhance vocabulary learning. Second, I examine studies that show how systematic vocabulary learning can lead to improvements in writing. Third, I look into the learning of formulaic expressions, such as patterns and collocations, and its application to L2 writing. Finally, I review research on the use of corpora in L2 writing instruction.

2.1.1 Using Writing to Enhance Vocabulary Learning

According to the Involvement Load Hypothesis (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001), vocabulary learning is reliant on a person’s depth of processing, which consists of two cognitive components
of “search” and “evaluation” and one motivational component of “need.” The more learners perceive the knowledge of the target words as indispensable for task completion (i.e., need), look up their meanings (i.e., search), and make comparisons between the given meanings of the words (i.e., evaluation), the involvement load increases and thus leads to better target word acquisition. This hypothesis predicts that engaging learners in a writing task with target words will result in high word retention due to the high involvement load this task requires. On the contrary, a reading comprehension task with the target words glossed for learners will result in low retention for the opposite reason. Numerous studies have attested to the positive effects of writing on vocabulary learning (e.g., Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001; Keating, 2008; Webb, 2005).

Hulstijn and Laufer (2001), for example, examined advanced EFL university students’ vocabulary retention of 10 target words through three tasks that differed in terms of their involvement load. As predicted, their results showed higher retention rates for tasks with higher involvement load: The task of writing a composition using the target words was most effective, followed by a reading comprehension plus target word fill-in task, and finally a reading comprehension with marginal glosses task. A more recent study by Keating (2008) examined vocabulary learning – using tasks similar to those of the Hulstijn and Laufer (2001) study – and found comparable results showing that retention for both productive and receptive vocabulary knowledge was highest for the task with the highest involvement load: the sentence writing task. Furthermore, Webb (2005) showed that learning words through writing a sentence was more effective than through reading glossed sentences for gaining various aspects of vocabulary knowledge when the time required for task completion was controlled.

Using writing for learning vocabulary has more pedagogical significance than just increasing learners’ involvement load. Referring to the transfer-appropriate processing
hypothesis (Blaxton, 1989; Morris, Bransford, & Franks, 1977), Lightbown (2007) argued that learners can better remember what they have learned when the cognitive processes and other conditions during learning are similar to those during retrieval. In other words, learners will be able to use language communicatively only when language is learned in a communicative context. Bringing this argument to the current topic, we can assume that learning to use vocabulary productively, as in the sentence writing task, will improve learners’ ability to retrieve this information when they are engaged in writing in the future. On the other hand, learning vocabulary through reading may only help learners to use this knowledge in similar receptive tasks.

For this reason, writing instructors should give priority to increasing learners’ productive vocabulary knowledge over receptive knowledge. They should also be aware that receptive vocabulary knowledge usually precedes productive knowledge and that the size of the former is larger than that of the latter for most learners (Fan, 2000; Laufer, 1998; Laufer & Paribakht, 1998; Webb, 2008). The full integration of L2 lemmas into lexical entries requires multiple exposures to the lexical entries in meaningful contexts (Jiang, 2000). Therefore, it is vital that learners are frequently exposed to and learn to use words in various meaningful contexts.

2.1.2 Vocabulary and Writing

Studies show that a focus on vocabulary throughout the writing process can help learners to use words productively in their writing. Muncie (2002), for example, proposed that teachers should incorporate prewriting activities that encourage vocabulary use (e.g., brainstorming for words) into their writing instruction, since these activities can provide L2 learners with a list of relevant vocabulary items that they can use in their writing. Webb (2009) also showed that
learners who received vocabulary instruction were able to use the target words more effectively in their writing, especially when they had learned them through a productive task.

Lee and Muncie (2006) examined the use of vocabulary in a post-reading L2 writing task by secondary school students from various L1 backgrounds. With repeated explanation, discussion, and elicitation of the target words through a mixture of activities based on the same topic, the teacher aimed to maximize the students’ exposure to the target words. The students were also required to write an essay on the topic utilizing a writing frame provided by the teacher. This writing frame aided the students in using the target words in their writing. The results showed that students’ productive use of high-level target words (i.e., less frequent words) and their lexical frequency profile (LFP) (Laufer & Nation, 1995) – which compares the words in a composition to the first one thousand, the next one thousand most frequent words of English, and the university word list – improved in the post-reading writing task.

In an earlier study with a similar population to that of the Lee and Muncie (2006) study, Lee (2003) found that systematic instruction on words (e.g., through elicitation, negotiation, elaboration, repetition, contextualization, etc.) after a reading activity enabled students to increase the use of the target vocabulary in their L2 writing in comparison to what they were able to do before the instruction. Furthermore, the quality of writing was judged to be higher in the post-instruction writing task.

The above studies imply that learners need multiple exposures to words in different contexts as well as repeated practice with the words to develop the ability to fluently retrieve the words from their mental lexicon and use them productively, such as in a writing task. Simply put, the frequency of lexical retrieval, in addition to the depth of processing, may be one of the determining factors in learning new L2 words (Folse, 2006).
Researchers have also emphasized that fluency in accessing and retrieving lexical information is crucial for fluent communication and therefore may influence writing performance. Snellings, van Gelderen, and de Glopper (2002) investigated whether they could train students to develop fluency in lexical retrieval through a computerized program in a classroom setting. The program was designed to train its users with four different types of exercises for the target L2 words, shifting from developing fluency in receptive to productive skills. The students from four classrooms were trained on two different sets of words. The training proved to be quite effective: Students were more accurate and fluent in lexical retrieval with the trained words than those who were not trained with the words.

In a later study, Snellings, van Gelderen, and de Glopper (2004) tested whether fluency in lexical retrieval would lead to improvements in the quality of narrative L2 writing. Their argument was that increasing fluency in lexical retrieval will decrease cognitive efforts in L2 writing, which in turn will allow learners to use the additional attentional resources to focus on other processes, such as planning and organization. The training was similar to that used in their previous study. They found that the enhanced fluency in retrieving words through the computerized training enabled the students to use the trained words more often in the narrative writing. However, this did not lead to overall improvements in writing quality. The authors speculated that other skills, such as organizing and revising ability, can as well have an influence on L2 writing.

2.1.3 Formulaic Expressions, Collocations, and Writing

Among other things, knowing a word includes having knowledge of the usage of the word, such as its patterns, collocations, and other types of formulaic expressions within a sentence (Nation, 2001). Learning these types of formulaic expressions can be beneficial for writing in
many ways. For example, they occur very frequently in written language. According to Sinclair’s (1991) idiom principle, “a language user has available to him or her a large number of semi-preconstructed phrases that constitute single choices, even though they might appear to be analysable into segments” (p.110). For language learners, prefabricated chunks, such as formulaic expressions, could be memorized and used as whole units in writing, which could free their cognitive resources during the composition process.

In addition, frequent patterns appear in certain genres and registers of writing. Coxhead and Byrd (2007), for example, noted that a type of discourse, such as academic writing, is characterized by certain vocabulary and grammar and that teachers can, therefore, learn to identify the language that their students need to learn. Biber, Conrad, and Cortes (2004) examined the use of lexical bundles – defined as “the most frequent recurring lexical sequences in a register” (p. 376) – in university classroom teaching and textbooks. They found that these two registers incorporated distinct lexical bundles in terms of discourse functions. They also found a strong relationship between the discourse function and the structure type of the lexical bundles. They argued that these lexical bundles are stored as unanalyzed units in the mental lexicon and serve as building blocks for constructing discourse.

Other studies have shown that formulaic expressions are processed more quickly than nonformulaic ones (Conklin & Schmitt, 2008; Jiang & Nekrasova, 2007), further implying that the former are likely to be stored mentally as single lexical units. Moreover, the meaning and structure of these lexical units are believed to be intrinsically associated: Units with similar meaning may have the same structure and vice versa (Hunston & Francis, 2000; Sinclair, 1991). These characteristics of formulaic expressions can allow their use to have favorable influences on learners’ writing processes.
In Bereiter and Scardamalia’s (1987) model of writing, the knowledge-transforming process is shown to be promising only when learners are able to coordinate a certain number of ideas during composition. All learners have limitations in their capacity to process a certain amount of information; thus, the already high processing demands of writing can restrict learners’ ability to engage in the knowledge-transforming process when their unfamiliarity with the language creates even a higher processing demand for language production. Learning formulaic expressions as single lexical units can therefore ease the writing process, freeing up learners’ cognitive resources by treating longer units of words as single lexical units.

Collocations are another aspect of formulaic expressions. However, they are somewhat different from other formulaic expressions in that (a) there is more flexibility in the combination of words in collocations than in formulaic expressions and that (b) languages normally have similar collocations that share a concept, while formulaic expressions tend to be language-specific (Yamashita & Jiang, 2010). Because of these characteristics, learning new collocations may be more susceptible to L1 influence than learning other formulaic expressions.

The studies on collocations generally attest to the benefits of acquiring collocational knowledge for writing. However, attaining this knowledge is problematic for many learners, including advanced L2 learners. Nesselhauf’s (2003) study, for example, examined the use of “verb-noun” collocations in essays produced by advanced German learners of English. The learners in the study experienced difficulties with incongruent collocations (i.e., collocations that are not shared by the two languages) and with those that were flexible in their usage. Moreover, the influence of the learners’ L1 was found to play a substantial role in their production of the collocations. Nesselhauf, therefore, claimed that instruction should focus on these two types of
collocations. Bahns (1993) has also argued that the teaching of collocations should primarily focus on incongruent collocations.

Similarly, Yamashita and Jiang (2010) examined the influence of L1 on learning L2 collocations. The participants were adult native speakers of English, ESL, and EFL learners. Overall, the native speakers of English performed more accurately and faster than the ESL learners, who in turn performed more accurately and faster than the EFL learners. Furthermore, the native speakers did not perform differently (i.e., statistically) for the congruent and incongruent collocations, while the ESL learners were more accurate with the congruent collocations and the EFL learners were more accurate and faster with the congruent collocations. This study showed that learners’ L1 has a considerable influence on learning L2 collocations.

Laufer and Girsai (2008) noted that learners who produce unusual collocations may be doing so by relying too heavily on their L1 collocational knowledge. They also argued that acquiring the productive knowledge of L2 collocations can be challenging for learners, because the lexical components of L2 collocations are not usually predictable from their L1 collocations. In their study, Laufer and Girsai encouraged teachers to provide explicit contrastive instruction on several related L1-L2 collocations. The study showed that teaching the related L1-L2 collocations together can be helpful for learners.

Another study by Fan (2009) compared the uses of collocations by Hong Kong ESL students and native British students using comparable corpora compiled from essays written by these two groups of students on the same writing task. The Hong Kong students’ uses of collocations were restricted and negatively affected by their L1. Furthermore, their collocation uses were impeded by their lack of L2 grammatical and lexical knowledge in that they showed
difficulties (e.g., with regard to word choices and uses of function words) in expressing their communicative intentions.

These studies clearly show that collocations appear to be a constant problem for L2 learners. In order to help learners to overcome difficulties with L2 collocations, Chang, Chang, Chen, and Liou (2008) developed an online collocation aid for Taiwanese learners of English. This system was designed to identify and correct the misuse of verb-noun collocations by suggesting a possibly correct collocation as feedback. The researchers found that the system was quite effective in detecting and providing appropriate collocations. However, this aid was designed specifically for Taiwanese learners of English.

2.1.4 The Use of Corpora and Writing

Various types of corpora have been used in L2 writing research, for example, the Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA), Collins Corpus, Brown Corpus, British National Corpus (BNC), and Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE). Specifically, researchers have sought to help learners address their difficulties in writing by raising their awareness of the lexico-grammatical aspects of language with the help of corpora use. One of the major principles underlying the use of corpora in writing is that grammar and vocabulary are interrelated (Francis, 1993; Halliday, 1994; Sinclair, 1991), which studies in corpus linguistics have provided evidence for.

Incorporating corpora into writing instruction can benefit learners in numerous ways (Block, 2009; Cobb, 1999; Kaur & Hegelheimer, 2005; Lee & Swales, 2006; Liu, 2011; O’Sullivan & Chambers, 2006; Sinclair, 1991; Yeh, Liou, & Li, 2007; H. Yoon & Hirvela, 2004). Corpora can: provide learners with ample authentic data that are not found in traditional grammar and reference books; help them to become autonomous learners through inductive
learning; become aware of various aspects of language and of their role as authors, and build confidence as learners; promote faster acquisition and retention of vocabulary knowledge and transfer of this knowledge to writing tasks; allow the standard for language use to be based on actual evidence of use rather than on native speaker intuition; and make it possible for learning to be contextualized, empowered, and progressive.

At the same time, incorporating corpora into L2 writing instruction can create new challenges for language learning (Bloch, 2009; Gaskell & Cobb, 2004; Granger, Kraif, Ponton, Antoniadis, & Zampa, 2007; Kennedy & Miceli, 2001; Liu, 2011; Sun, 2007; Vannestål & Lidquist, 2007; H. Yoon & Hirvela, 2004): Learners may experience frustration using a corpus, because it can be time consuming and the data a corpus provides do not necessarily indicate which words are appropriate in particular contexts or difficult for learners. Initially, training and guidance are needed to take full advantage of a corpus. Learners may not always be able to interpret the data a corpus produces; not have access to the necessary technology to use a corpus; and have difficulty with the query methods for finding relevant results.

The use of corpora in L2 writing is a recent domain of research that needs to be investigated further. Studies have largely examined the benefits of learning that corpora can offer learners. H. Yoon’s (2008) qualitative study, for example, investigated the use of Collins’ COBUILD Corpus in an advanced academic ESL course. She found that the corpus helped her students to discover common usage patterns of words, become aware of the lexico-grammatical aspect of language, and take more responsibility as writers. The corpus was especially useful for providing textual help in the students’ writing. Although the students’ overall writing process did not undergo a dramatic change, they were able to pay more attention to word usage and collocations and to form a habit of checking their written texts as they wrote.
Furthermore, in Todd (2001), Thai university students made small concordances of problematic lexical items and were able to induce patterns from the concordance to make self-corrections in their writing. Similarly, using a corpus was instrumental for correcting grammatical and lexical errors in writing for the undergraduate students learning French in O’Sullivan and Chambers’ (2006) study. Bloch (2009) used a concordancing program to assist learners in choosing appropriate reporting verbs in their academic writing. He noted that utilizing a specialized corpus – developed for a specific genre of writing – was beneficial for the learners. Moreover, Gaskell and Cobb (2004) demonstrated how online concordancing can be used to provide feedback to students’ writing. Their study showed that learners were eager and found it enjoyable to use a corpus as a writing tool. In Kaur and Hegelheimer’s (2005) study, learners were able to successfully acquire academic words and transfer this knowledge of vocabulary to an actual writing task with the help of an online concordance program and an online dictionary.

The use of corpora has also been found to be facilitative for developing professional writing skills. In Lee and Swales’ (2006) study, doctoral students with high motivation to improve their writing skills compiled corpora of their own writing and of expert writers, finding this to be informative and empowering. By comparing their writing with those of experts through the compilation of two different types of written corpora, they were able to discover aspects of language that they could not have learned from other resources. Furthermore, Hsieh and Liou’s (2008) study helped EFL graduate students in applied linguistics to learn to write research article abstracts through the use of corpus-based online instructional materials. Such instruction made it possible for the students to become more cognizant of the structure and language use in research article abstracts.
Similarly, corpus-based dictionary studies (e.g., Harvey & Yuill, 1997; McAlpine & Myles, 2003) have shown that learners can profit from the rich, authentic example sentences that corpus-based dictionaries make available, including information on qualitative definitions and usage of words, grammatical patterns, and collocations. Harvey and Yuill (1997) found that their learners consulted dictionaries mostly to check spelling or meaning of words, but that they were able to learn collocations unintentionally. Moreover, McAlpine and Myles (2003) proposed that learners can take advantage of online dictionaries with examples of collocation use to develop their writing skills. These studies demonstrate that corpus-based dictionaries can assist learners in solving various types of lexical problems in writing. However, Chon (2009) warned that dictionary use can create further problems for learners when they do not possess enough vocabulary knowledge of the language.

2.2 Theoretical Evidence

The above empirical studies show the need for a focus on vocabulary in writing instruction. In addition to the empirical evidence, a vocabulary-focused writing instruction should be informed by theory. For example, the language used in the writing of many L2 learners often resembles that of their L1. Without a clear conceptual understanding of this phenomenon, writing instruction may focus on the consequences of the problem itself, without taking into account the cause of the problem. A possible initial step into understanding this phenomenon may be to examine how words are learned and used for written production by L2 learners. For this purpose, I examine Jiang’s (2000) L2 lexical development and Levelt’s (1989, 1993) language production models in detail. Then, I describe the essential role vocabulary plays in creating cohesion and coherence in texts.
2.2.1 L2 Lexical Development

Two components, the lemma and the lexeme, make up a lexical entry (Levelt, 1989). The former contains the semantic and syntactic specifications of a word; the latter the morphological and formal (i.e., phonological or orthographical) specifications. For native speakers, these specifications are highly integrated into a lexical entry as long as words are not very low frequency or discipline-specific. By analyzing the introspective data of their learners’ inferencing strategies of unknown words, De Bot, Paribakht, and Wesche (1997) found that L2 learners may also have a similar organization structure of these components in their mental lexicon. According to Jiang (2000), however, L2 learners (especially those in an EFL environment) normally lack sufficient contextualized language input in their learning environment, which prevents them from extracting, creating, and integrating the specifications into a lexical entry. Furthermore, because learners already have an established semantic system in their L1 and are likely to rely on this system when learning a new word, the integration process is expected to be hindered.

Jiang proposed three developmental stages for the integration process of the linguistic specifications (i.e., semantic, syntactic, morphological, and formal) into lexical entries for L2 learners. Initially, L2 learners center on the formal specifications when learning a new word, its meaning being available through L1 translation or definition. This stage is called the “formal stage.” At this stage, the new lexical entry contains only the formal specifications, with a pointer that links the L2 word with its L1 translation. Learners can access the meaning and grammatical information about the word through the L2-L1 link (i.e., lexical association) or through explicit rules about the word. Such information, which is stored outside the lexical entry, cannot be automatically retrieved during language production. As a result, language production at the
formal stage becomes an arduous process, relying on the conscious association made between the L2 and L1 words.

With repeated use, the lexical association between the L2 word and its L1 translation becomes stronger, which enables the learners to simultaneously retrieve the formal and the semantic/syntactic specifications of the word from the L2 and L1 lexical entries, respectively. This stage is called the “L1 lemma mediation stage” – implying that the use of the L2 word is mediated by the L1 lemma. At this stage, the semantic and syntactic specifications of the L1 lemma are copied to the L2 lemma. Therefore, the lexical entry contains the formal specifications of the L2 word but the semantic and syntactic specifications of the L1 word. Furthermore, no morphological specifications are contained at this stage. Because of the direct connection between the L1 lemma and the L2 formal specifications within a lexical entry, language production at the L1 lemma mediation stage can be automatic to a certain degree. However, word choice and surface structure errors are expected as a result of the L1 lemma mediation for L2 language production. In addition, the lack of morphological specifications in the L2 lexical entry will require learners to use their explicit knowledge of morphology to choose appropriate word forms in producing language.

Finally, learners are able to extract and create the semantic, syntactic, and morphological specifications of the L2 word and integrate them into the L2 lexical entry when they are exposed to highly contextualized language input. This final stage is called the “L2 integration stage.” At this stage, all the linguistic specifications are part of the lexical entry and therefore can be retrieved automatically during communication. In other words, learners are able to use the L2 word in a similar manner to their L1 words.
Unfortunately, lexical development stops at the L1 lemma mediation stage for most learners even when sufficient contextualized language input is available to them. This is called “lexical fossilization.” Jiang (2000) argues that (a) the language processor will be less motivated to extract the semantic and syntactic specifications from the input at this stage, since they can be provided through L1 lemma mediation with a certain degree of automaticity and that (b) once the L1 lemma specifications have been copied to the L2 lemma, this will prevent the L2 specifications from being integrated into the L2 lexical entry. Helms-Park’s (2001) study, for example, found that the semantic, as well as syntactic, information of a new L2 word can be transferred from its related L1 word when it is being learned. However, L2 can also be a source of knowledge for learning new words. Through multiple exposures within meaningful contexts, learners may be able to make the transition from the L1 lemma mediation stage to the L2 integration stage.

2.2.2 Language Production

According to Levelt (1989, 1993), speech involves the four processes of (a) conceptual preparation, (b) grammatical encoding, (c) phonological encoding, and (d) articulation. Conceptual preparation takes place in what is called the Conceptualizer; grammatical and phonological encoding in the Formulator; and articulation in the Articulator. In this model, speech production (i.e., language production) is lexically-driven, in which lemmas and lexemes play central roles in the grammatical and phonological encoding processes, respectively. For the purpose of the present study, I will briefly examine only the first two processes, which are responsible for the generation of a message and its surface structure. In writing, orthographical encoding and the act of writing may correspond to the processes of phonological encoding and articulation in speech, although the processes involved may not be the same. De Bot et al. (1997)
proposed that Levelt’s language production model can be adapted to represent both spoken and written language modalities in L2 and L1 processing.

Speech begins with the conception of a communicative intention by the speaker. To make his or her intention comprehensible to the hearer, the speaker will choose speech acts and relevant information to express that intention and decide on their sequence of expression. This component of the conceptual preparation is called macro-planning. The assigning of a propositional shape, perspective, accessibility status, and language-specific details (e.g., tense and number) to the information constitutes the micro-planning of the conceptual preparation. What results from the macro- and micro-planning in the Conceptualizer is a pre-verbal message.

The Formulator receives the pre-verbal message and generates a surface structure for the message. In this process, lemmas are first retrieved from the speaker’s mental lexicon when the conceptual conditions of the pre-verbal message match the semantic specifications of the lemmas. Furthermore, the selection of lemmas conditions how the grammatical encoding will further progress. Lemmas also contain syntactic specifications of their lexical entries, which define the syntactic environment in which lemmas can be used. The generation of a surface structure for the message takes place in a manner that the syntactic environments for all the lemmas are fulfilled. Consequently, the output from the grammatical encoding process is a syntactic representation of the conceptual message. In this way, the generation of surface structure is lexically-driven, in which lemmas play a central role.

Levelt views lexical items as central for language production. This view is reflected in his lexical hypothesis (Levelt, 1989, p. 181):

The lexical hypothesis entails, in particular, that nothing in the speaker's message will by itself trigger a particular syntactic form...There must always be mediating lexical items, triggered by the message, which by their grammatical properties and
their order of activation cause the Grammatical Encoder to generate a particular syntactic structure.

Contrary to the past when linguists had prioritized the rules of syntax for language production (e.g., generative theory), a growing number of linguists now have come to realize that this process is lexically driven. Schönefeld (2001), for example, examined various linguistic models of sentence formation with experimental data, concluding that syntactic construction is a lexically-driven process. These linguists claim that lexical entries contain syntactic information, among others, that constrains the possible grammatical encoding of the speaker’s message.

According to Levelt’s model, it is not surprising that L2 learners make frequent lexical and grammatical errors before they make the transition to the integration stage of L2 lexical development. The reliance on the L1 lemma for L2 words will naturally lead to the formation of L1-based surface structures for producing language. Therefore, this transition has significant results for analyses of L2 language production.

2.2.3 Cohesion and Coherence

In addition to forming sentences, writing involves composing large units of text. Halliday and Hasan (1976) saw text as a semantic unit and believed that cohesion in a text could be established through various cohesive ties within the text. Among the five major types of cohesive ties that Halliday and Hasan defined (i.e., reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion), lexical cohesion – which refers to repetition or collocation of the same or related lexical items – is seen to play a predominant role in connecting sentences in discourse. Witte and Faigley (1981), for example, found that the quality of L1 essays they examined was related to the use of lexical cohesion ties in the essays. The manner in which vocabulary is used in a text can therefore affect the cohesiveness of the text.
A cohesive text, however, can be coherent to the reader only when he or she has access to the background knowledge underlying the text (Carrell, 1982). In other words, the reader’s interaction with a text will play a decisive role in establishing coherence of the text. Moreover, a text will be cohesive only if it is coherent to the reader. Witte and Faigley (1981) also emphasized coherence in a text, arguing that “writing quality is in part defined as the ‘fit’ of a particular text to its context, which includes such factors as the writer’s purpose, the discourse medium, and the audience's knowledge of an interest in the subject” (p. 199). From their viewpoint, coherence allows a text to be understood within a real world context. What this implies is that the way readers construct the meaning of a text will largely depend on their own understanding of the author’s intentions, of the discourse characteristics of the text, and of the world. In particular, the readers’ knowledge of words within a real-world context will determine the quality of a text. Therefore, vocabulary can assume a pivotal role in constructing coherence in a text. This role has significant pedagogical implications for writing instruction, as writers not only need to use cohesive devices to hold a text together, but also achieve coherence of the text by considering the expectations and knowledge of their readers.

In short, learners’ vocabulary knowledge will not only affect how they produce language, but also influence how they construct texts and meaning in a cohesive and coherent way. This provides the theoretical evidence for a focus on vocabulary in writing instruction.

2.3 The Use of L1

According to Jiang’s (2000) and Levelt’s (1989, 1993) models, L2 learners will be inclined to rely on their L1 to produce language in writing, since the L2 lemma specifications of most words – which play a central role in generating the surface structure of sentences – will be available through direct lexical association with or mediation of the lemmas of their
corresponding L1 words. In fact, one strategy that learners have been found to rely on for overcoming various lexical problems in L2 writing is the use of their L1 (Manchön, Murphy, & Roca, 2007). As Cumming’s (1989, 1990) studies have shown, learners tend to use their L1 to generate content and to make judgments about the appropriate uses of their L2 words or phrases based on their L1 standards. Research has also documented learners switching to their L1 during the writing process for various other reasons that involve accessing linguistic information stored in lemmas.

Qi (1998), for example, examined several factors that influence language-switching behavior, relying on think-aloud protocols from a graduate student whose L1 was Chinese. The student was asked to engage in think-alouds as she wrote three sets of writing tasks – each set consisting of tasks with low and high knowledge demands. The study showed that the student switched her language to L1 in order to quickly encode her ideas into L1 before continuing her flow of thought, to develop her thoughts more fluently, to verify the meaning of her L2 word choice against her L1, and to minimize her cognitive processing load. Furthermore, the student switched to whichever language she felt comfortable with to express her communicative intentions effectively.

Wang and Wen (2002) investigated the use of L1 in L2 writing with respect to L2 proficiency level and two types of writing tasks (i.e., narrative and argumentative writing). They discovered that the use of L1 increased for learners with low L2 proficiency: A great deal of the composition process for these learners appeared to consist of translating directly from their L1 to L2. The advanced learners, on the other hand, were found to use their L1 strategically for different purposes. In addition, more L1 use was found in narrative than in argumentative writing.
Considering that the learners in this study were engaged largely in generating text and ideas, the writing of the low proficiency learners seemed to be characterized mainly by L1 use.

Wang (2003) also examined the language-switching behaviors of eight Chinese ESL learners with different L2 proficiency levels as they wrote an informal personal letter and an argumentative essay. Wang found that the learners with high proficiency level switched to their L1 more often than those with low proficiency level. Both groups of learners switched to their L1 for similar purposes (i.e., idea generation, lexical searching, and meta-comments). However, the L1 use of the former group was qualitatively different from that of the latter group. The type of writing had no influence on the language-switching behaviors.

These studies illustrate that learners strategically switch to their L1 to encode and verify meaning, generate ideas, and search for appropriate lexical items, all of which are executed in the learners’ L1 to ease the process of L2 writing. Learners with low proficiency even translate directly from their L1 to L2. In spite of the many benefits of using L1 in L2 writing, the reliance on L1 can create difficulties for learners when their L1 differs linguistically from the L2. Theoretically, the use of L1 in L2 writing – which corresponds to the formal stage or the L1 lemma mediation stage in Jiang’s (2000) model – would inevitably result in writing that bears a resemblance to the learners’ L1 writing. In addition, studies by Nesselhauf (2003), Laufer and Girsai (2008), and Fan (2009) indicate that the learners’ L1 can be the main source of difficulties when learning collocations. For example, Hindi learners of English may experience difficulty with the English collocations ‘make a mistake’ and ‘do your hair’ since the appropriate phrasings for these expressions in their language are ‘do a mistake’ and ‘make your hair’.
2.4 Summary

The significance of vocabulary in writing is supported by empirical evidence for the bidirectional relationship between vocabulary and writing and by theoretical evidence for the lexically-driven nature of language production. This relationship calls for the integration of vocabulary learning into writing instruction. Muncie (2002) suggested that writing can help learners to convert their receptive vocabulary knowledge to productive knowledge by allowing them to experiment with the productive use of new words. Moreover, writing provides learners with opportunity for pushed output. Swain (1995, p.128) argued that “output may stimulate learners to move from the semantic, open-ended, non-deterministic, strategic processing prevalent in comprehension to the complete grammatical processing needed for accurate production.” Since writing does not permit learners to rely on non-linguistic clues (e.g., gesture, back-channeling, contextual clues, etc.) for communication, learners must depend exclusively on language to convey their meaning to readers. This process forces learners to attend to the formal aspects of language more intensively than they would usually do in oral communication.

It is imperative for writing instructors to make sure that learners acquire sufficient vocabulary knowledge before writing. Lee (2003) and Lee and Muncie (2006), for example, showed that multiple exposures to and elicitations of target words through teacher and peer interactions (e.g., negotiation, discussion, and elaboration) with guided writing can improve learners’ productive use of the target words and their lexical frequency profile of low frequency words in their writing. More importantly, considering the vital role vocabulary assumes in establishing coherence in a text, examining vocabulary at this stage of writing will enable learners to activate their background knowledge and generate content for their writing.
Words can also be learned through writing, as have been demonstrated by studies supporting the Involvement Load Hypothesis. In addition to increasing learners’ depth of processing of words, however, it is also important to design learning tasks that require learners to retrieve words repeatedly (Folse, 2006). According to Schmitt (2000), lexical knowledge has been found to be more prone to attrition than other linguistic aspects of language. It is, therefore, essential to engage learners in repeated retrieval activities after they have learned new words. Fluent lexical retrieval is crucial for fluent language production and can be transferred to writing skills as well (Snellings, van Gelderen, & de Glopper 2002, 2004).

Since learners encounter various lexical problems in L2 writing and this can have far-reaching consequences for their writing performance, writing instruction with a focus on vocabulary seems inevitable. Moreover, reliance on learners’ L1 may not be the fundamental solution to their problems, since this reliance can prohibit them from advancing to the final integration stage of L2 lexical development. In the past, vocabulary has been rather neglected and treated as just one component of writing. However, the literature review in this chapter clearly shows that vocabulary may be more intrinsically related to writing than has been assumed. If so, a focus on vocabulary may not only be necessary in writing instruction; it may provide the key to developing learners’ writing skills.
Chapter 3. Theoretical Framework of SRL

In this chapter, I present the framework of Self-Regulated Learning (SRL), which provided the theoretical foundations for implementing the one-on-one tutoring sessions in Phase 2 of the thesis study.

3.1 Self-Regulated Learning

3.1.1 Phases of SRL

The concept of self-regulation was derived from the social cognitive theory of Bandura (1986) and later applied to academic domains by Zimmerman, Schunk, and their colleagues (Dinsmore, Alexander, & Loughlin, 2008). Social cognitive theory views SRL as a dynamic, constantly changing process, in which the interaction of personal, behavioral, and environmental factors affect one another reciprocally (Bandura, 1986). Therefore, self-regulation is an overarching concept for covert, behavioral, and environmental self-regulation processes, all of which are viewed as “open-ended” processes (Zimmerman, 2000) that learners come to acquire as they “proactively increase performance discrepancies” by setting challenging but achievable goals and “reactively decrease performance discrepancies” by expending their efforts to actually accomplish these goals (Bandura, 1990, 1993; Locke & Latham, 1990; Zimmerman, 2000).

SRL is seen as a cyclic process that takes place in three major phases: (a) forethought, (b) performance or volitional control, and (c) self-reflection (Zimmerman, 1998, 2000). The first forethought phase consists of processes and beliefs that precede learning. In this phase, learners engage in task analysis in the form of goal setting and strategic planning. Also, there are self-motivation beliefs in this phase – such as self-efficacy, outcome expectations, intrinsic interest, and goal orientation – that motivate learners to self-regulate themselves.
The second performance or volitional control phase consists of processes that occur during learning. In this phase, learners focus on the task through self-control processes – such as self-instruction, imagery, attention focusing, and task strategies. Also, they track their own performance and its effects through self-observation processes – such as self-recording and self-experimentation. The third self-reflection phase consists of processes that follow students’ learning. In this phase, learners evaluate their performance through self-judgment processes of self-evaluation and causal attribution. This phase also includes self-reaction processes – such as self-satisfaction and adaptive or defensive inferences. Finally, the third stage of self-reflection feeds back to the forethought phase and affect subsequent learning. In this way, the three phases form the self-regulatory cycle of learning.

3.1.2 Levels of SRL

SRL skills are acquired in a series of four self-regulatory skill levels: (a) observation, (b) emulation, (c) self-control, and (d) self-regulation (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997; Zimmerman, 2000; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 1999, 2002). These levels are not developmental stages that all learners must go through to obtain SRL skills. Rather, it is believed that SRL skills are acquired most easily and effectively in this sequence (Zimmerman, 2000). The first two levels (i.e., observation and emulation) and the last two levels (i.e., self-control and self-regulation) are obtained through social and self-directed learning experiences, respectively. Furthermore, the former two levels prepare learners to gain competence at the latter two levels (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2002).

The first level of observation is acquired when learners demonstrate ability to observe and induce strategies and skills from expert models through “vicarious reinforcement.” Modeling provides a clear illustration of how the strategies and skills are to be performed. At this level,
learners are motivated to self-regulate through the vicarious awards of the models. The second level of emulation is acquired when learners are able to imitate the performance of the models through “direct reinforcement.” Rather than duplicate the exact performance of the models, learners are capable of imitating the models’ general patterns or styles of performance. Models also provide learners with social support and feedback, by which learners are motivated to self-regulate.

The third stage of self-control is acquired when learners gradually internalize the self-regulatory skills and strategies through “self-reinforcement.” They are able to independently use these skills and strategies at this level in a limited way and are motivated to self-regulate by self-rewards and self-satisfaction reactions for achieving the standards of the models. The fourth and final level of self-regulation is acquired when learners possess the ability to systematically adapt their self-regulatory skills across varying personal and environmental conditions. At this level, learners can perform the skills and strategies without much monitoring, being able to focus on maximizing the outcome of the performance. Learners are motivated to self-regulate by self-efficacy beliefs and intrinsic interest.

3.1.3 SRL and Sociocultural Theory

In L2 research, self-regulation has been closely associated with the Sociocultural Theory (SCT). From a SCT perspective, the primary source of exercising control over behavior and action in learning is self-directed language (Fox & Riconscente, 2008; McCaslin & Hickey, 2001; Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997). Namely, the mediating tool of language allows other-regulation to become internalized as self-regulation (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006): “It [internalization] is inherently social and interactional, and at its core is the mastery of signals – language” (McCaslin & Hickey, 2001, p. 235). Therefore, learners can amplify their ability to
self-regulate their actions and cognitive processes, such as learning, through the development of self-directed language (Poehner, 2008; Smagorinsky, 1998, 2001).

According to the social cognitive theory of SRL, learners acquire self-regulatory skills most successfully by first observing and emulating others. Similarly, SCT views self-regulation as originating from social interactions. For Vygotsky, human psychological development – including self-regulation – progresses through the internalization of social interactions, for which language provides the primary means (Vygotsky, 1978). Learners’ ability to self-regulate, therefore, can be said to grow out of their language-based social interactions (Fox & Riconscente, 2008).

Despite the apparent similarities in how the two theories view self-regulation, the social cognitive framework of SRL is different from SCT in that it (a) emphasizes the reciprocally interactive and influential roles of personal, behavioral, and environmental processes other than self-directed language, (b) claims that observation and emulation leads to constructive rather than passive processes, and (c) views self-regulation as domain- and task-specific (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997).

3.2 Two Factors that Influence SRL

3.2.1 Goals

At the very initial stages of a learning activity, learners have personal goals and self-efficacy beliefs for their learning, and these two factors (among others) influence the learners’ SRL process (Schunk, 2006; Schunk & Ertmer, 2000; Zimmerman, 2000). First, students who are alert to their goals are in a superior position to self-regulate their motivation and effort (Boekaerts & Cascallar, 2006). Locke and Latham (1990, 2002) view goal setting as a key variable in self-regulation. They define a goal as “the object or aim of an action, for example, to
attain a specific standard of proficiency, usually within a specified time limit” (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 705). Based on their investigations, Locke and Latham found that specific and difficult goals lead to enhanced performance. Goals affect performance – through self-regulation – by (a) directing attention and efforts to activities that are pertinent to the goal, by (b) empowering learners to invest greater effort for higher goals and to sustain their efforts, and by (c) guiding learners to use skills and strategies that are relevant to the task (Locke & Latham, 1990, 2002).

Goal orientation studies have also consistently shown that “mastery goals” (i.e., increasing mastery of competence, skills, or knowledge in relation to one’s own standards) have positive influences on all stages of SRL (Pintrich, 2000). Learners who adopt mastery goals are likely to be engaged in more SRL than those who do not adopt such goals, as they attempt to monitor, control, and regulate their learning processes (Pintrich & Schunk, 1996). Studies on the influence of performance goals on SRL, however, have shown mixed results. In general, students who adopt “performance-approach goals” (i.e., demonstrating competence by outperforming others) have been found to demonstrate higher adaptive patterns of cognition, motivation, affect, and behavior than those who adopt “performance-avoidance goals” (i.e., trying to avoid looking incompetent) (Pintrich, 2000).

Together, goal setting and goal orientation studies illustrate that setting high, specific, and achievable goals can exert positive influences on SRL. Skillful self-regulators, in fact, have been found to set specific, achievable goals in a hierarchical manner, whereas naïve self-regulators have been found to set unspecific goals that are not achievable (Zimmerman, 1998, 2000). Goals are essential for self-regulation, since they provide the standards against which to self-evaluate one’s progress and also the motivation to extend efforts, focus on relevant task features, and use effective strategies (Locke & Latham, 1990; Schunk, 1990).
3.2.2 Self-Efficacy

Another key factor that influences SRL is self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is the “judgment of one’s ability to organize and execute given types of performances” (Bandura, 1997, p. 21). Self-efficacy beliefs are indispensable especially in academic learning contexts, because they provide students with the impetus for learning and self-regulating their learning process (Schunk, 1984; Zimmerman, 1998). In particular, self-efficacy exerts influence on academic learning – and consequently one’s level of academic achievement – through cognitive, motivational, affective, and selection processes (Bandura, 1990, 1993; Locke & Latham, 1990; Zimmerman, 1998). In school settings, the teachers’ self-efficacy can also contribute to their students’ level of academic achievement (Bandura, 1993).

With regard to cognitive processing, students with high self-efficacy beliefs tend to set higher goals, commit themselves to their goals more fully, use better task strategies to attain their goals, and respond more positively to negative feedback than do students with low self-efficacy beliefs. For example, students who perform unsuccessfully in schools may do so because of their lack of skills, but also because of their low self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1990, 1993). Furthermore, learners’ motivation to deliberately engage and persist in academic tasks can be affected by their self-efficacy beliefs. Self-efficacy can also be responsible for the level of stress, anxiety, and depression learners experience in stressful situations – which can be best reduced through enhancing one’s sense of self-efficacy. Finally, self-efficacy can shape learners’ academic development altogether by influencing the choices of learning activities that learners make.

Because self-efficacy can decisively influence one’s level of academic achievement, helping students to develop positive self-efficacy beliefs about their SRL should be a foremost
concern for teachers. According to Bandura (1986), there are several sources of self-efficacy. First, students can promote their sense of self-efficacy through “enactive mastery experience.” This is the primary source of self-efficacy, providing the most trustworthy evidence of one’s performance. Through success and failure, students become aware of what they are capable and incapable of doing. Self-efficacy can also be attained through “vicarious experiences” provided by modeling. Seeing others perform successfully can enhance one’s own sense of self-efficacy. The third source of self-efficacy is “verbal persuasion.” Students are likely to maintain a high level of self-efficacy beliefs when others express confidence in their capability. Teachers should resort to these sources of self-efficacy whenever possible. Encouraging students to construct positive self-efficacy beliefs about themselves through such appropriate experiences is paramount (Bandura, 1986).

In summary, personal goals and self-efficacy play determining roles in forming learners’ SRL skills. Skillful self-regulators enter learning situations with specific, high goals and a strong sense of self-efficacy (Schunk & Ertmer, 2000). These two factors have been proven to affect self-regulation independently, but also to interact with each other in the process. Zimmerman, Bandura, and Martinez-Pons (1992), for example, discovered that self-efficacy can promote academic achievement both directly and indirectly by raising personal goals. Furthermore, goal-setting researchers have proposed the high-performance cycle (Latham, Locke, & Fassina, 2002; Locke & Latham, 1990). According to this cycle, high goals bring forth high performance; high performance leads to rewards; and rewards result in high self-efficacy beliefs, which produce even higher goals.
3.3 SRL and L2 Learning

The SRL framework can be readily applied to the L2 learning context. L2 learning is associated with complex personal, behavioral, and environmental factors: Learners come from different educational and L1 backgrounds with varying levels of L2 proficiency, cognitive abilities, and so forth. Their behaviors toward and reactions to learning differ, both individually and collectively as groups. The environment in which learning takes place is also diverse. Furthermore, L2 learners will exhibit goals for and self-efficacy beliefs about learning unlike those of L1 speakers. Therefore, empowering L2 learners with necessary SRL skills should enable them to become active agents of learning.

Writing is a goal-oriented activity (Cumming, 2006) and is often considered as the most difficult language skill for L2 learners to learn. Moreover, learners’ self-efficacy beliefs about their writing ability are expected to vary. Consequently, learners’ personal goals and self-efficacy beliefs with respect to writing will have a decisive impact on the amount of self-control they will be able to exercise over their writing process. Zimmerman and Bandura (1994) argued that strengthening learners’ sense of self-efficacy about writing through instruction can raise their personal standards for the quality of writing, as well as their academic goals and attainments. Furthermore, a close examination of the writing process – which consists of planning, drafting, and revising – shows that the act of writing itself heavily involves forethought, performance or volitional control, and self-reflection, the three phases of SRL.

Rather than presenting a developmental model of writing, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) proposed two separate writing process models of “knowledge telling” and “knowledge transforming” for novice and expert writers, respectively. According to the knowledge transforming model, expert writers continuously practice goal-setting, planning, self-reflecting,
and problem-solving processes during composition, whereas novice writers become exceedingly concerned with generating content by telling the knowledge they have about a topic. From this perspective, more expert writers are more competent at self-regulating their writing processes. Bereiter and Scardamalia also argued that rhetorical strategies, which all writers need to possess, can be learned only when such self-regulatory strategies have been first acquired. Fortunately, their studies have shown that novice writers can learn to apply self-regulatory strategies through intervention, such as procedural facilitation and goal concretization.

Not many studies have explicitly addressed SRL skills in writing, let alone in L2 writing. Olson and Land (2007) is an exemplary study in which the researchers worked with secondary school students, most of whom were ESL learners with limited English proficiency, on developing cognitive strategies for reading and writing. Their study covered a comprehensive list of strategies and lasted for eight years. Their goal was to have the students internalize and self-regulate various strategies in their reading and writing. The researchers provided diverse forms of modeling and support (i.e., demonstrating strategies through think-alouds and using color coding to help the students to distinguish different functional uses of text). These students showed significant improvements in their written essays each year, as well as in other academic outcome measures, such as their GPA and scores on standardized tests.

Furthermore, Graham, Harris, and colleagues have conducted research on teaching self-regulatory strategies to struggling writers (e.g., Graham & Harris, 1989; Graham, Harris, & Mason, 2005; Graham, Harris, & Troia, 1998; Harris & Graham, 1999; Harris, Graham, & Mason, 2006). Their studies have shown that helping struggling writers to develop self-regulatory strategies led to improvements in the quality of their writing. However, their studies did not distinguish L2 from L1 learners. Their instruction – which they refer to as “self-
regulatory strategy development” (SRSD) (Harris & Graham, 1992, 1996) – centers on teaching students self-regulatory strategies explicitly and systematically for successfully completing academic writing tasks. The SRSD instructional model engages students in memorizing specific procedures and self-statements to assist them in self-regulating their writing process in general. For example in Graham et al.’s (1998) study, the students memorized the mnemonic “TREE” for planning their essays, in which “TREE” stands for “note Topic sentence, note Reasons, then Examine reasons, note Ending” (p. 28).

Zimmerman, Bonner, and Kovach (1996) provided a model of SRL that aims to have learners develop SRL skills through the use of strategies. According to this model, learners need to continuously plan, implement, and monitor their strategy use to gain SRL skills for a given task, such as writing. The cycle involves the following four processes (p. 11):

1. Self-evaluation and monitoring occur when students judge their personal effectiveness, often from observations and recordings of prior performance and outcomes.
2. Goal setting and strategic planning occur when students analyze the learning task, set specific learning goals, and plan or refine the strategy to attain the goal.
3. Strategy-implementation monitoring occurs when students try to execute a strategy in structured contexts and to monitor their accuracy in implementing it.
4. Strategic-outcome monitoring occurs when students focus their attention on links between learning outcomes and strategic processes to determine effectiveness.

This SRL cycle corresponds neatly to the forethought, performance or volitional control, and self-reflection phases of SRL and takes into account learners’ goal setting and self-efficacy, the two factors that primarily influence SRL: Throughout the cycle, there is a constant monitoring and revision of goal setting through strategy implementation and a continuous monitoring and self-evaluation of self-efficacy in relation to strategy outcome.

This model can be utilized to develop SRL skills in writing through strategy use. Adopting such a learning framework for strategy instruction in language learning is particularly
vital. As Plonsky (2011) pointed out, L2 researchers on strategy instruction have not been able to provide effective means of cultivating learners’ ability to use strategies in language learning despite their agreement on the usefulness of learning L2 strategies. Following the example provided by Zimmerman et al., a teacher can work with students on writing and revising an essay. The students first write a draft while monitoring this process with a guideline and give an estimate score for their draft (Self-Evaluation and Monitoring), which serves as a measure of the students’ initial self-efficacy beliefs. At the next meeting, the teacher and the students compare the students’ estimated score to the actual score they receive from the teacher. The teacher goes over the essays, identifies problems that the students are having, sets goals to work on together, and decides on the strategies to use to overcome the perceived problems (Goal Setting and Strategic Planning). Next, the students revise their draft, employing the strategies and monitoring the process to ensure that the strategies are being implemented correctly (Strategy Implementation and Monitoring). The students also give an estimated score for the revision, which is compared to the actual score they receive at the next meeting (Strategic Outcome Monitoring). They can identify further problems and repeat the whole process as necessary.

3.4 Measuring SRL

In the past, self-regulation was viewed as a stable individual construct, irrespective of the context (Boekaerts & Cascallar, 2006). This conceptualization engendered trait-like measures – from self-report interviews and questionnaires – to describe typical self-regulatory strategies that learners tend to use. Winne and Perry (2000) classified these measures as “aptitude” measures of self-regulation. Due to the imprecision of aptitude measures (Zimmerman, 2008), Winne and Perry proposed an alternative way of assessing self-regulation as an “event.” Examining learners’ self-regulation while they are engaged in an L2 writing task would be an illustration of
assessing self-regulation as an event. One way of measuring self-regulation in this context is to have learners think-aloud while writing.

An advantage of using think-alouds to measure L2 learners’ self-regulatory processes online would be that it allows researchers to code their self-regulation into specific processes (e.g., goal setting, planning, self-monitoring, self-evaluating, etc.), which can be later analyzed (Winne & Perry, 2000). Such online measures of self-regulation can offer detailed information about how writers carry out the specific processes during composition and be uniquely valuable for diagnosing their self-regulatory processes (Zimmerman, 2008). With think-alouds, researchers are able to obtain a solid, objective understanding of the self-regulatory processes that students engage in during writing, because of their potential to capture the complexities involved in the unfolding self-regulatory processes (Azevedo, Moos, Johnson, & Chauncey, 2010; Greene & Azevedo, 2009).

However, limitations and challenges exist in employing think-alouds to measure self-regulation as an event: Think-alouds may be learners’ interpretations of events, failing to take account of cognitive processes that are reflective of the learning context or below the conscious level (Perry & Winne, 2006; Winne, 2010; Winne, Jamieson-Noel, & Muis, 2002). In addition, coding and analyzing think-aloud data properly can be time-consuming and require extensive training (Azevedo et al., 2010). Therefore, these researchers have argued for the need to complement think-aloud measures by keeping unobtrusive traces of learners’ cognitive activities over time with tools designed for this purpose – such as computer programs that save a log of learners’ actions while they are engaged in learning tasks.
3. 5 Tutoring and SRL

The few SRL studies on writing have been conducted in classrooms. However, adapting a SRL model, such as Zimmerman et al.’s (1996), to a one-on-one tutoring context should be promising in many respects. Tutoring has been generally claimed to be one of the most powerful modes of instruction for increasing literacy skills, its effectiveness having been widely documented (e.g., Burns, Senesec, & Symington, 2004; D’Agostino & Murphy, 2004; Ehri, Dreyer, Flugman, & Gross, 2007; Elbaum, Vaughn, Hughes, & Moody, 2000; Harmon, Keehn, & Kenney, 2004; Wasik & Slavin, 1993). Unlike classroom instruction, tutoring targets only one or a small number of learners at a time. Jun, Ramirez, and Cumming’s (2010) meta-analysis of research on tutoring literacy skills to adolescents revealed larger effect sizes for studies that involved smaller number of learners across various instructional settings.

According to Boekaerts and Niemivirta (2000), optimal conditions for SRL exist when learners are given the opportunity to set and pursue their own goals. With regard to the classroom context, they argued that

most goals that students pursue in the context of the classroom are not intentionally constructed on the basis of personal strivings or aspirations to comprehend the dynamics of unfolding learning episodes in the context of the classroom and to understand individual differences in the perception, interpretation, and appraisal of those episodes (p. 423).

In short, students are not always inclined to adopt teacher-set goals in classrooms. However, the personalized instruction that one-on-one tutoring fosters can create a favourable environment for students to set goals according to their own learning needs. Such an atmosphere may be particularly desirable for L2 learners, whose needs can be diverse even within a single classroom. Furthermore, Schunk and Ertmer (2000) claimed that students have little opportunity for SRL in classrooms when teachers decide what they should do, and when, where, and how they should do
it; students can self-regulate only when they can enjoy the autonomy to assume control over their learning (Zimmerman, 1994).

One of the greatest advantages of one-on-one tutoring is that it can offer individual support for the development of self-regulatory competence. Tutors can be excellent learning models for students to emulate, which is indispensable for the initial development of self-regulatory competence (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997). Through observation and emulation of tutors, students can also acquire strategies and skills that they will be able to apply later to their own learning contexts. At the self-control stage, when students’ SRL is still dependent on social support, tutors are there to provide the necessary support.

Furthermore, tutoring is likely to be beneficial for developing SRL skills, because it (a) allows instruction to be easily adapted to the tutees’ needs – giving them sufficient amount of practice with feedback (Ehri et. al, 2007) – and to be “personalized, delivered at the right moment, and repeated as frequently as needed for an individual child to understand, internalize, and recall” (Juel, 1996, p. 288), (b) helps tutees to develop a heightened sense of awareness as learners, evoking greater commitment to literacy activities (Friedland & Truscott 2005), and (c) can increase tutees’ time on task (Wasik & Slavin, 1993).

In these ways, tutoring can provide the optimal context for learners to develop their SRL skills. For goals to be effective, learners need feedback about their progress (Locke & Latham, 2002). Modeling is also necessary to develop one’s self-regulatory competence (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997). Tutoring can fulfill both requirements. Furthermore, Gordon, Morgan, O’Malley, and Ponticell (2007) noted that tutoring can offer continuous feedback to aid students in developing positive self-efficacy beliefs about learning. For tutoring to be successful, however, it should be planned, consistent, structured, and intensive, with ongoing assessment of the tutees
(Wasik, 1998; Wasik & Slavin, 1993). Therefore, incorporating a learning theory – such as the theoretical framework of SRL – into tutoring should be promising in many ways.

3.6 Summary

In this chapter, I first described the social cognitive framework of SRL – its definition, phases, levels, and two mediating factors. I then examined its applicability to L2 learning contexts, some challenges in measuring SRL skills, and the benefits of using one-on-one tutoring for developing SRL skills. Providing instruction for the purpose of improving communicative language skills will undoubtedly be valuable for learners. However, it is also paramount for teachers and researchers to be aware that L2 learning involves learners in a continuous and cyclic process of setting goals, monitoring progress, and self-evaluating their learning outcomes. Bandura (1993) stated that “a major goal of formal education should be to equip students with the intellectual tools, self-beliefs, and self-regulatory capabilities to educate themselves throughout their lifetime” (p. 136). In fact, self-regulation and self-efficacy have been found to be excellent predictors of academic performance (Pintrich & DeGroot, 1990).

Furthermore, skillful self-regulators are shown to set more effective goals, hold stronger self-efficacy beliefs about learning, exhibit higher motivation and interest in learning, and demonstrate greater ability to concentrate their attention on self-monitoring and self-evaluating their learning processes than are naïve self-regulators (Zimmerman, 1998). Therefore, developing self-regulatory competence for learning seems vital for all learners. This undertaking should be promising, since self-regulation can be enhanced through appropriate intervention, even for a short period of time (Perels, Gürtler, & Schmitz, 2005). As the old Chinese proverb goes, “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.”
Chapter 4. Methods

This chapter documents the design, participants, instruments, and data collection and analysis procedures of the research.

4.1 Overview of Study Design

Chapters 2 showed that there exists empirical and theoretical evidence for the significance of vocabulary in writing. In addition, my review of the SRL model in Chapter 3 revealed a close affinity between the writing process and the SRL phases. Taking into account the tendency for ESL learners to encounter various lexical problems at all stages of the writing process, it is essential to equip learners with the required SRL skills to overcome the lexical problems. Employing one-on-one tutoring as an instructional mode can be expected to provide an optimal environment for developing SRL skills.

For the thesis research, I examined these matters closely by attempting first to (a) identify typical lexical problems that young adult Korean ESL learners encounter in English writing, then to (b) devise strategies that can be effective for these learners, and finally to (c) help the learners to develop their SRL skills through the use of these strategies. Phase 1 of the study addressed the first two issues [i.e., (a) and (b)]; Phase 2 addressed the third [i.e., (c)].

There were two research questions (RQs) for the study:

**RQ1. How do Korean ESL learners address lexical problems in English writing?**

Specifically, I examined the following questions:

RQ1a. What are typical lexical problems that Korean ESL learners encounter in English writing?

RQ1b. What strategies do they use to address the problems?
RQ2. How do Korean ESL learners develop SRL skills to overcome lexical problems in the process of writing in English?

Specifically, I examined the following questions:

RQ2a. What changes are observable in the learners’ SRL skills for English writing throughout the intervention period?

RQ2b. How do their self-efficacy beliefs change as learners go through the cyclic model of SRL?

RQ2c. What influence does the change in the learners’ SRL skills have on their English writing performance?

RQ2d. How do the learners feel about the intervention as a way of developing their writing skills in English?

RQ1 was posed with Phase 1 of the study in mind. To answer this RQ, I conducted an exploratory study with eight young adult Korean ESL learners. RQ2 was related to Phase 2 of the study. I conducted an intervention study with five of the eight learners to answer this question. Despite the important role goals play in developing learners’ SRL skills, this study did not investigate changes in the participants’ goals. According to Cumming (2006), learners’ overall goals for L2 writing development do not change rapidly, so I did not expect that such changes would be evident over the period of my research. Instead, I collaborated with the participants and worked on setting specific, achievable goals for them throughout Phase 2 to maximize the development of their SRL skills.

Phase 1 was exploratory in nature, in which I attempted to identify lexical problems that Korean ESL learners encounter in writing by examining the writing of eight young adult Korean ESL learners. Based on the Phase 1 results, I devised an initial set of strategies, for which I had five of the eight learners self-regulate during Phase 2 of the study. In this sense, Phase 1 was a necessary and preparatory stage for Phase 2.
The intervention in Phase 2 was in the form of one-on-one tutoring. I planned a total of nine tutoring sessions for each of the five learners that participated in the intervention and focused on developing their SRL skills for writing through the use of various strategies that were initially devised in Phase 1 and further refined throughout Phase 2. I also conducted an interview with the participants after the intervention period. The study took place over five and a half months, from early February, 2010 to mid June, 2010. Table 4-1 below outlines the two phases of the study.

**Table 4-1. Outline of the study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Post-Intervention Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>collect and analyze data</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(identify learners’ lexical problems and devise strategies)</td>
<td>(develop SRL skills through one-on-on tutoring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-on-one tutoring was chosen to maximize the attainment of SRL skills for the participants. This is possible through the individualized support that one-on-one tutoring can offer. As described in the previous Chapter, tutoring provides a powerful instructional context for developing SRL skills. Furthermore, I expected that the participants would have different needs and that not all the strategies would work the same for the participants. The tutoring context also produces data akin to dynamic assessment, displaying learners’ unique and optimal capacities for development (Poehner, 2008). Therefore, it was essential to work with the participants individually. The eventual goal of developing SRL skills for the participants was to enable them to become independent writers in English.
4.2 Participants

There are numerous young adult Korean ESL learners in the Toronto area, mostly in their 20s or early 30s, who attend various ESL programs. These learners may be looking forward to studying at a university or college in an English-speaking country, such as Canada, or may be learners who come to Canada for several months to a year just to improve their English skills. I posted a recruitment advertisement in several web-based blogs for Korean ESL learners with my contact number and email address, describing the rationale, purpose, and requirements of the study (Appendix A). Initially, nine prospective participants contacted me. I met them individually, reviewed the recruitment letter (Appendix B) and the details of the study, and sought their participation. One of them decided not to participate in the study for personal reasons. In this way, I recruited eight young adult Korean ESL learners from the Korean community in the Toronto area for Phase 1 and continued to work with five of them for Phase 2. In return for the learners’ participation in Phase 1, I provided two tutoring sessions after the Phase 1 data collection to briefly diagnose their writing problems and gave suggestions for improving their writing. For the five learners that continued to participate in Phase 2, the tutoring intervention was provided free of charge as a compensation.

For the study, I focused on Korean ESL learners for three reasons. First, the number of Korean ESL learners studying in English-speaking countries has been increasing in the past years, which itself merits attention to educational practices that suit these learners’ particular needs. For example, the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) reported that in 2005, over half of the international students that came to Canada were Asian (CBIE, 2009). Furthermore, it reported that from 2001 to 2002, almost half of the international students were from Asia with South Korea being the top source country for all levels of study (CBIE, 2002). In
addition, the Consulate General of the Republic of Korea in Toronto reported that 25,587 Korean students were studying in Canada with a study permit in the year of 2003, with the number expected to increase every year (Consulate General of the Republic of Korea, 2003). Still, the latest SEVIS (Student and Exchange Visitor Information System) review, published by the U.S. government in 2009, reported that “South Korea remains the country with the highest number of Active students” (Student and Exchange Visitor Program, 2009). Despite the steadily growing number of Korean learners studying in English-speaking countries, research on this population of learners learning to write in English has been scarcely reported. Studies that focus exclusively on Korean learners of English have been conducted mostly in Korea, the results of which are not readily accessible to global community of researchers.

Second, Korean is linguistically different from English in many ways, a point to be discussed more fully in Chapter 8. In short, Korean – which takes a Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) structure – does not display many of the linguistic properties that are characteristic of English – which has a SVO structure. Moreover, the case system in Korean allows sentences to have flexible word order. Still, arguments that are recoverable from the context are normally omitted in Korean. For example, “있다” (literally “Saw” in English), a perfectly grammatical sentence in Korean, is not grammatical in English. These structural differences between Korean and English can pose difficulties for Korean learners of English in constructing phrases and sentences.

Moreover, Korean learners may also experience difficulty learning English vocabulary due to the differing orthographic systems of the two languages (Seymour, 2005). Korean has simple syllable structure and shallow orthography (i.e., the relationship between the letters and their sounds is straightforward); English on the other had has complex syllable structure and deep orthography (i.e., the relationship between the letters and their sounds is not straightforward).
Therefore, Korean learners may experience difficulty reading and pronouncing English words, which may result in the lack of visual and auditory rehearsal processes necessary for long-term retention of the words (Laufer, 1997). In addition, different phonological/morphological representation and processing that may exist between Korean and English (Cho, 2009; Yi, 2009) could create difficulties in recognizing English words for Korean learners.

Finally, as I am a Korean ESL learner myself, my knowledge of the Korean language and culture should be helpful in understanding some of the problems that are specific to this population of learners. Furthermore, the data collection instruments in the study chiefly involved verbal reports in the form of interviews and stimulated recall protocols. Allowing the participants to use Korean during the research helped to maximize the accuracy and relevance of their reports.

I had originally planned to recruit learners with an intermediate level of English proficiency. This level of English proficiency was chosen for two reasons: Since the participants were required to write, I needed learners who were proficient enough to write in English without too much difficulty; on the other hand, I thought these learners should not be so advanced that they would already have developed SRL skills as independent writers in English. In addition to English proficiency, a certain level of vocabulary knowledge is required for fluent writing to be possible. Therefore, I had planned to recruit students who had sufficient vocabulary knowledge in English to compose fluently, but showed some limitations in writing. However, I was only able to recruit nine participants when the study began and ended up with eight at the end of Phase 1, who possessed varying levels of vocabulary knowledge and writing skills. As a result, it was not possible to restrict the participants to only those that met these requirements.
Table 4-2. Profiles of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>FE Outside Korea?</th>
<th>Ever Lived in an ES Country?</th>
<th>Came to Canada in</th>
<th>Plan to Attend U/C in an ES Country?</th>
<th>Started to Learn E in</th>
<th>Presently Enrolled ESL Classes</th>
<th>How Often Do You Write in English?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>completed university</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jan, 201</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7th G</td>
<td>Business English / Speaking (advanced)</td>
<td>twice a week in Korea to correspond with clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>completed university</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>July, 2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7th G</td>
<td>Not at the present</td>
<td>2-3 times a week with a writing tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>completed university</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>about 52 months total in Canada since 2004</td>
<td>first in September, 2004</td>
<td>Yes (Canada)</td>
<td>6th G</td>
<td>Not at the present</td>
<td>write emails 3-4 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>completed university</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>about 24 months total in Canada since 2006</td>
<td>first in April, 2006</td>
<td>Yes (Canada)</td>
<td>7th G</td>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>one essay a day recently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>in university</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 months in Australia from 2007 to 2008</td>
<td>Jan, 2010</td>
<td>Yes (Canada)</td>
<td>5th G</td>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>use MSN every other day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>in university</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 months in the Philippines in 2009</td>
<td>Sep, 2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7th G</td>
<td>Conversation (pre-advanced)</td>
<td>frequently use MSN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>in university</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>July, 2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7th G</td>
<td>Not at the present</td>
<td>just started to write 3 essays a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>in university</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nov, 2009</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7th G</td>
<td>ESL English (pre-intermediate)</td>
<td>Wrote a diary for a month when first came to Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background information about the eight participants is provided in Table 4-2. The names in the Table are all pseudonyms self-selected by the participants. There were five male and three female participants, with a mean age of 26.8 years. When the study began, half of them had already graduated from university in Korea, while the other half were still in university in Korea and had come to Canada for a short term to take intensive English language classes. None of them had received any formal education outside of Korea. They had also first started to learn English in different grades. Most of them started in the 7th grade in accordance with the national curriculum at that time. Two participants (i.e., Abril and Ria) began to learn English at an earlier age at private language institutes in Korea.

Half of the participants had never lived in an English-speaking country; Ria and Sean had lived in Australia for 12 months and in the Philippines for three months, respectively, before coming to Canada; and Abril and August had been in Canada several times in the past to study English. Other than Abril and August, the rest of the participants had been in Canada for only a few months – ranging from one to seven months – when the study began. Furthermore, half of the participants had no plans to study at a university or college in an English-speaking country; Abril, August, and Ria had plans to study in Canada; and Paul had plans to study in Canada, USA, or England.

All of the participants had taken or were still taking ESL courses in Canada: Alex was enrolled in business English and conversation classes at the advanced level; August and Ria in TOEFL classes; Sean in conversation classes at the pre-advanced level; and Moon in general ESL classes at the pre-intermediate level. Sam, Abril, and Paul were not taking any classes at that time. The participants also differed with respect to how frequently they wrote in English: Alex indicated that he had corresponded with his clients via English documents about twice a
week when he was in Korea; Sam engaged in writing two to three times a week with a writing tutor; Abril frequently wrote emails in English; August and Paul practiced writing TOEFL essays regularly; Ria and Sean used MSN messaging frequently; and Moon had written a diary for a month when he first came to Canada.

Table 4-3 shows the results of the Vocabulary Levels Test (Schmitt, Schmitt, & Clapham, 2001) for the eight participants, which was administered in Phase1. From this test, 30 target words for the 5,000 level words and academic words were tested (refer to Section 4.3.1.3 for detailed description of the test). For the 5,000 level words, the scores ranged from 9 to 29, with a mean and standard deviation of 21 and 7.07, respectively; for the academic words, the scores ranged from eight to 30, with a mean and standard deviation of 23.38 and 7.35, respectively; and the total score ranged from 17 to 59, with a mean and standard deviation of 44.38 and 14.19, respectively. The results indicate that the participants differed vastly in terms of their English vocabulary knowledge. Alex, Sam, and Paul were in the high range; Abril, August, and Sean in the mid range; and Ria and Moon in the low range. The low scores for Moon were, especially, notable. Furthermore, the participants generally possessed more knowledge of the academic words than of the 5,000 level words, with the exception of Abril and Moon.

**Table 4-3. Results of the Vocabulary Levels Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alex</th>
<th>Sam</th>
<th>Abril</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>Ria</th>
<th>Sean</th>
<th>Paul</th>
<th>Moon</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,000 Level</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Maximum score for each word group was 30.*
Among the eight participants in Phase 1, five of them (i.e., Alex, Sam, Abril, August, and Ria) continued to participate in Phase 2 of the study. Paul and Moon had to leave for Korea shortly after Phase 1; Sean started Phase 2, but withdrew from the study after a few weeks when he enrolled in intensive language courses at a private language institute in Toronto.

4.3 Instruments

4.3.1 Phase 1

The instruments in Phase 1 consisted of two writing tasks, stimulated-recall interviews for the two writing tasks, a test of vocabulary knowledge, and a background questionnaire. All the instruments were administered to the participants individually in two separate one-on-one sessions.

4.3.1.1 Two writing tasks

There were two writings tasks for the participants in Phase 1: (a) an argumentative writing task (AWT) and (b) a translation writing task (TWT). For the AWT, I chose the following task from the independent writing test of the TOEFL test (ETS, 2009a):

Many students choose to attend schools or universities outside their home countries. Why do some students study abroad? Use specific reasons and details to explain your answer.

TOEFL writing tasks have been referred to as argumentative, opinion, or persuasive writing tasks. I chose the term argumentative writing to refer to this type of task in the sense that it chiefly requires learners to provide support for their argument within the task. Argumentative writing was chosen as the free writing task in Phase 1 since it was designed as an exploratory and
preparatory study for Phase 2, in which the participants focused on writing argumentative essays (refer to Section 4.3.2.1 for a detailed description of the argumentative writing task).

For the TWT, I asked the participants to translate a paragraph-long Korean passage into English (Appendix C). The Korean passage was a translated version of a paragraph-long English passage, which appeared in the English test section of the 2008 College Scholastic Ability Test – a high-stakes, annually-administered test developed by the Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation, and taken by all high school students who plan to attend a university or a college in Korea. The past test materials are available to the public for download at a website (http://www.kice.re.kr). I chose a passage from this test because of (a) the appropriate length of passages in this test (normally a paragraph long) for the purpose of the study, (b) the participants’ familiarity with this type of passage, which they had studied throughout their high school years, and (c) the difficulty level of the passages, which was deemed to be easy for reading, but suitable for a translation task.

The TWT was included for the following reasons. First, to evaluate precisely the types of lexical problems that the participants encountered in writing, it was necessary to know the exact message they were intending to write. By having the participants translate an existing text, there would be no ambiguity in what they were intending to write. Second, I was mainly interested in examining the participants’ lexical problems, that is, the difficulties they have in accessing the linguistic specifications stored in lemmas for language production. By performing a translation task, I expected these features to become prominent because the participants would not have to worry about generating content for their writing.

The two writing tasks are expected to require different writing skills, resulting in the participants’ using different lexical strategies for the two tasks. Uzawa (1996), for example,
showed that her Japanese learners’ attention to language use (i.e., “attention to single sentences, clauses, phrases, words, spelling, punctuation,” p. 279) was very high in a translation task, but very low when the same students did L1 and L2 essay writing tasks. Moreover, the learners in Uzawa’s (1996) study scored higher in the translation task than in the essay tasks.

The participants were allowed 40 minutes to complete each of the writing tasks. They used a laptop to type their answers and were allowed to use an electronic dictionary that I had provided while completing the writing tasks. With the electronic dictionary, the participants were able to consult an English-English, an English-Korean, and a Korean-English dictionary.

4.3.1.2 Stimulated-recall interviews

For the two writing tasks, I performed stimulated-recall interviews with the participants as they reflected on what they had previously written (Appendix D). The same interview protocol was used for the two writing tasks, and these interviews were administered to the participants immediately after they had completed each of the writing tasks. In the interviews, I first asked the participants a few general questions about whether they had found the tasks easy or difficult and what they had found to be the most difficult about completing the tasks. Next, I went over each composition sentence by sentence with the participants and probed deeper into their difficulties and strategy uses. Finally, I asked them whether they had any additional problems with completing the writing tasks. The interviews took approximately 20 minutes to complete and were audio-recorded. They were conducted in Korean to enable the participants to focus on their reflections without having to worry about using English and therefore to elicit a comprehensive verbal report from the participants.
4.3.1.3 Vocabulary Levels Test

To measure the participants’ knowledge of English vocabulary, I chose two sections from Schmitt, Schmitt, and Clapham’s (2001) Vocabulary Levels Test. With this test, I measured the participants’ vocabulary knowledge on the 5,000 level words and the academic words. The 5,000 level and the academic word sections each included 10 sets of word-definition matching items. For each set, the participants were required to choose the three correct words that went together with the three provided definitions. In total, 30 target words were tested in each section. The participants were able to finish the test in approximately 15 minutes. The results from this test were already documented above in Section 4.2.

4.3.1.4 Background Questionnaire

I also administered a questionnaire to the participants to obtain information about their personal, educational, and English learning backgrounds (Appendix E). There were a total of 11 items in the questionnaire, most of which were open-ended. The questionnaire was administered in Korean, and the participants were able to finish it in approximately 15 minutes. A summary of the participants’ responses to the questionnaire were provided above in Section 4.2.

4.3.2 Phase 2

The instruments used in Phase 2 were untimed argumentative writing tasks, stimulated-recall interviews, self-monitoring forms (SMFs), and a post-intervention interview. All the instruments were administered individually to the participants. I also kept a personal tutoring log during the intervention period.
4.3.2.1 Argumentative essay writing

To observe the participants’ development of SRL skills in writing, I focused on argumentative essay writing. Self-regulation is particularly crucial when learners engage in challenging tasks. The tasks used to study self-regulation must also be difficult and complex enough to enable learners to engage in self-regulation (Greene & Azevedo, 2009; Perry & Winne, 2006). Argumentative writing is often a challenging task for many L2 learners and was a type of writing that the participants needed to learn to succeed academically.

Therefore, I chose essay tasks from the TOEFL® iBT writing section. This section “measures the test taker's ability to write in an academic setting” (ETS, 2009b, p.22) – more specifically, it “measures the ability to write in a way that is appropriate for college and university course work” (ETS, 2009c, p.4). The TOEFL score reports provide information about “a student’s readiness to participate and succeed in academic studies in an English-speaking setting” (ETS, 2009a, pp.22) and has been used by North American universities for making admissions decisions about applicant’s academic English proficiency whose native language is not English. The writing section of the test includes two types of writing tests: the integrated and the independent writing tests. For Phase 2, I used four tasks from the independent writing section. This type of writing requires the test takers to “express an opinion and support it based on their own knowledge and experience” (ETS, 2009c, p. 22). None of the tasks required any specialized knowledge.

The four chosen tasks are shown in Table 4-4. To minimize the difference in the difficulty level of the four tasks, I chose four that were similar in terms of task requirements: All four tasks required the writers to make one choice among many possible options and provide support for their decision. For Tasks 1 to 3, the participants were asked to write a draft and two
revisions afterwards, each after having a one-on-one tutoring session with the researcher. For Task 4, they were only required to write a draft. Task 4 was included to obtain a post-intervention writing sample from the participants. The participants were asked to write their drafts or revisions during the week and bring them to their next tutoring session. Therefore, no specific time limit was imposed on completing the essays.

Table 4-4. Essay tasks for Phase 2

| Task 1 | If you could go back to some time and place in the past, when and where would you go? Why? Use specific reasons and details to support your choice. |
| Task 2 | What is a very important skill a person should learn in order to be successful in the world today? Choose one skill and use specific reasons and examples to support your choice. |
| Task 3 | If you could study a subject that you have never had the opportunity to study, what would you choose? Explain your choice, using specific reasons and details. |
| Task 4 | The twentieth century saw great change. In your opinion, what is one change that should be remembered about the twentieth century? Use specific reasons and details to explain your choice. |

4.3.2.2 Stimulated-recall interviews

Similar to in Phase 1, I administered a stimulated-recall interview with each of the participants after they had written the first draft essays of the four tasks. The questions I asked for the stimulated-recall interviews in Phase 2 (Appendix F) were parallel to those I had asked for the stimulated-recall interviews in Phase 1. In the interviews, I reviewed each composition sentence by sentence with the participants to probe into their difficulties and the associated use of strategies, but I also asked general questions about their experiences writing the drafts. The interviews took approximately 20 minutes to complete and were audio-recorded. Again, the stimulated-recall interviews were conducted in Korean to enable the participants to focus on their reflections without having to worry about using English.
4.3.2.3 Self-Monitoring Form

The participants were asked to complete the Self-Monitoring Form (SMF) each time they worked on their essays (Appendix G). This form was adapted from Zimmerman et al. (1996), who provided a similar sample form in each chapter of their book. In accordance with principles of SRL, this SMF was designed to help the participants to monitor the types of lexical problems they encountered in writing, their strategy uses, and their self-efficacy by having them reflect on these issues and keep a record of what they did each time they wrote their drafts or revisions.

The form required the participants to write down their goals for the week; indicate the day they worked on the essays and how much time they spent on that day; briefly describe what the difficulties were, why they were difficult, and what they did to address them; and self-rate their essays from a score of zero to five based on the TOEFL® iBT scoring rubrics for the independent writing test (ETS, 2009b), indicating their confidence level (i.e., a score of 1, 0, or -1) for the score.

The self-ratings – together with the confidence level scores – were used as measures of the participants’ self-efficacy. Following Zimmerman et al.’s (1996) method, the self-efficacy score was calculated by having the participants estimate a score they expected to receive for their essays and adjusting this score according to their confidence level in the score. A score of one was added to the estimated score if the participants felt “absolutely sure” about it; a score of one was subtracted from the estimated score if they felt “not very sure” about it; and no score was added or subtracted when they felt “quite sure” about the estimated score.

4.3.2.4 Post-Intervention Interview

After the intervention period, I administered a post-intervention interview to the participants to inquire about their perspectives on their experience with the intervention
(Appendix H). In the interview, I asked the participants about what their difficulties in writing had been prior to and after the intervention, whether the target strategies had been helpful to them, what they believed to have improved in their writing after the intervention, and how their perceptions of themselves as writers had changed. The interviews took approximately 25 minutes to complete and were conducted in Korean and audio-recorded.

4.3.2.5 Tutoring log

After each tutoring session, I kept an audio-recorded tutoring log in Korean, recording any thoughts I had with regard to the tutoring sessions.

4.4 Data Collection Procedures

4.4.1 Phase 1

As described in Section 4.2, I posted a recruitment letter for the study at several web-based blogs created specifically for Korean ESL learners. Once the prospective participants contacted me, I met with them individually at a spacious public library at which the participants had indicated they preferred to meet. I had two sessions with each of them, each lasting approximately 90 minutes, to collect data for Phase 1. In the first session, I first went over the recruitment letter, explained the details of the study, answered any questions related to the study, and sought their participation. Next, I administered the Vocabulary Levels Test, the AWT, and the stimulated-recall interview for the AWT.

Over a period of two weeks, I recruited nine participants and had the first 90 minute session with them. One student decided to withdraw from the study due to a conflict with her schedule. With the eight participants, who had completed the first session, I had another 90 minute session a week later. In the second session, I administered the background questionnaire,
the TWT, and the stimulated-recall interview for the TWT. I ended up with eight participants completing all the tasks for Phase 1.

After I had collected the data for Phase 1, I performed an initial analysis of the data in order to identify a set of typical difficulties that the participants had encountered in completing the AWT and TWT and to devise an initial set of strategies, which I planned to have the participants in Phase 2 learn to self-regulate. In the meantime, I had two feedback sessions – one for each of the writing tasks – with the participants in Phase 1. Each session lasted approximately 90 minutes, during which I reviewed the essays with the participants and offered feedback on how they could improve their essays. The feedback I provided to the participants in the two sessions was general and comprehensive in nature, not specific to or focused on lexicogrammatical issues. Before the feedback sessions, I listened to each of the participants’ stimulated-recalls and wrote down my comments in response to the difficulties they had reported. During the sessions, I reviewed these comments with the participants and provided my suggestions on how to improve the language use, content, and organization of their essays.

4.4.2 Phase 2

Among the eight participants in Phase 1, I was able to work with five in Phase 2. Two participants had to return to Korea shortly after Phase 1; one participant decided to withdraw from the study during Phase 2 as a result of his demanding schedule when he began to take several ESL courses at once. Despite some missing data, the five participants were able to complete Phase 2 of the study.

With the remaining five participants, I had one-on-one tutoring sessions over a period of nine weeks. The intervention followed the cyclic model of SRL proposed by Zimmerman et al. (1996). The cycle involves four processes: Self-Evaluation and Monitoring, Goal Setting and
Strategic Planning, Strategy-Implementation Monitoring, and Strategic-Outcome Monitoring. I worked with each participant through the SRL cycle via one-on-one tutoring, as the participants wrote a draft and two revisions for the three tasks. The participants additionally wrote a draft for the fourth task in the tenth week.

I asked the participants to write and revise their essays using an online word processor application from Google Docs (http://docs.google.com) and to share their essays with me. Each task required three weeks to complete and followed identical procedures. The intervention was held once a week in Korean for approximately one and a half hours at a convenient place chosen by the participants and involved identifying lexical problems that the participants had encountered while writing the essays and employing appropriate lexical strategies to address the perceived problems.

The first week was used for initial Self-Evaluation and Monitoring of the participants’ English writing process. I asked the participants to write a draft essay for the following week and monitor their process in doing so by completing the SMF each time they worked on the draft. In essence, the SMF required the participants to keep a record of the words, phrases, and sentences that caused them difficulty in the course of writing and of the strategies they utilized to cope with the problems. The SMF also asked them to self-rate their essays. At the first intervention meeting, I went over the scoring rubrics with the participants and asked them to rate their drafts and revisions each week. I also reviewed the SMF and the writing task with the participants to ensure that they had a clear idea of what they were required to do. The participants were requested to keep a record of the SMFs every week throughout the intervention period. Each week, I carefully examined the participants’ drafts and revisions, identified problematic words, phrases, and sentences for discussion and improvement, and gave a score for the essays.
In the second week, I examined the draft with each of the participants by administering a stimulated-recall session, reviewed their initial self-efficacy beliefs in comparison to the score I had given them, identified lexical problems that had caused them difficulty, and chose appropriate strategies for them to employ. This constituted the Goal Setting and Strategic Planning process of the SRL cycle. When introducing new strategies to the participants, I first provided modeling and support, which are crucial in the early stages of developing SRL skills. I then asked the participants to work on revising their draft for the next meeting, carefully monitoring their use of the strategies and making sure that the strategies were being implemented accurately. This constituted the Strategy Implementation and Monitoring process of the SRL cycle.

In the third week, I examined the revisions with the participants individually, discussed the effectiveness of the implemented strategies (i.e., the Strategic Outcome Monitoring process of the SRL cycle), checked their self-efficacy beliefs, further identified new problems (i.e., the Self-Evaluation and Monitoring process of the SRL cycle), and chose new strategies for the next revision (i.e., the Goal Setting and Strategic Planning process of the SRL cycle). I performed a final evaluation of the essay at the next meeting, asked each participant to write a draft on another task, and repeated the same process two more times, each with a different essay task. For the fourth task, the participants only wrote a draft. In this way, the participants went through several rounds of the SRL cycle during the course of drafting and revising their essays.

For the intervention, I centered first and foremost on the lexical problems that the participants encountered in writing. However, I additionally provided feedback on other aspects of their writing – for example, organization and content of the essay – that could be worked on. It would have been unethical and irresponsible for me to have focused exclusively on lexical
problems when the participants needed help with other problems in writing as well. After all, organization and content of an essay can heavily affect its coherence and cohesion, which vocabulary plays a central role in constructing (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Witte & Faigley, 1981). I therefore tried to draw the participants’ attention to their use of vocabulary whenever possible. I also considered the lexically-driven nature of language production (Levelt 1989, 1993), treating sentence structures according to the argument structure required by the head word in a phrase (e.g., the main verb of a sentence). After the intervention, I had a post-intervention interview with each of the participants to probe further into their perspectives on the intervention as a method of developing their writing skills.

4.5 Data Analysis

4.5.1 Phase 1

Phase 1 was an exploratory and preparatory study for Phase 2, the purpose of which was to obtain an initial understanding of the writing difficulties and the strategy use of the target population of learners before beginning the intervention in Phase 2 and to devise an initial set of strategies to work with in Phase 2. After the data collection in Phase 1, I conducted an initial analysis of the two writing tasks and the stimulated-recall interviews for the tasks before embarking on Phase 2. At this stage, I did not perform a thorough analysis of the data for administrative reasons (i.e., retaining the participants for Phase 2) and to maintain continuity in the transition from Phase 1 to Phase 2.

To understand the typical difficulties that the participants had encountered while completing the two writing tasks, I transcribed the stimulated-recall interviews in Korean, examined the transcriptions with reference to the participants’ essays and translations, and
produced a list of the most frequent lexico-grammatical problems the participants had been confronted with. This list consisted of the following four major categories:

(a) appropriate word choice

• The participants could not think of an appropriate word for their communicative intention in the first place.

• They could not decide which word to use when they thought of more than one word with a similar meaning in English (e.g., ‘power’ vs. ‘force’).

• They used a word inappropriately that seemed to be a direct translation of a Korean word (e.g., ‘stimulation’ instead of ‘enhance’).

• They could not use a word in its correct grammatical form or function (e.g., as a noun or a verb, etc.).

• They were confused with some commonly misused function word pairs (e.g., ‘it/that’, ‘another/other’, ‘almost/mostly’, etc.).

(b) unnatural expressions

• The expressions were incomplete (e.g., ‘the number’ without ‘of…’, ‘reason’ without ‘for…’).

• The expressions were Korean-like (e.g., ‘Korea people grammar ability’).

• They tried to use a different expression or shorten the expression if they could not find the right expression for their original meaning (e.g., saying ‘there are some’ instead of ‘there is hardly anyone’).

• They had difficulty with fixed expressions (e.g., ‘cannot help Verb+ing’, ‘the Comparative…the Comparative…’, ‘Not only…but also…’, etc.)

(c) sentence structures

• They did not include all the components required in a sentence by the verb (e.g., using the verb ‘remind’ without any other complement words following).

• They had difficulty with word order.

• Some just wrote down a sequence of words they could think of when they could not form a sentence they wanted (e.g., just focused on writing down the nouns in a sentence).

• They had difficulty combining words, phrases, and clauses to form larger units.
(d) grammatical issues

• They used a preposition when it was not required, and vice versa.
• They used the wrong preposition when it was required.
• Expressions could have been more effective if the participants had used modal verbs.
  Also, there were many incorrect uses of modal verbs.
• They could not decide whether to use ‘a’ or ‘the’.
• There were issues with tense and aspect.

To understand the strategies the participants had employed in Phase 1, I examined the transcriptions to see how much and for what purpose they had used the electronic dictionary I had provided. I discovered that the participants in most cases relied on their own resources to address their difficulties in completing the AWT, consulting the dictionary only to check spelling, find the meaning of English words, and find the corresponding English words for their intended Korean words. For the TWT, the participants primarily relied on their own resources, but they also consulted the dictionary frequently to find the corresponding English words for the original Korean words in the text.

Based on these initial analyses, I chose several linguistic tools (e.g., corpus-based dictionaries), devised a set of strategies that incorporated the use of these tools, and continued on to Phase 2 of the study, which began two weeks after the completion of Phase 1. These research strategies were refined throughout Phase 2 as I worked with the participants and came to understand them better. Thorough analyses of the difficulty and strategy use units were performed after the Phase 2 data collection when all the participants had completed the study. The coding and data analysis procedures at this stage are described in the following sections.
4.5.1.1 Stimulated-Recall Interviews

For both of the writing tasks (i.e., the AWT and TWT), I first transcribed the stimulated-recall interviews of all the participants in Korean, which was the language used for conducting the interviews. Then, I translated the Korean transcriptions of the participants’ responses to the general questions into English and grouped them together according to the aspects of difficulty they had commented on. For the participants’ responses to the sentence-by-sentence questions, I carefully examined them and identified all indications of difficulty that they had self-reported with reference to the written essays.

These identified units (referred to as difficulty units hereafter) were used as the basic unit of analysis – which included units from just one word to even whole sentences. I regarded all indications of difficulty as units for further analyses. That is, if a participant had indicated that he or she had difficulty with a word, the word was counted as one unit; if with a sentence, the sentence was counted as one unit. Furthermore, if a participant indicated he or she had difficulty with a phrase and a word within the same sentence, both the phrase and the word were counted as separate units. Once the difficulty units had been identified, I organized them in a spreadsheet, indicating (a) what the units were, (b) why the units were causing difficulty for the participants, and (c) what strategies the participants used to address the difficulty units. Afterwards, I analyzed (b) and (c) separately.

First, I coded the source of difficulty for each difficulty unit [i.e., (b)]. According to Levelt (1989, 1993) and Jiang (2000), learners may encounter problems in L2 language production when they cannot access or retrieve appropriate semantic and syntactic specifications of words, which are stored in the lemma component of lexical items. Learners may also face problems accessing or retrieving the morphological and orthographical specifications of words,
which are stored in the lexeme component of lexical items. In addition, learners may experience difficulty with non-linguistic issues, such as organization, content, or register.

Initially, I attempted to code the difficulty units according to the types of linguistic specifications (i.e., semantic, syntactic, morphological, and orthographical) the participants were having difficulty accessing. However, it appeared inappropriate to make a claim for what the participants were processing cognitively by coding the units in this manner. Furthermore, the stimulated-recall interviews revealed that in many instances, the participants encountered difficulty constructing the longer units of phrases, clauses, and sentences – which required them to access all the linguistic specifications in a complex manner. Therefore, I changed the coding categories accordingly to better represent the source of difficulty that the participants had reported. Nonetheless, the categories are fundamentally based on the theoretical models I adopted for the study.

The final categories of coding I used for the difficulty units were (a) Word Choice, (b) Collocation, (c) Structure, (d) Morphological Form, (e) Spelling, (f) Phrase Construction, and (e) Others. In coding the stimulated-recall interviews in accordance with these categories, I made judgments based on the participants’ original communicative intentions. For example, if a participant had difficulty finding a corresponding English word for an intended Korean word but instead used a phrase in English to express the meaning of the intended word, this difficulty unit was coded as Word Choice, and not Phrase Construction.

Furthermore, the coding categories for the difficulty units were part of a broader coding framework, which I had devised for coding the participants’ essays in Phase 2 and which is described in Section 4.5.2.1. I first coded the essays in Phase 2 and later followed the same
procedures to code the difficulty units of the essays in Phase 1. A description of each coding category with examples is provided below.

**Word Choice.** A difficulty unit was coded as Word Choice if the participants indicated that they had difficulty choosing an appropriate word for their communicative intentions.

- In the AWT, Sam wanted to use a word that corresponded to the Korean word ‘effectively’. He used the word ‘efficiently’ instead.
- In the AWT, Alex used the phrase ‘put together’ to communicate the meaning of the corresponding Korean word.
- In the TWT, Ria was not sure if the English word ‘range’ was a correct translation of the corresponding Korean word.

**Collocation.** A difficulty unit was coded as Collocation if the participants indicated that they had difficulty using an appropriate word in relation to another word. There were no difficulty units coded as Collocation in Phase 1.

**Structure.** A difficulty unit was coded as Structure if the participants indicated that they had difficulty with the structure that a particular word required, especially the verbs. Difficulties with word order and the use of determiners were also coded as Structure.

- In the AWT, Paul was not sure of the word order in the phrase ‘But three reasons above’.
- In the AWT, Sean was not sure if the definite article was needed in the phrase ‘the most important thing’.
- In the TWT, Abril did not know what structure the verb ‘remind’ required in the sentence ‘It works in unconsciousness to make the atmosphere, remind, and solve the profound memories’.

**Morphological Form.** A difficulty unit was coded as Morphological Form if the participants indicated that they had difficulty using the right form of a word, including word forms associated with tense, case, number, and active or passive voice.
• In the AWT, Sam was not sure if he could use the gerund form of the verb ‘talk’ in the dependent clause ‘Although many Korean afraid of talking with foreign people’.
• In the AWT, Paul was not sure whether he should use the singular or the plural form of the word ‘experience’ in the phrase ‘a few good experiences’.
• In the AWT, Abril had difficulty deciding on the correct form of the relative pronoun ‘who’ in the sentence ‘There are more chances to succeed for whom can use English and other languages well’.
• In the TWT, Ria was not sure of the form of the verb ‘make’ in the sentence ‘It is makes us to pleasant or sadly...’.

**Spelling.** A difficulty unit was coded as Spelling if the participants indicated that they had difficulty with the correct spelling of a word.

• In the AWT, Moon consulted the dictionary for the correct spelling of the word ‘progress’.
• In the TWT, Sean consulted the dictionary for the correct spelling of the word ‘instinct’.

**Phrase Construction.** A difficulty unit was coded as Phrase Construction if the participants indicated that they had difficulty with language units larger than words — that is, with constructing a phrase, a clause, or a sentence. Coordination was also coded as Phrase Construction.

• In the AWT, Alex had difficulty constructing the phrase ‘for social success’ in English and therefore, avoided using it.
• In the AWT, August was unsure of her sentence ‘But it is hard to most of students’.
• In the TWT, Moon had difficulty constructing the clause ‘When until forget every things’.
• In the TWT, Sam encountered difficulty with coordination in the sentence ‘It can make us happy or grief, spiritless or powerful and a certain kind of music can overwhelm our thought until we forget everything without itself’.
Others. All other difficulty units were coded as Others. This category included difficulty issues with punctuation, register, and organization of the essay. In the TWT, some difficulties the participants experienced were related to ambiguity in the Korean text.

• In the AWT, Sam had difficulty with the use of commas in the sentence ‘These day, according to the globalization, learning English is getting more important’.
• In the AWT, Abril was concerned about using the pronoun ‘you’ in an academic essay.
• In the AWT, August had difficulty organizing the introduction and conclusion of her essay.
• In the TWT, Alex was not sure what the phrase ‘to which they dance or move their bodies’ modified in the Korean text.

After coding the difficulty units, I analyzed the strategies that the participants had used to address these difficulty units (referred to as strategy use units hereafter). Similar to the difficulty units, I considered each indication of strategy use as a unit. For example, if a participant had used more than one strategy for a difficulty unit, all the strategies were counted as separate units. The participants were allowed to use an electronic dictionary, which I provided, to complete the writing tasks in Phase 1. Therefore, other than consulting the dictionaries, the participants had employed a range of self-strategies to address the difficulties they had encountered while completing the two writing tasks. Unfortunately, the participants did not always report their use of strategies.

To develop the categories for coding the strategy use units, I first entered all the strategy use units into a spreadsheet and then grouped them according to general similarities evident among them. I repeatedly read over the strategy units carefully and refined the groupings several times in the process. At the end, I came up with six broad categories to code the strategy use units: (a) exercising best judgment, (b) using one’s own resources, (c) rephrasing, (d) consulting
a dictionary, (e) avoiding, and (f) others. The coding examples for the strategy use units are presented in Chapter 5 as part of the results for RQ1b.

4.5.1.2 Vocabulary Levels Test and Background Questionnaire

The Vocabulary Levels Test and the Background Questionnaire were administered to obtain background information about the participants and were not analyzed separately in any other way. For the Vocabulary Levels Test, a score of one was given for a correct answer and a score of zero for an incorrect answer then tallied to total a maximum score of 60.

4.5.2 Phase 2

4.5.2.1 Stimulated-Recall Interviews

The data analysis procedures for the stimulated-recall interviews in Phase 2 were similar to those for the stimulated-recall interviews in Phase 1. First, I transcribed the stimulated-recall interviews of the five participants in Korean. Next, I translated the Korean transcriptions of the participants’ responses to the general questions into English. For the participants’ responses to the sentence-by-sentence questions, I examined their responses with reference to the written essays and identified all the difficulty units – which were used as the basic unit of analysis. Again, I organized them in a spreadsheet, indicating (a) what the units were, (b) why the units were causing difficulty for the participants, and (c) what strategies the participants used to address the difficulties (i.e., strategy use units).

Similar to the coding in Phase 1, I regarded all indications of difficulty and strategy use as separate units and coded each difficulty unit according to the coding framework in Table 4-5. Also, I recoded the units three months later and asked another person to code 20% of the total units. The intra-coder and inter-coder agreement were 86.89% and 81.71%, respectively. The
comparatively low inter-coder agreement was due to minor confusion that arose from the category “Others.” The disagreements were addressed and resolved through discussion.

Table 4-5. Coding framework for the stimulated-recalls in Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The first column on the left of Table 4-5 consists of the same coding categories of the difficulty units that were used in Phase 1. The categories in the top first row represent the linguistic tools the participants used to address the difficulty units. This coding framework was developed based on the definitions of SRL skills and lexical strategy use that I adopted for the study, which were “the self-directive ability to use appropriate lexical strategies for addressing lexical problems in writing” and “the use of linguistic information from various linguistic tools to address lexical problems in writing,” respectively. By using the coding framework, I attempted to describe the participants’ development of SRL skills over time in terms of the changes in (a) the source of their difficulties and (b) their use of strategies.

The coding examples for the seven categories of the difficulty units were provided in Section 4.5.1.1. Because the coding results of the difficulty units revealed that a large portion of them were related to Phrase Construction issues, I analysed this category separately and coded these difficulty units according to whether they were (a) noun phrases, (b) predicate phrases, (c)
adverb phrases, (d) prepositional phrases, or (e) clauses. Predicate phrases included verb and adjective phrases that were used as predicates in a sentence. Sentences were included in the clause category.

The coding categories of the strategy use units refer to the linguistic tools that the participants used to implement the lexical strategies. Generally, ESL learners face limitations in learning words in rich authentic context. Moreover, writing is for the most part, a solitary endeavour. In Phase 2, my goal was to help the participants to gain easier access to such context in writing through the use of corpus-based linguistic tools. My primary focus in employing these lexical strategies was to assist the students in first choosing a word that best matched their communicative intention and then becoming aware of the structure required by this word (i.e., how this word is used within a sentence along with other words). Recognizing that the participants have unique needs and may desire to use different types of strategies, I chose several corpus-based linguistic tools that were available online.

As already specified in Table 4-5, the participants and I mainly consulted the following linguistic tools during the intervention period in Phase 2: (a) English dictionary, (b) thesaurus, (c) Korean-English dictionary, (d) collocations dictionary, and (e) corpus. Although we used more than one type of dictionary for some of the linguistic tool categories, I have labelled each of the five categories here as singular. The participants had already been familiar with using (a), (b), and (c), albeit in a limited way. I selected these tools, hoping to take maximum advantage of and build on the use of the tools the participants would have been familiar with. I also chose (d), realizing that this tool would help the participants to make informed word choice decisions in relation to other words. Finally, I chose (e) because of the rich authentic data (i.e., language input) it offers with regard to the actual use of spoken and written language and because of its
potential use as a tool for writing. Below, I have described how I used these linguistic tools during the intervention period. The strategy use units that incorporated the use of these tools were coded accordingly.

**Self-strategy.** This category included self-strategies similar to those described in Phase 1. Moreover, if the participants did not report any strategy use for a difficulty unit, I coded it as a self-strategy, assuming that the participants made best use of their own resources to address the problematic issue at hand.

I did not analyze the self-strategies in Phase 2 for two reasons: (a) the participants’ strategy uses in Phase 1, which involved predominately self-employed strategies, were analyzed in detail and (b) the participants’ self-reports in Phase 2 differed somewhat from their self-reports in Phase 1. In the Phase 1 stimulated-recall interviews, the participants provided a detailed account of their self-employed strategies – presumably because they were basically left to their own resources, with the exception of an electronic dictionary, to complete the two writing tasks. On the contrary, the Phase 2 stimulated-recall interviews appeared to demonstrate that the participants were preoccupied more with reporting the strategies that we had worked on together rather than with reporting their own self-strategies. Furthermore, their overall reports seemed to become less and less detailed as the same questions were being asked repeatedly for every sentence in their essays throughout the four stimulated-recall sessions. Nonetheless, the self-strategies in Phase 2 should be understood as being similar to those found in Phase 1.

**English dictionary.** The participants’ knowledge of English words is likely to be inaccurate to varying degrees. We used several English dictionaries to examine the meanings of English words when the participants were not sure of them. The two that were especially helpful were the *Collins COBUILD* dictionary (available at http://www.collins language.com) and the
Moreover, we used the English dictionaries along with a thesaurus to compare the meaning of synonyms that the thesaurus supplied for a consulted word. This was necessary since the thesaurus the participants used just provided a list of synonyms and antonyms without their definitions.

Another use of English dictionaries was to examine the sentence structures required by verbs. In a sentence, the predicate dictates the overall structure of the sentence. Therefore, I emphasized the significance of choosing the most appropriate verb for a sentence with regard to the participants’ communicative intentions and constructing sentences based on the structure that the verb required. We used a few dictionaries that were very useful in this respect. Again, the *Collins COBUILD* dictionary offers definitions in accordance with the sentence structures that the main entry words are used in. In addition, the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* provides neatly organized sentence structure patterns for the main entry verbs.

**Thesaurus.** There were instances in which the participants used a word whose core meaning matched that of their intended Korean word, but showed difficulty in selecting a more appropriate word that could better communicate their intentions. In such cases, I tried to aid the participants in choosing the most appropriate word by having them compare the use and meaning of the word’s synonyms, distinguish the shades of meaning and the contexts in which the words are used, and select one that most accurately matched their communicative intentions. The *Oxford Learner’s Thesaurus* was a valuable tool, which not only categorizes words according to their similarities in meaning, but also offers their definitions and comparisons of their uses. We consulted this thesaurus together at the tutoring sessions, but it was not accessible online for the participants to use when working on their essays. When the participants experienced difficulty in
choosing a word among several synonyms, we looked up the antonyms of these words to see if we could better distinguish the meaning of the words. The thesaurus provided by Collins (available at http://www.collinslanguage.com) was particularly helpful in this respect, since it provides both synonyms and antonyms for a word.

Furthermore, consulting the thesaurus was valuable for helping the participants to incorporate more specific words into their essays. One characteristic of the participants’ writing was that they preferred general words (e.g., ‘good’, ‘bad’, etc.) to more specific ones. We used the thesaurus to examine a wide range of words that were associated with the general words they were using, contrasted the meaning of the words, and tried to select more specific words for their essays. I continuously encouraged them to consider words that specifically matched their communicative intentions first, since their word choice would have consequences on their sentence structures.

**Korean-English dictionary.** The participants frequently encountered difficulty thinking of a word or a phrase in English that corresponded to their intended Korean word or a phrase. One strategy that stood out as extremely practical for the participants in this respect was looking up the intended Korean word or phrase in a Korean-English dictionary, which supplied numerous English example sentences along with their Korean translations. By examining and comparing the example sentences in both languages, the participants were able to select the most appropriate English word or phrase for their communicative intentions. The dictionary we used was from the Korean Naver Dictionary website (available at http://endic.naver.com).

**Collocations dictionary.** Some of the participants’ awkward phrasings in their writing were due to the inappropriate use of collocations in English. The individual component words within the phrasings would not have been problematic. However, their collocations more often
resembled those of the Korean language, which led to awkward phrasings in English. The participants differed in their ability to demonstrate appropriate use of collocations. We consulted the *Oxford Collocations Dictionary* (also accessible from http://endic.naver.com) primarily for the following three purposes.

First, we used this dictionary as a diagnostic tool to verify the accurateness of the collocations in the participants’ writing. More specifically, when there were awkward phrasings in the participants’ essays, we consulted the collocations dictionary to examine the appropriateness of collocations within the awkward phrasings. Furthermore, the participants used it to look up collocations that they were uncertain about using.

Second, the collocations dictionary served as a handy tool for constructing sentences. The dictionary provides lists of words – arranged in different grammatical categories (e.g., nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, etc.) – that could be used as collocates of the main entry words. These were very useful for constructing the basic elements of a sentence. A sentence normally requires a subject and a predicate. That is, a grammatical sentence will at least have a noun as its subject and a verb or a linking verb plus an adjective as its predicate. The sentence may also have another noun as the object of its verb. Having decided on one of the elements, the students could use the collocations dictionary to select other appropriate collocations of that word.

Third, the collocations dictionary was consulted to help the participants to elaborate on their sentences. Along with the basic elements, a sentence may also have modifiers, such as adjectives and adverbs. One of the characteristics of the participants’ writing was that it lacked the use of modifiers and consequently seemed somewhat bland. We used the collocations dictionary to make the essays more descriptive by looking for appropriate modifiers to use in the
sentences. The dictionary also supplies fixed phrases in which the main entry words are frequently used. These were also useful for elaborating sentences in the essays.

**Corpus.** I introduced the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (available at http://www.americancorpus.org) to the participants at different points in the intervention period. I first spent some time explaining what a corpus was, how they could benefit from using this corpus in writing, and how they could use the corpus in practical ways. I selected several basic search commands they could take advantage of right away, demonstrated the use of each command, and discussed the query results together.

With this corpus, we were able to study the actual usage of a word or phrase in spoken or written English based on a massive language database. The corpus allowed us to check the frequency of a word (or phrase) of interest with reference to its occurrence in the database, find its collocations with information on their frequency of occurrence and grammatical category, examine its synonyms and other associated words, and compare its usage in different registers (e.g., academic and spoken English), just to name a few. For some participants, this corpus became a powerful tool for writing.

**Others.** The participants also searched the internet or used word processor tools – for example, to check spelling or punctuation – to address their difficulty units. There were only a few strategy use units that were coded as Others. For example, Abril was not sure of the correct spelling of the word ‘incident’. She checked the spelling of this word through the word processor tool she was using.

4.5.2.2 Essays

Several measures were employed to examine changes in the quality of the participants’ essays. The main focus of the intervention was on helping the participants to develop their
lexical proficiency in writing by enabling easier access to the L2 semantic and syntactic specifications of words through the help of corpus-based linguistic tools. To examine the changes in the participants’ texts with regard to lexical use and sentence structure, measures for lexical richness and syntactic complexity were calculated for the participants’ first draft and final revised essays of the four tasks. In calculating these measures, the essays were corrected for spelling, capitalization, and punctuation. To examine the changes in the overall quality of essays with regard to native-speaker intuition, rankings by two native speakers for the first draft and final revised essays of the four tasks were used.

**Lexical richness.** I incorporated two measures of lexical richness for the study: (a) type-token ratio and (b) Lexical Frequency Profile (LFP). The type token ratio is “the ratio in per cent between the different words in the text and the total number of running words” (Laufer & Nation, 1995, p. 310). I used the following calculation:

\[
\frac{\text{number of types}}{\text{number of tokens}}
\]

Although widely used, the type-token ratio can be unstable for short texts – by and large characteristic of essays written by L2 learners (Laufer & Nation, 1995). After reviewing the limitations present in several commonly used measures of lexical richness, Laufer and Nation proposed the LFP as an alternative. This measure shows “the percentage of words a learner uses at different vocabulary frequency levels in her writing” (p. 311). Simply put, it compares the words in a text to different frequency level word groups and calculates the percentage of the words in the text that are found in each of the frequency level word groups. For the study, I used the Vocabprofile tool (available at http://www.lextutor.ca) to calculate the LFP of the participants’ essays. This tool analyzes words in a text in relation to (a) the first 1,000 words (K1
words) of the General Service List (GSL) (West, 1953), (b) the next 1,000 words (K2 words) of the GSL list, and (c) the Academic Word List (AWL words) (Coxhead, 2000). The GSL includes 2,000 word families that are most widely used in English; the AWL includes 570 word families that are commonly used in academic contexts, but are not included in the GSL.

**Syntactic complexity.** The mean length of sentence (MLS) in words was used as the measure for syntactic complexity. This was calculated by:

\[
\text{number of words} / \text{number of sentences}
\]

According to Ortega (2003), syntactic complexity refers to “the range of forms that surface in language production and the degree of sophistication of such forms” and has been used in L2 writing research “to evaluate the effects of a pedagogical intervention on the development of grammar, writing ability, or both” (p. 492). Researchers have employed many other measures of syntactic complexity in their research, such as mean length of clause, mean length of T-unit, clauses per T-unit, etc. I chose MLS for the measure of syntactic complexity because sentence was the basic unit of focus in the tutoring and the stimulated-recall sessions as well as for the SMFs. Furthermore, the inaccurate use of punctuation by the participants occasionally made it difficult to use the other measures in a systematic way.

**Rankings and comments.** After the data collection in Phase 2, I recruited two native speakers of English (Appendix I) with ample experience in teaching ESL writing – who were working toward their PhD degree in Second Language Education – to rank and give comments on the participants’ essays in Phase 2. For each participant, I randomly mixed the first draft and the final revised essays of the four tasks and asked the two native speakers to provide a ranking of the essays with their comments on why they thought one essay was better or worse than the
others (refer to Appendix J for the full guidelines). The two raters ranked the essays and audio-recorded their comments on the essays individually at a time of their convenience.

Later, I converted each ranking into a score – starting with a score of one for the lowest ranking and adding a score of one for each higher ranking – and used these ranking scores to compare the ranking results. Furthermore, I transcribed all the comments made by the two raters and classified them under the two categories of Strengths and Weaknesses for each of the essays that were ranked. The raters provided a concise evaluation of the essays, which covered all aspects of writing. A summary of their comments on the essays according to their strengths and weaknesses is provided in the two case studies in Chapter 7.

4.5.2.3 Self-Monitoring Form

The participants were asked to provide various types of information for the SMF (see Section 4.3.2.3). The information they supplied with regard to the difficulty and strategy use units was first entered into a spreadsheet and coded later according to the coding framework in Table 4-5. This information for the first draft essays largely overlapped with and was a subset of the information that the participants had reported in the stimulated recall interviews. Moreover, the development of the participants’ SRL skills was analyzed in relation to only the first draft essays of the four tasks. Therefore, the units in the SMFs of only the revised essays for the two case study participants were coded for further analyses.

One of the functions of the SMF was to elicit information about the participants’ use of strategies throughout the intervention period. Unfortunately, the participants differed considerably in how they made use of the forms, which made it difficult to use the data from the SMFs in a way that was equivalent across all of the participants. Nonetheless, I assumed that the information participants did provide in the forms about their strategy use represented their main
focus of interest in revising their essays. Therefore, the strategy use units reported for the forms in Chapter 7 can be considered as traces of the main strategies the two participants had used to revise their essays.

The scores on the self-ratings and their confidence levels were used for analyzing the participants’ self-efficacy beliefs. Following the SRL framework of Zimmerman et al. (1996), I initially considered the combined scores (i.e., self-rating score + confidence level score) as their self-efficacy scores. With a few exceptions, however, the participants mostly resorted to giving a neutral score of ‘0’ for their confidence level scores. Furthermore, a confidence level score of ‘1’ or ‘-1’ turned out to carry too much weight in the total score in comparison to the self-rating scores, which were mostly in the three to four scoring range. Therefore, I decided not to combine the scores, but report the results of the two scores separately.

4.5.2.4 Post-Intervention Interviews

I first transcribed all the post-intervention interviews in Korean and then translated them into English. After reading over the transcriptions repeatedly, I found four themes that emerged across the interviews. I summarized the results of the interviews for each of the five participants with regard to (a) the helpfulness of the intervention, (b) the development of SRL skills, (c) the changes in self-efficacy beliefs, and (d) the difficulties in writing that remained after the intervention period.

4.5.2.5 Tutoring Log

I transcribed the audio-recorded tutoring log in Korean and translated the necessary sections into English. The tutoring log mainly included comments about what the participants
and I had worked on together in each tutoring session. These comments were used to write up the case study chapter.

4.5.3 Summary of Data Analysis

RQs 1 and 2 were related to Phases 1 and 2 of the study, respectively.

To answer RQ1a (i.e., *What are typical lexical problems that Korean ESL learners encounter in English writing?*), I analyzed the difficulty units identified from the stimulated-recall interviews for the two writing tasks in Phase 1 as well as the participants’ responses to the general questions about their difficulties.

To answer RQ1b (i.e., *What strategies do they use to overcome the problems?*), I analyzed the strategy use units identified from the stimulated-recall interviews for the two writing tasks in Phase 1 as well as the participants’ responses to the general questions about their use of strategies.

To answer RQ2a (i.e., *What changes are observable in the learners’ SRL skills for English writing throughout the intervention period?*), I analyzed (a) the difficulty and strategy use units that were identified from the stimulated-recall interviews for the participants’ first draft essays of the four tasks over the period of 10 weeks of individual tutoring and (b) the participants’ responses to the general questions about their difficulties and use of strategies. For the difficulty and strategy use units, I examined the changes in their frequency across the four tasks. Since the participants showed idiosyncratic trajectories in the development of their SRL skills, I included two separate case studies following the overall result chapters. For the two case studies, I additionally analyzed the SMFs to examine the two participants’ difficulties and use of strategies in the revised essays and referred to the tutoring log to describe the content of the intervention for each task.
To answer RQ2b (i.e., How do their self-efficacy beliefs change as learners go through the cyclic model of SRL?), I analyzed the self-rating and the confidence level scores provided by each of the five participants in the SMFs over the period of 10 weeks of individual tutoring.

To answer RQ2c (i.e., What influence does the change in the learners’ SRL skills have on their English writing performance?), I analyzed the participants’ first draft and final revised essays with respect to their lexical richness, syntactic complexity, and native speaker rankings over the period of 10 weeks of individual tutoring. For these measures, I examined their changes within and across tasks for each of the five participants. For the two case studies, I also provided a summary of the comments made by the two raters for the essays according to their strengths and weaknesses.

To answer RQ2d (i.e., How do the learners feel about the intervention as a way of developing their writing skills in English?), I analyzed the post-intervention interviews and provided a summary for each participant with regard to the helpfulness of the intervention, SRL skills, self-efficacy beliefs, and difficulties that remained after the intervention period.
Chapter 5. Phase 1 Results

In this chapter, I present the findings for Phase 1 of the study, which was guided by the first research question. The findings presented in this chapter are based on the eight participants who participated in Phase 1. The findings for Phase 2 of the study are presented in Chapter 6.

5.1 RQ1a. *What are typical lexical problems that Korean ESL learners encounter in English writing?*

This section presents the findings on the difficulties that the participants reported as they wrote the AWT and TWT in Phase 1.

5.1.1 Argumentative Writing

Table 5-1 shows the coding results of the difficulty units that the participants in Phase 1 reported for the sentence-by-sentence questions in the stimulated-recall interview for the AWT. The numbers in the Table here (and in the Tables hereafter) indicate frequencies. There were a total of 125 difficulty units reported by the eight participants. The “Total” column shows that the participants differed with regard to the number of units they reported (i.e., from 10 for August to 25 units for Sam).

The most frequent areas of difficulty experienced by the participants were in the following order: Phrase Construction (50.4%), Word Choice (21.6%), Structure (10.4%), Others (6.4%), Morphological Form (5.6%), and Spelling (5.6%). The Others category included issues with punctuation (reported by Sam and Moon), organization (reported by Abril, August, and Ria), and register (reported by Abril).
The participants’ responses to the general questions about their difficulties in writing the essay – which were asked before and after the sentence-by-sentence questions – also shed light on the areas of difficulty for the participants. First, many of them commented that the most difficult part about writing the AWT was putting their thoughts into English. The evidence for this was also apparent in the high percentage of Phrase Construction difficulty units (50.40%). For example, Alex remarked that “I’m in a situation now where I need to first think in Korean and then write in English…The most difficult part was putting my Korean thoughts into English.” Also, August observed that she experienced difficulty translating her thoughts into English in a short time. Sam and Paul indicated that they had difficulty making appropriate word choices during this transfer process. Paul, for example, stated that “I think in Korean and I have to put this into English. This doesn’t happen right away. The most difficult part is finding the right words to use.”

Another area of difficulty that many participants commented on generally was vocabulary. This was also revealed in the sentence-by-sentence questions (cf., 21.6% of the difficulty units were coded as Word Choice). For example, Paul remarked that “I can think of the content when I write, but can’t think of the words and expressions to use.” Also, Sean mentioned
that “Choosing appropriate words is difficult. The words provided by the Korean-English dictionary seem to have similar meanings.”

Third, many participants indicated that the difference in the sentence structures between English and Korean caused them difficulty (cf., 10.4% of the difficulty units were coded as Structure). For example, Sam observed that “The sentence structures used by Korean- and English-speaking people are different, and this is very difficult for me.” Moon also indicated that “Writing sentences is difficult for me because the word order in English and in Korean is different.”

Fourth, the participants experienced difficulty with the organization of their essays. Sean, for example, remarked that he organized his essays in Korean with an introduction, body, and a conclusion and wondered whether English-speaking people thought in the same way. Abril expressed that she had difficulty starting the essay and was not able to provide enough supporting examples because of the limited time. Ria gave an elaborate comment on organization:

I need to be able to write the introduction, the reasons, and the conclusion according to the topic… Providing examples is the hardest. People should be able to empathize with you when they read your writing, and it’s difficult to write in that way… Writing should be concise and coherent… If there is a claim, there should be supporting reasons. However, I write whatever comes to my mind. That’s why I start to write another sentence when I’m not even finished with the sentence I’m working on.

5.1.2 Translation Writing

The coding results of the difficulty units that the participants in Phase 1 reported for the sentence-by-sentence questions in the stimulated-recall interview for the TWT are shown in Table 5-2. The total number of units reported by the participants for this writing task was 139, with the number of units reported by the participants ranging from 10 for Moon to 25 for Ria.
Table 5-2. Difficulty units for the TWT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Word Choice</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Morphological Form</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Phrase Construction</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abril</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(47.5%)</td>
<td>(3.6%)</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(38.1%)</td>
<td>(3.6%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent areas of difficulty experienced by the participants were Word Choice (47.5%), Phrase Construction (38.1%), Spelling (5%), Structure (3.6%), Others (3.6%), and Morphological Form (2.2%), in the given order. The Others category included issues with ambiguity in Korean (reported by Alex and August) and punctuation (reported by Abril).

The results above show that the difficulty units for the most part were related to Word Choice and Phrase Construction (i.e., 47.5% and 38.1%, respectively). Together, they made up 85.6% of the difficulty units. The participants’ responses to the general questions similarly revealed that the most difficult part about writing the TWT was finding the right words and expressions. For example, Alex said that “It was difficult to find expressions that could communicate what I understood in Korean… I didn’t feel confident about the expressions I used.” Similarly, Sean indicated that he frequently had to consult the dictionary for words to use and that he tried to paraphrase his sentences into easier ones. Sam also mentioned that he was not sure what approach would enable him to use the most appropriate expressions. In addition, Abril remarked that “I really didn’t have difficulties at the beginning, but I consulted the dictionary later because there were difficult words and Korean expressions.”
The participants also commented that they had difficulty constructing the longer units of sentences. Sam, for example, remarked that “Overall, I had difficulty constructing sentences. In a long sentence, I’m not sure what I should use as the main subject, whether I should be dividing it into shorter sentences, or whether I should be using conjunctions to connect the expressions.” Paul also observed that he had problems with the sentence structures of long sentences, and Moon indicated that word order was a problem for him. Similarly, August stated that “You only need to focus on the meaning when translating from English to Korean, but this translation required me to focus a lot on the sentence structures. I wasn’t able to translate freely because of this…This is very difficult.”

Other than Word Choice and Phrase Construction issues, the Korean text itself appeared to have posed difficulty for some of the participants. For example, Alex commented that “Sometimes, I was ambiguous about what was being modified. This can be unclear in Korean, but the structure in English must be clear.” Similarly, Sean remarked that “Even Korean people do not write this way, so it was difficult to write this in English.”

5.1.3 Summary

For the sake of comparison, Table 5-3 shows the total frequency of the difficulty units for both writing tasks together. Several observations can be made here.

| Table 5-3. Difficulty units for both writing tasks |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                | Word Choice     | Structure       | Morphological   | Spelling        | Phrase Construction | Others          | Total           |
| Argumentative  | 27 (21.6%)      | 13 (10.4%)      | 7 (5.6%)        | 7 (5.6%)        | 63 (50.4%)         | 8 (6.4%)        | 125 (100%)      |
| Translation    | 66 (47.5%)      | 5 (3.6%)        | 3 (2.2%)        | 7 (5%)          | 53 (38.1%)         | 5 (3.6%)        | 139 (100%)      |
First, the participants reported a slightly greater number of difficulty units for the TWT than for the AWT. Second, the participants had difficulty with Phrase Construction issues in both writing tasks, but more so for the AWT. Third, the participants attended to Word Choice difficulty units much more in the TWT than in the AWT. In fact, the percentage of Word Choice difficulty units was the highest among all the difficulty units in the TWT. This result is to be expected since the nature of the TWT required the participants to use English words that corresponded to the Korean words in the given text, whereas the participants had more freedom to use English words of their own choice in the AWT. Fourth, the percentage of Structure and Others difficulty units was slightly higher in the AWT than in the TWT.

Fifth, the participants had low, but similar percentages of difficulty units for Spelling in both writing tasks. However, one participant (i.e., Sean), especially, had difficulty with Spelling issues. For the TWT, six of the seven units for Spelling were reported by this participant alone. The participants as a whole had much less difficulty with Spelling in the TWT than in the AWT. Sixth, similar results appeared for the Morphological Form category. That is, the three units for Morphological Form were reported only by Ria. Evidently, most of the participants had much less difficulty with Morphological Form in the TWT compared to the AWT.

5.2 RQ1b. What strategies do they use to overcome the problems?

In this section, the overall findings on the use of strategies that the participants reported for the AWT and the TWT in Phase 1 are presented first. Next, examples of strategy use for the two writing tasks are presented. Although many comparable strategies were employed in both tasks, differences did appear.
5.2.1 Argumentative Writing

Table 5-4 shows the coding results of the strategy use units that the participants in Phase 1 reported for the sentence-by-sentence questions in the stimulated-recall interview for the AWT. There were a total of 91 strategy use units reported by the participants. The number of strategy use units reported by each participant ranged from seven for Abril and August to 19 for Sam. The most frequently reported strategy use units were in the following order: exercising best judgment (30.8%), using one’s own resources (24.2%), avoiding (15.4%), rephrasing (14.3%), and consulting a dictionary (14.3%).

Table 5-4. Strategy use units for the AWT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EBJ</th>
<th>UOR</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abril</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(30.8%) (24.2%) (14.3%) (14.3%) (15.4%) (1.1%) (100%)

Notes. EBJ = exercising best judgment. UOR = using one’s own resources. RP = rephrasing. CD = consulting a dictionary. AV = avoiding. O = others.

5.2.2 Translation Writing

The coding results of the strategy use units that the participants reported for the sentence-by-sentence questions in the stimulated-recall interview for the TWT are shown in Table 5-5. The total number of strategy use units reported was 110, with the number of units reported by each participant ranging from 10 for Moon to 21 for Sean. The most frequently used types of strategies were consulting a dictionary (37.3%), rephrasing (23.6%), exercising best judgment (20%), avoiding (8.2%), using one’s own resources (5.5%), and others (5.5%).
Table 5-5. Strategy use units for the TWT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EBJ</th>
<th>UOR</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abril</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. EBJ = exercising best judgment. UOR = using one’s own resources. RP = rephrasing. CD = consulting a dictionary. AV = avoiding. O = others.

For comparison, Table 5-6 shows the total number of strategy uses by the participants in Phase 1 for both writing tasks. An initial observation is that the participants reported slightly more strategy units for the TWT than for the AWT. Second, the participants used rephrasing strategies more in the TWT than in the AWT. In the stimulated-interview session for the TWT, many of the participants commented that doing a direct translation of the Korean text into English was difficult, citing this as the reason for the higher percentage of rephrasing strategies in this task.

Table 5-6. Strategy use units for both writing tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EBJ</th>
<th>UOR</th>
<th>RP</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>AV</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30.8%)</td>
<td>(24.2%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(15.4%)</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(5.5%)</td>
<td>(23.6%)</td>
<td>(37.3%)</td>
<td>(8.2%)</td>
<td>(5.5%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. EBJ = exercising best judgment. UOR = using one’s own resources. RP = rephrasing. CD = consulting a dictionary. AV = avoiding. O = others.

Third, the participants consulted dictionaries more frequently in the TWT than in the AWT. The percentage of strategy units for consulting a dictionary was highest among all the strategies in the TWT. This strategy consisted primarily of the participants’ searching the
Korean-English dictionary for English words that corresponded to the Korean words in the text. On the other hand, the use of the English dictionary was low. Interestingly, the opposite was true in the AWT, for which the participants used mostly the English dictionary.

Fourth, the participants exercised their best judgment and relied on their own resources more in the AWT than in the TWT. Fifth, the percentage of strategy use units for avoiding was higher in the AWT than in the TWT. Table 5-5 shows that seven of the nine strategies units for avoiding in the TWT were reported by Ria alone, however, again confirming her idiosyncracies in relation to the other participants. On the whole, the participants used more avoiding strategies in the AWT than in the TWT. These results seem reasonable because the text the participants had to translate into English was provided in the TWT, whereas they had the freedom to select their own ideas and compose their own essays in the AWT.

5.2.3 Examples of Strategy Use from the AWT

The examples of strategy use in both writing tasks were coded under the following six main categories: (a) exercising best judgment, (b) using one’s own resources, (c) rephrasing, (d) consulting a dictionary, (e) avoiding, and (f) others.

5.2.3.1 Exercising best judgment

The strategies in this category included the following subcategories:

(a) Make a guess based on best judgment

In some cases, the participants had difficulty deciding among options and were left to guess based on their best judgment.

• In his sentence ‘Although many Korean afraid of talking with foreign people because we couldn’t have much time to talk with them’, Sam was not sure whether to use the phrase ‘afraid to talk’ or ‘afraid of talking’. He chose to use the latter.
• Moon used the word ‘ability’ several times in his essay. He was not sure whether to use the word ‘skill’ or ‘ability’. He chose to use ‘ability’ because he believed that “this word is used more frequently.”

(b) Use a known word that best matches the intended meaning of a word

When word choice was a problem, the participants often used a known word that best matched their intended meaning of a word.

• In the sentence ‘We can easily find lots of English academy in Korea anywhere’, Sam used the word ‘academy’ to mean ‘a private education institute’ (‘학원’ in Korean, literally a compound consisting of two words ‘learn’ and ‘house’), which abounds in Korea. He remarked “I wanted to emphasize private education. I used the word ‘academy’ because I thought the expression ‘English school’ would be awkward.”

• Sean in his essay wrote ‘So all of student wish that improve their abilities’. He mentioned that he used the word ‘improve’ to express the meaning of “increase” or “make it grow.”

5.2.3.2 Using one’s own resources

The strategies in this category included the following subcategories:

(a) Use memorized forms/patterns of structure or expression

In several instances, the participants took advantage of forms/patterns of structures or expressions that they were familiar with.

• For example, Sean wrote the sentence ‘Actually they can find a job compared to another students in Korea’ in his essay. He indicated that he frequently used the pattern ‘can…compare to’, which he can think of instantly when writing.

• Paul wrote ‘But as fate would have it, it is a fact we cannot deny’. He learned the phrase ‘as fate would have it’ from a movie and enjoys using it.
(b) Use the only available word/expression

On many occasions, the participant used a word or expression because it was the only one they could think of.

- In his essay, Sam wrote ‘We couldn’t use English more than 3 hours if we stay in Korea and also our improvement is going to go slowly’. He intended to express the idea that the process of improving his English skills would be slow due to the insufficient amount of input in Korea. The expression that he could think of was ‘is going to go slowly’.

- Abril used the word ‘foreign’ a couple of times in her essay. She wanted to use a different word because she felt that “it is not a good word to use.” She mentioned, however, that she could not find any other word to replace this word.

5.2.3.3 Rephrasing

The strategies in this category included the following subcategories:

(a) Use alternative expression for difficult ones

Another strategy used by the participants was to rephrase an expression in a different way when the intended meaning was difficult to express in English. This strategy was used in a variety of ways in the TWT.

- Alex wanted to convey the message that “The internet and the development of communication technology widened their scope of thinking,” but ended up saying ‘The development of communication technique could be one reason of their journey’.

- In the sentence ‘Most Koreans still think that getting a degree in another county, for example in America, Canada, UK, and so on, is better than doing it in Korea even though the school is not well-known’, Paul resorted to using the phrase ‘not well-known’ when he was actually thinking about “a medium-sized university that is not too big or too prestigious in comparison to Seoul National University in Korea.”
(b) Use a word-for-word translation from Korean to English

In some cases, the participants relied primarily on their L1 for difficult expressions, making a word-for-word translation from Korean into English.

- For example, in the sentence ‘However, if we go to abroad and we automatically are going to use English more than in Korea’, Sam had intended to say “use English in a foreign country more than we would in Korea,” but had difficulty with the phrase ‘more than in Korea’ (‘한국에서보다’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘Korea in than’). He noted that this was a direct word-for-word translation from Korean.

- In his essay, Moon wrote the sentence ‘So korea people problem are speaking’. The difficulty for him was to use the intended phrase ‘korea people problem’ (‘한국 사람들의 문제’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘Korea people’s problem’) as the subject of the sentence. He indicated that he made a word-for-word translation from Korean to English for this phrase. He had intended to say “So Korean people have problems with speaking skills.”

(c) List a series of words

Another strategy that the participants used when they had difficulty constructing longer expressions was to use a series of known words as their building blocks.

- Alex indicated that “everything was difficult” about constructing the sentence ‘Furthermore they can hear easily about failure at work due to English from people around them’. The issue of word choice seemed especially difficult for him. He formed the structure of this sentence by listing a series of prepositions that were needed in the sentence.

- In the sentence ‘So I think other countries people fast to learning is faster than Korean people’, Moon had difficulty constructing the phrase ‘other countries people fast to learning’ as the subject of the embedded clause in the sentence. He tried to construct the phrase by using a series of nouns that he knew.
5.2.3.4 Consulting a dictionary

The strategies in this category included the following subcategories:

(a) Consult an English dictionary

Several participants consulted the English dictionary to check the spelling and meaning of words.

• Alex looked up the word ‘pursuing’ to check its spelling. Likewise, Sean looked up the words ‘recession’, ‘military’, and ‘definitely’.

• Sam had difficulty distinguishing the words ‘despite’, ‘in spite’, and ‘although’ from one another. He looked up these words for their meanings.

(b) Consult a Korean-English dictionary

A few participants consulted the Korean-English dictionary to look up English expressions that corresponded to the Korean ones.

• August searched the word ‘competitive power’ (‘경쟁력’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘competition power’) in the sentence ‘Thus, students have to study other languages, and it can be another competitive power for their future’.

• In the sentence ‘It is clear that all of them will give them a wider mental horizon’, Paul found the phrase ‘wider mental horizon’ (‘더 넓은 시야’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘more wide view’) from the Korean-English dictionary.

5.2.3.5 Avoiding

There were two types of strategies related to avoidance that the participants employed. The first type – which did not lead to the resolution of their problems – involved the participants’ forsaking their attempts to construct expressions that were difficult for them. The other type was
more productive in that the participants actively searched for alternative words or expressions to avoid repetition.

(a) Avoid using a difficult expression

- Alex did not express the idea of the students’ going abroad “to achieve social success” in his sentence ‘Most students decided to go abroad to succeed in Korean without especial reasons’.

- Abril used the rhetorical question ‘Why is it happening?’ in her introductory paragraph. Although she wanted to give further explanation to this question, she had difficulty doing so and therefore just ended the paragraph with the sentence ‘There are several reasons that some students study at the foreign countries’.

(b) Use another word to avoid repetition

- Sean used the phrase ‘go abroad’ in the sentence ‘If you want to go abroad, you must have a lot of money’ because he had used the phrase ‘study abroad’ in an earlier sentence and wanted to avoid repeating the same phrase again.

- In the sentence ‘Also, most schools and Universities demand language test score when students apply for the school’, August used the phrase ‘apply for the school’ to avoid using the same phrase ‘schools and Universities’ at the beginning of the sentence.

5.2.3.6 Others

- Alex first used the present perfect tense for the verb ‘decide’ in the sentence ‘Most students decided to go abroad to succeed in Korean without especial reasons’, but changed it to the past tense when he saw the word underlined in red by a word processor software he was using.
5.2.4 Examples of Strategy Use from the TWT

Examples of strategy use in the TWT are grouped in the same categories as those for the AWT. To facilitate readers’ understanding, the intended English translations according to the original source are provided in parallel to the participants’ translations in brackets.

5.2.4.1 Exercising best judgment

The strategies in this category included the following subcategories:

(a) Use a known word that best matches the intended meaning of a word

The participants occasionally had difficulty choosing between two similar words. In such cases, they chose the one that they thought best matched their intended meaning.

- In his sentence ‘Force of music is diversified’ (‘The power of music is diverse’), for example, Sean was considering the choice between the two words ‘force’ and ‘power’ (‘힘’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘power’). Interestingly, he did not think either was appropriate. He chose the former, judging that this word also carried the connotative meaning of “to have influence on something.”

- Abril thought that she could use either the word ‘amusing’ or ‘exciting’ (‘신나는’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘exciting’) in her sentence, ‘Music is instinctive and amusing sound for some people who usually dance with it or move their bodies’ (‘To some it is mainly an instinctive, exciting sound to which they dance or move their bodies’). She thought ‘amusing’ was a better word to use.

(b) Look for a better word than the original Korean word

- In the sentence ‘Another people try to understand the meaning about lyrics’ (‘Other people listen for its message’), Sean used the word ‘lyric’ instead of ‘message’ (‘메시지’ in Korean, a loan word for ‘message’), thinking that the message of music is in its lyrics.
• August used the word ‘effect’ instead of ‘power’ in her sentence ‘Music has variety effects’ (‘The power of music is diverse’), judging that the Korean word ‘power’ (‘힘’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘power’) in the text meant a non-physical type of influence.

5.2.4.2 Using one’s own resources

The strategies in this category included the following subcategories:

(a) Use memorized forms/patterns of expressions to convey meaning

• In the sentence ‘There is hardly anyone who doesn’t respond to music to any extend’ (‘There are few people who do not react to music to some degree’), Alex used the phrase ‘to any extend’. He used this phrase because he knew the phrase ‘to some extant’. The sentence structure starting with ‘There is’ here also was a pattern that he knew and often used.

(b) Use a word/expression that comes to one’s mind

A few students mentioned that they used whatever word or expression they could think of at the time of writing.

• Sam had difficulty translating the long sentence ‘Music is an instinct and active sound for dancing or moving their body to some of people’ (‘To some it is mainly an instinctive, exciting sound to which they dance or move their bodies’). He did not know where to start. He read the sentence in Korean and wrote down whatever he could in English.

• For the same sentence, Ria wrote the phrase ‘waving the body’ (‘moving their body’). Even though she tried to look up another word for ‘wave’ (‘움직이 는’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘moving’), this was the word she thought of at the time of writing and so used it in her essay.

5.2.4.3 Rephrasing

The strategies in this category included the following subcategories:

(a) Phrase the intended word/expression in a different way
For difficult words and expressions, the participants occasionally tried to phrase them in a different way.

• Paul had difficulty with the phrase ‘the rest’ in his sentence ‘some music can overwhelm our spirit until spirit forgets the rest’ (‘some music is capable of overtaking the mind until it forgets all else’). He tried, but was unsuccessful at finding an appropriate expression for ‘all else’ (‘그 밖의 모든 것’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘that outside everything’) and ended up using the phrase ‘the rest’ instead.

• In his sentence ‘Some people appreciate special or patter a form of it’ (‘Other people listen for its message…, appreciating its formal patterns or originality’), Moon could not find a right word to use for the word ‘originality’ (‘독창성’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘originality’). He chose to use the word ‘special’ instead, but in an incorrect way.

(b) Paraphrase

Some of the participants did not follow the exact translations, but paraphrased based on their own understanding of the sentences.

• Sean, especially, paraphrased most of his sentences. For example, he wrote ‘Another people try to understand the meaning about lyrics. And they approach a form, structure as a profession and then they listen to its pattern and originality’ for the sentence ‘Other people listen for its message, or take an intellectual approach to its form and construction, appreciating its formal patterns or originality’.

• Abril also paraphrased her sentence ‘However, above all, it is almost impossible that there is someone exists who cannot be touched by any kind of music’ (‘Above all, however, there can be hardly anyone who is not moved by some kind of music’).
(c) Use a word-for-word translation from Korean to English

For some difficult expressions, the participants relied on doing a word-for-word translation from Korean to English.

- For example, Alex had difficulty constructing the phrase ‘almost never exist’ (‘거의 없다’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘almost not exist’) in the sentence ‘However, first of all, the people who don’t be impressed by any kind of music could almost never exist’ (‘Above all, however, there can be hardly anyone who is not moved by some kind of music’). The phrase was a word-for-word translation from Korean to English.

- Paul used the noun phrase ‘deep memory’ (‘깊은 기억들’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘deep memories’), which was a word-for-word translation from Korean to English, in his sentence ‘It work on unconsciousness that it makes a mood or people enhance or people’s deep memory recall’ (‘It works on the subconscious, creating or enhancing mood and unlocking deep memories’). Interestingly, it is also an appropriate phrase in English.

5.2.4.4 Consulting a dictionary

The strategies in this category included the following subcategories:

(a) Consult an English dictionary

There were a few instances in which two of the participants used the English dictionary to check the spelling of words.

- Some of the words the participants looked up to check spelling were ‘instinct’, ‘lyric’, ‘pattern’, ‘structure’, ‘exhausted’, ‘overwhelm’, etc.

(b) Consult a Korean-English dictionary

All the participants used the Korean-English dictionary frequently to look up a Korean word for its corresponding English word. Some of the words the participants looked up were ‘intrinsic’ (‘본능적’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘instinctive’), ‘formal’ (‘형식적’ in Korean,
literally meaning ‘formal’), ‘originality’ (‘독창성’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘originality’), ‘unconsciousness’ (‘무의식’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘subconscious’), ‘encourage’ (‘고양시켜주다’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘enhance’), ‘profound’ (‘깊은’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘deep’), ‘overpower’ (‘압도하다’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘overtake’), etc.

5.2.4.5 Avoiding

The strategies in this category included the following subcategories:

(a) Avoid using a difficult expression

The participants sometimes failed to use a word or expression they wanted to use because they simply lacked the linguistic knowledge to do so.

• For his sentence ‘It affect to unconsciousness to make mood or encourage and lead deep inside of memories’ (‘It works on the subconscious, creating or enhancing mood and unlocking deep memories’), Sam felt that there was something missing after the verb ‘encourage’. However, he left it alone, not knowing what the verb required.

• Ria just used the verb ‘is’ in her sentence ‘music is all range of emotion’ (‘Music covers the whole range of emotions’), because she could not think of a verb for the word ‘cover’.

(b) Use another word to avoid repetition

There were only two instances in which one participant voluntarily used another word to avoid repetition.

• For example, in her sentence ‘Some people is listening a massage of music or thinking about pattern and originality of it that approximate intellectually form and structure of music’ (‘Other people listen for its message, or take an intellectual approach to its form and construction, appreciating its formal patterns or originality’), Ria used the word ‘thinking’ to avoid repeating the word ‘listening’, which she had just used in the same sentence.
5.2.4.6 Others

- When there was ambiguity in the Korean text, the participants gave a translation based on their own interpretation. In the sentence ‘Another people intend to listen to the message of music’ (‘Other people listen for its message’), Alex was not sure whether the phrase ‘listen to’ (‘들으려하거나’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘listen try’) in the Korean text also signified the intention of listening. Alex included the word ‘intend’ to emphasize this aspect of meaning.

- August used the word ‘energetic’ in her sentence ‘It makes us happy or sad, or spiritless or energetic’ (‘It can make us feel happy or sad, helpless or energetic’). She had intended to use the phrase ‘full of energy’, but used ‘energetic’ instead to maintain consistency with the other one-word adjectives in the sentence.

- In his sentence ‘Music is mainly the instinctive and amusing sound to some people to make them dance or move their bodies to the music’ (‘To some it is mainly an instinctive, exciting sound to which they dance or move their bodies’), Paul first considered using either the phrase ‘based on’ or ‘according to’, but decided to use ‘to the music’ because he thought they sounded too academic.

5.2.5 Summary

Table 5-7 shows the coding results of the 91 strategy use units for the AWT in relation to the difficulty units for which these strategies were employed.

| Table 5-7. Difficulty X strategy use units for the AWT |
|-----------------|--------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|
|                 | EBJ    | UOR  | RP   | CD   | AV   | O    | Total  |
| Word Choice     | 12     | 7     | 0    | 3    | 4    | 0    | 26     |
| Structure       | 8      | 1     | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 9      |
| Morphological Form | 2     | 1     | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1    | 4      |
| Spelling        | 0      | 0     | 0    | 7    | 0    | 0    | 7      |
| Phrase Construction | 5     | 13    | 13   | 3    | 9    | 0    | 43     |
| Others          | 1      | 0     | 0    | 0    | 1    | 0    | 2      |
| Total           | 28     | 22    | 13   | 13   | 14   | 1    | 91     |

Notes. EBJ = exercising best judgment. UOR = using one’s own resources. RP = rephrasing. CD = consulting a dictionary. AV = avoiding. O = others.
In general, the participants exercised best judgment primarily for Word Choice, Structure, and Phrase Construction difficulty units; used their own resources to address Phrase Construction and Word Choice units; used rephrasing strategies solely for Phrase Construction units; consulted dictionaries mainly for Spelling, but also for Word Choice and Phrase Construction units; and resorted to avoiding strategies for Phrase Construction and Word Choice units. There was one case of using the Others strategy (i.e., using the Microsoft word tool) for a Morphological Form unit.

Table 5-8 shows the coding results of the 110 strategy use units for the TWT in relation to the difficulty units for which these strategies were employed. In general, the participants exercised best judgment solely for Word Choice difficulty units; used their own resources to address Word Choice and Phrase Construction units; used rephrasing strategies primarily for Phrase Construction units; consulted dictionaries mainly for Word Choice, but also for Spelling and Phrase Construction units; and resorted to avoiding strategies for Phrase Construction and Word Choice units. There were six instances in which the Others strategies were used (see Section 5.2.4.6 for examples).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty X Strategy Use Units for the TWT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EBJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. EBJ = exercising best judgment. UOR = using one’s own resources. RP = rephrasing. CD = consulting a dictionary. AV = avoiding. O = others.
Together, the participants exercised their best judgment mostly for Word Choice difficulty units, but also for Structure and Phrase Construction units in the AWT; relied on their own resources for Word Choice and Phrase construction units in both writing tasks; employed rephrasing strategies for Phrase Construction units; consulted dictionaries for Word Choice, Spelling, and Phrase Construction units in both writing tasks, but mostly for Word Choice units in the TWT; and used avoiding strategies for Word Choice and Phrase Construction units. The participants’ strategy use in relation to their difficulty units was very similar in both writing tasks, with the exception that they frequently consulting dictionaries for Word Choice units in the TWT.
Chapter 6. Phase 2 Results

In this chapter, I present the findings for Phase 2 of the study, which was guided by the second research question. The findings presented in this chapter combine results for the five participants who continued to participate in Phase 2. Chapter 7 provides case studies of two participants, Alex and Ria, to illustrate in detail the developmental processes of the two participants who differed most in their SRL skills.

6.1 RQ2a. What changes are observable in the learners’ SRL skills for English writing throughout the intervention period?

In this section, I present findings about the difficulty and strategy use units that the five participants reported for the first draft essays of the four tasks in Phase 2. As described in Chapter 4, I analyzed the changes in the difficulty and strategy use units across tasks to examine the participants’ development of SRL skills over the intervention period.

The overall coding results of the stimulated-recall interviews for the five participants in Phase 2 are shown in Table 6-1. The results are based on self-reports for the sentence-by-sentence questions in the interview. The first left column represents the categories of the difficulty units; the top row represents the strategy use units. There were a total of 349 difficulty and 352 strategy use units reported by the participants over the four writing tasks. It is very likely that the participants occasionally attempted to employ more than one strategy to address a difficulty unit. For the most part, however, they reported one strategy – probably the one that was most effective – for each difficulty unit or did not indicate a use of strategy, with the exception that Alex and Sam reported two strategy use units for two and one difficulty units,
respectively. Therefore, these three difficulty units (i.e., one unit each for Word Choice, Collocation, and Phrase Construction) in Table 6-1 were coded twice.

### Table 6-1. Overall coding results of the stimulated-recall interviews in Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Notes. WC} = \text{Word Choice. C} = \text{Collocation. S} = \text{Structure. MF} = \text{Morphological Form. Sp} = \text{Spelling. PC} = \text{Phrase Construction. O} = \text{Others. SS} = \text{Self-Strategy. ED} = \text{English Dictionary. Th} = \text{Thesaurus. KED} = \text{Korean English Dictionary. CD} = \text{Collocations Dictionary. Cr} = \text{Corpus.}\]

### 6.1.1 Difficulty Units

The coding results of the difficulty units reported for the sentence-by-sentence questions in the stimulated-recall interviews for the first draft essays of the four tasks in Phase 2 are shown in Table 6-2. Since the essays from Task 1 to Task 4 were written in chronological order with similar time intervals between each task, Table 6-2 illustrates the changes in the participants' areas of difficulty according to time.

In total, 349 difficulty units were coded. The number of units reported by the participants gradually decreased from 120 in Task 1 to 91 in Task 2 to 73 in Task 3 and finally to 65 in Task 4. Overall, the categories of difficulty units from the most to the least frequently reported were: Phrase Construction (50.4%), Word Choice (17.8%), Collocation (9.7%), Others (9.5%),
Structure (5.7%), Morphological Form (5.7%), and Spelling (1.1%). The Others category mostly included punctuation and organization, but also register and essay content issues.

Table 6-2. Difficulty units in Phase 2 across tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Task 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word Choice</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(17.6%)</td>
<td>(13.7%)</td>
<td>(18.5%)</td>
<td>(17.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
<td>(9.9%)</td>
<td>(16.4%)</td>
<td>(16.9%)</td>
<td>(9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.2%)</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>(5.5%)</td>
<td>(4.6%)</td>
<td>(5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological Form</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>(3.1%)</td>
<td>(5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(3.1%)</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(45%)</td>
<td>(54.9%)</td>
<td>(54.8%)</td>
<td>(49.2%)</td>
<td>(50.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.3%)</td>
<td>(12.1%)</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>(4.6%)</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.3%)</td>
<td>(12.1%)</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>(4.6%)</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several observations can be made from Table 6-2. First, among the categories of difficulty, Phrase Construction occupied the largest portion of difficulty units across all four tasks, comprising nearly half of the reported difficulty units (i.e., 50.41%). Despite the several weeks of intervention, the participants continually experienced difficulty in constructing phrases. This tendency implies that: (a) the participants chiefly attended to relatively larger units of language than words in their writing, and (b) they had to access or retrieve a combination of linguistic specifications stored in lexical items (i.e., semantic, syntactic, morphological, and orthographic) simultaneously to construct the phrases.
Table 6-3. Phrase Construction units by participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
<th>Predicate Phrase</th>
<th>Adverb Phrase</th>
<th>Prepositional Phrase</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(42.9%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(3.6%)</td>
<td>(28.6%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(46.2%)</td>
<td>(12.8%)</td>
<td>(2.6%)</td>
<td>(7.7%)</td>
<td>(30.8%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abril</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>(13.9%)</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>(55.6%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.4%)</td>
<td>(21.7%)</td>
<td>(8.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(52.2%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(54%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(28.4%)</td>
<td>(17.6%)</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
<td>(44.9%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-3 shows the coding results of only the Phrase Construction units for each of the five participants according to the types of phrase construction involved. As a whole, the participants frequently encountered difficulty in constructing clauses (44.9%), noun phrases (28.4%), predicate phrases (17.6%), adverb phrases (4.5%), and prepositional phrases (4.5%), in that order. For all the participants, the percentage of adverb and prepositional phrases was low. The extent of attention given to predicate phrases was fairly high. Furthermore, the percentage of noun phrases was higher than that of clauses for Alex and Sam, whereas the opposite was true for the other three participants.

Table 6-4 shows the coding results of the Phrase Construction units, this time across the four tasks. As shown in the Table, the percentage of attention to clause units remained around 50% until Task 3, but showed a significant drop in Task 4. Moreover, the percentage of noun phrases decreased until Task 3 but then increased in Task 4, while that of predicate phrases increased until Task 3 but then decreased in Task 4. The number of units for adverb and prepositional phrases was too small to show any meaningful trends.
Table 6-4. Phrase Construction units across tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
<th>Predicative Phrase</th>
<th>Adverb Phrase</th>
<th>Prepositional Phrase</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>17 (31.5%)</td>
<td>5 (9.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.9%)</td>
<td>4 (7.4%)</td>
<td>27 (50%)</td>
<td>54 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>15 (30%)</td>
<td>7 (14%)</td>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>24 (48%)</td>
<td>50 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
<td>13 (32.5%)</td>
<td>0 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (2%)</td>
<td>20 (50%)</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
<td>6 (18.8%)</td>
<td>4 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.4%)</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>32 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50 (28.4%)</td>
<td>31 (17.6%)</td>
<td>8 (4.5%)</td>
<td>8 (4.5%)</td>
<td>79 (44.9%)</td>
<td>176 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering the data in Table 6-2, a second observation is that the percentage of Collocation difficulty units gradually increased across tasks from 1.7% in Task 1 to 16.9% by the end of the intervention period. The amount of increase was distinct through Task 3 (i.e., from 1.7% to 9.9% to 16.4%) and continued to Task 4 (i.e., 16.9%). As illustrated in Section 5.1, the participants did not experience difficulty with collocation issues before the intervention began. They seemed to become better aware of and to attend more to collocation issues in their writing throughout the intervention. These trends with regard to each participant will be further discussed in Chapter 8.

Third, Table 6-2 shows that the participants maintained a fairly high level of attention to word choices throughout the tasks. Although the percentage of Word Choice units dropped slightly in Tasks 2 and 3, it increased again to 18.5% in Task 4. Improving both word choice and collocations in writing necessitates access to appropriate semantic specifications of words. When the Word Choice and Collocation units were merged together, the percentage of the merged difficulty units increased progressively across tasks (i.e., from 21.7% to 27.5% to 30.1% and finally to 35.4%). The participants seemed to become more attentive to using better words in their writing by attending increasingly to word or phrase collocations.
Fourth, Table 6-2 shows that the percentages of Structure and Morphological Form units were both approximately 10% in Task 1, but declined afterwards. Furthermore, the percentage of Spelling units was low throughout the tasks and that of the Others category was lower in the latter two tasks. Apart from the trends cited above – particularly for types of attention to phrase structures and collocation – these data show minor fluctuations by task rather than distinct changes in difficulty issues for the participants over time.

6.1.2 Strategy Use Units

The coding results of the stimulated-recall interviews with regard to strategy use by the five participants in Phase 2 are shown in Table 6-5. In total, 352 strategy use units were coded. The most frequently used strategies were in the following order: Self-strategy (63.1%) then uses of the Korean-English dictionary (18.5%), Corpus (7.1%), Collocations dictionary (4.5%), English dictionary (2.3%), Thesaurus (2.3%), and Others (2.3%). The Others category included mainly searching the internet, but also using the Microsoft word tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Type</th>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Task 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83.3%)</td>
<td>(60.4%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(44.8%)</td>
<td>(63.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.2%)</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
<td>(5.5%)</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KED</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.2%)</td>
<td>(19.8%)</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td>(28.4%)</td>
<td>(18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.7%)</td>
<td>(4.1%)</td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
<td>(10.4%)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.5%)</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations that can be made from the coding results in Table 6-5 are, first, that the percentage of Self-strategy units progressively decreased across the four tasks: It started at 83.3% in Task 1, but dropped to 44.8% by the time of Task 4, which was approximately half the original portion. At the start of the intervention period, the participants relied predominately on self-employed strategies; the next two most frequently employed strategies – consulting the Korean-English and English dictionaries – constituted only 13.4% of the total reported strategy use units. The participants’ strategy use at this point closely resembled their strategy use in the AWT in Phase 1, 14.3% of which was also consulting the Korean-English and English dictionaries and the rest, self-employed strategies. By the time the intervention period was over, the participants seem to have shifted their uses of self-employed strategies to strategies that involved particular lexical tools rather than their own memories or independent analyses.

Table 6-6 shows the use of self-strategies for each participant across tasks. The percentages of self-strategy units with respect to the overall strategy use units are shown in brackets. As shown in the Table, the proportion of this category of strategy use by Sam and Ria
gradually decreased, with the exception of an increase in Task 4 for Ria. For Alex, there was a sharp decrease after Task 1 to a constant level maintained throughout subsequent tasks. The use of self-strategies for Abril was over 90% from Task 1 to Task 3, but slightly decreased in Task 4. For August, it fluctuated but remained fairly high.

Second, there was a steady increase in uses of the Korean-English dictionary chronologically. All the participants took advantage of consulting the Korean-English dictionary when necessary. As L2 learners of English, the use of the Korean-English dictionary when they did not have direct access to the L2 words for concepts they wanted to write about should be expected. Furthermore, the several weeks of tutoring would not have been long enough for the participants to have gained much distinct productive knowledge of vocabulary.

Third, there was an increase in the use of the collocations dictionary and the corpus, despite decreases in their usage in Task 3 and Task 4, respectively. These two linguistic tools were completely new to the participants when the study began, evident in the absence of their usage in Task 1. Their combined usage increased to 8.8% in Task 2, and even more so to 27.1% in Task 3, but then dropped to 19.4% in Task 4. The unusually high percentage of increase in the use of the corpus in Task 3 (i.e., from 1.1% in Task 2 to 23% in Task 3) was produced by one participant (i.e., Alex), who used the corpus extensively for writing this task.

Fourth, the use of the English dictionary, the thesaurus, and other tools remained low throughout the tasks. The percentage of English dictionary use even showed a tendency to decrease in general. Two participants (i.e., Alex and Sam) mostly produced the few uses of the thesaurus.
6.2 RQ2b. *How do their self-efficacy beliefs change as learners go through the cyclic model of SRL?*

This section examines the participants’ self-ratings within the same task sets (i.e., for the first draft and final revised essays of each task) and across tasks (i.e., with regard to only the first draft essays of the four tasks). The participants did not receive any help or feedback when they wrote their first drafts, but their revised essays for each task were done after having received approximately 90 minutes of tutoring intervention.

The participants’ self-rating and confidence level scores for all their draft and revised essays of the four tasks are shown in Table 6-7. The self-rating results with regard to only the first draft essays are provided in Table 6-8 for ease of reference across tasks. In these two tables, the essays are labelled as follows: the first number indicates the task number; and the second number indicates the draft or revision number. For example, T11 refers to the first draft of the first task; T12 to the second draft (i.e., the first revision) of the first task; and T13 to the third draft (i.e., the second revision) of the first task. There was only one draft for Task 4, which is labelled as T4. The same labelling is used hereafter.

| Table 6-7. Self-rating and confidence level scores by participants |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                   | Task 1         | Task 2         | Task 3         | Task 4         |
|                   | T11 | T12 | T13 | T21 | T22 | T23 | T31 | T32 | T33 | T4 |
| Alex              | SR  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |
|                   |     | 2   | 3   | 4   | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 4   | 4  |
|                   | CL  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  |
| Sam               | SR  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |
|                   |     | 3   | 3.5 | 4   | 3.5 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 4.4 | 3.8|
|                   | CL  | -1  | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  |
| Abril             | SR  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |
|                   |     | 3   | 4   | 4.6 | 3   | 4   | 4.5 | 3   | 4   | -   | 3  |
|                   | CL  | 1   | -1  | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0.5 | 0   | 0   | 1  |
| August            | SR  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |
|                   |     | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4   | 2.9 | 4   | 4.5 | 3   | 3.5 | -   | -  |
|                   | CL  | -1  | 0   | 0   | -1  | 0   | -1  | 1   | 1   | -   | -  |
| Ria               | SR  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |
|                   |     | 2   | 3   | 3.5 | 3   | 3   | -   | 3   | 3.5 | 3   | 4.5|
|                   | CL  | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | -   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  |

*Notes.* SR = Self-Rating. CL = Confidence Level.
The nature and amount of change in self-efficacy beliefs differed for each participant. Therefore, the results are presented separately for each participant, which is followed by a summary of the results.

6.2.1 Alex

Within tasks. Alex’s self-rating scores changed from 2 to 3 to 4 for each subsequent draft in the first task. The magnitude of change over drafts in the second task was much smaller, with an increase of only 0.2 and 0.3 for T22 and T23, respectively. In the third task, there was even a decrease of 0.1 in the self-ratings from T31 to T32. Alex reported some difficulty in using the corpus when it produced too many results for him to manage at this stage, causing him to feel less confident about this revised essay. The self-rating then increased to 4 for T33.

Across tasks. There was a gradual increase in his self-rating scores. Alex started out with a self-rating of 2 and ended with 4, a doubling in magnitude, though Alex might have been overly conservative in self-rating his first essay.

Confidence level. For only T21 and T22 did Alex indicate a confidence level of 1. Alex gave himself a low self-rating of 2 with a confidence level of 0 for T11. He might have started with a low rating since this was his first essay. After having worked on two revisions for the first task, he gave himself a rating of 3.3 for T21 with a confidence level of 1. His self-rating for the next draft slightly increased to 3.5 with the same confidence level of 1. The confidence level score for all the other essays was 0.
6.2.2 Sam

**Within tasks.** Sam showed a steady increase in self-rating scores of drafts within each task. Furthermore, the magnitude of increase from the first to second revised essays, was greater (approximately from 0.5 to 0.6) compared to the increase from the first draft to the first revised essays, which was approximately from 0.2 to 0.5.

**Across tasks.** Sam displayed a gradual increase in self-rating scores across tasks, although his self-ratings remained the same at 3.5 for T21 and T31. Sam started out with a self-rating of 3 and ended with 3.8.

**Confidence level.** Sam gave himself a self-rating of 3 with a confidence level score of -1 for his first essay. He might not have been confident about this rating, since this was the first essay he had to rate. For T21, Sam’s self-rating was 3.5 with a confidence level score of 1. The other confidence level scores were all 0.

6.2.3 Abril

**Within tasks.** Abril also showed a steady increase in her self-rating scores within each task. With Abril, the magnitude of increase from the first draft to the first revised essays, which was a self-rating score of 1, was greater compared to the increase from the first to second revised essays, which was approximately from 0.5 to 0.6. Abril did not write a second revised essay for Task 3 (i.e., T33).

**Across tasks.** Abril’s self-ratings for the first draft essays remained the same across tasks with a score of 3. She chose a safe score (i.e., about midway between 3 out of 5) for all her first draft essays.

**Confidence level.** Abril’s confidence level scores were interesting. She started out with a self-rating of 3 with a confidence level score of 1 for her first essay. For her next revision, she
gave a higher rating of 4. She might have felt that the revised essay was much better, but with uncertainty, which led her to give a confidence level score of -1 for the revision. The confidence level increased again to 0 for T13. Her confidence level score for all Task 2 essays was 0. This slightly increased to 0.5 for T31, then went down to 0 again for T32. By T4, her confidence level was up to 1 again.

6.2.4 August

**Within tasks.** August’s self-rating scores also increased across drafts within each task. However, the scores remained the same at 3.5 for T11 and T12. The magnitude of increase was approximately from 0.5 to 0.6. August did not write a second revised essay for Task 3 (i.e., T33).

**Across tasks.** August dropped in self-rating scores from 3.5 for T11 to 2.9 for T21, and then showed a small increase from 2.9 for T21 to 3.0 for T31. August did not write a draft essay for Task 4.

**Confidence level.** August’s confidence level scores were low and fluctuated from -1 to 0 until the third task. She gave herself a rating of 3.5 with a confidence level score of -1 for her first essay. Her rating was the same for T12, but increased to 4 for T13. Her confidence level score for the two revisions was the same at 0. For T21, August gave herself a low 2.9 with a confidence level score of -1. Her self-rating increased to a high 4 on her next draft with a confidence level score of 0. Her rating increased even to a 4.5 on the next draft, but with a low confidence level score of -1. For her self-ratings on the next two essays on the third task, her confidence level score was 1.
6.2.5 Ria

**Within tasks.** Ria showed some increase in self-rating scores within tasks. However, the scores remained the same at 3 for T21 and T22. There was even a decrease of 0.5 from T32 to T33. Ria wrote T23, but did not provide a self-rating for that essay.

**Across tasks.** Ria displayed a gradual increase in self-rating scores across tasks, with the exception that the scores remained the same at 3 for T21 and T31. Ria started out with a self-rating of 2 and ended with 4.5, a notable increase. It appeared that Ria felt very confident about her writing at the end of the intervention period.

**Confidence level.** Ria’s confidence level score remained 0 throughout the intervention period with the exception of her first essay, which was a score of 1.

6.2.6 Summary

**Within tasks.** In most cases, the participants’ self-ratings increased as they made revisions within each task. This result was expected, since the participants had worked on improving the revisions after having received feedback.

**Across tasks.** In general, the self-ratings showed a tendency to increase across tasks for Alex, Sam, and Ria. The overall increase in ratings by Alex and Ria was relatively large. For Abril, her self-ratings remained the same across tasks; for August, they fluctuated.

The self-rating scores of the participants’ first essay (i.e., T11) must be interpreted with care. I did not provide the participants with sample ratings that could serve as guidelines to their rating. They were asked to self-rate their essays according to the TOEFL scoring rubrics. Although I went over the rubrics with each participant in detail before asking them to rate their essays, their first rating might not have been as reliable as the other ratings, which they had given after having received feedback about their previous ratings.
Confidence level. With the exception of Abril and August, the confidence level score of the other participants was mostly 0. Overall, the participants seemed quite neutral in respect to the confidence they had in rating their essays. Many of them mentioned that they were not sure whether they had self-rated their essays accurately when I asked them how they felt about their ratings. The confidence level scores were irregular for Abril and August.

6.3 RQ2c. *What influence does the change in the learners’ SRL skills have on their English writing performance?*

In this section of the chapter, I provide a summary of results of the lexical richness and syntactic complexity measures for the participants’ essays and of the rankings for these essays by the two native speakers. The detailed empirical results supporting each observation in this section appear in Appendix K for readers who may wish to refer to them. Once again, these measures are examined within and across tasks.

As described previously, the participants wrote the first draft essays on their own without receiving any feedback. In contrast, for subsequent compositions, they had opportunities to work on several lexical strategies to improve them. Although the revised essays might have resulted in somewhat better text quality, the extent to which the essays improved depended on various factors – such as the appropriateness and effectiveness of the strategies that individuals used or the time and effort they exerted for each task. Therefore, comparing the measures of the revised essays might not have the same value as comparing those of the first draft essays.
6.3.1 Lexical Richness and Syntactic Complexity

For measures of lexical richness, the type-token ratio and the Lexical Frequency Profile (LFP) were calculated; for syntactic complexity, the mean length of sentence (MLS) was calculated.

**Type-token ratio.** With a few minor exceptions, the type-token ratio of the final revised essays was higher than that of the first draft essays within each essay task for most participants. For Abril, the opposite tendency was observable for the second and third tasks. With regard to only the first draft essays, the type-token ratio generally increased across tasks. However, it fluctuated for August. Overall, the type-token ratio in the written compositions of Alex, Sam, and Ria, which ranged approximately from mid 0.4 to mid 0.5, was comparably higher than that of Abril and August, which ranged approximately from mid 0.3 to mid 0.4.

**LFP.** Overall, most words in the participants’ essays belonged to the K1 word group; only a small percentage of the words belonged to the K2 word or the AWL word group. However, the change in the LFP was noteworthy. In general for all the participants, the percentage of K1 words exhibited a tendency to decrease from the first draft to the revised essays within each essay task, whereas that of the K2 and AWL words showed a tendency to increase. With regard to only the first draft essays for most of the participants, the percentage of K1 words displayed a general tendency to decrease across tasks, whereas that of the K2 and AWL words revealed a tendency to increase. For Abril, the percentage of K2 words decreased from Task 1 to Task 3; for August, the percentage of AWL words was irregular across tasks. Overall, Alex and Ria showed a high use of AWL and K1 words, respectively, compared to the other participants.

**Syntactic Complexity.** The participants somewhat differed with respect to the measure of syntactic complexity. Within each task, results for this measure generally increased from the
first draft to the revised essays for Alex and Abril; it tended to decrease for August and Ria; and it was irregular for Sam. With regard to only the first draft essays, the MLS showed a general tendency to increase across tasks for Alex, Sam, and Ria; the opposite was true for Abril and August.

6.3.2. Ranking

**Within tasks.** In general, the final revised essays received higher rankings by the native speaking raters than the first draft essays within the same task sets for most of the participants. For Rater 1 (R1), 86.7% of the revised essays were ranked higher than their first draft versions; for Rater 2 (R2), 73.3% of the revised essays were ranked higher; and in total, 80% of the revised essays were ranked higher than their first draft versions. In other words, the participants demonstrated notable improvements in their revised essays in terms of ranking scores.

There were a few exceptions however. For Alex, R2 gave a much lower ranking for the revised essay in Task 3 (i.e., by a score of 3); for Abril, R2 gave a lower ranking for the revised essays in Tasks 2 and 3 (i.e., each by a score of 1); and for August, the same was true for R1 in Task 1 (i.e., by a score of 1) and Task 3 (i.e., by a score of 2) and for R2 in Task 1 (i.e., by a score of 1).

**Across tasks.** In general, the ranking order of the first draft essays across tasks was in chronological order for most of the participants with a few minor exceptions in which one of the tasks were worse or better than the normal expectation. For Sam and Abril, the ranking order was irregular for R1 and R2, respectively. Overall, the latter tasks tended to have high ranking scores. One factor that might have exerted influence on the overall quality of the essays is the topic or subject matter of the tasks themselves. That is, although I selected similar tasks that required the participants to choose one among many options to write on, Tasks 1 and 3 were more personal
compared to Tasks 2 and 4. Some of the participants might have been more or less confident in and capable of writing about personal matters, which may also have required different linguistic and rhetorical skills than the other tasks did.

In addition, the ranking scores of the last task essay (i.e., T4) – which was written for the final day of tutoring – were not as high as might be expected. The participants knew they were not required to write a revision for this task. It is possible that they might not have been as motivated to write the draft essay for this task as for the previous written essays. Furthermore, a few participants indicated that this task itself was very difficult to write on.

Finally, the ranking results for Abril and August were rather difficult to understand. As with the results of the other measures in this study, their results were anomalous compared to the results of the other participants, a point to be discussed in Chapter 8.

6.4 RQ2d. How do the learners feel about the intervention as a way of developing their writing skills in English?

In this section, I provide a summary of each of the five participants’ impressions about the value of the intervention for developing their writing abilities in English. I have summarized the post-intervention interviews with regard to the students’ perceptions of (a) the helpfulness of the intervention, (b) development of SRL skills, (c) changes in self-efficacy beliefs, and (d) difficulties in writing that remained after the intervention period.

6.4.1 Alex

Overall, Alex expressed positive opinions about the intervention. He indicated in his interview that “At first, I thought it would be impossible to write professionally in English… I now know what resources to look into. It just takes some time, but I think I can do it now.” He
also observed that he found writing much easier after the intervention compared to when he had first started. For example, he had difficulty expressing his thoughts in English before and therefore had to use roundabout expressions to do so. He now felt more confident about using English expressions. Nevertheless, he still found it difficult to find English words that reflect the exact nuance of Korean words.

The intervention also appeared to have positively influenced Alex’s SRL skills. Alex was one of the strongest self-regulators among the participants. Therefore, I tried to encourage him to use strategies on his own to address his difficulties rather than provide him with explicit corrective feedback. With regard to this approach, Alex expressed that “The corrections you provided were helpful, but showing me how to search and how to solve the problems by myself was the most helpful.” Similarly, he mentioned that “learning to find expressions that I wanted to say was helpful.”

Furthermore, Alex stated that the strategies we had worked on together were helpful, particularly the corpus. At the post-intervention interview, he observed, “The corpus shows how a word is actually used in a sentence. It helped me to find the right sentence structure for a word. The corpus was very helpful.” He also found the thesaurus useful, remarking that “using a thesaurus gave me more options. I could find a word whose meaning matched what I wanted to say.” This remark was somewhat surprising in that the stimulated-recall interviews and the SMFs did not reveal much about Alex’s use of the thesaurus.

Finally, it was evident that the intervention had helped Alex to gain confidence in his writing ability. He said “I improved a lot...At first, I was worried what people would think about my writing. But now, I feel much more confident because I can write based on the actual evidence from the corpus. I’ve improved the most in terms of my self-confidence as I am able to
check other resources as I write.” Again, he mentioned that “at first, I lacked much confidence and had to use only the sentences that I knew to express what I want. Now, I can search for expressions that I want to use. So, as a writer, I can use expressions more abundantly.”

6.4.2 Sam

Sam indicated that the intervention had been helpful for him. For example, he commented that the intervention had assisted him to learn about resources he could use and about the aspects of writing that he needed to be more attentive to. He also observed that the intervention had afforded him the opportunity to think more about his problems in writing and look for better expressions; as a result, he now felt he could reduce some of the mistakes he normally made while writing in English.

The intervention also appeared to have helped Sam to build confidence in his writing. He remarked that:

I used to be anxious a lot and write short sentences without much writing skill. I think I can now write more complex and English-like expressions. I also used to feel embarrassed showing a piece of my writing to other people. But now, I feel okay if I’ve worked on it enough.

Sam had been especially concerned about writing simple sentences in English, but felt that he now had learned to “make my sentences a bit more polished.” He also stated that he was able to overcome some uncertainties about his writing by learning to revise his essays through the use of various resources.

With respect to SRL skills, Sam expressed that the intervention had helped him to become more aware of his problems in writing. He indicated that he used to overlook some of his mistakes unconsciously in the past, assuming they were correct; that he used to forget about them
after writing and would not worry about them; but that he had become more cognizant of them through the intervention. Furthermore, Sam mentioned that the strategies he had learned were very useful. For example, he remarked that:

Examining sentence structures and finding appropriate prepositions that collocate with the verbs I was using were very helpful…I had never thought that choosing words that collocate with other words was that important. Learning to use the strategies made it possible for me to realize how important this is. This is difficult to learn by yourself.

Finally, Sam commented on the difficulties he still had in writing. He indicated that using English-like expressions was the most difficult aspect of writing for him. Furthermore, he experienced difficulty writing concise sentences. He expressed concern about the fact that he wrote sentences using a lot of commas and conjunctions, saying that “I use a lot of commas…I think a lot about using ‘and’, ‘so’, and ‘but’…These conjunctions always jump into my mind after I write a sentence, so I use them in almost every sentence.” Despite these difficulties, Sam remarked that the intervention had aided him to make his writing more sophisticated and to address his difficulties in writing by using appropriate resources.

6.4.3 Abril

The intervention appeared to have helped Abril to improve her writing by offering her the opportunity to write often. She remarked that “I think learning through repetition is important. Writing is easier now since I’ve been practicing it.” She also commented that she became better at choosing words through practice. Furthermore, Abril thought that the intervention had helped her to organize her essays better. She mentioned that “I learned one thing. I’ve never been good at writing conclusions…I didn’t use to write a summary in the conclusion before. Now, I’ve tried summarizing and I find writing the conclusion easier.”
Abril also appeared to have built her confidence in writing. In the interview, she frequently indicated that she felt more assured about writing in English, saying that:

I feel confident… You explained everything in a kind way… You corrected my grammar, suggested other expressions, helped me to elaborate on my content… You also gave me encouragement, so I feel much more confident.

She also said that she still thought of herself as a novice writer with a lot more to learn.

With respect to SRL skills, Abril expressed that the strategies we had worked on together were new to her, but useful. She remarked that the corpus was especially appropriate for her and helpful in that she was able to examine how other people were writing and whether the expressions she wanted to use were actually being used frequently by other people. In a way, the corpus helped her to decide whether “I want to use the expressions.” Abril also stated that she liked using the collocations dictionary, the Korean-English dictionary, and the example sentences that this dictionary supplied.

Abril also talked about her difficulties in writing. She indicated that she still had problems with word choice, saying that “I think of the words a lot in Korean, because English is not my native language. When I translate them, they become awkward.” She also observed that she had difficulty writing in a grammatical way, using academic words, and organizing her paragraphs in a manner that would be relevant to the task.

6.4.4 August

August commented that the intervention had been helpful in that she had learned to organize and structure her essays, to write the introduction and body paragraphs with supporting examples, and to begin her essays more easily. She also mentioned that she had preferred to have worked on more diverse tasks than to have worked on each task for three weeks. She remarked,
“We worked on a task for three weeks, and I felt that it might have been good to work on more tasks and try to write in various ways. With more tasks, I could have been able to write in more various ways.”

August also expressed concerns about her confidence in writing. Unfortunately, the intervention appeared to have raised her anxiety about writing. She indicated that she did not feel like a good writer, saying that:

It’s better not knowing. You can become bold if you don’t know. At first, I had not been aware of these things, so I wrote as I wanted. If I were told to write on a topic now, I don’t think I could write as fast as before. I would have to consider more things and think more…I think I have to practice more.

August had been preparing for the TOEFL test when the study first began and had been used, as practice for test preparation, to writing on a topic, receiving quick feedback on her essay, and continuing to another topic. Although the purpose of the intervention – its focus on helping the participants to become more cognizant of their difficulties and of relevant strategies to address them – was to empower the participants with the necessary SRL skills to become independent writers, this process of consciousness-raising may have had an unfavourable, disruptive effect in August’s case. Furthermore, spending three tutoring sessions revising her essays for each task might have implicitly given August the impression that she needed to improve her essays more dramatically than was actually necessary or feasible.

August observed that she had become more aware of her difficulties in writing. She indicated that in the past she had trusted what she wrote, thinking that there was nothing wrong with her sentences because people could understand them. The intervention seemed to have presented August with new challenges and directions for further developing her writing skills. She remarked that:
So, I’ve become more careful about my writing...I’ve learned more specifically about what my difficulties were. So, I understand now what I need to revise to improve the quality of my writing. This is a big change for me. Before, I used to think vaguely that all I needed to do was memorize a lot of vocabulary because I lacked vocabulary knowledge. Now, I know more precisely what I lack, not just vocabulary knowledge.

In the interview, August also commented about her difficulties in writing. She stated that she had difficulty expressing her communicative intentions appropriately and connecting her ideas in a logical manner. She also mentioned that using native-like English expressions was still difficult for her.

6.4.5 Ria

The intervention seemed to have removed some fear about writing in English for Ria. When the study first began, Ria had expressed that she did not even like writing in Korean, much less in English, because of her limited writing skills. In the interview, she remarked, “I do not hate writing anymore like I had really used to. If someone were to give me a topic to write on now, I would think about the topic, consult dictionaries…I would have no big problem writing.”

With respect to SRL skills, Ria observed that the intervention had helped her to become aware of certain strategies she could use in writing. She mentioned, “I would have never thought about using the strategies by myself…I don’t know if I will be able to use all the strategies that we had worked on, but I can be more aware of them.” The intervention especially appeared to have helped Ria to use vocabulary in a productive way, employing the strategies we had worked on, which was one of the main goals of the study. She remarked:

I think that it’s important to understand how words are used by consulting a dictionary. Grammar is also important, but I can write now if I know a lot of vocabulary and their usage…I had never really looked up words in dictionaries
before, but this has really helped me…Now I know that I can write if I have enough thoughts and ideas about a topic and know how to connect the words.

Furthermore, the intervention appeared to have helped Ria to acquire certain basic writing skills. For example, Ria indicated that she had come to understand how to organize her essays: “In the past, I used to feel overwhelmed just to connect sentences together, but now I’ve learned to write logically. I used to write without much thought, but I’ve learned how to write well and to write in an organized way.” Ria also stated that what had been most helpful about the intervention was that “I learned to write on my own and I know what to do.”

In addition, Ria observed that the intervention had helped her to learn to write by enabling her to practice writing. When the study first began, Ria had demonstrated limited writing proficiency. In response to the question about whether the intervention had been beneficial or not, she responded:

It has been very helpful…I don’t know what other people think, but it has opened a new way for me. I used to hate writing and did not want to even think about it…I learned how to write. I can’t say for sure whether there are people who can write without such instruction, but as for me, I didn’t know before. You gave me advice on how to write better and on which resources to consult. Writing has become easier because I was able to learn the meaning of words, as well as their usage. These have helped me to write. The tutoring, especially, has helped me to writer more easily.

Nonetheless, Ria also commented on difficulties that she still had in writing. She mentioned that writing was not automatic for her yet and therefore was a slow and challenging process. She still had to look up words frequently and pay attention to how they were used and whether they were used grammatically in her sentences. Moreover, she remarked that “I feel like I’m making the same mistakes all the time. I know how to write, but I’m not used to writing. I
feel like I’m writing in the same pattern when I can write differently…My writing seems dull and dry. It’s as though I’m just writing without much of anything else.”

Overall, though, the intervention appeared to have provided Ria with a constructive, learning experience in writing. She commented:

When you gave me feedback, I learned about your thoughts on some of the issues that would have never gotten my attention. I learned about things that I had never thought about before. Your feedback changed my thinking, and its influence on my writing was tremendous…I felt like we were writing together and not by myself. I could write only so much by myself, but I was able to write more because we were working together.
Chapter 7. Two Case Studies

This chapter presents case studies of Alex and Ria. Since the developmental trajectory of the SRL skills for each of the five participants in Phase 2 was idiosyncratic, as demonstrated in the previous chapter, and the tutoring interventions were tailored individually to each student, it is worth examining these unique characteristics and processes as separate cases. I chose the two participants among the five to illustrate and contrast the development of the SRL skills during the tutoring for strong and weak writers in English as a second language: Alex was the strongest writer among the five; Ria was the weakest. In the following sections, a detailed chronological documentation of what happened during the intervention period is given for Alex and Ria. These two cases also serve to describe the types and range of approaches to intervention and strategy development that I adopted while tutoring the participants individually in Phase 2 of this research.

In presenting the case studies of Alex and Ria, I have included all of their first draft and final revised essays as well as documented all the difficulty and strategy uses units – together with their coding results – that they had reported for the sentence-by-sentence questions in the stimulated-recall interviews. The identified units are in brackets. For each unit, there is a set of labels in superscript font that corresponds to the coding results. The first label in the set refers to the category of difficulty unit; the second to the category of strategy use unit. For example, \textsuperscript{PC, SS} (time trip)’ shows that (a) the identified difficulty unit was ‘time trip’; that (b) this difficulty unit was coded as Phrase Construction; and that (c) self-strategy was employed to address this difficulty unit.

In addition to the essays, I have provided a summary of the two raters’ comments on these essays, using the abbreviation “P#” to refer to particular paragraphs when describing raters’ comments about each text. The raters ranked and commented on all the essays for one participant.
before moving on to the next participant. Furthermore, the essays were randomly mixed and labelled codes (e.g., from A1 to A7), so the raters could not know the order of the tasks nor the order of the draft essays within each task.

One interesting phenomenon of the ranking and commenting process was that the two raters invariably made their own judgments and guesses regarding which essay was the draft or revised version within each task, often comparing the two versions and referring to them accordingly – for example, as “revision,” “revised version,” “previous one,” “earlier draft,” “companion piece,” etc – when commenting on the essays. Consequently, R1 and R2 correctly ranked 86.7% and 73.3% of the revised essays higher than their previous draft essays, respectively. For Alex and Ria, the two raters correctly identified all the draft and revised essays except for one case, in which R2 ranked Alex’s revised essay for Task 3 lower than its draft version.

7.1 Alex’s Case Study

7.1.1 Task 1

Figure 7-1 shows Alex’s first draft essay for the first task. The essay is 412 words in length, in which he wrote about why he would choose to go back to his first year of high school. Alex spent three hours writing the draft and remarked that “I focused on going back in time, thought about what I would like to change in the present, chose three that were important to me, wrote the introduction, elaborated on each of the three points, and wrapped up the essay.” Similar to the other participants’ essays, this essay was written in the traditional five-paragraph-essay format, a point to be discussed in Chapter 8. The three body paragraphs seem well-developed, whereas the introduction and the conclusion paragraphs appear to be less so.
First of all, I chose (to go) back to 1995 because I could (save) my best friend’s life. I met my best friend in middle school and until when he died (suppose) we shared everything (each other, for example), study, sports, romantic relationship, troubles. He was the man who made me know that friendship is also one (type) of love. He committed suicide in 2007 (all of a sudden), I didn’t realize that he was suffering from a mental disease until (he did). After losing my best treasure, I could realize he gave me some (clue) about his problems. I’m still (feeling sorry), and (guilty) and regretting everyday that I had not taken care of him as a best friend. Actually, I think if I was not able to save him, my time movement would be totally meaningless.

Secondly, I chose 1995 because if I went back to 1995, I (could) go to better university than one I’ve already graduated from since I can go to high school again and study harder than I did. I didn’t know the importance of the name of university in the Korean society until I took (the first step into the society). Even though the university I’ve graduated from (is) a kind of good in Korea, I could not help feeling the high wall of Seoul University. If I had known these situation of Korean society, I must have studied harder and gone to the Seoul University even if I had to go to University one year later.

Lastly, the last reason I chose 1995 is that I can apply for the KATUSA as (my military service). I think the most wasteful time in my life is the 26 months in the military service. My specialty in the army was the (trench mortar). All skills I learned from army have been totally needless since I finished the military service except (being) patient. If I had been to KATUSA, I could have learned at least English skill.

For these reasons, I’ve chosen 1995. Although it’s impossible to go back to some time, imagining about it was good (for) me because I could realize the importance of the present.
several verb issues (e.g., ‘if I was not able to save him’ in P#2, ‘must have studied harder’ in P#3); some of the phrasings were awkward (e.g., ‘my time movement’ in P#2, ‘feeling the high wall of Seoul University’ in P#3) or informal (e.g., ‘is kind of good’ in P#3); and it was less compelling, lacked voice, and shorter compared to the revision.

7.1.1.2 Difficulties

| Table 7-1. Coding results of Alex’s Task 1 first draft stimulated-recall |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|
|                             | SS  | ED  | Th  | KED | CD  | Cr  | O  | Total |
| WC                          | 2   | 1   | 1   | 2   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 6 (25%) |
| C                           | 1   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 2 (8.3%) |
| S                           | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 3 (12.5%) |
| MF                          | 5   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 6 (25%)  |
| Sp                          | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 0   |
| PC                          | 6   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 7 (29.2%) |
| Total                       | 17  | 3   | 1   | 3   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 24   |


Table 7-1 shows the coding results of Alex’s Task 1 stimulated-recall interview.

In the interview, Alex indicated that “I was familiar with the topic, so writing the content of the essay wasn’t difficult. However, expressing what I want to say in English is still difficult for me… I want to be able to write English-like expressions.” According to the coding results, Alex’s most frequently reported difficulty units were Phrase Construction (29.2%), Word Choice (25%), Morphological Form (25%), Structure (12.5%), and Collocation (8.3%).

With respect to the Phrase Construction difficulty units, Alex reported having problems constructing a few noun phrases (i.e., ‘time trip’, ‘the first step into society’, and ‘my military service’), a noun clause (i.e., ‘what I want’), a predicate phrase (i.e., ‘feeling sorry’), and two sentences (i.e., ‘Every time…military service’ and ‘I could…I want’). He was also challenged by
Word Choice (e.g., ‘save’, ‘type’, ‘clue’, etc.) and Collocation issues (i.e., ‘guilty’ with ‘feeling sorry’ and ‘for’ with ‘good’). Morphological Form units mostly concerned tenses (e.g., ‘suppose’, ‘could’, etc.) and other word forms (e.g., between ‘to go’ and ‘going’). Alex’s difficulties with Structure involved word order (e.g., in ‘each other, for example’) and the phrase ‘change all these things into’.

7.1.1.3 Strategy Use

As shown in Table 7-1, most of the strategies Alex used in Task 1 were self-employed strategies (70.8%). I take this to imply that he did not have control over the necessary strategies or resources to cope with the difficulties he was experiencing while writing in English when the tutoring first began. Most of what Alex reported in this interview just pointed to what the difficulties were without much indication of what Alex may have specifically tried to do to address them. The strategies that he did use included mostly consulting the English (12.5%) and the Korean-English (12.5%) dictionaries to address issues of Word Choice (i.e., ‘save’, ‘trench mortar’, ‘all of a sudden’), Collocation (i.e., ‘for’), Morphological Form (i.e., ‘to go’), and Phrase Construction (i.e., ‘the first step into society’).

7.1.1.4 Intervention

Alex was the strongest English writer among the participants. Therefore, I decided to work with him on improving the “academic” tone and register of his writing, particularly by increasing specificity and variety in his word choices with the help of the collocations dictionary. I explained to Alex the importance of using appropriate collocations in writing, emphasizing that awkward expressions usually result from the use of inappropriate collocations. I selected some words from the essay, consulted these words in the collocations dictionary with Alex, and
demonstrated how he could fine-tune his choice of collocations for these words to achieve specificity in his word choice. Another characteristic of Alex’s first task essays was the limited use of modifiers in his sentences. To promote variety in his word choice, I showed Alex how he could take advantage of the collocations dictionary to incorporate various adjectives and adverbs into his sentences.

We also looked up several ambiguous words from the essay in the thesaurus and talked about other word choices that could have improved clarity in the essay. Furthermore, I noticed that most of the subjects in his sentences started with the personal pronoun ‘I’. So we worked on ways to promote variety in Alex’s phrasing of subjects by using alternative words.

7.1.1.5 Self-Monitoring Form

| Table 7-2. Coding results of Alex’s SMFs for Task 1 revisions |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | SS   | ED   | Th   | KED  | CD   | Cr   | O   | Total         |
| WC              | 0    | 1    | 1    | 2    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 4 (25%)       |
| C               | 0    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 4    | 0    | 0    | 5 (31.3%)     |
| S               | 1    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1 (6.3%)      |
| MF              | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1 (6.3%)      |
| Sp              | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1 (6.3%)      |
| PC              | 2    | 0    | 0    | 3    | 1    | 0    | 0    | 6 (37.5%)     |
| O               | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 0    | 1 (6.3%)      |
| Total           | 3    | 2    | 1    | 5    | 5    | 0    | 0    | 16 (100%)     |


Table 7-2 shows the coding results of Alex’s SMFs for his two Task 1 revised essays together. The three most frequently addressed difficulty units were Phrase Construction (37.5% in the revisions, compared to 29.2% in the first draft), Collocation (31.3% in the revisions, compared to 8.3% in the first draft), and Word Choice (25% in the revisions, compared to 25% in the first draft). It was evident from the SMFs that Alex attended more to Collocation units in
his revised essays than in his first draft. This trend reflects the focus of the intervention sessions for Task 1 on using the collocations dictionary as a tool to improve Alex’s writing.

In terms of strategy use, likewise, Alex’s use of self-employed strategies declined considerably across the revisions of his essays (i.e., from 70.8% to 18.8%, as indicated by contrasting the frequencies in Tables 7-1 and 7-2). In turn, his frequent use of the collocations dictionary was noticeable during the revisions. Alex also indicated that for the revised essays – especially for the final revision – he focused on looking up verbs in the collocations dictionary and finding appropriate adverb collocations for these verbs. Similarly, Alex’s use of the Korean-English dictionary increased slightly.

7.1.1.6 Task 1 Revision

Figure 7-2 shows Alex’s final revised essay for the first task.

7.1.1.7 Raters’ Comments on Task 1 Revision

**Strengths.** R1 gave a much higher ranking for this revision (by a score of five) compared to its draft version, mentioning that this text was more developed; the acronym ‘KATUSA’ in P#4 had been explained; the sentence ‘After losing...about his problems’ in P#2 now seemed poetic and had voice; and the introduction was better because it included more detail. R2 similarly perceived this revision to be a better essay (by a score of five), indicating that the revision was personal and compelling; it had a good thesis; it had a strong voice, especially in the sentence ‘He was the man...one type of love’ in P#2; there were complex sentences (e.g., ‘When I was...in Korean society’ in P#3); and the vocabulary was effective and appropriate in most places.
**Figure 7-2. Alex’s final revised essay for Task 1**

Every time I think about a time travelling, three things come to my mind: a good friend of mine whom I had known for almost 20 years, relatively low reputation of my university, and military service I had to serve in as a part of obligation of a Korean male citizen. Eventually, it is my conclusion that if I went back to 1995 when I was in my first year in high school, the three things described above could be perfectly corrected as I want now.

First of all, I surely chose to go back to 1995 because I could save my best friend’s life. The first place I met my best friend was our middle school and until he died I supposed we truly confided in each other about everything, such as how to properly prepare school exams, how to be good at sports, and how to overcome difficulties in romantic relationship or household economy. He was the man who taught me that friendship is also one type of love. He committed suicide in 2007 all of a sudden. Irresponsibly, I didn’t realize that he was suffering from a mental illness until he died. After losing my most precious person, it wrung my heart to realize that he gave me some clue about his problems. I still feel desperately sorry, and guilty and deeply regret everyday because I had not taken care of him as his best friend. Actually, I think if I were not to be able to save him, my time travelling would be totally meaningless.

Secondly, the reason I chose 1995 is that if I went back to 1995, I could go to a better university than the one I already graduated from since I can go to high school again and study even harder than I had before. I hadn’t clearly understood how much significance a reputation of a university could have in the Korean Society until I took the first step into the society. Even though the university I graduated from is fairly good in Korea, I could not help feeling the barrier of Seoul University. Seoul University is the most difficult university to gain admission into and is considered as a place where the most intelligent people gather in Korea. When I was a high school student, I had general concept that graduating from Seoul University would be helpful for my life, but I hadn’t realized yet the actual advantages in graduating Seoul University in Korean society. If these situations of Korean society had been clear to me, I would have studied harder and tried harder to go to the Seoul University even if this meant I had to go to University one year later.

Lastly, the last reason is that it would make it possible to apply for the Korean Augmentation to the United States Army (KATUSA), to fulfill my military obligation. Every Korean male citizen has to carry out military obligation for almost 2 years. Just before they start to serve in military obligation, they choose their specialty roughly based on their preference and their own skills. That is, the men without special skills, such as medical or chemical skill usually join the army. The men who have advanced English skill can join KATUSA. By the time I decided to carry out military obligation, I chose to join the army without careful consideration although I could apply for the KATUSA. I think the most unproductive time in my life was the 26 months in the army. My specialty in the army was the trench mortar. All the skills I had learned from army became totally needless after the military service. However, I did learn one important thing in life: patience. If I had been to KATUSA, I could have learned at least English skill.

For these reasons, I’ve chosen 1995. Although it’s impossible to go back to some time in the past, imagining about it was really worth to me because I could realize the importance of the present.

**Weaknesses.** R1 commented that the phrase ‘trench mortar’ in P#4 was not clear; the verb ‘wrung’ in P#2 was not idiomatic; and there were some unclear sentences (e.g., ‘Irresponsibly…he died’ in P#2 and ‘Secondly, the reason…I had before’ in P#3). R2 observed
that the phrase ‘help feeling the barrier of Seoul University’ in P#3 was awkward and that there were some small issues with comma usage and word choice (e.g., the word ‘needless’ in P#4).

7.1.2 Task 2

**Figure 7-3.** Alex’s first draft essay for Task 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I think the most important skill people should learn today is a effective communication skill with other people.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First of all, the people who have a good communication skill can (access) (accurate) and (proper) information quickly. We are living in huge amount of information (expressed) in various languages and (spread) throughout the world today. [The ability of getting valuable information has to be considered as one of important requisites for success.] Though the (information science) is go on evolving [such as search engine is developing continuously], it is still hard to find precise information during the given time without help of other people who know language you can’t understand or have knowledge about the source where we can get proper information. In this regard, we can say that the communication skill with people who can provide proper information you are looking for is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondly, they can significantly (increase) the work efficiency by encouraging mutual cooperation among business colleagues as well as social community members. Although it (becomes vitally important as industries get complicated), cooperating with business colleagues is getting hard with increasing of the people who have (individualistic tendency). Because the friction between colleagues due to the lack of proper communication skill (is directly linked with) decrease of work efficiency, most companies and government organizations require good communication skill as one of necessary qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lastly, they can (conduct) successful negotiation with other companies or other social groups. [These days, we (have had high exposure to) have to reach positive agreement in various negotiating tables, for example, between a company and another company, a government and a company, an employee and an employer.] As industries globalizes, chances to negotiate are getting increase and the negotiating situations are getting diverse. Once an agreement is concluded, it has a great effect as well as it is hard to (reverse) a decision. Therefore, communication skill specially persuading opponents and taking the (advantageous) position at the negotiating table is very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For these reasons, communication skill is the most important skill a person should learn in order to be successful in the world today. Developing good communications skill is very hard because we have to (consider) other people’s mind as well as ourselves’. Therefore, we have to keep trying to have a good communication skill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Alex’s first draft essay for the second task is shown in Figure 7-3. The essay is 381 words in length and is the shortest among his first draft essays on the four tasks. However, Alex spent
five hours writing the essay – two hours more than he had spent writing the first task. He explained, “When I had worked on the first task, it didn’t take me a long time to write because I had not known what to do. It took me longer this time. I wasn’t quite satisfied.” In this essay, Alex wrote about the importance of communication skills.

7.1.2.1 Raters’ Comments on Task 2 First Draft

**Strengths.** R1 gave a higher ranking for this draft (by a score of one) than for the Task 1 first draft, commenting that this essay was stronger than the latter in that the ideas and examples were more developed, the topic was clear, and it was organized. R1 also remarked that the thoughts in the essay were rather complex, and the paragraph development showed sophistication. R2 observed that there was good cohesion, vocabulary, and collocation.

**Weaknesses.** R1 indicated that the introduction was weak because it did not say much or give help to the text; there were some unclear references (e.g., ‘social community members’ in P#3 and ‘they’ in P#4); and the sentence ‘Once an agreement…a decision’ in P#4 was unclear, needing explanation. R2 commentated that the introduction was weak; some phrasings were unclear (e.g., ‘We are living in huge amount of information’ and ‘given time’ in P#2); there was an unsubstantiated claim in P#3 (i.e., ‘with increasing of the people who have individualistic tendency’); the pronoun ‘they’ in P#4 had an unclear reference; and there was unnecessary information in P#4 (i.e., ‘These days…an employer’).

7.1.2.2 Difficulties

Table 7-3 shows the coding results of Alex’s Task 2 stimulated-recall interview. Alex indicated having difficulty with English expressions, as he had during the stimulated-recall interview session for Task 1:“I still have difficulty making English expressions from Korean… I
tried to use clearer expressions, but this was difficult.” He also remarked that he felt his sentences were getting unnecessarily long as he tried to make his expressions more descriptive. He wanted to make his sentences more natural-sounding and concise.

As displayed in Table 7-3, the difficulty units that Alex addressed mostly were Phrase Construction (42.9%) and Collocation (38.1%), with less attention given to Word Choice (9.5%), Structure (4.8%), and Morphological Form (4.8%) units. The Phrase Construction difficulty units included the construction of noun phrases (i.e., ‘requisites for success’, ‘information science’, and ‘individualistic tendency’), predicate phrases (e.g., ‘becomes vitally important as industries get complicated’, ‘have had high exposure to’, etc.), and sentences (i.e., ‘The ability…success’ and ‘These days…an employer’). With respect to Collocation, Alex examined the collocations of the words ‘information’ (i.e., ‘access’, ‘accurate’, ‘proper’, ‘expressed’, and ‘spread’), ‘efficiency’ (i.e., ‘increase’), ‘negotiation’ (i.e., ‘conduct’), and ‘position’ (i.e., ‘advantageous’). Alex also experienced difficulty choosing the words for ‘reverse’ and ‘consider’. Additional problems were the required structure following the phrase ‘such as’ (i.e., Structure) and the tense of the verb ‘is’ in ‘is developing continuously’ (i.e., Morphological Form).

Table 7-3. Coding results of Alex’s Task 2 first draft stimulated-recall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 [9.5%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 [38.1%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 [4.8%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 [4.8%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 [42.9%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 21 [100%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.2.3 Strategy Use

As can be seen in Table 7-3, Alex relied primarily on the use of the collocations resources and the Korean-English dictionary to address his difficulties while composing. The former was used solely for units coded as Collocation (e.g., collocations of the word ‘information’), while the latter for mostly Phrase Construction (i.e., constructing noun phrases), but also once for Word Choice (i.e., ‘reverse’). He also used the thesaurus twice (i.e., for the words ‘increase’ and ‘consider’) and once used the English dictionary to examine the sentence structure following the phrase ‘such as’. It is worth noting that Alex’s use of self-strategies during his first drafts dropped from 70.8% in Task 1 to 14.3% in Task 2.

The stimulated-recall interview revealed an interesting aspect to Alex’s approach to composing: He chose one central word for each paragraph and then consulted the collocations dictionary to find appropriate collocations for the words he wrote. The following excerpt from the interview illustrates this process:

I chose ‘communication skill’ as the most important skill, and thought of three reasons for why, along with three central words to characterize them. For the first paragraph, I chose the word ‘information’; for the second paragraph, ‘cooperation’; and for the third paragraph, ‘negotiation’. I tried to write what I wanted by focusing on finding accurate verbs to use with these three words. For example, I checked the collocations for ‘information’ and came up with verbs, such as ‘access’ and ‘approach’. I had first thought of using the verbs ‘get’ or ‘have’. As I searched for more academic expressions, I ended up with these two words. I thought that ‘access’ would be a better word that reflected the Korean meaning of ‘to get information’. Furthermore, I searched for other collocations of the word ‘information’ that could be used as modifiers and found words, such as ‘proper’ and ‘accurate’.

7.1.2.4 Intervention

By the time we had the first tutoring session for Task 2 – which was three weeks after Alex had been first introduced to the collocations dictionary – Alex appeared to have no
difficulty using the dictionary as a tool on his own. So I wanted to challenge him to make use of the corpus early on in the intervention period, recognizing it as a complex but useful tool that could increase Alex’s potential as a writer. I introduced the corpus to Alex, explaining to him in detail, with examples, how to use the corpus. We discussed varying ways to consult the corpus for his writing to improve expressions and specificity in word choice with regard to his communicative intentions. Alex showed an especially keen interest in using the corpus.

In addition, Alex and I continued to work on using the collocations dictionary to improve his word choice. Alex also indicated during one of the tutoring sessions that he experienced difficulty using transitional words, so we talked about how using transitional words can add coherence to the text, going over various relevant expressions involving transitional words together.

7.1.2.5 Self-Monitoring Form

The coding results of Alex’s SMFs for his two Task 2 revised essays together are shown in Table 7-4. Alex did not provide much information in the SMFs for this task. The forms showed that Alex attended to several Collocation difficulty units, with some attention to Word Choice and Structure units. In terms of strategy use, Alex used the corpus as the primary tool to address these difficulties. Alex mentioned during the tutoring sessions that he found the corpus to be extremely helpful – particularly when searching for a range of modifiers to use in his sentences – because the corpus supplied various words with the frequency of their usage based on data from actual spoken and written English. Alex also indicated that using the collocations dictionary and the corpus together was quite effective for his writing.
Table 7-4. Coding results of Alex’s SMFs for Task 2 revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


7.1.2.6 Task 2 Revision

Figure 7-4 shows Alex’s final revised essay for Task 2.

7.1.2.7 Raters’ Comments on Task 2 Revisions

**Strengths.** R1 gave a higher ranking for this revision (by a score of three) than for its draft version, commenting that the introduction had more detail; the composition was organized with examples articulated well; sentences were extended or better phrased (e.g., ‘Now…amount of information’ in P#2 and ‘we find…business companies’ in P#4); and the vocabulary was more precise (e.g., ‘accurate and key information’ in P#2). R2 also gave a better ranking for the revision (by a score of one) and indicated that there was good cohesion between and within paragraphs and that complex vocabulary was used in an appropriate manner (e.g., ‘evolution of information science’ in P#2, ‘individualistic tendency’ in P#3).

**Weaknesses.** R1 remarked that the essay was focused, but that the thesis could have been stronger; unclear phrasings were present (e.g., ‘other people…the location of source’ in P#2); and there were some issues about word choice and plurals. R2 observed that the conclusion was weak; there was an unsubstantiated claim in P#3 (i.e., ‘because of the increase in the people who
show individualistic tendency’); the sentence ‘Once an agreement...the decision as well’ in P#4 was unclear; and there were some minor grammar issues.

**Figure 7-4. Alex’s final revised essay for Task 2**

There exist surely a lot of skills to be successful today such as strong leadership, communication skills, and business skills involving valuable insight into prospective business, etc. Though those skills could be equally important, I think effective communication skills establishing great relationship with other people are most important among them.

First of all, with a good communication skill, people can access accurate and key information quickly. Now, we live in the world in which there is huge amount of information expressed in various languages and widely spread. Accordingly, the ability to obtain valuable information undoubtedly has to be considered as one of the important factors in the success. In spite of the evolution of information science such as continuing development of search engine, it is not still easy to find precise information within a given time without the help of other people who know language you don’t understand or have knowledge about the location of source. In this regard, the communication skill with people who can provide necessary information is particularly important.

Secondly, a person who has a good communication skill can significantly contribute to increase the work efficiency by encouraging mutual cooperation among business colleagues as well as social community members. Although cooperation with business colleagues becomes increasingly important with globalization, this is getting more difficult to achieve because of the increase in the people who show individualistic tendency. Likewise, because the conflicts among colleagues due to the lack of proper communication skill are directly linked with decrease in work efficiency, as one of necessary qualifications for employment, most companies and government organizations require good communication skill.

Lastly, a person who has good communication skill can conduct successful negotiation with other companies or other social groups. As industries globalizes, we find ourselves on complex negotiation tables with the government organizations and business companies. Once an agreement is reached, the effect on the negotiation parties can be large and it is hard to reverse the decision as well. Therefore, communication skill especially the ability to persuade opponents and take up the advantageous position at the negotiation table can be very important.

For these reasons, I believe communication skill leads a person to success in the world today. However, developing good communications skill is fairly hard in proportionate to the big advantage it gives us because good communications skill requires us to consider other people’s mind as well as ourselves’. Therefore, we have to keep trying to have a good communication skill.

7.1.3 Task 3

Figure 7-5 shows Alex’s first draft essay for the third task, in which Alex chose economics as the subject he would like to study. The essay is 415 words in length, the longest
among Alex’s four first-draft essays. Alex spent five hours writing it and indicated that he had more to say in the essay, but decided to shorten the text.

**Figure 7-5. Alex’s first draft essay for Task 3**

**PC,SS:** I would choose economics, though I might not be able to say that I have never had the opportunity to study it. There definitely was a class, titled “Politics and Economics” in the middle and high school, but I hardly have memory of studying economics. That’s probably because it was a boring subject, and I also was totally not interested in the subject. However, I have regretted that I (didn’t have) any knowledge of economics since I started working for a living.

First of all, Knowledge of economics makes it easy to meet nice people and make good friends. People’s relationship starts from good conversation and the good conversation could (occur) well when people have common interests to talk about, no matter what it is. In my case, because I majored mechanical engineering and my job is a patent attorney, it is hard to meet people who (share) (mutual) interests in my working area. Thus, when I meet people who are not interested in my field, I sometimes could not (manage) good conversation with them in account of the lack of material to talk about. However, I think if I had knowledge of economics, I could understand (current) economic problems in which lots of people are interested and by talking about them, I can manage (casual) conversation and establish good relationship.

Secondly, I could get more money with (strategic investment) using knowledge of economics. That is, knowledge based on economics would give me (the ability to look at economic trends) and this ability enable strategic investment especially in the stock market or real-estate market which will (make) (big) profits.

Lastly, I think knowledge of economics could make me a more active citizen who can independently distinguish which is right or wrong about social problems, such as political issues, and participate in social activities more actively. To be specific, because most social problems are related to the economic problems, it is impossible to understand and judge behavior of politicians and (exercise the right) as a citizen unless I have knowledge of economics.

For these reasons, I would like to study economics. Of course, economics should be a subject not that I want to study but that I learned already. However, as far as I know, lots of Korean do not have knowledge of economics as much as people in most developed countries due to (poor) Korean education system. Therefore, I will study economics hard meanwhile I would like to encourage other people to study economics either.


7.1.3.1 Raters’ Comments on Task 3 First Draft

**Strengths.** R1 observed that this essay was focused, developed, structured, and answered the prompt; the author did a good job contrasting his own education to what he would like to
have studied; and the vocabulary and grammar were quite good. R2 commented that the essay was well organized and supported neatly with examples; the introduction was effective and displayed real voice; there were strong vocabulary and good collocations (e.g., ‘strategic investment’ in P#3, ‘independently distinguish’ and ‘exercise the right as a citizen’ in P#4); and the sentence ‘it is impossible to understand…knowledge of economics’ in P#4 was nicely written.

**Weaknesses.** R1 stated that the sentence ‘Knowledge of economics…make good friends’ in P#2 was not clear until the end and that the sentence ‘Of course…I learned already’ was not idiomatic, contradicting in meaning with the next sentence. R2 indicated that there were a few minor verb issues (e.g., ‘not interested’ in P#1, ‘could’ in P#2, ‘enable’ in P#3) and that there was an overly strong claim in P#2 (i.e., ‘Knowledge of economics makes it easy to meet nice people and make good friends’).

7.1.3.2 Difficulties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11 (61.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (27.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The coding results for Alex’s Task 3 stimulated-recall interview session are shown in Table 7-5. Alex remarked in the interview that choosing appropriate words for the task was difficult: “Having graduated from a college of engineering, I haven’t written anything on
economics. Nor did I have any interest in this area. So, it was difficult to choose words that were relevant to economics.” The results in Table 7-5 show accordingly that Alex was predominantly occupied with addressing Collocation (61.1%) difficulties. His other areas of difficulty were Phrase Construction (27.8%), Structure (5.6%), and Morphological Form (5.6%).

Alex, for example, looked up collocations of the words ‘conversation’ (i.e., ‘occur’, ‘manage’, and ‘casual’), ‘interests’ (i.e., ‘share’ and ‘mutual’), and ‘economic problems’ (i.e., ‘current’). With regard to Phrase Construction units, Alex had difficulty constructing noun phrases (i.e., ‘strategic investment’ and ‘the ability to look at economic trends’), predicate phrases (i.e., ‘might not’ and ‘exercise the right’), and the first sentence of the essay (i.e., ‘I would…study it’). Finally, Alex encountered difficulty with tenses in the phrase ‘didn’t have’ (i.e., Morphological Form) and with the position of the phrase ‘totally not’ within the sentence (i.e., Structure).

7.1.3.3 Strategy Use

Table 7-5 shows that with the exception of consulting the Korean-English dictionary twice for constructing phrases (i.e., ‘the ability to look at economic trends’ and ‘exercise the right’) and of relying on self-employed strategies in two instances (i.e., for deciding the tense of ‘didn’t have’ and for constructing the ‘I would…study it’ sentence as a whole), Alex depended solely on using the corpus to address his composing difficulties, primarily for collocations, but also for problems with Phrase Construction (i.e., ‘might not’ and ‘strategic investment’) and Structure (i.e., the positioning of the phrase ‘totally not’).

Indeed, Alex indicated in the stimulated-recall interview that he searched the corpus about 50 to 60 times while preparing this essay. Evidently, by this time, Alex was finding the corpus to be a useful and effective tool for writing:
Searching for a better word choice is possible with the corpus once I have decided on a few central words to use. So, I find myself not using other strategies. You can examine a range of words according to their frequency of use...Once I have decided on what to write and chosen a few words to use, I can search the corpus and find verbs, adjectives, and adverbs that can be used together with the words all at once. So, I don’t get to use the other strategies...I used to consult the Korean-English and the collocations dictionaries before, but now I use the Korean-English dictionary only to change Korean expressions into English.

It is also interesting to note how Alex composed this first draft. He remarked that, usually in the past, he had consulted dictionaries as he wrote sentence by sentence, but that for this draft, Alex first wrote down what he wanted to say and then revised by inserting transitional phrases, looking up better words in the dictionary and searching the corpus.

7.1.3.4 Intervention

The corpus featured conspicuously in Alex’s third composition. Now after three sessions of tutoring from me and practicing on his own, Alex appeared to demonstrate self-control over using the corpus while he wrote. Furthermore, his writing seemed to have improved overall. During the tutoring sessions, we talked about further refining his word choices using the various strategies that we had worked on in the previous meetings (e.g., collocations, corpus, thesaurus, etc.) and about incorporating appropriate modifiers (i.e., adjectives and adverbs) into his sentences. Moreover, I emphasized the significance of using accurate and specific verbs in his sentences, since they serve as predicates and influence the overall structure of the sentences. Alex also brought up questions about the use of various forms of English punctuation. We went over some according to the publication manual of the American Psychological Association (APA, 2001), comparing those used in his essay with those exemplified in the book.
7.1.3.5 Self-Monitoring Form

The coding results of Alex’s SMFs for his two Task 2 revised essays together are shown in Table 7-6. The information provided here is limited: Alex’s main concern was with Collocation difficulty units and punctuation issues (i.e., colons, semicolons, and dashes, coded in the Others category). His strategies included mostly the use of the corpus, but also the collocations and the Korean-English dictionaries. The three punctuation units were address by self-employed strategies.

Table 7-6. Coding results of Alex’s SMFs for Task 3 revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (55.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to the tutoring log, Alex remarked that he consulted the collocations dictionary and the corpus for the revisions, but mainly the corpus. He commented that the corpus worked better for him and that he eventually searched the corpus because the collocations dictionary do not supply example sentences to indicate the context in which the words are used. One concern he had with using the corpus was that it produced many results, occasionally making it difficult for him to choose one among them.

7.1.3.6 Task 3 Revision

Figure 7-6 shows Alex’s final revised essay for the third task.
I would choose economics, though I might not be able to say that I have never had the opportunity to study it. There definitely was a class, titled “Politics and Economics” in middle and high school, but I hardly have any memory of studying economics. That’s probably because it was a boring subject, and I also was not interested in the subject much. However, I have regretted not having studied economics since I started working for a living.

First of all, with knowledge of economics, it would be much easier to make newfound friends. People’s relationship starts from good conversation, which could occur naturally when people have common interests to talk about: no matter what they may be. In my case, I majored in mechanical engineering and I currently work as a patent attorney; it is hard to meet people who share mutual interests in my working area. Thus, when I meet people who are not interested in my field, I sometimes cannot carry on interesting conversation with them on account of the lack of topics to talk about. However, I believe that with knowledge of economics, I could understand current economic problems: many people are interested in; by talking about the economic problems, I would be able to manage casual conversation and establish friendly relationship with newfound friends.

Secondly, I could make more money through strategic investment using knowledge of economics. We live today, following economic rules people have made. We can compete against other people only after understanding the economic rules. Knowledge of economics would give me the ability to figure out economic trends. This ability would enable me to strategically invest especially in the stock market or real-estate market: it would bring substantial profits.

Lastly, I think knowledge of economics could enable me to be a more active citizen who can independently distinguish what is right from wrong regarding social problems -such as political issues- and enthusiastically participate in social activities. To be specific, because many social problems are related to the economic problems, it is impossible to understand and judge the behavior of politicians and exercise the right as a citizen without knowledge of economics.

For these reasons, I would like to study economics. Of course, economics should be a subject that I should have already studied. However, as far as I know, a lot of Koreans do not have as much knowledge of economics as people in most developed countries due to the poor Korean education system. Therefore, I will study economics hard and in the meantime, I encourage other people to also study economics.

7.1.3.7 Raters’ Comments on Task 3 Revision

**Strengths.** R1 gave a higher ranking for this revised essay (by a score of three) compared to its draft version, commenting that the essay was more developed; the vocabulary was better (e.g., ‘substantial profits’ in P#3); the use of punctuation was varied and improved in style (e.g., in P#2); and the sentence ‘Of course…already studied’ in P#5 was more grammatical and better phrased compared to its previous phrasing. This was the one case in which R2 incorrectly judged the order of the written essays and gave a lower ranking for this essay (by a score of three) than
for its draft version. R2 remarked that there was good vocabulary and that the things that were
done well in first draft version were the ones that were also done well in this revision.

**Weaknesses.** R1 mentioned that the use of punctuation was inappropriate in a few places
(e.g., in P#2 and P#4). R2 stated that the essay was slightly more awkward compared to the first
draft version; some word choices were problematic (e.g., ‘newfound friends’ in P#2); and there
were punctuation errors with colons and commas.

7.1.4 Task 4

Figure 7-7 shows Alex’s essay for the fourth task. The essay is 402 words in length. Alex
wrote about the development of the internet as the greatest change in the 20th century, spending
six hours writing this draft, the longest time among the four first drafts he had written.

7.1.4.1 Raters’ Comments on Task 4 Essay

**Strengths.** R1 observed that the essay was readable and well organized and that the
thesis statement was very clear. R2 commented that the essay answered the prompt well; there
was good cohesion between and within paragraphs; some vocabulary were used extremely well
(e.g., ‘big difference in accessibility and availability of information’ and ‘tendency widened the
gap between the rich and poor’ in P#2, ‘the internet has facilitated globalization’ in P#4,
‘advantageous facts’ in P#5); and there were complex sentences (e.g., ‘However, the
internet…social problems as well’ in P#2, ‘As the online shopping…become more convenient’
in P#3).

**Weaknesses.** R1 noted that the sentence ‘Before the internet…for the information’ in
P#2 was confusing; the subject of the sentence ‘As the online shopping…become more
convenient’ in P#3 was not clear; and the conclusion was not supported. R2 remarked that there
was unsupported information in P#1 (i.e., ‘the development of the Internet based on the PC revolution’) and that there were verb tense issues (e.g., in P#2).

Figure 7-7. Alex’s essay for Task 4

In the twentieth century, there are a number of great \( \text{PC,KE} \) (political), \( \text{PC,KE} \) (economical), and \( \text{PC,KE} \) (scientific) changes in the world, such as \( \text{PC,KE} \) (the fall of the Berlin Wall), \( \text{PC,KE} \) (the independence of South Korea), \( \text{PC,KE} \) (the development of a nuclear weapon), etc. Above all, I think the biggest change which had a significant influence on our lives was the development of the Internet based on the PC revolution.

First of all, regardless of the wealth and social statues of the people looking for some information, all internet users have become \( \text{MF,SS} \) (being) able to have access to huge amount of information through the internet. \( \text{PC,KE} \) (Before the internet), there was a big difference in accessibility and availability of information depends on \( \text{PC,SS} \) (who is the person looking for the information). That is, information tended to be \( \text{WC,KE} \) (concentrated) on the intelligent or rich people and this tendency widened the gap between the rich and poor. However, the internet \( \text{PC,KE} \) (offered the disadvantaged groups equal chances) to obtain the necessary information without limit in time and space, and places where they could express their own opinions on social problems as well.

Secondly, the internet has totally changed the \( \text{PC,KE} \) (market structure). As the online shopping was quickly \( \text{C,KE} \) (facilitated), it enabled people to shop in their house escaping from the typical form of off-line shopping so that people’s life could become more convenient. Moreover, it has become possible for customers to compare prices of all the products from different companies through the world. As a result, while the customers could purchase products at a low price, the competition between companies has become so fierce.

Finally, the internet has \( \text{C,KE} \) (facilitated) globalization. Through the internet, people have been able to \( \text{C,KE} \) (openly) communicate with other people in the far distance as if they lived in neighborhood, even if they were in other countries. Therefore, people would have naturally experienced and learned other culture, and this \( \text{WC,Ke/Th} \) (encourage) people to understand each other and narrow culture differences between regions and nations.

For these reasons, I think the biggest change in the twentieth century was the development of the internet. Although the above paragraphs describe only about the advantageous facts of the development of the internet, there are sure to be many disadvantages, and there are still many people who cannot get benefits of the internet. However, I strongly believe that \( \text{PC,KE} \) (the advantages of the internet far outweighed the disadvantages) and we have to keep trying to \( \text{C,SS} \) (enhance) the advantages.


7.1.4.2 Difficulties

Table 7-7 shows the coding results from Alex’s Task 4 stimulated-recall interview session. For this essay, Alex chose to write about ‘the development of the Internet based on the
PC revolution’ – a topic that he was not knowledgeable about. In the stimulated-recall interview, he remarked that “I wasn’t familiar with the topic, so it was difficult to translate what I thought in Korean into English. There are many loan words for internet terms in Korean, so I wasn’t sure whether these words were used in English the same way.” Table 7-7 shows that Alex encountered difficulties primarily related to Collocation (40%), Phrase Construction (35%), and Word Choice (15%), but also to a lesser extent related to Structure (5%) and Morphological Form (5%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Alex addressed the collocations of the words ‘change’ (i.e., ‘political’, ‘economical’, and ‘scientific’), ‘shopping’ (i.e., ‘facilitated’), ‘globalization’ (i.e., ‘facilitated’), ‘communicate’ (i.e., ‘openly’), and ‘advantages’ (i.e., ‘enhance’). Phrase Construction issues focused on several noun phrases (e.g., ‘the fall of the Berlin Wall’, ‘market structure’, etc.), a prepositional phrase (i.e., ‘before the internet’), and two noun clauses (i.e., ‘who is…the information’ and ‘the advantages…the disadvantages’). Alex also experienced difficulties with Word Choice for ‘concentrated’ and ‘encourage’, the structure following the verb ‘offer’ (i.e., Structure), and the tense of the verb ‘being’ (i.e., Morphological Form).
7.1.4.3 Strategy Use

As indicated in Table 7-7, Alex, for the most part, relied on using the corpus and the Korean-English dictionary to address the various difficulties he encountered while composing. The former was used mainly for Collocation and the latter for Phrase Construction units. Alex also reported two instances of using the collocations dictionary for Collocation and one instance of using the thesaurus for a Word Choice difficulty. In the interview, Alex summarized his use of strategies for this essay in the following way:

I used the corpus and the collocations dictionary to look up words that collocated with other words. I used the corpus the most, but also the collocations dictionary and the thesaurus. I used the corpus to search for collocations and the Korean-English dictionary to change Korean expressions into English. I also searched the results from the Korean-English dictionary in the corpus to make sure they were used in the actual language.

During the interview, I became curious about Alex’s understanding of his own writing process. To this, he responded:

I try to think about the meaning in English. If this fails, I try to think in Korean. Afterwards, I try to write the sentences, using the structure such as subject + verb + object. Then I check the actual usage of the words and their relationships with one another. If any of them are not used, I replace them with other words. Afterwards, I add the adjectives and the adverbs.

The above two statements reveal an interesting aspect of Alex’s writing process. Alex first tries his best to construct sentences on his own. In the process, he uses the Korean-English dictionary to look up any words or expressions that he has difficulty with. He then examines whether his words, expressions, and their usage in relation to one another are appropriate using the corpus or the collocations dictionary, aiming to improve specificity in his word choices. Finally, he
consults the same two tools to add descriptiveness to his sentences by inserting appropriate modifiers.

7.1.5 Summary of Alex’s SRL Skill Development

The coding results of Alex’s difficulty and strategy use units together for the four tasks are shown in Table 7-8. Overall, Alex attended most frequently to Collocation (34.9%), Phrase Construction (33.7%), Word Choice (13.3%), Morphological Form (10.8%), and Structure (7.2%) difficulty units. It was noteworthy that Alex attended more to Collocation than to Phrase Construction problems, even though approximately half of the difficulty units combined for all five of the participants in Phase 2 were Phrase Construction units.

Table 7-8. Overall coding results for Alex’s four first draft writing tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29 (34.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28 (33.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The order of Alex’s most frequently employed strategy units was Self-strategy (30.1%), Corpus (25.3%), Korean-English dictionary (24.1%), Collocation dictionary (10.8%), English dictionary (4.8%), and Thesaurus (4.8%). Compared to the overall strategy use of the five participants in Phase 2, Alex relied much less on self-strategies (i.e., the percentage of this category for the five participants combined was 63.1%) and much more on the corpus and the collocations dictionary (i.e., the percentages of these two categories for the five participants
combined were 7.1% and 4.5%, respectively). There was not a big difference between Alex’s use, compared to the other four participants, of the Korean-English dictionary (cf., 18.5% overall), English dictionary (cf., 2.3%), and the thesaurus (cf., 2.3%).

The distribution of Alex’s difficulty units across tasks and its graphic representation are shown in Table 7-9 and Figure 7-8, respectively. They show that Alex’s: (a) percentage of Word Choice difficulty units decreased after Task 1, but increased again in Task 4; (b) percentage of Collocation units increased from Task 1 to Task 3 and then dropped in Task 4; (c) percentage of Structure and Morphological Form units decreased after Task 1 and remained low afterwards; and (d) percentage of Phrase Construction units fluctuated across tasks. The percentage of Word Choice and Collocations difficulty units together imply that while Alex composed these four compositions and their revisions, he increasingly attended over this period to accessing or retrieving the semantic specifications of words stored in the lemma component of English lexical units.

**Table 7-9. Distribution of difficulty units across tasks for Alex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Task 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
<td>(12.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(38.1%)</td>
<td>(61.1%)</td>
<td>(38.9%)</td>
<td>(34.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(4.80%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>(7.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(4.80%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.2%)</td>
<td>(42.9%)</td>
<td>(27.8%)</td>
<td>(38.9%)</td>
<td>(34.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of Alex’s strategy use units across tasks and its graphic representation are shown in Table 7-10 and Figure 7-9, respectively. The Table and Figure show that Alex’s: (a) use of self-strategies decreased sharply after Task 1 and remained low afterwards; (b) use of the English dictionary and the thesaurus was relatively low or absent throughout the tasks; (c) use of the Korean-English dictionary fluctuated across tasks, but remained relatively high; (d) use of the collocations dictionary was high in T2 and also evident in T4; and (e) use of the corpus was relatively high in Tasks 3 and 4. By the end of the intervention period, Alex appeared to have relied on using the corpus and the Korean-English dictionary to address most of his composing difficulties in English.
### Table 7-10. Distribution of strategy use units across tasks for Alex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Task 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(70.8%)</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(30.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.2%)</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(38.1%)</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
<td>(35%)</td>
<td>(24.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(77.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(25.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Figure 7-9. Distribution of strategy use units across tasks for Alex

*Notes. KED = Korean-English Dictionary.*
7.2 Ria’s Case Study

7.2.1 Task 1

Ria’s first draft essay for the first task is shown in Figure 7-10. The essay is 246 words in length. Ria did not indicate how much time she had spent writing the essay. In this essay, Ria expressed her regrets about not having pursued a career as a violinist.

Figure 7-10. Ria’s first draft essay for Task 1

PC,SS [most people want to WC,SS (return) some time or place. PC,SS [when they are something to regret or wonder to PC,SS (another way) if they were failed.] PC,SS [they want to PC,ED (fix it up) or make a new start.]] also if i had opportunity to go back some time i want to go back 10years ago. i was in middle school and i had to choose between PC,KED (general education) and PC,KED (arts high schools). PC,SS (some children do not know what they want to do in the future. also i did not know what i had to do.) at that time, i palyed the violin to go arts school. however, PC,SS (it is hard to me.) PC,SS (it is my mother’s choice not me.) PC,SS (my mother expect to me she want to grow up well) and lives diffirent life than other people. PC,SS (but i gave up to go arts school. but now i know and i want to play the violin again and go to arts school.) PC,SS (if i had gone back i could have not given up to school), and my mother was not disappointed to me. PC,SS (everyone) knows 'sarah chang' she is popular violinist in the world. i want to be like her. she is WC,SS (successed) as a violinist. also she MF,SS (was) WC,SS (go through) many difficulties and hard time. WC,SS (everything) is not easy to get WC,SS (something). i regret to stop play the violin. PC,SS [now i should stand hard practicing, training. and then i can be PC,SS (violinist of the best in the world).]


7.2.1.1 Raters’ Comments on Task 1 First Draft

Strengths. R1 commented that there was a sense of development and a form of opening and closing in the essay, although these were difficult to detect; the example at the end was good; there was good transition; and vocabulary was fine overall. R2 did not comment on the strengths of this essay.
Weaknesses. R1 remarked that there was no sense of structure and paragraphing in the essay; the sentences looked like bullet points; there was no capitalization; the ideas did not always link together; and the essay was problematic in various ways. R2 observed that superficial aspects, such as capitalization and paragraphing, obscured all the rest of the writing.

7.2.1.2 Difficulties

Table 7-11 shows the coding results of Ria’s Task 1 stimulated-recall interview. According to the Table, Ria’s areas of difficulty were Phrase Construction (73.9%), Word Choice (21.7%), and Morphological Form (4.3%). The high percentage of the Phrase Construction units was especially conspicuous. This category included noun phrases (e.g., ‘another way’, ‘general education’, ‘violinist of the best in the world’, etc.), a predicate phrase (i.e., ‘fix it up’), and mostly sentences (e.g., ‘when they are…were failed’, ‘some children…i had to do’, ‘if i had gone back…disappointed to me’, etc.). Ria also encountered problems with Word Choice (e.g., ‘return’, ‘successed’, ‘everything’, etc.) and Morphological Form (i.e., the tense in the phrase ‘was go through’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the stimulated-recall interview, Ria offered a detailed account of the difficulties she had encountered. As corroborated in Table 7-11, most of them were related to constructing sentences, in which she struggled to elaborate her thoughts in English. For example, she wrote in the first paragraph, ‘most people want to return some time or place, when they are something to reget or wonder to another way if they were failed’. She explained:

I wanted to make the first two sentences longer, but this was difficult. I wanted to say ‘Everybody wants to go back to the past, because when they have regrets about choices they had made in the past, they become curious or have different thoughts about the path they had not taken’, but I started to get a headache, and it was very difficult to say this. I couldn’t think of words like ‘crossroad’, so I had to use another word to convey the connotation… I had really wanted to write about ‘crossroad’, but couldn’t think of such a word.

In her responses to the general questions in the interview, Ria also expressed that achieving coherence in her essay and organizing the essay accordingly were difficult. She remarked that “The problem for me is knowing how to make my writing flow. I should add examples and quote from other sources, but these are difficult for me. The introduction, body, and the conclusion should all fit together, but I feel like I’ve written this essay very subjectively.”

7.2.1.3 Strategy Use

The stimulated-recall interview revealed that Ria’s use of strategies was distinctly limited at the start of the intervention period. Table 7-11 shows that 82.6% of Ria’s strategy use units were self-employed strategies. Most of these concerned the use of her own resources within her ability to get her message across in English. In the interview, she frequently commented about her inability to express certain phrases and sentences as she had intended (i.e., Phrase Construction units), which definitively proves how much she was struggling as she wrote.
The Table also shows that there was a restricted use of the other strategies. On one occasion, she looked up the phrase ‘fix it up’ in the English dictionary. Furthermore, she consulted the Korean-English dictionary to look up a noun phrase (i.e., ‘general education’) and two verbs (i.e., ‘succeeded’ and ‘go through’) in Korean. For the verb ‘succeed’, she inappropriately used the noun form instead. Ria also mentioned in the interview that “The essay should be formal, so I tried to choose words from a range of synonyms and use them accordingly.”

7.2.1.4 Intervention

Ria did not write much for the first task and seemed to lack essential writing skills at this point. She especially appeared to have difficulty constructing basic sentences. In line with Levelt’s (1989, 1993) language production model, we first worked on selecting exact words that she was trying to communicate and then examined the structures that these words required.

One characteristic of Ria’s writing was her simple and limited use of vocabulary. Furthermore, she expressed her inability to use more specific and academic words in place of the general ones she had used (e.g., ‘anything’ and ‘something’). To help her with this problem, I encouraged her to first think of the words to use in Korean and then look them up in the Korean-English dictionary website, examining the example sentences – which the dictionary supplied in both the Korean and English translations – and choosing the English words in the given contexts that best corresponded to her intended Korean words. We also talked about consulting the collocations dictionary to improve her word choice. The dictionary would enable Ria to easily access a set of appropriate collocations she could use with other words. Furthermore, it would allow her to add descriptiveness to her sentences by incorporating modifiers into them.
After addressing word choice problems, the next step was to heighten her awareness of the actual usage of words within sentences. Nouns and modifiers were less of a problem than verbs, which govern the overall structure of a sentence. Therefore, we centered on examining this matter for some of the verbs she had used in the essay by consulting corpus-based English dictionaries, such as the Collins COBUILD dictionary. We further talked about using the Korean-English dictionary to extract phrases in English from the example sentences.

7.2.1.5 Self-Monitoring Form

The coding results of Ria’s SMFs for her two Task 1 revised essays together are shown in Table 7-12. Only nine difficulty units were reported in the forms. With such limited information, it is difficult to make any noteworthy observations about Ria’s difficulties and use of strategies other than that she continued to have difficulty with Phrase Construction (66.7%) and that she mainly relied on her own strategies (77.8%) to address her problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It still appeared that Ria possessed little control over her strategy use. Only two strategy use units in the table – other than self-strategies – were coded as Korean-English dictionary. Although not fully reported in the SMFs, Ria indicated during the tutoring sessions that she
consulted the Korean-English dictionary to revise the essay. She further remarked that she tried to change many of the repetitive words in her essay, but was not sure whether she had done so correctly. Some of the replaced words were still awkward. It appeared that she replaced words with other synonyms that she did not know well. No trace of this was reported in the SMFs.

7.2.1.6 Task 1 Revision

Figure 7-11 shows Ria’s final revised essay for Task 1.

**Figure 7-11.** Ria’s final revised essay for Task 1

| Most people would want to turn back some time or place in the past. because they regret what they said or wonder what would happen other ways when if they were failed such as plan, business, marriage. they want to correct or make a new start. if i had the opportunity go back to before i would go back 10 years ago when i was in middle school. because i would wish to go to arts school not public school. people do not perceive when they young what they hope to do in the future. similarly i did not know what i had to do. at that time, i had to choose between a regular public high school and a specialize high schools. when i was young, i started playing the violin to go to arts school. however, it was hard for me to play the violin. since the choice was my mother's not mine. my mother expected me to grow up well and live a different life from another people. but i stop playing the violin and pass up going to arts school. as time passes, i realized that i was amiss. as a result, i learn from my major mistake and i have a challenging me to my musical limit and keep trying to be one of the best violinist. Everyone knows 'sarah chang'. she is the most talented violinist that has ever lived and superb violinist that Korea has ever produced. i admire and desire to be like her. she was a successful violinist. Also she went through the rough time. as the saying goes, nothing great is easy. today, i should be able to endure long hours of practising, training, and then i would do my best. To sum up, for these reasons, if i could go back i would go to speacial school. i would not have given up playing the violin, and i would not have disappointed my mother again. |

7.2.1.7 Raters’ Comments on Task 1 Revision

**Strengths.** R1 gave a higher ranking (by a score of three) for this revised essay compared to its first draft version, commenting that it was visually different from the first draft version; the essay was more developed overall; there were now paragraphs, which supplied more detail; the sentences were more grammatical with capitalization; there was improvement in the use of vocabulary (e.g., ‘amiss’ in P#2); the sentence ‘since the choice was my mother's not mine’ in
P#2 was better phrased; and the example in P#3 was described more clearly. R2 also perceived the revised essay to be of better quality (by a score of three) than the first draft version, but did not comment on the strengths of the essay.

Weaknesses. R1 remarked that there were some problems with grammar, spelling, and punctuation. R2 observed that the organization was not strong; P#3 was off topic; and there were numerous errors in the essay.

7.2.2 Task 2

Ria’s first draft essay for the second task is shown in Figure 7-12. The essay is 210 words in length. Ria chose to write about the importance of learning English for this task because “this is what I am learning now” and spent three hours completing the draft.

**Figure 7-12. Ria’s first draft essay for Task 2**

There are different people and different skills. but a foreign language is one of the most important skill PC,KED (of all many), PC,SS (especialy english for severl resons) PC,SS (that a people could learn english in order to be successful in the world).

To start with, english is an internatinal language. in other word, it has already become univasal language. if i can SS (speak in english) WC,SS (well) i can get a good job such as WC,KED (public service personnel), WC,KED (diplomatist), WC,KED (trader). these jobs provide PC,ED (good salaries).

Secondly,learning english is one of best way to be succes in a business. so if PC,SS (i can not leraning english) i can hardly achieve in business. PC,ED (for example, when i do research to important imfomation on the internet for business or for meeting to meet foreign parters is almost impossible without english.)

Lastly, PC,SS (speaking english) is help for go abroad. PC,SS (if i can speak in english you can go anywhere you want) because english is common language in the world. travle is PC,SS (not only fun but also good experience) to PC,KED (make wide eyes).

To sum up, nowdays in order to be successful in the world people sould learn english as second language. english is essential and important PC,SS (to live in glovalization). also PC,SS (english would be larger) than before.

7.2.2.1 Raters’ Comments on Task 2 First Draft

**Strengths.** R1 indicated that the essay had improved over the Task 1 first draft, giving a higher ranking for this essay (by a score of one); there was organization and a sense of enumeration, although not parallel; the transitions seemed to be used well; and P#1 was nicely written. R2 also gave a higher ranking for this essay (by a score of one) than for the Task 1 first draft and stated that the example in P#4 was good.

**Weaknesses.** R1 commented that there were plural, capitalization, and spelling problems; the phrase ‘to make wide eyes’ in P#4 was not idiomatic; and the sentence ‘also English would be larger than before’ in P#5 was unclear, needing development. R2 remarked that the essay was short and not developed.

7.2.2.2 Difficulties

Table 7-13 shows the coding results of Ria’s Task 2 stimulated-recall interview session. As displayed in the table, 12 difficulty units (70.6%) were categorized as Phrase Construction, four units (23.5%) as Word Choice, and one unit (5.9%) as Structure. Similar to Task 1, Ria primarily experienced difficulty with Phrase Construction (cf., 73.9% in Task 1) and Word Choice (cf., 21.7% in Task 1) problems. The former included the construction of noun phrases (i.e., ‘good salaries’ and ‘learning English’), a predicate phrase (i.e., ‘make wide eyes’), a prepositional phrase (i.e., ‘of all many’), an adverb phrase (i.e., ‘to live in globalization’), and mostly clauses and sentences (e.g., ‘that a people…in the world’, ‘i can not leraning english’, ‘for example…without english’, etc.). The latter included the adverb ‘well’ and some words related to occupation (i.e., ‘public service personnel’, ‘diplomatist’, and ‘trader’). Ria also had difficulty with the structure in the phrase ‘speak in English’.
Table 7-13. Coding results of Ria’s Task 2 first draft stimulated-recall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12 (70.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In her responses to the general questions in the interview, Ria also talked about experiencing difficulty with the organization of the essay. She remarked:

Writing the introduction was difficult, and I was concerned about how to start the essay...I have to write about three things in the body, but could not think of them. So, I just wrote down what I could start with...but I am not sure whether there is enough content in there...I could not think of a way to provide support for my claims...I also can’t think of any other ideas, so my writing looks simple and short. I would like to change this, but it’s difficult for me at this time, so I just write whatever comes to my mind. This is the only way I can write.

7.2.2.3 Strategy Use

Table 7-13 shows that 58.8% of the strategy use units were self-strategies, which dropped considerably from 82.6% in Task 1. Of more importance is the fact that Ria did not remark about her lack of ability to address her difficulties in Task 2 as frequently as in Task 1. She mostly employed self-strategies for Phrase Construction difficulty units, but also for Word Choice (i.e., the adverb ‘well’) and Structure (i.e., the phrase ‘speak in english’) units.

Ria also demonstrated a fairly high use of the Korean-English dictionary, which increased from 13% in Task 1 to 29.4% in Task 2. This was to address Word Choice (i.e., the words ‘public service personnel’, ‘diplomatist’, and ‘trader’) and Phrase Construction (i.e., the
phrases ‘of all many’ and ‘make wide eyes’) problems. Although occasionally unsuccessful in using the Korean-English dictionary to address her writing difficulties, she appeared to have found it to be a useful tool. Finally, Ria consulted the English dictionary for the phrase ‘good salaries’ and searched the internet (coded as Others) in writing the sentence ‘for example…without english’.

The coding in Table 7-13 was based solely on the participants’ responses to the sentence-by-sentence questions in the interview. In her responses to the general questions about the essay, Ria emphasized that she frequently consulted the Korean-English dictionary to examine the example sentences it supplied and looked up many words in the thesaurus. Below the essay, Ria had written a long list of words with their synonyms. She indicated that she found it difficult to use advanced vocabulary in her writing and that she, therefore, wrote the essay using simple vocabulary first, then searched some words that she thought she could replace, and wrote them down below the essay. To my question about what she would like to improve about her essay, Ria responded:

The words I’ve used are very basic ones. I would like to replace them with the words I have written below the essay. I keep using words that I had previously used. I can’t think of many words when I’m writing, so I keep using the ones that I had used comfortably in the past.

It was evident that Ria was starting to learn some strategies to cope with her writing difficulties. She remarked that the strategies were still difficult for her since “I’m just learning to write now” and that it would have been better to use a variety of other expressions, but “I don’t think I’m able to do that yet.”
7.2.2.4 Intervention

The use of general words (e.g., ‘be’, ‘have’, ‘get’, ‘good’, ‘bad’, etc.) and of simple sentences characterized Ria’s writing. She also stated that she experienced difficulty choosing specific words and connecting the words together to construct sentences. I tried to make writing a litter easier for Ria by helping her to think of words related to the task and to use these words as basic building blocks for constructing sentences. This could also improve coherence in her writing. We made an outline together, producing a list of words related to ‘job’, ‘information’, and ‘experience’ for each of the body paragraphs. We used the Korean-English dictionary to extract English words from the supplied example sentences when she could not think of the English words – which was a strategy she had been using.

After we had brainstormed a list of words to use, we looked them up in the collocations dictionary and examined how these words could be connected with other words in an appropriate way and how she could add modifiers to her sentences. Because Ria was having difficulty with basic sentence structures, we focused on finding words for the basic elements of a sentence (i.e., nouns for subjects/objects and verbs) and on connecting them together.

In a later intervention session, I introduced the corpus to Ria. Being aware that using the corpus at that time could be a challenge for her, I hoped that it would help her to improve specificity in her word choices and to construct sentences by examining the actual usage of words and phrases in the language database. We went over the basic functions of the corpus using some of the words and phrases in the essay.

7.2.2.5 Self-Monitoring Form

Unfortunately, Ria did not fill in the SMFs for the revised essays of Task 2. Her difficulties and use of strategies can only be conjectured based on the tutoring log. For her first
revision, Ria made changes to some of her expressions, which became much better. Furthermore, she revised the first and second body paragraphs with a focus on employing relevant vocabulary to the task – a strategy we had worked on in the previous meeting. She had not yet completed the third body paragraph this way. For the final revision, Ria did not make any substantial changes, most of the changes simply reflecting what we had discussed previously.

By Task 2, there was a noteworthy change in the way Ria made use of the dictionaries. She remarked in the tutoring sessions that in the past, she had mainly looked up words for their meaning, but now focused on the usage of words, further commenting that this has been very helpful for her. In particular, Ria appeared to have found the Korean-English dictionary to be an indispensable tool for her English writing. She indicated that she had not known how to connect words together previously, but that she now searched the Korean-English dictionary with two words simultaneously and examined the example sentences for this purpose.

7.2.2.6 Task 2 Revision

Figure 7-13 shows Ria’s final revised essay for the second task.

7.2.2.7 Raters’ Comments on Task 2 Revision

**Strengths.** R1 gave a much higher ranking (by a score of five) for this revised essay compared to its first draft version, commenting that it was the strongest among Ria’s essays; everything was in paragraphs; it was organized and had enumeration; the ideas in P#2 were well organized; the extended example in P#2 was sophisticated; the use of the rhetorical question in P#2 (i.e., ‘Who would do better job at work?’) was good; using the adverb ‘today’ to start the essay in P#1 was effective; and P#1 had specific examples. Similarly, R2 ranked this essay higher (by a score of three) than its draft version, observing that the revised essay was tighter
with better examples and fewer errors and included more information to support the claims made in the essay (e.g., in P#3).

**Weakness.** R1 remarked that there were some problems with capitalization (e.g., in P#1), although it was getting better, and with spelling (e.g., in P#1 and P#4). R2 stated that there was an unsupported claim in P#2 (i.e., ‘one who can speak…better job at work?’).

**Figure 7-13.** Ria’s final revised essay for Task 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Today, Young students go abroad to study english. Because when they join a huge company such as in SAMSOUNG, HYUNDAI, they should show their good english skills to them. A foreign language is especially english skills one of the most important skill. There are several reasons why people should learn english in order to be successful in the world.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To start with, To be success in the world, we should find a good job in public service, diplomacy, trading etc. they should provide a good salaries. If we can speak english well it will be more easier to get a job. For example, There are two types of people. one who can speak a second language and the another who can not speak. Who would do better job at work? English ability is important in a tight job market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondly, English is one of best way to be succesful in a business. If i can not english i will achieve in business. For example, when i do research to important gain imfomation we could use the internet. The website is in english. it has already become a universal language even internet envrironment. also speaking skills can be helpful when go overseas for business meeting to meet foreign parthers. thus we should learn english to do well in works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To sum up, In order to be successful in the world people should learn english as second language. english would be larger than before in our society. for that reasons english is essential and important to live and impossible without it in glocalization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.3 Task 3

Ria’s first draft essay for the third task is shown in Figure 7-14. The essay is 312 words in length – the longest among the first draft essays written by Ria. She spent five hours drafting the essay, in which she talked about her desire to study child education. She indicated that “It was not difficult to decide on the subject to write on because I am currently learning how to teach English to children.” This draft appears to be much better written than her previous essays. The expressions in the essay also seem to be more native-like.
Figure 7.14. Ria’s first draft essay for Task 3

There are many subjects that I have never had the chance to study. But if I could have a chance for study I would like to learn teaching young children in English. (the detailed reason will be illustrated as following)

Today, teacher is the most popular stable job for women. The reason is high pension incomes and guaranteed for the future. When I was young, I always want to be a teacher. (but the dream did not come true) I did not study hard when I was in high school so I could not go to university of education. If I have a chance to learn I would like to study teaching young children.

In addition, I am interest in nursery education than others. (I feel that God has called me to teach for kids) (everybody know if someone think long to do something eagerly they would do anything to become the best) as I mentioned above, I could not learn a young children education before so I do not know anything about that. I want (to learn professionally) and then I would like to take care of children with playing the game, singing a song etc.

If I would be a teacher I could do my best. also (I will be proud of) the children who is learn something from me. (remember her who was my best teacher), when I were in kindergarten, she is my role model who is a great person. (looking back on it now), I was heavily influenced by her. also (I developed a passion to teaching and a love of learning from her). I desperatly hope to be a teacher.

To sum up, If I could learn a subject I have never get an opportunity to learn, teaching young children that would be my preference. (i wish really hard, I will do what I want.)


7.2.3.1 Raters’ Comments on Task 3 First Draft

Strengths. R1 commented that the essay was developed and answered the question posed for the task; punctuation was improving; the examples in P#3 and P#4 were good; and the author’s voice was present in the essay. R2 compared this essay with the revised essay of Task 2, remarking that the examples in this essay were better; there was more voice in the essay; and it was more interesting to read. R2 gave a higher gave a higher ranking for this draft essay (by a score of one) than for the revised essay of Task 2.

Weaknesses. R1 observed that the spelling was problematic and that there were issues with subject-verb agreement. R2 stated that they essay contained numerous errors and lacked sufficient examples to support its main thesis.
7.2.3.2 Difficulties

Table 7-14 shows the coding results of Ria’s Task 3 stimulated-recall interview. As displayed in the table, 13 of the 16 difficulty units (i.e., 81.3%) were coded as Phrase Construction (81.3%), two (12.5%) as Structure, and one (6.3%) as Word Choice. It was apparent that Ria was experiencing difficulty with longer units of language than just words. The difficulty units in the Phrase Construction category included mostly sentences (e.g., ‘the detail reason…as following’, ‘everybody know…the best’, ‘i remember…a great person’, ‘i wish…i want’, etc.), but also predicate phrases (e.g., ‘think long’, ‘be proud of’, ‘looking back on it now’, etc.). The two units coded as Structure involved word order in the phrase ‘to learn professionally’ and in the sentence ‘i will be proud of…from me’. Ria also had difficulty with the word choice of ‘eagerly’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (81.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Ria indicated in the stimulated-recall interview that “It was easier to write about myself this time than in the previous tasks.” She also seemed to have found an easier way to organize her thoughts. She commented that “Somebody had told me that in English writing, a sentence should elaborate on the previous written sentence. So, I tried to do that.”
7.2.3.3 Strategy Use

Table 7-14 shows that 62.5%, 25%, and 12.5% of the strategy use units were coded as Korean-English dictionary, Self-strategy, and Collocation, respectively. The significant increase in the use of the Korean-English dictionary here was notable. In the interview, Ria mentioned that she received a lot of help from the example sentences provided by the Korean-English dictionary. The table further reveals that she relied on using this dictionary, for the most part, to address Phrase Construction difficulties. By this time, it appeared that Ria possessed some level of control over using this tool to cope with one of her greatest difficulties in English writing – constructing phrases and sentences.

It is also interesting to note that Ria consulted the collocations dictionary to address two Phrase Construction difficulty units in the draft. This was the first time she had used this tool in her writing, which might have resulted from the focus on using the collocations dictionary in the previous tutoring sessions. Ria remarked that “I used the two words ‘learn’ and ‘remember’ frequently. I knew there should be something following these words, but I wasn’t sure of the structure. So, I consulted the collocations dictionary.”

One of the greatest changes for Ria by this time was her self-confidence as a writer. In the interview, she commented:

I’m not afraid of writing anymore…If I concentrate and consult dictionaries as I write, I don’t feel reluctant to writing as I previously had felt. I can start writing and finish a piece now. I’m becoming more aware of how to write in English by examining example sentences…I now know how to put my thoughts into writing.

7.2.3.4 Intervention

Ria’s writing appeared to have improved conspicuously by the third task. Furthermore, she now seemed to understand how to use collocations in her writing. For the revised essays, we
worked on refining some of the expressions using the collocations dictionary and the corpus. Ria also indicated that she had difficulties with organization and content. Therefore, we talked about the importance of organizing an essay in a way that the sentences within a paragraph relate to the topic sentence and tried to reorganize some of the content in the essay. In addition, we looked at several prewriting strategies (e.g., free-writing, outlining, etc.) she could employ to organize her essays more effectively. Building on the previous tutoring sessions, we continued to work on brainstorming a list of focal words relevant to the task and using these words to construct sentences and generate content in the essay.

7.2.3.5 Self-Monitoring Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The coding results of Ria’s SMFs for her two Task 3 revised essays together are shown in Table 7-15. Ria only reported three difficulty units in the SMFs, making it unrealistic to offer any interpretations based on these forms. Therefore, Ria’s difficulties and use of strategies for the revised essays can only be conjectured from the tutoring log. It appeared that Ria added some sentences to each paragraph to strengthen the content, reorganized the essay slightly, and replaced several general words (e.g., ‘anything’, ‘something’, etc.) with more specific ones. She
indicated that she focused on revising the content, but that she also used the Korean-English dictionary frequently to improve her expressions.

7.2.3.6 Task 3 Revision

Figure 7-15 shows Ria’s final revised essay for the third task.

**Figure 7-15.** Ria’s final revised essay for Task 3

> When i was young, i had always wanted to be a teacher for young children. but now i am not a teacher. so if i could have a chance to study to me i would like to study early childhood english education. and then i want to accomplish my dream. the detailed reasons will be illustrated as followed.

Today, teaching is the most popular and stable job for women. because of high pension incomes and guaranteed future. especially if i pregnant i could get holiday for a moment. there are many benefits from policy. for this reasons, many of them want to be a teacher. But it is lead to competition with people. in my case, i did not study hard when i was in high shool. as a result, i could not go to a university of education. our society is need a good high school records to enter a prestigious university. also some majors- such as medicine, law, education - are many competions to get accepted.

In addition, I am interested in early childhood education. i feel that God has called me to teach kids. for example, i am happy to take care of my cousins. the children always curious about around them and when i explain to them they understand. it was make me happy. as mentioned above, i could not study childhood education before so i do not know much about that. i want to study professionally and then i would like to take care of children playing the game, singing a song with them.

Also, i would be proud that children would be able to learn basic knowledge from me. i remember my kindergatten teacher, who has been my role model. she teached me very well and also helped me to understand easier. looking back now, i realize that i was heavily influenced by her. also i developed a passion for teaching and a love for learning from her.

To sum up, i deeply regret that i did not study hardly when i was in high scool. if i would study hard i could go to a university of education. and then i could be a teacher. therefore.

7.2.3.7 Raters’ Comments on Task 3 Revision

**Strengths.** R1 gave a higher ranking for this revised essay (by a score of one) than for its first draft version, commenting that this essay was longer (and therefore had more errors) with added information; P#2 was more developed; and the dashes in P#2 were used well. R2 also judged this essay to be of better quality (by a score of one) compared to its draft version, observing that this essay contained the most thought and the least mistakes among all Ria’s
essays; it had good order with some voice; and the author had a plan that readers could follow using cohesive devices between paragraphs.

**Weaknesses.** R1 remarked that there were verb and tense problems in P#3 (e.g., ‘children always curious’, ‘it was make me happy’); spelling errors were present (e.g., in P#4); and the essay did not seem finished at the end. R2 stated that the information in P#5 could better fit in P#1; there was not much within paragraph cohesion; and the conclusion was a bit weak.

### 7.2.4 Task 4

Ria’s essay for the fourth task is shown in Figure 7-16. The essay is 235 words in length and is one of Ria’s shortest first draft essays. However, she worked on this essay for seven and a half hours, spending more time drafting this essay than any of her previous essays. For the essay, she chose to write about the advances in science and technology as the greatest change in the twentieth century. She indicated that “I chose this topic because I’ve just been obsessed with the thought of buying an iPad recently. The topic was so profound that I didn’t know what to write.”

### 7.2.4.1 Raters’ Comments on Task 4 Essay

**Strengths.** R1 commented that punctuation in general was getting better and that the essay was in paragraphs; the argument flowed well with nice transitions; there was a relevant current event example in P#1; and the use of the rhetorical question in P#2 (i.e., ‘why do people…ipad?’) was effective. R2 did not comment on the strengths of this essay.

**Weaknesses.** R1 pointed out that there were spelling errors (e.g., in P#3); the phrase ‘several millenial history’ in P#2 was confusing; there was an instance of incorrect subject-verb agreement in P#3 (i.e., ‘workers and students wants’); the word choice ‘sould’ in P#2 was problematic; the topic sentence in P#3 was unclear; and there were still some issues with
capitalization. R2 observed that P#4 did not quite fit in with the rest of the essay or the prompt; the author chose a very broad topic and then talked about something else; the conclusion was weak; and there were sentence and word level errors similar to those present in the other essays.

Figure 7-16. Ria’s essay for Task 4

A lot of WC,SS(things) have been changed and developed in the twentieth century. Among them, Advances in science and technology have brought about C,C(remarkable) changes in people's lives. particularly, PC,KED(men,woman and children) are interested in ipod, iphone, ipad. moreover, apple fans around the world are looking forward to release soon. PC,SS(from my point of view), PC,KED(Imformation science) became the world's most valuable and useful thing for us.

First of all, why do people actually like the the ipod, iphone, ipad? as mentioned above, those things have been changing our life style with PC,KED(several millenial history). PC,SS(in the past, we sould not calling each other with smart phone, should not using the computer with wireless technology, should not listening music or watching tv, movies with audio/video device.)

By MF,SS(apperance) of the all the items, SS,(but), PC,SS(there is nothing we can not do through new technology). PC,KED(when and where) it is perfect to do many things such as game, e-mail, reading, study, search etc. also the technology makes it easy to carry all information in my pocket. O,SS(as a result, workers and students wants to buy it.)

To sum up, if i had to choose one that should be remembered, i would choose the science and technology as a great development. I would like to expect the new technology world in all places as the last ten. also i wonder PC,O(who will swich on to mobile tv)?


7.2.4.2 Difficulties

Table 7-16 shows the coding results of Ria’s Task 3 stimulated-recall interview session.

Two weeks had passed since the previous tutoring session, in which we had wrapped up the third task. In the interview, Ria remarked that it was not easy to write after taking a rest for two weeks and that she should be writing regularly. She also expressed concerns about the use of non-academic vocabulary in her essay and the organization of the essay. As shown in Table 7-16, Ria reported eight difficulty units for Phrase Construction (61.5%) and one unit for each of the other categories, with the exception of the Spelling category. In her previous stimulated-recall
interviews, Ria’s difficulties had centered mostly on Phrase Construction and Word Choice issues. It appeared that by the end of the intervention period, Ria was beginning to attend to other problems as well.

Table 7-16. Coding results of Ria’s Task 4 first draft stimulated-recall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 (61.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Phrase Construction included the construction of noun phrases (i.e., ‘men, woman and children’, ‘information science’, and ‘several millenial history’), a prepositional phrase (i.e., ‘from my point of view’), an adverb phrase (i.e., ‘when and where’), and sentences (‘in the past…video device’, ‘there is nothing…technology’, and ‘who will swich on to mobile tv’). Ria also addressed difficulties with Word Choice (i.e., the word ‘things’), Collocation (i.e., the collocation of the words ‘remarkable’ and ‘change’), Structure (i.e., the appropriate location of the conjunction ‘but’ in the sentence ‘By apperance…technology’), Morphological Form (i.e., the proper morphological form of the word ‘apperance’ in the phrase ‘by apperance’), and Others (i.e., whether the sentence ‘as a result…buy it’ fitted in the paragraph).

7.2.4.3 Strategy Use

Table 7-16 reveals that seven of the 13 strategy units (i.e., 53.8%) were coded as self-strategies, four (i.e., 30.8%) as Korean-English dictionary, one (i.e., 7.7%) as Collocations
dictionary, and one (i.e., 7.7%) as Others. The Other category here refers to Ria’s using the expression ‘who will switch on to mobile tv?’ from an article she had read. Furthermore, Ria consulted the Korean-English dictionary to address Phrase Construction units and the collocations dictionary for phrasing of ‘remarkable changes’.

In the interview, Ria again commented about the usefulness of the Korean-English dictionary:

I made use of the example sentences from the Naver website. I didn’t find all the expressions I wanted to use, but by examining these sentences, I am learning when and how to use the expressions and to adjust my writing accordingly, which is enabling me to say what I want.

She further stated that “When I look something up in the dictionary, I don’t try to follow exactly what the dictionary offers, but try to restructure what I want to say depending on the context.”

In addition, Ria indicated that she tried to organize the essay by following the brainstorming method we had worked on together previously. She also seemed to have gained more confidence in doing this. She remarked that “I think I now know how I should write. Once I have written something down, I try to make the flow more logical and think about what could follow rather than just writing down whatever comes to my mind.”

7.2.5 Summary of Ria’s SRL Skill Development

The coding results of the difficulty and strategy use units together for Ria’s first draft essays on the four tasks are shown in Table 7-17. Overall, Ria reported mostly Phrase Construction (72.5%) and Word Choice (15.9%) difficulty units. The other units occupied only a small percentage of the total difficulty units. The high percentage of the Phrase Construction units – which was much higher than the overall percentage of the five participants (i.e., 50.4%) –
was notable. The percentage of the Word Choice units was similar to the overall percentage (i.e., 17.8%).

Table 7-17. Overall coding results for Ria’s four first draft writing tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>KED</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Cr</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Furthermore, Ria primarily relied on the use of Self-strategies (58%) and of the Korean-English dictionary (31.9%). The percentage of the other strategies was low. Compared to the overall strategy use of the five participants, Ria relied a little less on the use of self-strategies (cf., 63.1% overall) and slightly more on the use of the Korean-English dictionary (cf., 18.5% overall).

The distribution of Ria’s difficulty units across tasks and its graphic representation are shown in Table 7-18 and Figure 7-17, respectively. They show that Ria’s (a) percentage of Word Choice difficulty units decreased after Task 2 and remained low afterwards; (b) percentage of Collocation was absent until the last task; (c) percentage of Structure increased until Task 3, then dropped slightly in Task 4; (d) percentage of Morphological Form was low or zero across tasks; and (e) percentage of Phrase Construction was high in all four tasks. It is interesting to note that by the end of the intervention period in Task 4, Ria attended less to the Phrase Construction difficulty units, trying to address the other problems equally.
Table 7-18. Distribution of difficulty units across tasks for Ria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Task 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21.7%)</td>
<td>(23.5%)</td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
<td>(7.7%)</td>
<td>(15.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.7%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.7%)</td>
<td>(5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.7%)</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73.9%)</td>
<td>(70.6%)</td>
<td>(81.3%)</td>
<td>(61.5%)</td>
<td>(72.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7.7%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 7-17. Distribution of difficulty units across tasks for Ria

Notes. WC = Word Choice. MF = Morphological Form. P Con = Phrase Construction
The distribution of Ria’s strategy use units across tasks and its graphic representation are shown in Table 7-19 and Figure 7-18, respectively. The Table and Figure show that Ria’s (a) use of self-strategies gradually decreased from Task 1 to Task 3, then increased slightly in Task 4;
(b) use of the English dictionary disappeared after Task 2; (c) use of the thesaurus was absent in all tasks; (d) use of the Korean-English dictionary gradually increased from Task 1 to Task 3, but then dropped slightly in Task 4; and (e) the use of the collocations dictionary appeared from Task 3. Overall, Ria relied less on the use of self-strategies as her reliance on the use of the Korean-English dictionary increased. Furthermore, the use of the collocations dictionary in Tasks 3 and 4 was noteworthy. A longer intervention period might have been able to show Ria’s use of other strategies as she gradually became to develop control over the strategies.
Chapter 8. Discussion

In this chapter, I first present a summary of the findings, interpreting them in relation to relevant theories. Then, I examine implications for pedagogy arising from the study. Next, I describe several limitations of the study and suggest directions for future research. This chapter ends with concluding remarks about the significance of the study.

8.1 Summary of Findings

The first main research question was associated with Phase 1 of the study.

8.1.1 RQ1a (What are typical lexical problems that Korean ESL learners encounter in English writing?)

For the two writing tasks in Phase 1 – the argumentative and translating writing tasks – the participants primarily reported Phrase Construction and Word Choice difficulties in their stimulated-recall interviews. Moreover, the percentage of the former was higher than that of the latter in the AWT, whereas the opposite was true in the TWT. It was clearly evident that the greatest problem for the participants was finding appropriate English words and expressions for their corresponding Korean phrases. In comparison to these two units, the portion of other difficulty units reported was relatively small.

8.1.2 RQ1b (What strategies do they use to overcome the problems?)

The participants showed some differences in their uses of strategies for the two writing tasks: In the AWT, the most frequently employed strategies were exercising best judgment (30.8%) and using one’s own resources (24.2%). In the TWT, the participants mainly relied on consulting a dictionary (37.3%), rephrasing (23.6%), and exercising best judgment (20%).
sum, the participants took more advantage of consulting a dictionary (mostly the Korean-English dictionary) and rephrasing strategies and less of the other strategies in the TWT than in the AWT. Furthermore, they reported more avoiding strategies in the AWT than in the TWT.

8.1.3 RQ2a (*What changes are observable in the learners’ SRL skills for English writing throughout the intervention period?*)

The second main research question was associated with Phase 2 of the study.

8.1.3.1 Aggregate Results for Five Participants on Four Tasks

**Difficulty units.** Phrase Construction occupied the largest portion (i.e., almost half) of difficulty units, and this level was maintained across the four tasks. The percentage of Word Choice difficulty units, which took up the next largest portion, was fairly high (i.e., approximately 20%) throughout the tasks, although it had a tendency to decrease slightly. The percentage of Collocation difficulty units showed a tendency to increase gradually across tasks. The percentage of the other difficulty units remained relatively low across tasks.

**Strategy use units.** The participants’ strategy use at the start of the intervention closely resembled their strategy use for the AWT in Phase 1. However, changes were observed after the intervention began. First, the percentage of self-strategy units, which occupied the largest portion of the strategy use units, gradually decreased across tasks. The overall decrease from 83.3% in the first task to 44.8% by the end of the intervention period was quite substantial. Second, uses of the Korean-English dictionary, which all the participants often took advantage of, gradually increased across tasks. Third, uses of the collocations dictionary and the corpus, which appeared from the second task, tended to increase across tasks, but decreased in the third and fourth tasks, respectively. Finally, uses of the English dictionary, the thesaurus, and other tools remained low throughout the tasks.
8.1.3.2 Individual Case studies

In answering RQ2a, the developmental trajectories of the SRL skills for each of the participants were found to be idiosyncratic. Therefore, case studies of Alex and Ria were presented in Chapter 7.

**Alex.** Overall, Alex mostly attended to Collocation (34.6%), Phrase Construction (34.6%), and Word Choice (12.3%) issues. His percentage of Collocation units tended to increase across tasks, whereas the opposite was true for his Word Choice units. The percentage of his Phrase Construction units fluctuated across tasks. With regard to strategy use, Alex mostly employed self-strategies (30.1%), the corpus (25.3%), and the Korean-English dictionary (24.1%). More specifically, Alex’s use of self-strategies decreased considerably after the first task and remained low afterwards; his use of the corpus was especially frequent in the latter two tasks; and his use of the Korean-English dictionary fluctuated across tasks, but remained relatively high.

**Ria.** Overall, Ria reported mostly Phrase Construction (72.5%) and Word Choice (15.9%) difficulties. The other units occupied only a small percentage of her total difficulty units. The high percentage of Phrase Construction units, which remained high across tasks, was noteworthy. Furthermore, her percentage of Word Choice units decreased and remained low after the second task. With regard to strategy use, Ria relied almost exclusively on the use of self-strategies (58%) and of the Korean-English dictionary (31.9%). Specifically, her use of self-strategies tended to gradually decrease, whereas her use of the Korean-English dictionary exhibited the opposite tendency.
8.1.4 RQ2b (*How do their self-efficacy beliefs change as learners go through the cyclic model of SRL?*)

The participants’ self-ratings of their essays were examined within and across tasks. In general, the self-ratings increased as the participants made revisions to their draft compositions within each task. Furthermore, the self-ratings displayed a tendency to increase across tasks for Alex, Sam, and Ria, whereas they remained the same for Abril and fluctuated for August. With regard to the confidence level scores, the participants were mostly neutral (i.e., a score of 0) in their self-ratings with the exception of Abril and August.

8.1.5 RQ2c (*What influence does the change in the learners’ SRL skills have on their English writing performance?*)

To investigate the changes in the quality of the participants’ essays, the participants’ essays were analyzed in terms of their lexical richness, syntactic complexity, and native speaker rankings within and across tasks. For lexical richness measures, I used the type-token ratio and the LFP; for syntactic complexity, I used the MLS.

**Type-token ratio.** Within tasks, the type-token ratio of the revised essays was generally higher than that of the first draft essays for most of the participants. For Abril, the opposite tendency was observed for the second and third tasks. Across tasks, the type-token ratio in general increased across tasks. However, it fluctuated for August.

**LFP.** Most words in the participants’ essays belonged to the K1 word group, with only a small percentage of them belonging to the K2 word or the AWL word group. Within tasks, the percentage of K1 words revealed a tendency to decrease from the first draft to the revised essays, whereas that of the K2 and AWL words had a tendency to increase. Across tasks, the percentage of K1 words exhibited a tendency to decrease across tasks, whereas that of the K2 and AWL
words displayed a tendency to increase for most of the participants. The percentage of K2 words decreased for Abril, while that of AWL words was irregular for August.

**MLS.** The changes in the MLS were not as consistent as the other measures. Within tasks, the MLS generally increased from the first draft to the revised essays for Alex and Abril, but decreased for August and Ria. It was irregular for Sam. Across tasks, the MLS showed a general tendency to increase for Alex, Sam, and Ria, but to decrease for Abril and August.

**Native-speaker rankings.** The revised essays in general had higher rankings than the first draft essays within tasks for most of the participants. Moreover, the two raters ranked 86.7% and 73.3% of the revised essays higher than their first draft versions, respectively. Across the sequence of tasks, most rankings were higher on the whole. However, for Sam and Abril, the ranking order was irregular for the two raters, respectively.

8.1.6 RQ2d (*How do the learners feel about the intervention as a way of developing their writing skills in English?*)

Overall, the participants expressed positive attitudes toward the intervention. All the participants responded that the intervention was helpful for them, remarking that it helped them to write in an academic manner and according to their communicative intentions more easily, to learn to use linguistic resources in a useful way, to choose more appropriate words, to organize their essays and write in a logical way, to practice writing more frequently, to write independently, and to acquire necessary writing skills. One participant (i.e., August) indicated that she would have preferred to have worked on more varied tasks.

With regard to SRL skills, the participants indicated that through the intervention, they felt that they became more aware of their difficulties in writing and of the strategies they could employ to address their difficulties – which they found useful. They also stated that they learned
to cope better with their difficulties on their own. Regarding self-efficacy beliefs, the participants observed that they had gained confidence in writing. One participant, however, mentioned that the heightened awareness of her problems in writing actually raised her anxiety about writing. Finally, the participants also commented about the difficulties they still experienced after the intervention, such as making exact word choices, using native-like expressions, organizing their essays more logically, having to look up words frequently, and making grammatical mistakes.

8.1.7 Conclusions

Phase 1 showed that the participants encountered various types of difficulties in their L2 writing in relation to accessing and retrieving the semantic, syntactic, morphological, and orthographical specifications stored in the lexical entries of their mental lexicons for English. Moreover, the participants were found to primarily employ self-strategies to cope with their difficulties.

Phase 2 revealed changes in the participants’ attention to areas of difficulty and strategy use (i.e., changes in SRL skills). However, it was difficult to identify definite patterns from the difficulty and strategy use units reported by the participants as a whole. This was because the developmental trajectories of the SRL skills for each participant were idiosyncratic, as evident in the case studies of Alex and Ria. Examined individually, the participants’ attention to difficulties and their use of strategies became progressively more focused.

Along with the changes in the participants’ SRL skills, their self-efficacy beliefs and the quality of their essays exhibited visible improvements: The participants demonstrated gradual increases in their self-efficacy beliefs both within and across tasks, and the quality of the essays generally became better both within and across tasks with regard to their lexical richness, syntactic complexity, and native-speaker rankings of text quality. Furthermore, the participants
remarked in the post-intervention interview that the intervention had been helpful and had exerted positive influences on their development of SRL skills and self-efficacy beliefs, even though certain difficulties in English writing still existed after the intervention period.

Although no causal relationships among the changes in the various measures can be established, the study clearly illustrated that positive changes in SRL skills for English writing were associated with improvements in self-efficacy beliefs and writing quality. In particular, this study demonstrated that developing SRL skills for employing lexical strategies to address difficulties in the formulation process of L2 writing helped to increase the lexical richness, syntactic complexity, and native-likeness (i.e., based on native speaker rankings) of these learners’ written texts as well as enhance their self-efficacy beliefs about their L2 writing.

8.2 Implications for Theory

8.2.1 Lexical Development and Language Production

The findings of the study can be interpreted in relation to Jiang’s (2000) L2 lexical development and Levelt’s (1989, 1993) language production models. According to the two models, lexical retrieval and language production are automatic processes for native speakers. In contrast, L2 learners access the linguistic specifications (i.e., semantic, syntactic, morphological, and orthographic) of L2 words mostly through their L1. Furthermore, their formulation and grammatical encoding processes tend to be conscious and laborious, causing difficulties for L2 learners. The findings of the present study confirmed these two postulations.

8.2.1.1 Reliance on L1

The constant use of the Korean-English dictionary by all the participants implies that they had not yet advanced to the final integration stage of L2 lexical development for many of the
English words they were using in their compositions. For these words, the participants may be at the formal stage – relying on the link between the L2 words and their equivalent L1 translations through the use of the Korean-English dictionary – or be at the L1 lemma mediation stage – consulting the dictionary to check the appropriateness of the L2 words even when the L1 semantic specifications of these words have already been copied to their lexical entries. The former is more likely to be the case except when the participants were intentionally verifying the use of their L2 words by consulting the dictionary, since the retrieval of the words in the L1 lemma mediation stage would be automatic.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that the participants’ uses of the Korean-English dictionary were much higher in the TWT than in the AWT. Because the TWT required the participants to translate an existing Korean text into English, the meaning (i.e., semantic specifications) of the message was already provided and fixed. In the AWT, the participants were free to compose their own messages, which could have led them to avoid constructing messages or using phrases that they considered difficult in the L2. The fact that the participants frequently consulted the Korean-English dictionary in the TWT clearly illustrates that they were still at the initial stages of acquiring many L2 words, indicating that their uses of these words were mainly through lexical association or L1 lemma mediation. This finding provides empirical evidence for the L2 lexical development model proposed by Jiang.

A related finding was the notably higher number of Word Choice difficulty units reported in the TWT than in the AWT. This implies that the participants experienced more difficulty finding L2 equivalent translations for the L1 words when the semantic specifications were provided in the TWT than when they were not in the AWT. Again, the participants could have avoided using words that they were uncertain of in the AWT – which might just be the case
given the higher percentage of avoiding strategies reported in the AWT than in the TWT. Similarly, the participants relied on using their own resources to address their difficulties more in the AWT than in the TWT. Studies with Korean EFL learners have similarly reported that Korean learners largely rely on their L1 when composing English essays. Oh (2006), for example, analyzed essays written by 60 university students in Korea and discovered that most of the lexical phrasing errors in the essays (as high as 78.2% of the errors in some sections) were due to L1 interference that resulted from reliance on L1. Moreover, Cha (2005) examined deviant lexical uses in essays written by 65 Korean university students and found that the students’ reliance on literal translation from Korean to English accounted for the highest portion (35.1%) of the deviant lexical uses found in their essays. As these studies and the present study illustrate, reliance on the native language when composing in English appears to be a persistent problem for Korean learners of English.

8.2.1.2 Grammatical Encoding Processes

One finding of the study was that the participants’ attended infrequently to Morphological Form and Spelling difficulty units. In Phase 1, only 11.2% and 7.2% of the difficulty units were reported for the two categories combined in the AWT and the TWT, respectively; in Phase 2, only 6.8% of the total difficulty units were reported for these two categories. Evidently, the participants did not attend much to retrieving the morphological and orthographical specifications stored in the lexeme component of their mental lexical entries. According to Levelt, lemmas and lexemes play central roles in the grammatical and phonological encoding (i.e., in speech) processes of language production, respectively. Rather than attending to morphology or spelling, the participants were chiefly occupied with the grammatical encoding
process during their L2 writing. This finding supports the claim that morphological knowledge may not be an integral part of L2 learners’ language competence (Jiang, 2004).

The participants’ primary attention to the grammatical encoding process was evident in the large portion of their difficulty units related to Phrase Construction, which included the construction of phrases, clauses, and sentences. Seemingly, the participants mostly attended to units longer than single lexical items during the grammatical encoding process, accessing and retrieving the semantic and syntactic specifications of lexical units in complex ways. Unfortunately, the stimulated-recall interviews were not able to capture whether the participants were experiencing difficulty retrieving the semantic or the syntactic specifications (or both) during the grammatical encoding process. Taking into account that the participants reported difficulties related to word choice when this was the case, it seems plausible that some of the Phrase Construction units were related solely to structuring words within phrases/clauses/sentences appropriately – which could account for the small number of Structure units reported in the study (i.e., 10.4% and 3.6% for the AWT and the TWT, respectively, in Phase 1 and 5.7% in Phase 2).

Furthermore, the high percentage of Phrase Construction units reported in the study is an expected result in light of the fact that the grammatical encoding processes of Korean and English are substantially different. Of the total Phrase Construction difficulty units, clause construction (including sentence construction) occupied the greatest portion (44.9%). The following linguistic properties of the Korean language, which are comprehensively described in Sohn (1999), may provide some explanations for why Korean learners have difficulty constructing phrases and clauses in English.
First, Korean is a SOV (i.e., subject-object-verb) language, in which the predicate always comes at the end of a clause or a sentence. This is different from English, a SVO language, in which the predicate usually comes after the subject. Similar to other predicate-final languages, Korean has postpositions, whereas English has prepositions; all modifiers precede the modified element in Korean, whereas this can be the opposite in English; unlike English, there are no articles, relative pronouns, and wh-element movement or inversion involved in question formation in Korean.

Second, the productive use of case particles in Korean allows the ordering of arguments within a clause or sentence to be highly flexible as long as the predicate comes at the end. More surprisingly, arguments are normally omitted when they are contextually or situationally recoverable. The case in English is very different in that predicates define the overall argument structure of a sentence.

Another characteristic of the Korean language is that a transitive verb in Korean does not usually allow an inanimate noun to be its subject. This may explain why the participants in the study heavily used the personal pronoun “I” as the subject of their sentences. In fact, one of the strategies we had worked on during the intervention was to promote variety in the phrasing of subjects. In addition, not many transitive verbs can be used in the passive voice in Korean. Interestingly, most of the participants’ sentences were written in the active voice.

One of the greatest differences in the two languages lies in the fact that Korean is an “agglutinative” language – meaning that “a long chain of particles or suffixes with constant form and meaning may be attached to nominals (nouns, pronouns, numerals, noun phrases, etc.) or predicate (verb or adjective) stems” (Sohn, 1999, p. 15). In other words, much phrase construction in Korean is performed through the process of affixation, in which Korean suffixes
and particles do not have counterparts in non-agglutinative languages, such as English. Therefore, a wide range of particles and predicate suffixes fulfill various semantic and syntactic functions in Korean, whereas these functions may be performed by function words in English. For example, predicates inflect in complex ways in Korean to express subject honorific patterns, tense/aspect, modality, mood, and sentence type. Moreover, adjectives also inflect in the same manner as verbs in Korean without the help of a copular verb.

Following clause construction, noun phrase construction occupied the second largest portion of the Phrase Construction difficulty units (28.4%) in the study. Two characteristics of noun phrase construction in Korean deserve attention here. First, compounding abounds in the Korean language. In particular, Sino-Korean words – words that originated from Chinese and currently constitute more than 60% of Korean vocabulary – are mostly compound words. In Korean, nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, numerals, determiners, and particles all undergo compounding processes. Of all these types, compound nouns are the most abundant. Therefore, Korean learners may experience difficulties finding appropriate English expressions for these Korean noun compound words. Indeed, many of the noun phrase construction difficulty units in the study concerned constructing noun compounds. For example, Sam experienced difficulty constructing the noun phrase ‘age of keen competition’ (‘경쟁시대’ in Korean is one compound noun, literally meaning ‘competition era’) in his second essay task.

Second, Korean is a head-final language, meaning that all dependent elements of the head normally precede the head. This is also true for constructing noun phrases. Being a head-final language, Korean does not distinguish the expressions ‘a motivated learner’ and ‘a learner who is motivated’, which are structurally different in English. Constructing noun phrases in English can be especially difficult for Korean learners when the head noun is preceded by a long modifying
element. This was also evident from the participants’ stimulated-recall interviews. For example, Alex had difficulty constructing the noun phrase ‘the ability to look at economic trends’ (‘경제적인 이슈를 보는 눈’ in Korean, literally meaning ‘economic issue look eye’) in his third essay task.

The above differences in the grammatical encoding processes of the two languages may justify the high percentage of Phrase Construction difficulty units reported in the present study. Because grammatical encoding can be a conscious process for L2 learners, L2 writing is likely to be an arduous and difficult task. In the present study, it appeared that the participants were hesitant to address all their difficulties in order to promote fluency in their writing. More specifically, the participants relied heavily on exercising their best judgment and using one’s own resources especially for the AWT (but also for the TWT) in Phase 1. Similarly, the participants reported a large number of self-strategies in Phase 2, despite its decrease across tasks. Employing self-strategies to address difficulties should promote fluency in writing, whereas applying the strategies we had worked on together during the tutoring intervention could be more disruptive to the writing process. Simply put, the participants did not invest the same amount of effort and time for each of their difficulty units. They appeared to have been selective in addressing their difficulties to maintain a certain level of automaticity in their writing (cf. Whalen & Menard, 1995).

8.2.2 Self-Regulated Learning

The social cognitive theory of SRL was used as the learning framework in Phase 2. In this section, findings relevant to this framework are discussed.
8.2.2.1 Changes in SRL Skills

The participants exhibited idiosyncratic trajectories in developing their SRL skills. That is, the changes in the difficulties and the use of strategies were distinctive for each participant. These changes, however, were not haphazard, but rather were progressive. Alex, for example, attended gradually more to the semantic specifications of words in his writing. Furthermore, his reliance on the corpus to address his difficulties increased progressively. For Ria, her continual struggle with constructing phrases and sentences – for which she had gained confidence in her later essays – was salient. Moreover, she increasingly found the Korean-English dictionary to be a particularly powerful tool for writing.

Sam gradually attended more to Phrase Construction and less to Word Choice difficulties. By the end of the tutoring session, his attention to both categories was about even. Sam appeared to be a strong self-regulator. However, he preferred to write his first drafts without the help of the linguistic tools, opting to use them later in his revisions. Similar to Alex, Sam’s use of the corpus increased with time. Abril’s and August’s attention to the semantic specifications of words increased steadily. With regard to strategy use, they preferred direct and corrective feedback (i.e., other-regulation) to their own regulation of strategies.

These increases in the difficulty units attended by the participants should not be interpreted as meaning that the intervention introduced the participants to new areas of difficulty that were not present prior to the intervention. On the contrary, it appears reasonable to assume that the participants’ awareness of these problems in their English writing was raised through the intervention. For example, the participants did not report any difficulties with Collocation in Phase 1. However, the percentage of Collocation units in Phase 2 gradually increased across tasks. One of the major goals of the intervention in Phase 2 was to enable the participants to
communicate their intentions more effectively in writing by attending to such problems. Therefore, the increase in the Collocation units across tasks was an expected and desired result of the intervention.

The study also revealed that the participants relied predominantly on their self-employed strategies at the start of the study. The strategies reported in the stimulated-recall interviews in Phase 1 should be understood as those used by the participants when they were left to their own resources and an electronic dictionary to compose timed-writing essays. Nevertheless, these strategies do in many ways represent the strategies that ESL learners would normally use in their writing, as evidenced from the stimulated-recall interviews for the first task in Phase 2. Task 1 was the first untimed written essay that the participants had composed in Phase 2 prior to any intervention. The interviews for this task revealed that all the participants at this stage of study relied primarily on their own resources to write with the exception of a few instances in which they consulted dictionaries. Despite their continued reliance on some self-strategies, this tendency gradually diminished over Phase 2, while the participants’ dependence on the other strategies increased across tasks. Although this thesis research was not a study of dictionary use, it was able to demonstrate how such linguistic tools can empower L2 learners to become confident and independent writers.

It also appeared that the participants’ strategy use was somewhat dependent on the level of their writing ability. De Larios et al. (1999, 2006) discovered in their studies that proficient writers attended more to upgrading strategies than did less proficient writers, who attended more to compensatory strategies. The two case studies of Alex and Ria precisely corroborated their findings. Alex was the strongest writer among the five participants in Phase 2 with the highest score on the Vocabulary Levels Test (i.e., 59 out of 60 points). His use of strategies in response
to the increasing Word Choice and Collocation difficulties across tasks resembles the upgrading strategies reported in the studies by De Larios et al. to resolve upgrading problems – defined as “problems resulting from an effort to upgrade the expression of meaning or to find a better match between intention and expression or both” (De Larios et al., 2006, p. 106).

Ria, on the other hand, possessed limited writing skills and scored the lowest on the Vocabulary Levels Test (i.e., 30 out of 60 points) among the five participants in Phase 2. Her uses of strategies in response to her struggles with constructing phrases and sentences in her essays were similar to the compensatory strategies reported in the studies by De Larios et al. to resolve formulation problems – defined as a “gap between an intended meaning and the lexical units and syntactic structures needed to express it” (De Larios et al., 2001, p. 514). However, she also began to show concerns for upgrading her use of words and expressions in her latter essays.

8.2.2.2 Phases of SRL

The intervention in Phase 2 followed the cyclic model of SRL proposed by Zimmerman et al. (1996), which involved the four processes of Self-Evaluation and Monitoring, Goal Setting and Strategic Planning, Strategy-Implementation Monitoring, and Strategic-Outcome Monitoring.

**Self-evaluation and monitoring.** The SMFs were designed to help the participants to monitor their writing process and become aware of their difficulties as they completed the forms while working on their essays. In this way, filling out these forms was intended to be part of the SRL process. Differences existed in how the participants made use of the SMFs. Some of the participants were faithful in completing the forms, while others were less so. Neglecting to fill out the forms does not necessarily mean that the participants failed to monitor their writing. Stopping every now and then to do so may have interfered with their writing processes. In addition to monitoring their writing processes, the participants were also asked to self-rate all
their draft and revised essays as part of the self-evaluation process. This was essential for heightening the participants’ awareness of their progress.

**Goal setting and strategic planning.** Goal setting and strategic planning were important components of the intervention. Before each tutoring session, I carefully and repeatedly read over the participant’s essays and selected a few strategies to work on together with each person. During the session, the participants and I examined these strategies and addressed other difficulties they had brought up. At the end of the session, we set goals to work on till the next session. In setting the goals, I recommended the participants use the strategies I had chosen – which was necessary to keep the participants focused on the strategies – but also encouraged them to share their own goals.

**Strategy-implementation monitoring.** The participants revised their essays by themselves and therefore were on their own to monitor their implementation of the strategies that were introduced at the tutoring sessions. The SMFs were intended to help the participants to monitor their use of strategies by requiring them to describe each strategy they had employed for their difficulties. However, it was difficult to ensure that the participants were always monitoring their implementation of strategies. Therefore, it was necessary to review the SMFs and discuss with each learner their uses of strategies at the start of each tutoring session.

**Strategic-outcome monitoring.** In the tutoring sessions, the participants and I reviewed the essays and discussed whether the strategies they had used were helpful and effective. We also talked about our ratings for the essays, which we had separately given before each tutoring session, as a way of monitoring the outcome of their strategy use (i.e., how their use of strategies influenced the quality of their essays). The participants frequently remarked that this feedback on progress was useful, enabling them to have more confidence in practicing the strategies.
8.2.2.3 Levels of SRL

SRL skills are initially developed through reliance on social sources of observation and emulation. Through practice, this reliance shifts to self-oriented sources of self-control and self-regulation (Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997; Zimmerman, 2000). In the present study, the participants differed in the levels of SRL they exercised, some demonstrating a higher level of SRL skills than others. Furthermore, the participants increasingly used and gained control over strategies that they found helpful and effective.

**Observation.** From the modelling I provided, the participants may or may not have been able to induce the major features of a strategy in focus. The support and modelling I gave differed depending on the participants’ needs and level of self-regulatory control. My role as the social model would have definitely influenced the participants’ observation of strategy use.

**Emulation.** The participants were on their own to practice the strategies as they drafted and revised their essays. The only form of social support available was the feedback I provided and the brief discussion the participants and I had about their strategy use at the tutoring sessions. The lack of online social assistance during practice could have hindered the further development of their SRL skills. Moreover, the intervention period may not have been long enough to allow sufficient practice of the strategies.

**Self-control.** The participants showed varying levels of self-control over the strategies. The structured intervention with a focus on a small number of strategies for similar tasks could have been conducive to developing self-control over some of the strategies. Other factors, such as the perceived ineffectiveness of the strategies, may have prevented the participants from developing self-control over these strategies.
**Self-regulation.** The study involved only argumentative essays. It is difficult to confirm whether any of the participants had gained full self-regulation of the strategies over which they demonstrated a high level of self-control in this one type of rhetorical context. They may or may not have been able to adapt their strategy use to other writing tasks or to a more natural writing environment. In view of the fact that some participants were able to use a few strategies throughout the four tasks, they may have gained a fairly high degree of self-regulation of these strategies.

8.2.2.4 Dysfunctions in SRL

For two of the participants in the study, Abril and August, carrying out the tutoring sessions according to the SRL framework was rather challenging. It appeared that they expected me to supply straightforward alternatives to their problematic expressions, preferring to know what was wrong with their expressions and get better substitutions for them, whereas my goal was to have them self-regulate appropriate strategies to address the difficulties on their own. Their revised essays also revealed that they largely incorporated my suggestions in their essays rather than attempting to find their own solutions. The results for these two participants are not encouraging despite the several months of individual tutoring.

Zimmerman (2000) identified four sources of self-regulatory dysfunction: (a) a lack of social learning experiences, (b) the presence of apathy or disinterest, (c) mood disorders, and (d) learning disabilities (pp. 27-28). All the participants likely had similar social learning experiences, at least during their formal education, in that they all received their education in Korea where educators follow a national curriculum. Furthermore, the participants displayed no indication of mood disorders or learning disabilities. Relevant to the discussion here then is the second source of self-regulatory dysfunction: the presence of apathy or lack of interest. It is
possible that the two participants failed to perceive the value of the strategies in addressing their writing difficulties. Motivational factors, such as intrinsic interest, can play a vital role in sustaining efforts to self-regulate throughout the SRL process (Zimmerman, 2000). Some participants’ low level of interest in the strategies could have exerted negative influences on how they managed to develop SRL skills.

Furthermore, lack of interest may be associated with the goals certain learners set. Abril and August appeared to have embraced outcome goals – contrary to process goals – in that they were more concerned about finding the right expressions (i.e., outcome) than about implementing the strategies correctly (i.e., process). Their focus on this learning outcome, rather than on the learning process, might have reduced their opportunities to discover the usefulness and value of the strategies (Schunk & Swartz, 1993).

Another factor deserving consideration here is the influence of context on learning. Abril and August had resided in Canada for some length of time when the study began, whereas the other participants had been in Canada for only a few months. This issue is discussed in Section 8.2.3.2 from a different theoretical perspective.

8.2.3 Examining the Results through Other Lenses

Some of the findings of the study can be better understood through learning frameworks other than SRL. In the section, I examine the nature of feedback I provided to the participants and the influence of context on learning through the lenses of Dynamic Assessment and Communities of Practice, respectively.
8.2.3.1 Dynamic Assessment

For the five participants, I conducted the tutoring sessions based on the same framework of SRL and followed similar procedures. However, their needs and the level of support they required differed for each participant. Consequently, the feedback I supplied could not be identical for all the participants. The social cognitive theory of SRL values the crucial role that social support plays in the initial stages of SRL development but lacks a means to account for the evolving nature of instruction in relation to the continual assessment of learners’ abilities.

Traditionally, assessment has involved defining a construct of interest and designing tests that measured the construct in a reliable, valid, and useful way (Bachman, 1990; Bachman & Palmer, 1996). According to the Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory (SCT), however, this type of assessment does not reflect the full range of learners’ abilities in that assessment and instruction are not fully integrated, but viewed as two separate practices (Rea-Dickins, 2004). SCT argues that to understand learners’ true abilities, it is necessary to interact with them during assessment and recognize what they are able to do alone and with assistance. This form of assessment takes into account not only the learners’ “past development”, but also their “development in progress” (Poehner, 2008; Poehner & Lantolf, 2005).

In this way, SCT argues for the integration of instruction and assessment in the form of Dynamic Assessment (DA). Instruction becomes an essential component of the assessment procedure in accordance with the principle that mediation is necessary to understand the full range of learners’ abilities (i.e., assessment) and that this mediation at the same time guides the further development of these abilities (i.e., instruction) (Poehner, 2008). Through negotiated mediation, teachers are able to identify and act on a learner’s zone of proximal development.
(ZPD). Hence, instruction and assessment influence learning by creating a ZPD for each learner and by providing assistance from a more capable other.

In line with the framework of DA, understanding the participants’ past development in writing and their differing needs was crucial and of foremost concern in initially co-constructing their ZPDs. As described in Chapter 4, the participants differed considerably with respect to their experiences in learning English in general, and in learning English writing in particular. All the participants had learned English primarily through formal English education in Korea, which started at grade seven. Abril and Ria had began to learn English a little earlier through private instruction.

However, their experience in learning English after formal education was far from the same. Working as a patent attorney, Alex regularly had the opportunity to write in English by communicating with his clients via English documents. He showed a high level of writing ability and was able to construct complex sentences. Sam’s writing experience was limited to some writing in his previous ESL courses and to regular essay writing with another tutor at that time. He also had strong writing skills, but frequently demonstrated awkward phrasings in his essays. Abril and August had taken numerous ESL courses – which likely included writing instruction – during their long residence in Canada. They appeared to show greater fluency in their colloquial language use compared to the other participants. Ria had spent a year in Australia before coming to Canada. However, she possessed only basic writing skills.

With this understanding of differences in the participants’ past development in English writing, the instruction I provided had to be tailored to the needs of each participant according to my continual assessment of their developing writing and SRL skills. Alex was able to learn to employ the strategies quite quickly with confidence. Normally, one tutoring session for a
strategy was enough, and Alex gained more control over the strategies – especially using the collocations dictionary and the corpus – as he continued to use them. Therefore, little explanation and modeling of the strategies were needed once introduced, and the tutoring sessions were characterized by the sharing of our ideas on addressing the specific problems he confronted.

Sam also demonstrated the ability to learn to employ the strategies quickly, but he occasionally expressed a lack of confidence in using them. He frequently asked whether the revisions he had made using the strategies were correct. Furthermore, he favoured writing his first drafts on his own and taking advantage of the strategies only to revise his essays. Therefore, I gave Sam detailed comments on his revisions, consulting the linguistic tools together during the tutoring sessions.

Abril and August found it rather difficult to follow the SRL framework. They preferred to receive direct corrective feedback than to employ the strategies on their own to address their writing problems, being attentive to identifying and correcting problematic words or expressions that were present in the essays.

Ria frequently expressed having difficulty constructing sentences and learning the strategies to cope with her difficulties. Therefore, Ria needed a lot of modelling and explaining of the strategies. We normally went through each of her drafts sentence by sentence and tried to employ the strategies during the tutoring sessions together to revise some of her sentences.

In this way, the intervention (i.e., instruction) was guided by the continual, ongoing assessment of the participants. As the intervention began, I realized that different strategies would be needed by each of the participants because they displayed varying levels of writing ability. However, finding the right strategies for each of them was a challenge. I spent the first few weeks trying out various strategies with them. Afterwards, my recommendations for strategy
use became more tailored to the needs of each participant as I came to understand the specific problems they were each experiencing.

8.2.3.2 Communities of Practice

Another point worthy of consideration here is the influence of context on the participants’ learning. Three of the five participants (i.e., Alex, Sam, and Ria) had been in Canada for only a short period when the study began. For these learners, the sudden shift from learning English in an EFL (i.e., learning English where it is not a major or official language) to an ESL (i.e., learning English where it is a major or official language) context may have had an impact on their learning. In contrast, two of the participants (i.e., Abril and August) – who showed anomalous results – had been residents of Canada for some time. The social cognitive theory of SRL views self-regulation as occurring in a continuously changing environment, in which personal, behavioral, and environmental factors interact with and influence one another (Bandura, 1986). This framework, however, does not fully take into account how learners exercise their agency in learning with regard to the context in which learning takes place and to the construction of identity within the context.

According to the framework of Communities of Practice (COP) (Wenger, 1998, 2000), context is proposed to influence learners in two ways: (a) how the learners align their past experiences as learners to the competence required for membership into a community and (b) how the learners construct their identities as learners. These two contextual influences are claimed to be crucial in establishing the skills to be learned in a COP and the meanings to be put into the learning process by learners, respectively.

The COP framework claims that people find meaning in engagement with a community through practice. The practice of a community also defines what skills are needed to become a
competent member of the community. When newcomers enter an existing COP, their experience might not match the competence required for its membership by the COP. Learning is believed to take place here when the newcomers are able to align their experience with the required competence. However, if the experience and competence are too close or distant, learning will be hindered; an appropriate amount of tension is needed for learning to occur.

For Alex, Sam, and Ria, moving from an EFL to an ESL context to study shortly before the study began meant entering a completely new COP. To become a legitimate member of the new COP, they had to align their past experience of learning English with the competence level required by the COP. This tension may have provided the motivation for learning to take place. On the contrary, Abril and August did not have to enter a new COP when the study began. Although they were required to participate in a one-on-one tutoring session once a week to improve their academic writing skills, they had already been planning to attend a university or a college in Canada and preparing for academic writing. The lack of tension between their past experience and the competence required by their COP may have hindered them from taking full advantage of the learning opportunities.

Moreover, the context of learning might have influenced how the participants constructed their identities as learners. The act of writing, in particular, is considered to be an act of identity construction (Hyland, 2002; Ouellette, 2008). From a COP perspective, a person’s sense of identity can decide and structure what matters for learning and how it proceeds (Wenger, 2000). Because Abril and August had resided in Canada for a long time (compared to the other participants), they might have constructed their identities as advanced learners of English, aspiring to minimize the mistakes in their essays rather than to employ the strategies to address their difficulties. The opposite might have been true for the other three participants.
8.2.4 Methodological Issues

Certain methodological issues in the study need to be discussed. This section examines two: using a qualitative case study design and measuring SRL skills.

8.2.4.1 Case Studies

Learning always occurs in a certain, but never in the exactly same, context. More importantly, learning always involves a learner, none of whom are the same. This was my rationale for choosing a longitudinal study with only a few participants. Such interpretive qualitative studies may be an especially appropriate means of investigating the impact of technology on developing L2 writing skills (Matsuda, Canagarajah, Harklau, Hyland & Warschauer, 2003). Although the overall results of the study for the five participants combined are presented in Chapter 6, their development of SRL skills should be viewed as separate cases – as in the case studies of Alex and Ria in Chapter 7.

With so few participants, the results of the study obviously lack generalizability. Or do they? As Yin (2003, pp. 32-33) pointed out, case studies are generalizable not to other populations (i.e., statistical generalization based on population sampling), but to theoretical propositions (i.e., analytic generalization related to theories):

In statistical generalization, an inference is made about a population (or universe) on the basis of empirical data collected about a sample…The mode of generalization for cases studies is analytic generalization, in which a previously developed theory is used as a template with which to compare the empirical results of the case study.

From this viewpoint, the results of each case in the present study should be interpreted based on the theoretical framework of SRL. I predicted that engaging the participants in the cyclic processes specified in Zimmerman et al.’s (1996) SRL model to address their lexical
problems in writing would foster their development of SRL skills, and that this in turn would have positive outcomes for their writing performance. In fact, the findings of the study showed that the participants, albeit to different degrees, learned to self-regulate the strategies and that the quality of their writing in terms of lexical richness, syntactic complexity, and native speaker rankings improved within and across tasks. These findings provide evidence for the analytic generalizability of the study.

8.2.4.2 Measuring SRL Skills

Empirical research must define a construct of interest concretely and measure it accordingly. However, clearly defining and measuring complex socio-cognitive variables, such as self-regulation, may not be possible. Following Zimmerman et al.’s (1996) model of SRL to guide the intervention, I adopted a somewhat narrow view of SRL, restricting it to the participants’ self-directive ability to employ appropriate lexical strategies for addressing their lexical problems in writing. I identified and analyzed the difficulty and strategy use units reported in the participants’ stimulated-recall interviews, but this method of data collection has certain limitations.

In particular, the veridicality of verbal protocols (i.e., “whether the information in verbal reports accurately represents the thought process it is designed to capture”, Bowles & Leow, 2005, p. 417) – such as stimulated-recalls – has been questioned. The Information Process Theory (Ericsson & Simon, 1984, 1987, 1993, 1998) assumes that the process of thinking represents a sequence of relatively stable cognitive states, which can be captured through the subjects’ verbal reports. However, this may be truer for concurrent verbal protocols (e.g., think-alouds) than for retrospective verbal protocols (e.g., stimulated-recalls). In a stimulated-recall session, the verbalization takes place sometime after the completion of a task (cf. Gass &
Mackey, 2000). For the verbal reports of stimulated-recalls to be accurate, they must be performed shortly after task completion.

From this viewpoint consideration needs to be given to how much of people’s cognitive processes stimulated-recalls are able to capture. As Winne (2010) noted, self-reports allow researchers to access the product, and not the cause, of cognitive operations. This is precisely what happened in the present study. The participants only reported what they did to address their difficulties in writing. The coding of the strategy use units for Phase 2 was fairly clear because this involved identifying the types of linguistic tools the participants reported to have used. However, the coding process of the strategy use units for Phase 1 and of the difficulty units for both phases proved to be far more challenging due to limitations in capturing the participants’ underlying cognitive processes with stimulated recalls. In addition to these limitations, the participants might not have fully reported their difficulties and use of strategies in the stimulated-recall interviews, which was especially apparent in the SMFs.

8.3 Implications for Pedagogy

This section describes some pedagogical implications that can be drawn from the study, namely the need to incorporate language-focused instruction, vocabulary instruction, and corpora use into writing pedagogy and practice. Other considerations – such as utilizing one-on-one tutoring, untimed writing tasks, the five-paragraph-essay format, and technology in writing instruction as well as the issue of learners’ multicompetence – are also discussed.

8.3.1 Focus on Language Use

Writing requires the ability to integrate various skills in complex ways. Writers not only need to possess language skills, but also non-language skills – such as thinking and
organizational skills. Interestingly, the study revealed that the participants’ difficulties in L2 writing were largely related to language use problems. It is true that the sentence-by-sentence questions in the stimulated-recall interviews were designed to elicit information about the participants’ difficulties regarding words, phrases, and sentences in the essays. Nonetheless, the participants’ responses to the general questions about their writing difficulties confirmed that they were primarily occupied with issues of language use in their writing.

In keeping with Levelt’s (1989, 1993) language production model, the participants’ difficulties with language use pertained to the grammatical encoding of their communicative intentions. The success of this process depends on the learners’ ability to fluently access the semantic and syntactic specifications stored in the lemma component of their lexical entries. Unfortunately, this lexico-grammatical aspect of language has received relatively little attention in classrooms with the emergence of process writing in L2 writing instruction. Some researchers have even proposed that offering feedback on grammar can be harmful for L2 learners (e.g., Truscott, 1996, 2004). What this study illustrates vividly and clearly, however, is that the participants, with varying degrees of writing proficiency, attended mainly to the lexical and grammatical features of language (i.e., choosing appropriate words and constructing larger units with these words) during the formulation process of writing.

Instruction aiming to increase learners’ lexico-grammatical knowledge in language use should be one of the primary concerns for L2 writing teachers, as learners have been found to engage chiefly in the formulation process during writing, in which this knowledge plays a central role. For example, DeLarios and colleagues (1999, 2001, 2006) discovered in their research that their Spanish learners of English indeed focused first and foremost on this process when writing in English. Even proficient learners were found to spend considerable time in this process. For
these reasons, instruction on the lexical and grammatical features of language in L2 writing classrooms should produce fruitful learning outcomes for learners and because vocabulary and grammar distinguish different types of discourses (Biber, Conrad, & Cortes, 2004; Biber, Conrad, Reppen, Byrd, & Helt, 2002; Coxhead & Byrd, 2007; Schleppegrell, Achugar, & Orteiza, 2004).

In sum, a certain level of focus on the formal aspects of language within a meaningful context seems necessary in L2 writing instruction. In the L2 literature, research on Form-Focused Instruction has consistently shown that both explicit types of instruction and feedback that direct learners’ attention to language forms are more effective than those that are implicit (DeKeyser, 1994, 1995; Ellis, 2001; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Loewen & Philp, 2006; Lyster, 2004; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Norris & Ortega, 2000; Robinson, 1996; Russell & Spada, 2006; Spada, 1997; Spada & Lightbrown, 2008; Williams & Evans, 1998; Yabuki-Soh, 2007).

Importantly, the implementation of such instruction should be empirically and theoretically grounded. For the present study I chose “lexical entry” as the central unit for producing language, and accordingly I attempted to help participants to overcome the lexical problems in their writing. Although the intervention was informed by theory, strong empirical evidence for the most effective ways of implementing this instructional approach still needs to be accumulated.

8.3.2 Vocabulary Instruction

Implications for vocabulary instruction can also be drawn from the study. For example, the analysis of the participants’ essays showed that over 90% of the words they had used in the essays were in the K1, K2, and AWL word groups. Even essays written by quite advanced writers in the study displayed similar results. This implies that in teaching vocabulary to L2
learners, instruction on the most frequently used and academic vocabulary can benefit learners in numerous ways. Since the lists of these word groups are easily accessible online (e.g., http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/~alzsh3/acvocab/wordlists.htm), structuring vocabulary instruction based on these word groups should not be difficult.

Furthermore, the study illustrated that instruction on collocational knowledge was beneficial for the participants. However, strategic planning of teaching L2 collocational knowledge to learners is needed. For example, teachers need to be aware of the types of collocations that learners can benefit from instruction. Even native speakers of English have been shown to vary in their knowledge of collocations according to their age, gender, dialect, socioeconomic status, and so forth (Dronjic & Helms-Park, in press). Therefore, instruction on tight collocations that are widely known by native speakers of English may be effective.

Studies have also shown that the influence of learners’ L1 on learning L2 collocations can be tremendous (Fan, 2009; Laufer & Girsai, 2008; Nesselhauf, 2003; Yamashita & Jiang, 2010). Incongruent collocations, for example, are especially difficult to learn for non-native speakers. The frequency of input is important for incongruent collocations to be initially stored in the lexicon. However, once they are stored, frequent input may not be required for them to establish a direct link with their relevant concepts. On the contrary, the frequency of input may not be important for congruent collocations to be stored in the mental lexicon. However, because their processing is dependent on the L1, extensive input will be required before direct link with the concepts can be established (Yamashita & Jiang, 2010).

Similarly, instruction on formulaic expressions other than collocations, such as idioms and fixed-phrases, should be beneficial for learners in improving their productive language use. The ability to process longer units of language as a whole could promote fluency and accuracy
(or native-likeness) in writing for learners, enabling them to attend more to other aspects of writing. On the contrary, learners who lack such ability may easily experience frustration while writing. In the present study, the participants reported a large number of Phrase Construction difficulty units. Teaching these learners and other like them to use formulaic expressions could be one practical way to assist them in achieving fluency in constructing phrases and sentences.

The study also revealed that the participants frequently relied on their L1 through the use of the bilingual Korean-English dictionary. Some participants found this dictionary to be a powerful tool for writing. Indeed, learners regularly draw on their L1 as a resource for L2 writing, and bilingual dictionaries can be useful for learners in the early stages of lexical development by allowing them to take advantage of their existing L1 semantic system. However, the use of this tool may also reinforce the association between the L2 and L1 words, which could result in prohibiting learners from advancing to the final stage of lexical development.

Finally, the study revealed that the participants’ attention to morphological problems was infrequent. Teaching learners to understand the structure of words could help them to learn new words more effectively. In fact, studies have shown high correlations between vocabulary knowledge and morphological awareness (Lin et al., 2012; Nagy, Berninger, & Abbott, 2006). In Cumming’s (2012) study, eight graduate students tutored 21 adolescents at risk with their literacy skills. In particular, one of the tutors focused on raising her tutee’s morphological awareness. After a few months of tutoring, the tutee showed visible improvements in measures of vocabulary knowledge, morphological awareness, reading, and writing. Such instruction on morphological knowledge should be included in L2 writing instruction, since this knowledge may not be an integral part of L2 learners’ lexical knowledge (Jiang, 2004). All the more,
applying the SRL learning framework to help learners to develop morphological awareness of English words should be fruitful.

Full lexical competence (i.e., the ability to integrate various linguistic specifications into lexical entries) (Jiang, 2000) will take time to develop naturally for L2 learners. Initially, receptive knowledge of frequently occurring words could be taught through explicit instruction when time is a factor. Paribakht and Wesche (1997), for example, compared incidental vocabulary learning through reading only and through reading with vocabulary instruction, finding that the group with both reading and vocabulary instruction performed better. Norris and Ortega’s (2000) meta-analysis of the effectiveness of L2 instruction showed that explicit types of instruction resulted in higher effect sizes than did more implicit types. The challenge for teachers would be in devising effective learning strategies to help learners to acquire the productive knowledge of vocabulary required for L2 writing.

Jiang argues that rich contextual language input is required to develop lexical competence. In other words, learners need multiple exposures to words to develop productive knowledge of these words. Wesche and Paribakht (2000), for example, argued that “learning the meaning of a new word is incremental and normally involves more than one exposure as learners elaborate different aspects of word knowledge and practice this knowledge by using it” (p. 205). Furthermore, Nagy, Herman, and Anderson (1985) found that the probability of learning a word from context after just one exposure was only between .10 and .15. Still, Nation’s (1990) study concluded that five to 16 exposures were needed for full acquisition. Fortunately, technological developments in corpus linguistics have made it possible to provide learners with rich, relevant contextual language input.
8.3.3 The Use of Corpora

Numerous advantages for incorporating the use of corpora into L2 writing instruction have been reported in research: For example, uses of corpora can (a) provide meaningful input for learning aspects of language use in writing, (b) be effective for teaching the vocabulary or grammar of a language, (c) raise awareness of language use and rhetorical features of writing, and (d) provide valuable information about collocations and patterns of common word usage in context (Bloch, 2009; Gaskell & Cobb, 2004; Hsieh & Liou, 2008; Lee & Swales, 2006; Liu, 2011; O’Sullivan & Chambers, 2006; Vannestål & Lidquist, 2007; H. Yoon & Hirvela, 2004).

Moreover, corpora can be used as an effective tool for learning new words. Jiang (2000) pointed out two main obstacles to L2 lexical development: poverty of L2 input and the existence of an established L1 semantic system. Ideally, corpora could help learners to advance to the integration stage of lexical development by supplying massive amount of authentic, contextualized language input, from which learners can extract and create linguistic specifications of L2 words and integrate them into their lexical entries. With the plethora of language data available online, overcoming the first obstacle has become possible for L2 learners.

Corpora can also be used as a powerful tool for writing, as shown in Alex’s case study. In L2 writing research, various corpora have been used as research and reference tools (C. Yoon, 2011). With regard to the former, learners can examine corpora data to discover rules and patterns of a language; with respect to the latter, learners may consult corpora to cope with problems in their writing. Alex’s case study particularly demonstrated the potential of using corpora as a powerful reference tool. Furthermore, Alex was able to use the expressions from the corpus he consulted with confidence, knowing how frequently they were used in the actual language.
The use of corpora in L2 writing instruction should be well informed by research, however. In his research synthesis study on this issue, C. Yoon (2011) identified several factors worth considering when incorporating the use of corpora into L2 writing instruction. First, a corpus should not be considered as a panacea to all writing problems. Its effectiveness as a learning tool can be influenced by the differing learning preferences and motivation of learners. Second, selecting the right type of corpus for learners is paramount. There are numerous types of corpora available (e.g., the Corpus of Contemporary American English, Collins, Brown, BNC, etc.) that vary in their content and size. Teachers who prefer to use corpora in their instruction should be knowledgeable about the various types of corpora and chose one that fulfills the learners’ needs and the purpose of instruction. Third, learners need training and practice in using corpora. More specifically, learners will need to understand the functions that are available in a corpus, the query commands used to search the corpus, the information they can utilize from the output generated by the corpus, and so on. Without such training and practice, using corpora can even become frustrating for learners. Fourth, possessing general computer and Information Technology skills can be helpful for learning to use corpora.

8.3.4 Other Considerations

**One-on-one tutoring.** The study showed that the participants not only experienced various types of difficulties in their writing, but also preferred to use different strategies to address their problems. Therefore, understanding the participants as individual learners and tailoring the tutoring sessions according to their differing needs were essential in developing the participants’ SRL skills in writing. The one-on-one intervention in this study provided a favourable context for this development to take place. However, such a context or individualized relationships may not be available in many regular writing classrooms. Nonetheless, teachers
may usefully set aside time to spend time with their students individually, for example, through one-on-one conferences, in which they may mutually identify problems in students’ writing and negotiate to find solutions (Cumming & So, 1996). Interaction that occurs in such oral conferences can have positive influences on learners’ writing processes (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Haneda, 2004). What is crucial here is building a trusting relationship with learners. Learners may initially show some level of resistance, but taking the time to build trust and rapport with them is essential for successful learning (Cumming, Al-Alawi, & Watanabe, 2012; Knouzi, 2012).

**Untimed writing.** The participants were allowed plenty of time (i.e., one week) to draft and revise their essays in Phase 2 of the study. Such untimed writing tasks may be needed to develop SRL skills in writing. Extensive deliberate practice during the emulation stage of SRL is crucial for learners to develop self-control over target strategies (Zimmerman, 2000; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 1997, 1999). Moreover, it is important for learners to monitor their implementation of SRL strategies until they have gained full self-regulatory competence over the strategies (Schunk & Swartz, 1993; Zimmerman, 2000; Zimmerman et al., 1996). To facilitate and promote such practice and monitoring, learners should not be constrained by short time limits in writing – such as writing an essay on a topic within 30 minutes, as in proficiency test. Timed-writing may not afford learners the opportunity to learn the actual usage of words through purposeful thinking about their writing and may even discourage them from using otherwise available resources for writing. Allowing learners enough time to work on their essays, without necessarily giving them any feedback, can even improve accuracy in their writing (Polio, Fleck, & Leder, 1998).

**Five-paragraph-essay format.** The participants mainly followed the traditional five-paragraph-essay format with an introduction, body, and conclusion to write their essays. The
nature of the writing tasks – which were taken from the standardized TOEFL argumentative writing section – could have encouraged them to do so. Furthermore, the participants might have been explicitly taught to write English essays in this manner by their ESL teachers. Amidst the controversies over product- versus process-oriented writing and teacher- versus student-centered learning, there exists many factors that exert influence on how teachers provide instruction (Bickmore, Smagorinsky, & O’Donnell-Allen, 2005; Johnson, Thompson, Smagorinsky, & Fry, 2003; Smagorinsky, Wilson, & Moore, 2011). Johnson et al.’s (2003) study, for example, vividly described the experience of an apprentice teacher, who came to structure her writing classes around the five-paragraph-essay theme. As this study demonstrates, teachers may be pressured to embrace product-oriented and teacher-centered instruction – regardless of their teacher training/education background – because of (a) school and community expectations to achieve high scores in standardized tests, (b) encouragement from other teachers at school to adopt this type of instruction, (c) curriculum materials that reflect such teaching beliefs, and (d) experiences of learning in this manner when they were students. Writing teachers, therefore, need to be careful and informed about the instructional approach they take.

**Technology.** The study utilized corpus-based linguistic resources that were available online to the general public. This study would not have been feasible without such resources, which recent advances in technology have made possible. In one sense, such technology has become an indispensable tool for teaching and learning language (Hyland, 2003; Johnson, 2002; Pennington, 2003). However, it should be used only as a tool – and not transform the fundamental goals – for language learning (Warschauer, 2002). It is paramount for researchers and teachers to discover the pedagogical objectives that technology-based teaching has the potential to fulfill (Salaberry, 2000; Salaberry, 2001).
**Multicompetence.** Knowing more than one language has now become very common, and there are wide varieties of English that are spoken throughout the world. Although it may be desirable to have L2 learners use English like a native speaker, it is now becoming increasingly difficult to characterize who the native speaker is (Cook, 1992, 2003). Teachers and researchers should be aware that learners possess this “multicompetence” in language – defined as the “knowledge of two or more languages in one mind” (Cook, 2003, p. 2) – and be careful that learners do not lose their voice or identity in their use of English.

**8. 4 Limitations and Future Directions**

In this section, I summarize several limitations of the study and propose directions for future research. First, I primarily relied on stimulated-recall interviews to examine changes in the participants’ SRL skills. Regrettably, using stimulated recalls to probe into the participants’ underlying cognitive processes turned out to be somewhat problematic, especially for those in Phase 2, which were performed sometime after task completion. My rationale for not using concurrent think-alouds was to examine the development of the participants’ SRL skills in an untimed writing context. Unfortunately, the participants chiefly reported the outcome of their cognitive processes rather than the process of thinking that allowed them to arrive at their decisions. Future studies should consider other methods of measuring SRL skills, such as think-alouds and traces. Moreover, complementing learners’ self-reports with teacher observations of learners’ writing performance can enhance credibility to measuring SRL skills (Zimmerman & Martinez-Pons, 1988).

In line with the framework of DA, the self-regulatory scale in Aljaafreh and Lantolf’s (1994, p. 471) study could also have been used to measure SRL skills. This scale rates the level of learners’ self-regulation based on the level of support (i.e., feedback from a tutor) they need to
accomplish a task. Aljaafreh and Lantolf suggested that feedback should be graduated and contingent – starting at an implicit level and increasingly becoming more specific as required by learners – and that it should be offered only when required – being withdrawn as soon as the learners are able to perform individually. This type of feedback takes into account the ways in which learners respond to their teachers’ mediation and is, therefore, reflective of their ZPDs and progressive levels of independent functioning, though it is not clear how informative this scale might be about vocabulary learning per se, which was a primary focus of the present inquiry.

Second, there were limitations in the coding framework I used to investigate the types of linguistic specifications with which the participants were experiencing difficulty accessing or retrieving during the formulation process of writing. Although based on the theoretical models I adopted for the study, this approach did not always permit clear distinctions in the coding process. In particular, many difficulty units were coded as Phrase Construction, which required the participants to access various types of linguistic specifications in complex ways. The coding framework I used was not able to clearly distinguish the complexities involved here. A more fully-developed coding framework would have produced better results.

Third, I worked with the participants on only a few strategies that incorporated the use of corpus-based linguistic tools, with little knowledge of the usefulness and effectiveness of the strategies. I chose these tools with the goal of helping the participants to become cognizant of the meaning and usage of words based on actual language data. Despite their easy accessibility, research on the use of these tools in writing is limited. Studies with more research- and pedagogically-grounded strategies are needed.

Fourth, I did not examine the influence of the participants’ goal setting on their development of SRL skills. Learners with process goals are able to discover the usefulness of
strategies by focusing on learning them, and therefore to continuously apply such strategies in the future (Schunk & Swartz, 1993). Thus, process goals are important in the early stages of SRL development (Zimmerman, 2000). However, shifting to outcome goals once learners have gained self-control over the strategies can result in better performance (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 1997, 1999). Future studies should look into the relationship between the types of goals learners adopt and their development of SRL skills.

Fifth, the study lacked appropriate means to enhance the participants’ self-efficacy beliefs. Schunk (2006) pointed out that learners can experience low self-efficacy beliefs in writing because of the difficulties involved in accurately monitoring their learning progress, so it is therefore crucial for any intervention aimed to promote literacy learning to address learners’ self-efficacy for learning. Schunk further recommended using extensive modeling in teaching, having learners frequently experience success in learning, developing learners’ goal-setting and self-evaluation skills, and instructing learners to use effective learning strategies as a way of enhancing their self-efficacy beliefs. Further studies that aim to systematically enhance learners’ self-efficacy beliefs are needed.

Sixth, the participants would have benefited more from better models. Learners first start developing SRL skills from observation, in which modeling plays a vital role. The similarity between the observer and the model is an important factor here (Kitsantas, Zimmerman, & Cleary, 2000; Schunk, 2006; Schunk, Hanson, & Cox, 1987; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2002). In other words, having learners observe “coping” models that show gradual improvement of skills compared to “mastery” models that perform the skills perfectly from the beginning can be more effective. In a tutoring context, such as this study, peer tutors may serve as excellent models. Moreover, this could minimize the authoritative role that tutors have been reported to take in
tutoring sessions (Thonus, 2004). More studies are needed that further address the influence of models on the development of SRL skills.

Seventh, the study was focused primarily on the lexically-driven formulation process of writing in relation to participants’ L2 lexical problems and strategies. Needless to say, this is only one aspect of writing that learners need to exercise control over to become proficient L2 writers. In addition, the formulation process was viewed through the lenses of specific language production and L2 lexical acquisition models. Studies that examine other aspects and processes of writing (e.g., planning and revising processes) using different theoretical models (e.g., the more syntactically-driven language production models) are definitely needed. Moreover, vocabulary plays an important role in establishing coherence and cohesion in writing. This is another area for future research.

Eight, the study only examined five Korean ESL learners working on argumentative essays in a one-on-one tutoring context. The study lacks statistical generalizability, and therefore, the findings in this research only illustrate, rather than define authoritatively, how SRL skills can develop for ESL learners. Learners initially rely on other-regulation and social support before they are able to exercise self-regulation in their learning. The pedagogical focus of the study, which aimed to maximize this support, necessitated the one-on-one tutoring as the mode of instruction. Furthermore, the study showed that the participants’ reports of their difficulty and strategy use units somewhat differed for the two writing tasks in Phase 1. More studies with other types of writing tasks, diverse populations of learners with different L1 backgrounds and English proficiency levels, and various educational contexts are undoubtedly needed to clearly understand how SRL skills develop among L2 learners engaged in English writing. In particular, considering the fact that languages differ structurally from one another in varying degrees, future
research on developing SRL skills in writing with learners from other L1 backgrounds are especially needed.

Ninth, the intervention period may not have been long enough to witness distinctly significant changes in the participants’ development of SRL skills. By the end of the intervention period, the participants were beginning to regularly employ a few of the lexical strategies to address their difficulties in writing. Some participants showed remarkable control over some of the strategies. A longer study would have been able to provide a fuller picture of how the participants develop self-regulatory control over these strategies.

Finally, there was limitation in my role as a researcher in implementing the intervention for the study. I tried my best to understand the participants’ differing needs and to provide the intervention accordingly. Nonetheless, I was always aware of my shortcomings in supplying the necessary support for the participants. In reflection, I feel that I have learned more from the study than the participants may have. A more experienced researcher may have produced better and more insightful results for the study.

8.5 Conclusion

Through continual self-evaluation, planning, implementation, and monitoring of strategy use, the study aimed to help five participants to develop SRL skills in writing. The study was pedagogical in nature but also informed by theory. In attempting to help the participants to overcome their difficulties in writing, I relied on the lexically-driven model of language production proposed by Levelt (1989, 1993) and on the L2 lexical development model by Jiang (2000), presuming that the difficulties in the formulation process of writing were lexical in nature; devised strategies that would help the participants to access and retrieve the necessary linguistic specifications stored in lexical items for writing; and followed Zimmerman et al.’s
(1996) model of SRL to equip the participants with the required SRL skills for employing these strategies in writing.

The study focused on the formulation process of writing, attempting to help the participants to write according to their communicative intentions with more ease. With the premise that language production is lexically-driven, the strategies were designed to help the participants to access the L2 linguistic specifications through the use of corpus-based linguistic tools. As proposed by Jiang (2000), the study revealed that the participants primarily relied on their L1 lexical knowledge (i.e., through L2-L1 lexical association and L2 lemma mediation) to write their essays and this resulted in their uses of the L2 language being reflective of their L1. Furthermore, the participants were found to attend primarily to the grammatical encoding process of language production. As the participants began to rely more on the linguistic tools to write their essays, their expressions became more native-like. Although this study was not a study of dictionary use, I was able to demonstrate how such linguistic tools can empower learners to become confident and independent L2 writers.

It is difficult to claim how much the participants’ SRL skills in L2 writing developed over time. I did not conceptualize self-regulation as consisting of stable developmental stages that they must go through to acquire SRL skills (Zimmerman, 2000). Rather, I viewed it as being dynamic – namely, as consisting of a series of “events in action” (Winne, 2010) – and tried to illustrate the changes in the participants’ SRL skills with respect to their difficulties and use of strategies based on their self-reports, despite the limitations in measuring SRL skills with stimulated-recall interviews.

Therefore, it is more appropriate to consider how the participants’ SRL skills developed over time. In the course of the intervention, the types of linguistic specifications that the
participants attended to and the types of strategies they employed became progressively more focused and specific: Each of the participants (a) became increasingly occupied with improving word choices or phrase constructions and (b) gradually shifted from employing self-strategies to one or two types of lexical strategies to achieve their goals. Simply put, the participants were able to gradually gain self-control over the strategies to communicate their intentions more effectively. It is important to note that such development of SRL skills does not necessarily mean that the participants should or would begin to narrow their use of the strategies; on the contrary, no one strategy will work for all the participants or be effective for resolving all the problems (Zimmerman, 1998, 2000). What was significant for the participants was that they progressively became capable of relying less on their self-strategies.

The study also showed that developing self-regulatory control over strategies that were designed to help the participants to better access and retrieve the linguistic specifications of English words was beneficial for formulating language according to their communicative intentions, which in turn had positive influences on building their self-efficacy beliefs as writers and on improving the quality of their writing with respect to lexical richness, syntactic complexity, and native speaker intuition. Simply put, the study was able to demonstrate that systematic strategy instruction in writing through the learning framework of SRL was beneficial for improving the participants’ writing skills (cf., Plonsky, 2011). Equipping the participants with SRL skills seemed essential for developing their writing skills in that writing itself requires highly self-regulatory behaviours.
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Appendix A
Advertisement (translated into Korean)

Volunteers Requested To Improve English Writing

I am a PhD student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. I am looking for eight Korean ESL learners with an intermediate level of English proficiency to participate in my thesis study. The purpose of the study is to gain understanding of the types of lexical problems Korean ESL learners encounter in English writing and to help the learners to overcome the problems. I would like to work with learners who look forward to improving their English writing skills in terms of choosing appropriate words, phrases, collocations, sentence structures, etc. and to making their overall writing more native-like in English.

The study will take place in two phases. I will first spend a couple of weeks working with the participants to identify specific problems that Korean ESL learners may encounter in English writing. Afterwards, I will tutor five of the participants for a period of nine weeks to help them overcome their problems in writing, as we work on writing and revising essays.

For your participation in my study, I will provide the tutoring sessions free of charge. If you participate only in the first phase, I will compensate for your time by providing you with two tutoring sessions afterwards to diagnose your problems in English writing and to suggest tips on how to improve your writing skills.

The study may benefit you in two ways. First, you will have a chance to become aware of your own writing problems in English and strategies you can use to overcome the problems. Second, this study will help you to become an independent English writer.

If you are interested in participating in my study, please contact me. I will meet you individually and describe the study in more detail. Thank you very much.

Phone: 416-737-9077
Email: seungwon.jun@gmail.com
Appendix B
Recruitment Letter: for Korean ESL learners (translated into Korean)

Volunteers Requested To Improve English Writing

I am a PhD student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. I am looking for Korean ESL learners who are willing to participate in my study. The title of the study is called “Developing Self-Regulated Learning Skills to Overcome Lexical Problems in Writing: Case Studies of Korean ESL Learners”. The purpose of this research is to gain understanding of the types of lexical problems Korean ESL learners encounter in English writing and to help the learners to develop self-regulated learning skills to overcome these problems. The study is undertaken in partial fulfillment for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Toronto, under the supervision of Professor Alister Cumming.

I am looking for Korean ESL learners with a specific (intermediate) level of English proficiency. Therefore, I will first ask you to complete a vocabulary test and a timed argumentative writing task followed by a stimulated-recall session. This will take approximately 90 minutes to complete, and the stimulated-recall session will be audio-recorded. If you represent the population of learners I am looking for, I will ask you a week later to complete a background questionnaire, translate a 150-200 word Korean text into English, and have another stimulated-recall session about the translation task, which will also be audio-recorded. This will take approximately 90 minutes to complete and will end the first phase of the study. I will recruit seven other Korean ESL learners like you to participate in this phase.

Before continuing to the next phase, I will examine the data I have collected from you and the other participants to identify common lexical problems that you encounter in English writing and devise a set of strategies to help you overcome the problems. I will invite five among the eight of you (based on the criteria of having similar abilities in English) to continue to participate in the second phase of the study. For this phase, you will be asked to do the following:

(a) Tutoring: I would like to have one-on-one tutoring sessions with you for approximately nine weeks. We will work on writing and revising essays on three tasks during this period. I will prepare a set of strategies for you to use to overcome some difficulties that you may encounter in writing in English and will ask you to keep a brief record of what you do.

(b) Stimulated-recall sessions: The stimulated-recall sessions will be part of the tutoring sessions and will administered three times, after each time you finish writing a draft for the three writing tasks. In these sessions, like an interview, I will ask you to reflect on what you wrote and ask you questions related to what you wrote. Each session will take approximately 30 minutes to complete and will be audio-recorded.

(c) Interview: After the nine weeks of tutoring, I would like to interview you to ask about your perceptions of the tutoring intervention. This interview will take approximately 30 minutes to finish and will be audio-recorded.
The total time required for your participation is 3 hours in the course of two weeks for the first phase of the study and 14 hours in the course of 10 weeks for the second phase. For your participation in the first phase, I will compensate for your time by providing you with two tutoring sessions afterwards to diagnose problems you may have in English writing and to suggest tips to improve your English writing skills. If you continue to participate in the second phase, the nine weeks of tutoring will be your compensation.

The study may benefit you in two ways. First, you will have a chance to become aware of your own writing problems in English and strategies you can use to overcome the problems. Second, you will be able to develop self-regulated learning skills in writing, which will help you become an independent English writer. I have had several years of doing research on L2 writing and have taught English writing to Korean students. I grew up and was educated in Korea myself.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time, for any reason, if you wish, and you may refuse to do any of the tasks. I will keep all the information about you fully confidential. When I write up the results of the research, which may or may not be published, you will be referred to by a pseudonym of your choice, and I will obscure any personal information that may identify you in any way. I will store all the data that I collect from you in a locked drawer or in a password-protected computer in my office for 5 years after the study and then destroy them systematically. Only I and my thesis supervisor will have access to these data. Also, I will be happy to provide you with a summary of this study after I have written up the results.

If you agree to participate in this research, could you kindly complete the consent form below with your signature, printed name, and date? Please keep a copy of this letter for your reference.

If you have any questions about this research or procedures, I would be happy to answer them and describe the research in more detail. If you have any further questions regarding your rights as a participant, you may also contact the University of Toronto Research Ethics Board at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or 416-946-3273.

Sincerely,

**Student Investigator**
Seung Won Jun, PhD Student
phone: 416-737-9077
seungwon.jun@gmail.com

**Faculty Supervisor**
Professor Alister Cumming
phone: 416-978-0276
acumming@oise.utoronto.ca

Program: Second Language Education, OISE / University of Toronto
I have read and understood Seung Won Jun’s letter of (Date), and I agree to do the tasks described in the recruitment letter for the research called “Developing Self-Regulated Learning Skills to Overcome Lexical Problems in Writing: Case Studies of Korean ESL Learners”. I am returning this signed and completed consent form, and I have kept a copy of the letter describing this research for my future reference.

Name (please print) ______________________________
Signature ______________________ Date ______________________________

**Appendix C**
Passage for the Translation Writing Task
(from the 2008 College Scholastic Ability Test developed by the Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation. Available for download at http://www.kice.re.kr)

There are few people who do not react to music to some degree. The power of music is diverse and people respond in different ways. To some it is mainly an instinctive, exciting sound to which they dance or move their bodies. Other people listen for its message, or take an intellectual approach to its form and construction, appreciating its formal patterns or originality. Above all, however, there can be hardly anyone who is not moved by some kind of music. Music covers the whole range of emotions: It can make us feel happy or sad, helpless or energetic, and some music is capable of overtaking the mind until it forgets all else. It works on the subconscious, creating or enhancing mood and unlocking deep memories.
Appendix D
Stimulated-Recall Session for Phase 1 (administered in Korean)

(After the participants complete the argumentative writing/translation tasks)

Now, let’s review what you have just written.

Guiding Questions

1. Did you find this easy or difficult? What was the most difficult part about writing the essay/translation?

Let’s start with the first sentence and talk about each sentence.

2. Did you have problems with any words, phrases, or the sentence structure for this sentence?

3. Why was this word/phrase/sentence structure causing you problems?

4. How did you come up with this word/phrase/sentence structure?

5. Did you have problems with any other aspects of this sentence?

(Go over each sentence in the same manner.)

6. Did you have any problems with other issues when writing the essay/translation?
Appendix E
Background Questionnaire (translated into Korean)

1. Please choose a pseudonym that you would like to use: ______________________________

2. What is your date of birth (yy/mm/dd)? _________________________

Your gender (circle one): Male or Female?

3. What is your current education level (tick one)?
   _____ completed high school   _____ in college/university   _____ completed college/university

Please specify if you received any formal education in a country other than Korea:
______________________________________________________________________________

4. When did you come to Canada to study (year/month)? ________________________________

5. Have you ever lived in an English-speaking country? Where, when, and for how long?
______________________________________________________________________________

6. Do you plan to attend a university/college in an English-speaking country: Yes or No?
   If yes, where? ____________________________

7. When did you first start to learn English (age or grade)? _____________________________

   Have you ever studied English intensively anywhere outside of school in Korea (please specify)?
______________________________________________________________________________

8. Do you use English with anyone on a regular basis (please specify)?
______________________________________________________________________________

9. Which ESL classes are you taking now? At what level?
______________________________________________________________________________

   Have you ever taken any writing classes? ____________________________________________

10. How often do you write in English? _____________________________________________

11. What is the most difficult part about writing in English for you?
______________________________________________________________________________

   What do you mostly focus on? _____________________________________________________
Appendix F

Stimulated-Recall Session for Phase 2 (administered in Korean)

(Have the draft ready to review with the participant.)

Guiding Questions

1. Could you briefly tell me how you wrote this draft?

2. Did you find this easy or difficult?
   What was the most difficult part about writing the draft?

3. Did you use any functions from the computer to help you?

Let’s start with the first sentence and talk about each sentence.

3. Did you have problems with any words, phrases, or the sentence structure for this sentence?

4. Why was this word/phrase/sentence structure causing you problems?

5. How did you manage to deal with the problems?

6. Did you have problems with any other issues for this sentence?

   (Go over each sentence in the same manner.)

7. Did you have any other problems with the draft?

8. What would you like to improve about the draft? Could you be more specific?
Appendix G
Self-Monitoring Form

Goals for this week:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task # 1, first draft</th>
<th>Day of Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much time did I spend on the draft?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had problems with the following words, phrases, and sentences:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Why was it difficult?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did I do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Why was it difficult?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did I do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Why was it difficult?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did I do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Why was it difficult?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did I do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Why was it difficult?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did I do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score that I expect to receive (0-5) ________ How do you feel about the score? (-1,0,1)______
Appendix H
Post-Intervention Interview for Phase 2 (administered in Korean)

Guiding Questions

1. How do you feel about writing after the intervention? How easy or difficult do you find writing for you compared to when we first met?

2. What did you mostly focus on when you wrote?

3. What is still difficult for you when you write? Could you be more specific?

4. How effective do you find the strategies that we worked on together?

5. Could you tell me how the intervention has helped or has not helped you become aware of your writing problems and of the strategies to overcome them?

6. Could you tell me in detail how the intervention has or has not helped you in writing? What was most helpful? What was least helpful?

7. How was the intervention like for you? Generally, and in terms of the SRL cycle (self-monitoring and assessment, setting goals, strategy implementation, my feedback, etc.).

8. Do you think you have improved over the past few months? In what ways?

9. How do you feel about yourself as a writer (compared to when we first met)?

10. Are there any ESL courses you have taken during the tutoring period? How often have you written in English during the tutoring period?

11. Could you tell me about your writing experiences in Korean (e.g., how often your write, difficulties you face, writing in university, etc.)?

12. What was your grade point average in university?
Appendix I
Recruitment Letter: for Native-Speaker Raters

Volunteers Requested

Date

I am a PhD student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. I am looking for native speakers of English to participate in my study. The title of the study is called “Developing Self-Regulated Learning Skills to Overcome Lexical Problems in Writing: Case Studies of Korean ESL Learners”. The purpose of this research is to gain understanding of the types of lexical problems Korean ESL learners encounter in English writing and to help the learners to develop self-regulated learning skills to overcome the problems. The study is undertaken in partial fulfillment for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Toronto, under the supervision of Professor Alister Cumming.

I would like to ask you to participate in this study. For this study, you will be asked to rank five sets of essays written by five Korean ESL learners and provide brief comments on why you think one essay is better than the other. This will take approximately five hours to complete and will be audio-recorded. I will provide you with a compensation of $20 per hour for your time and effort.

Your participation is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time, for any reason, if you wish, and you may refuse to do any of the tasks. I will keep all the information about you fully confidential. When I write up the results of the research, which may or may not be published, you will be referred to by codes (e.g., rater1, rater2), and I will obscure any personal information that may identify you in any way. I will store all the data that I collect from you in a locked drawer or in password-protected computer in my office for 5 years after the study and then destroy them systematically. Only I and my faculty supervisor will have direct access to these data.

If you agree to participate in this research, could you kindly complete the consent form below with your signature, printed name, and date? Please keep a copy of this letter for your reference.

If you have any questions about this research or procedures, I would be happy to answer them and describe the research in more detail. If you have any further questions regarding your rights as a participant, you may also contact the University of Toronto Research Ethics Board at ethics.review@utoronto.ca or 416-946-3273.

Sincerely,

Student Investigator
Seung Won Jun, PhD Student
phone: 416-737-9077
seungwon.jun@gmail.com

Faculty Supervisor
Professor Alister Cumming
phone: 416-978-0276
acumm@oise.utoronto.ca

Program: Second Language Education, OISE / University of Toronto
I have read and understood Seung Won Jun’s letter of August 18, 2010, and I agree to do the tasks described in the recruitment letter for the research called “Developing Self-Regulated Learning Skills to Overcome Lexical Problems in Writing: Case Studies of Korean ESL Learners”. I am returning this signed and completed consent form, and I have kept a copy of the letter describing this research for my future reference.

Name (please print) __________________________________________

Signature ___________________________ Date __________________________

Appendix J
Guidelines for Ranking

I have here five sets of seven essays written by five Korean ESL learners. The essays have been written based on four tasks from the Independent Writing section of the iBT TOEFL. There is a draft and a revision for three tasks and just a draft for one task. For one learner, one of the essays is missing.

For each learner, please read the essays carefully and rank them from the best-written to the worst-written in terms of overall essay quality. After you have ranked the essays, please explain why you think one essay is better (or worse) than the other, providing comments especially on the use of langue (e.g., the use of words/phrases, collocations, and sentence structures, etc.), but also on the content and organization of the essays as needed to justify your ranking. Please repeat this process for each learner.

The essays have been randomly mixed and coded for your reference. Please audio-record this process of ranking and providing comments and use the codes to refer to the essays. You may name the files Participant A, Participant B, etc.
Appendix K
Detailed Analyses for Research Question 2c

1. Lexical Richness and Syntactic Complexity

1.1 Alex

Table K-1 shows the text analysis results for Alex’s essays with respect to lexical richness and syntactic complexity. In the table, the letter ‘R’ indicates the final revised essays for the three tasks. For example, T1 indicates the first draft essay of Task 1; T1R indicates the final revised essay of Task 1.

Table K-1. Text analysis results of Alex’s essays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tokens</th>
<th>types</th>
<th>ratio</th>
<th>Lexical Frequency Profile (%)</th>
<th>MLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>K2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>91.02</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1R</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>87.72</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>80.84</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2R</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>85.58</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3R</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>85.15</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>82.34</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. K1 = first 1,000 words of the GSL. K2= next 1,000 words of the GSL. AWL = Academic Word List. MLS = mean length of sentence. Measures for the first draft essays are shaded.

Type-token ratio. With the exception of T1R, the type-token ratio of Alex’s revised essays was slightly higher than that of the first draft essays for each task. With regard to only the first draft essays, the type-token ratio gradually increased from 0.42 for T1 to 0.5 for T4. There was a slight decrease in the ratio from T2 to T3.

LFP. Within each task, Alex’s percentage of K1 words from the draft to the revised essays decreased, whereas that of K2 words and of the AWL words increased, with the exception of T3R for the K2 word group. With regard to only the first draft essays, the general trend was a
steady decrease in the percentage of K1 words and an increase in that of K2 and AWL words across tasks. The increase of AWL words from T1 to T2 was especially large.

**Syntactic Complexity.** Within each task, the MLS of Alex’s revised essays was greater than that of the first draft essays, with the exception of T3R. With regard to only the first draft essays, the MLS progressively increased from 19.81 for T1 to 25.06 for T4.

1.2 Sam

Table K-2 shows the text analysis results of Sam’s essays with respect to lexical richness and syntactic complexity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>tokens</th>
<th>types</th>
<th>ratio</th>
<th>Lexical Frequency Profile (%)</th>
<th>MLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>K2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>92.32</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1R</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>88.92</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>83.01</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2R</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>79.19</td>
<td>8.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>88.86</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3R</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>86.35</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>81.58</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* K1 = first 1,000 words of the GSL. K2 = next 1,000 words of the GSL. AWL = Academic Word List. MLS = mean length of sentence. Measures for the first draft essays are shaded.

**Type-token ratio.** Within each task, the type-token ratio of Sam’s revised essays was higher than that of the first draft essays. With regard to the only the first draft essays, the type-token ratio gradually increased across tasks, with the exception of T3.

**LFP.** Within each task, the percentage of K1 words from Sam’s first draft to the revised essays decreased, whereas that of the K2 and AWL words increased, with the exception of T1R for K2 words and T3R for AWL words. With regard to only the first draft essays, Sam’s
percentage of K1 words displayed a tendency to gradually decrease, whereas that of the K2 and AWL words tended to steadily increase across tasks.

**Syntactic Complexity.** There was not a clear pattern in the MLS for Sam’s writing within tasks. It increased from the draft to the revised essay in Task 1, but decreased in Tasks 2 and 3. With regard to only the first draft essays, the MLS progressively increased from 18.71 for T1 to 20.39 for T3, but dropped to 14.83 for T4.

1.3 Abril

Table K-3 shows the text analysis results of Abril’s essays with respect to lexical richness and syntactic complexity.

| Table K-3. Text analysis results of Abril’s essays | Lexical Frequency Profile (%) | MLS |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| tokens | types | ratio | K1 | K2 | AWL | Off List | |
| T1 | 771 | 273 | 0.35 | 87.29 | 5.71 | 1.43 | 5.58 | 15.73 |
| T1R | 794 | 296 | 0.37 | 85.01 | 5.79 | 2.27 | 6.93 | 14.47 |
| T2 | 337 | 153 | 0.45 | 89.91 | 4.15 | 2.37 | 3.56 | 15.32 |
| T2R | 455 | 200 | 0.44 | 83.96 | 6.37 | 4.62 | 5.05 | 15.69 |
| T3 | 344 | 162 | 0.47 | 81.98 | 2.91 | 3.49 | 11.63 | 14.96 |
| T3R | 398 | 166 | 0.42 | 80.9 | 2.26 | 4.27 | 12.56 | 16.67 |
| T4 | 450 | 216 | 0.48 | 75.33 | 7.11 | 6.67 | 10.89 | 20.09 |

*Notes.* K1 = first 1,000 words of the GSL. K2 = next 1,000 words of the GSL. AWL = Academic Word List. MLS = mean length of sentence. Measures for the first draft essays are shaded.

**Type-token ratio.** Within each task, the type-token ratio increased from Abril’s first draft to the revised essay for the first task, but decreased for the second and third tasks. With regard to only the first draft essays, the type-token ratio showed a gradual increase from 0.35 for T1 to 0.48 for T4.

**LFP.** Within each task, for Abril, the percentage of K1 words from the first draft to the revised essays decreased, whereas that of the K2 and AWL words increased, with the exception
of T3R for the K2 word group. With regard to only the first draft essays, the percentage of K1 words slightly increased from 87.29% for T1 to 89.91% for T2, but steadily decreased afterwards to 75.33% by T4. The percentage of Abril’s K2 words progressively decreased from T1 to T3, but then had a sudden increase to 7.11% for T4. The percentage of AWL words gradually increased from 1.43% for T1 to 6.67% for T4. The increase from 3.49% for T3 to 6.67% for T4 seems noteworthy.

**Syntactic Complexity.** Within each task, Abril’s MLS increased from the first draft to the revised essays, with the exception of T1R. With regard to only the first draft essays, her MLS decreased slightly from 15.73 words for T1 to 14.96 words for T3, but then jumped to 20.09 words for T4. The increase here was noticeably larger than the decrease.

1.4 August

Table K-4 shows the text analysis results of August’s essays with respect to lexical richness and syntactic complexity. August did not write the draft essay for Task 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Lexical Frequency Profile (%)</th>
<th>MLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K1</td>
<td>K2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>89.52</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1R</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>91.19</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>85.45</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2R</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>83.97</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>85.19</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3R</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>84.42</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* K1 = first 1,000 words of the GSL. K2 = next 1,000 words of the GSL. AWL = Academic Word List. MLS = mean length of sentence. Measures for the first draft essays are shaded.
**Type-token ratio.** Within each task, the type-token ratio of August’ revised essays was higher than that of the first draft essays. With regard to the only the first draft essays, the type-token ratio increased from 0.36 for T1 to 0.39 for T2, but then dropped back to 0.35 for T3.

**LFP.** Within each task, the percentage of August’s K1 words from the draft to the revised essays decreased for second and third tasks; for the first task it increased slightly. The percentage of K2 and AWL words from the draft to the revised essays increased, with the exception of T1R for the AWL word group. With regard to only the first drafts, the percentage of K1 words gradually decreased across tasks, whereas that of the K2 words increased. The increase of K2 words from T2 to T3 was notable. The percentage of AWL words was irregular. There was a high increase from 1.14% for T1 to 6.26% for T2, but then dropped to 1.42% for T4.

**Syntactic Complexity.** Within each task, the MLS of August’s first draft essays was higher than that of the revised essays. With regard to only the first draft essays, the MLS showed a steady decrease across tasks.

1.5 Ria

Table K-5 shows the text analysis results of Ria’s essays with respect to lexical richness and syntactic complexity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table K-5. Text analysis results of Ria’s essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tokens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes.* K1 = first 1,000 words of the GSL. K2= next 1,000 words of the GSL. AWL = Academic Word List. MLS = mean length of sentence. Measures for the first draft essays are shaded.
Type-token ratio. Within each task, the type-token ratio of Ria’s revised essays was slightly higher than that of the first draft essays for the first and third tasks; for the second task, it was higher for the first draft essay. With regard to only the first draft essays, the type-token ratio tended to increase across tasks. It dropped slightly for T3, but then jumped to 0.6 for T4. The ratio of 0.6 for T4 is quite high compared to that of other essays.

LFP. Within each task, the percentage of K1 words from Ria’s draft to the revised essays decreased, whereas that of the K2 and AWL words increased, with the exception of T2R for the K2 word group. With regard to only the first draft essays, the general tendency was that the percentage of the K1 words decreased across tasks, whereas as that of the K2 and AWL words increased. The percentage of K1 words increased slightly from T2 to T3, but then had a big drop for T4. The percentage of K2 words dropped from T2 to T3, but then increased again for T4. The overall increase in the percentage of AWL words across tasks was quite remarkable.

Syntactic Complexity. Within tasks, the MLS of Ria’s revised essays was lower than that of the first draft essays for the second and third tasks; for the first task, the MLS of the revised essay was higher. With regard to only the first draft essays, the MLS showed a gradual increase across tasks.

2. Ranking

The results of the two native speakers’ rankings for the five participants are shown in Table K-6. The essays were ranked from worst to best. With a few exceptions, the final revised essays were ranked higher than the first draft essays. In Table K-7, the rankings are replaced with scores. The essays were given a score from 1 to 7 (1 to 6 for August) in the order of ranking starting from the lowest; the higher the score, the better ranking the essays received. Finally, Table K-8 presents the ranking results based on the rankings of the first draft essays. The
numerical values in brackets indicate the amount of improvement in terms of ranking scores from the first draft to the revised essays for each task. For example, a 1+ indicates that there was an improvement of 1 ranking score from the first draft to the revised essay; similarly, a 1- indicates that there was a decrease in the score by 1. The overall Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient for the two native speaker rankers was .61.

Table K-6. Ranking results for the participants’ essays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Rankings (from worst to best)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>T1  T2  T4  T3  T2R T1R T3R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>T1  T2  T2R T3R T4  T1R T3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>T3  T3R T1  T1R T4  T2  T2R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>T2  T3  T1  T4  T2R T1R T3R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abril</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>T2  T3  T3R T1  T2R T4  T1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>T2R T2  T4  T3R T3  T1  T1R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>T1R T1  T2  T3R T2R T3  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>T1R T1  T3  T3R T2  T2R -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>T1  T2  T4  T1R T3  T3R T2R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>T1  T2  T4  T1R T2R T3  T3R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table K-7. Ranking results converted into scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T1R</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T2R</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T3R</th>
<th>T4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abril</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table K-8. Ranking results for the first draft essays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Rankings from worst to best (amount of improvement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>T1 (5+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>T1 (5+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>T3 (1+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>T2 (4+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abril</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>T2 (4+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>T2 (1-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>T1 (1-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>T1 (1-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>T1 (3+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>T1 (3+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Alex

**Within tasks.** For R1, Alex’s revised essays had higher rankings than the first draft essays within the same task sets. The amount of improvement from the first draft to the final revised essays, especially for the first task, was substantial. For R2, the revised essays had higher rankings than the first draft essays within the same task sets for the first and second tasks only. Interestingly, R2 ranked the first draft essay of the third task much higher than the revision, commenting that T3R seemed slightly more awkward than T3 due to some word choice issues and punctuation errors. Alex had experimented with using different types of punctuation in T3R, which might have given R2 the impression that it was the draft rather than the revised essay. The amount of improvement for the first task again was noteworthy.

**Across tasks.** The ranking order of the essays for both the raters was T1-T2-T4-T3. With the exception of T4, this ranking order was in chronological order. Nonetheless, the essays of the latter two tasks were ranked higher than those of the earlier tasks.

2.2 Sam

**Within tasks.** For R1, the revised essays were ranked higher than their first draft essays within the same task sets. The amount of improvement in each task, however, was small, with an
increase of only one rating score alike. For R2, the revised essays also had higher rankings than the first draft essays within the same task sets. Contrary to R1, however, the amount of improvement that R2 saw in each of the tasks was considerable, especially for the third task.

**Across tasks.** The ranking order of the essays for R1 and R2 was T3-T1-T4-T2 and T2-T3-T1-T4, respectively. The ranking order of R1 was irregular, whereas that of R2 was fairly chronological, with the exception of T1 being ranked as one of the highest. Both raters ranked T3 in the lower range and T4 in the higher range.

### 2.3 Abril

**Within tasks.** For R1, the revised essays had higher rankings than the first draft essays. The amount of improvement from the draft to the revised essays was comparably large for the first and second tasks than for the third task. For R2, the revised essays of the second and third tasks actually had slightly lower rankings than their first draft essays. Only the first task had a higher ranking for the revised essay. The change of the ranking scores, however, from the first draft to the revised essays (i.e., either +1 or -1) was small. For Task 2, R2 commented that it was difficult to decide which of the two versions was better, but that the second body paragraph in the first draft was much tighter, fit better with the rest of the essay, and was more relevant to the prompt. For Task 3, R2 commented that the conclusion in the revised essay, although longer, was full of incomplete sentences, which did not work that well.

**Across tasks.** The ranking order of the essays for R1 and R2 was T2-T3-T1-T4 and T2-T4-T3-T1, respectively. The ranking order of R1 was in chronological order, with the exception of T1 being ranked higher than T3. The ranking order of R2 was not as clear. Both raters ranked T2 the lowest and T1 in the higher range. The reason for the high ranking of T1 by both raters might have to do with the length of this essay, which was almost twice as long as Abril’s other
essays. Although a longer essay does not necessarily result in a better essay, the task for this essay was rather personal, and the length of the essay may have contributed to the overall development of Abril’s account of her story.

2.4 August

**Within tasks.** For R1, the ranking of the revised essays for the first and the third tasks was lower than their draft essays by one and two scores, respectively; only the the revised essay of the second task had a higher ranking than its draft version, with an improvement of only one ranking score. For R2, the revised essays of Tasks 2 and 3 had higher rankings than their first draft essays, each by a score of one; the ranking of the revised essay in the first draft slightly dropped by a score of one.

Both raters gave a higher ranking for the first draft essay than for its revised version for Task 1. August’s revision process in the essays for this task was quite interesting. There were only minor changes in her revision after the first tutoring session. However, she decided to change the general ideas and the organization of her essay in the final revision, which resulted in a completely different version of the essay. Both raters thought this version was not as good as the first draft version. For Task 3, R1 commented that the first draft essay was stronger with less awkward phrases than the revised essay.

**Across tasks.** The ranking order of the essays for R1 and R2 was T1-T2-T3 and T1-T3-T2, respectively. Both ranking orders were in chronological order, with the exception of T2 being ranked higher than T3 for R2.
2.5 Ria

**Within tasks.** For R1, the revised essays had higher rankings than the first draft essays. The amount of improvement for the first two tasks, especially the second task, was substantial. For R2, the revised essays also had higher rankings than the first draft essays. The amount of improvement for the first two tasks was also noteworthy.

**Across tasks.** The order of ranking for both raters was T1-T2-T4-T3. This ranking was in chronological order, with the exception of T3 being ranked higher than T4. Nonetheless, the latter two tasks were ranked higher than the earlier two tasks.