COMPARISON OF UNIVERSITY LEVEL EFL LEARNERS' LINGUISTIC AND RHETORICAL PATTERNS AS REFLECTED IN THEIR L1 AND L2 WRITING

Abbas ZARE-EE[*]

Mohammad Taghi FARVARDIN[**]

Abstract: This study focused on the linguistic and rhetorical patterns of L1 and L2 writing samples of Iranian EFL learners and aimed to determine possible quantitative differences. For this purpose, an intact EFL class including 30 Iranian EFL learners at an English department (F=21, M=9) was selected and the participants were asked to write English and Persian compositions on the same topic in an argumentative style in two separate sessions. These tasks were then holistically scored according to the ESL Composition Profile (Jacobs et. al. 1981) by two expert scorers. The number of words, number of words per sentences, number of spelling errors and number of T-units were also manually counted for both the English and the Persian tasks. The collected data were used to compare and contrast the linguistic and rhetorical patterns of the L1 and L2 writing samples. The results of the study showed that: a) there was a moderate positive correlation (r=0.47 p<0.05) between L1 and L2 writing total scores, b) texts written in L1 were significantly longer than those written in L2, c) L1 writing texts were more complex than L2 writing ones in terms of T-units, d) T-units in texts written in L1 were more than those written in L2, and e) the number of spelling errors in L2 writing samples were higher than those of L1 writing samples. These results were compared to those of similar studies comparing L1 and L2 writing. Implications arising from these findings were also explained.

Keywords: writing, t-unit, writing ability, contrastive rhetoric, L1, L2.

Özet:. Bu makale, İranlı İngilizce öğrencilerinin anadillerinde ve yabancı dilleri olan İngilizcede yazdıkları yazı örneklerinin dilsel ve sözbilimsel yapıları üzerinde durmakta ve olası nicel farklılıkları belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, bir İngilizce bölümünden 30 İranlı İngilizce öğrencisi (Kız=21, Erkek=9) içeren bir İngilizce sınıfı seçilmiş ve katılanlardan iki ayrı oturumda aynı konu üzerinde İngilizce ve Farsça tartışmacı bir tarzda kompozisyon yazmaları istenmiştir. Daha sonra bu kompozisyonlar iki uzman tarafından ESL (İkindi Dil olarak İngilizce) Kompozisyon Profiline (Jacobs ve ark. ,1981) göre değerlendirilmiştir. Aynı zamanda, hem İngilizce hem de Farsça kompozisyonlarda kelime sayısı, her bir cümledeki kelime sayısı, kelime yazım hataları ve T-birim sayıları sayılmıştır. Toplanan veri anadil ve yabancı dildeki yazı örneklerinin dilsel ve sözbilimsel yapılarını karşılaştırmak için kullanılmıştır. Çalışmanın sonucu gösterdi ki: a) anadil ve yabancı dilde yazma toplam notları arasında orta dereceli pozitif bir korelasyon (r=0.47 p<0.05) vardır b) anadilde yazılan metinler yabancı dilde yazılan metinlerden anlamlı derecede uzundur c) anadilde yazılan metinler yabancı dilde yazılanlara göre T-birimleri açısından daha karmaşıktır d) Anadilde yazılan metinlerdeki T-birimleri, yabancı dilde yazılanlardan daha fazladır e) Yabancı dilde yazılan metinlerdeki kelime yazım hataları, anadilde yazılan

---

[*] University of Kashan, Faculty of Humanities, Kashan, Iran. zare-ee72@kashanu.ac.ir

[**] University of Kashan, Kashan, Iran. a.farvardin@gmail.com

metinlerdekinden daha fazladır. Bu sonuçlar, anadilde ve yabancı dilde yazmayı ele alan benzer çalışmaların sonuçlarıyla karşılaştırılmıştır. Bu bulgulardan yapılan çıkarımlar da açıklanmıştır.

Keywords: Yazma birimi, t-birimi, yazma becerisi, karşılaştırmalı sözbilim,, anadil, ikinci dil

Introduction

In the last two decades, the field of second language acquisition research has witnessed a proliferation of research into writing processes and products. Studies revolving around L1/L2 writing processes can be roughly divided into three types (McCarthy et al., 2005). The first type of research deals with linguistic or rhetorical patterns between L1 and L2 writing processes and the discrepancies among these patterns (e.g. Silva, 1993; Ting, 1996). The second group of studies attempts to delve into the role of culture in distinguishing L1 from L2 writing (e.g. Ramanathen & Atkinson, 1999; McCarthy et al., 2005). Finally, another type focuses on the role of instruction on L1 and L2 writers (e.g. Gutierrez, 1992; Valdes, 1999).

Whether L1 writing processes are different from L2 writing processes has long been a controversial issue in L2 writing research (Casanava, 2004). This issue is important because the idea of using L1 theory for explaining and developing L2 writing may be inappropriate if the L1 writing processes are different from L2 writing processes (Mu & Carrigton, 2007). Otherwise, L1 writing theory may be a relevant model for L2 writing (Beare, 2000). As Brown (2001, p.339) put it, some pedagogical implications of comparing L1 and L2 writing are that:

> (a) it is important to determine appropriate approaches to writing instruction for L2 writers in different contexts, (b) writing teachers need to be equipped to deal effectively with the sociocultural and linguistic differences of L2 students, and (c) the assessment of L2 writing may need to take into account the fundamental differences between most L1 and L2 writing.

Generally, there are two opposing lines of research comparing L1 and L2 writing. Some researchers (e.g. Bitcher & Basturkman, 2006; Hinkel.2004; Lee, 2005; McCarthy et al 2005; Martínez, 2005; Silva, 1993; Thorson,2000) believe that L1 writing processes are different from those of L2 writing, while others (e.g. Matsumoto, 1995) emphasize the fact that these two processes are similar. Studies of L1/L2 writing similarities and differences have been both quantitative and qualitative. Among the studies which confirm a linear association between L1 and L2 writing through statistical analyses are De Jesus (1984), Cook (1988), Hirose & Sasaki (1994), Sasaki & Hirose (1996) and Kamimura (2001). Cook (1998) found a moderately significant correlation between L1 and L2 writing quality scores of 24 ESL Spanish students. Other studies such as Carson et al. (1990), Pennington and So (1993) found no significant positive relationship between L1 and L2 writing. In other words, research findings are so far contradictory, inconsistent, and incomplete in many ways as shown in a comprehensive review by Silva (1993).

To compare the results of different studies of L1 and L2 writing processes and products, Silva (1993) analyzed 72 reports of related empirical research and found that studies comparing linguistic and rhetorical patterns of L1 and L2 writing have mainly concentrated on written text features such as fluency, accuracy, quality, structure and morphosyntactic features. In his words,

the main features targeted in the literature include fluency (length of sentences and number of words per sentence); accuracy (errors, esp. morphosyntactic errors, lexicosemantic errors, and errors with verbs, prepositions and nouns); quality (effectiveness, i.e. received holistic scores); structure including general textual patterns, narrative structure and argument structure. For further clarification of the possible linguistic and rhetorical similarities and differences between L1 and L2 writing samples, reference can be made to Kaplan's (1966) classical work. According to Kaplan (1966), general textual patterns are concerned with "thought pattern" in the text. Narrative structure deals with the manner of narration as well as voice of the writer. Argument structure is related to paraphrasing, rhetorical connectedness and segmental (introduction, discussion, and conclusion). Morphosyntactic features refer to complexity (e.g. number of T-units in the text), style, and tone.

T-Unit, also studied in the present work, is a common measure of structural complexity of written texts. The number of T-units relative to the length of the text can help researchers decide on the syntactic complexity of the text. A T-unit has been defined as one independent clause together with whatever dependent clauses attached to it (see Richards & Schmidt, 2002). For example, "students went to school" is one simple T-unit. The sentence "Even though they felt tired, students went to school because of the importance they always attached to their presence in the class" is also considered as one T-unit.

Second language writing scholarship focusing on the above-mentioned features of written texts in L1 and L2 has come up with different results about the variables of focus in this study. As far as the variable of fluency in L1/L2 writing is concerned, some studies suggest that L2 writing is a less fluent process and that L2 texts usually contain shorter and fewer words (e.g. Benson et al. 1992; Cummings, 1990; Hall, 1990; Lux,1991; Morangne & Silva, 1991; Silva,1990; and Tagong, 1991). Studies such as Dennet (1985, 1990) reported that L2 texts were longer than L1 texts and contained more words. Few studies such as Frodesen (1991) concluded that L1 and L2 texts were of similar lengths. As far as the variable of accuracy in L1/L2 writing is concerned, research clearly shows that L2 writers make more errors in general (Silva, 1993). Among the studies which confirmed this claim were Benson et al. (1992), Frodesen (1991), and Silva (1990). In addition, studies such as Benson et al. (1992) and Frodesen (1991) showed that L2 writers had more morphosyntactic errors. Studies that confirmed greater number of lexicosemantics errors in L2 writers' texts included Benson et al. (1992) and Yu & Atkinson (1988). Also, Benson (1980) and Silva (1990) showed that L2 writers had more errors with regard to verbs, prepositions, articles and nouns.

In terms of the quality of L1 and L2 texts, Campbell (1990), Hafernick (1990) and Xu (1990) reported L2 texts were less effective (i.e. received lower holistic scores (see the review by Silva, 1993). From the perspective of the organization of writing, Kubota (1998) found that many students' L1/L2 expository and persuasive written texts were organized similarly in L1 and L2. In another study L1/L2 organizational scores correlated positively in both types of writing (Hirose, 2003). In general terms, previous research has shown L2 writing to be less complex (Park, 1988), less mature and less stylistically appropriate (Yau, 1989). Research has also revealed shorter T-units in L2 writers' texts (Cummings, 1990; Dennett, 1985, 1990; Gates 1978; Kamel, 1989).

The research comparing L1 and L2 writing strongly indicates that the two processes are similar in their broad outlines (Silva, 1993). However, they are different in numerous and important ways, some of which were discussed above. These differences can never be ignored since they can have significant theoretical and instructional implications. Evaluation criterion, teaching procedures, and the socio-cultural significance of L2 writing can be totally different from that of L1 writing and place new responsibilities on the L2 writing teachers' and researchers' shoulders. In line with this research tradition and to make up for the lack of systematic research on this issue in Iran, the present study was designed to focus on the linguistic and rhetorical patterns of L1 and L2 writing samples of Iranian university EFL learners and to determine possible quantitative differences.

Methodology

This study aimed to compare the performance of EFL learners on a single writing task written in both Persian and English. The study used a mainly quantitative framework to answer the following research questions.

1. Is there any relationship between Persian-speaking university EFL learners' holistic writing scores on Persian and English argumentative tasks?
2. Are there any significant differences between the total number of words written by Persian-speaking university EFL learners for an in-class argumentative task in both Persian and English?
3. Are there any significant differences between the total number of sentences written by Persian-speaking university EFL learners for an in-class argumentative task in both Persian and English?
4. Are there any significant differences between mean number of words per sentence written by Persian-speaking university EFL learners for an in-class argumentative task in both Persian and English?
5. Are there any significant differences between the total number of T-units written by Persian-speaking university EFL learners for an in-class argumentative task in both Persian and English?

Participants

A total of 30 students enrolled in an EFL writing class (M=9, F=21) participated in the present study and provided the Persian and English writing samples needed for the analyses. This quasi-experimental design for data collection was selected to allow for the control of performance conditions. The participants, aged from 19 to 22, were second-year intermediate learners based on their placement records and institutional proficiency records. They were majoring in English Translation at the University of Kashan, Iran. They had passed two introductory writing and grammar courses, and at the time of data collection, they were on a writing course in the English department called "Advanced Writing" which does not of course teach what its name implies. The national syllabus for BA in English translations requires students to pass two "Grammar and Writing" courses, a so-called "Advanced Writing" course and an "Essay Writing" course one after the other. The main focus of the "Advanced Writing" course is to teach the participants the key concepts of writing including writing topic sentences and introductory paragraphs, developing ideas in the body, and writing conclusions.

Data collection
The participants were asked by their instructor to write a composition on the following topic in the classroom: "Going Abroad is not the Only Way to Learn English". In the first session fifteen participants were asked by the professor to write Persian compositions and the rest were asked to write English compositions. In the second session, held on the following day, those who had written in Persian in the first session wrote in English and those who had written in English in the first session wrote in Persian on the same topic. The same topic was used for L1 and L2, because different topics could influence writing quality. The topic of "Going Abroad is not the Only Way to Learn English" was chosen because it was considered familiar, interesting, and motivating for the participants. The participants were not informed beforehand that they would be writing in class, nor were they aware of the possible topic. They were asked to write for 30 min, but they were also allowed to continue for as long as a maximum of 45 minutes if they could not finish. They were not permitted to use a dictionary.

This design was used to eliminate any possible effects for task sequence or variable related to writing performance such as resources, time, topic, etc. The usual procedure in the writing class is that the teacher first explains one of the different sections of an academic English paragraph such as the topic sentence, the major and minor supporting sentences, the concluding sentence, the transitions, or the type or rhetorical organization. Then students are shown the same parts in a model paragraph in their book. They are then asked to write a whole paragraph based on what they have learned which will be treated in a product-oriented approach in the following session. Students' paragraphs may be written in the class or at home as directed by the teacher. The data for the present study was collected in the classroom to make sure that the performance conditions were the same for all the participants.

Scoring
The ESL Composition Profile (Jacobs, et. al. 1981 see Appendix) was used to measure students' both L1 and L2 writing performance. The rating was used to score the collected samples in five differently-weighted criteria: Content, Organization, Sentence Construction, Voice, and Mechanics. Content refers to linguistic features dealing with the effectiveness and relatedness of the text to the assigned topic. Organization refers to the argument structure. High score on organization means that writers state and support their position fully and are inclined to develop their argument by restating their position (Silva, 1993). Voice deals with strong personal engagement of the reader. More use of pronoun I, more explicit themes and more real scenes are the sign of more active engagement of the writer and lead to higher score in the scoring process. The last part, the mechanics of the finished form refers to the punctuation, spelling, capitalization, margin, and other face features of the sample.

Both L1 and L2 compositions were scored by two different scorers who were TEFL specialists. The total score for each sample was the mean of the two raters' scores. The consistency of the two raters' judgments was tested using correlation analysis which showed a high level of inter-rater reliability (r=0.89).

Data Analysis
After scoring, the number of words, the number of sentences, the number of T-Units, the number of spelling errors, and mean word per sentence (WPS) for each sample were counted. T-Unit was

defined as one independent clause together with whatever dependent clauses were attached to it (see Richards & Schmidt, 2002). For comparing L1 and L2, all the above mentioned variables were summarized using the SPSS software. Descriptive statistics were use to summarize the differences between the Persian and English writing samples produced by the participants under similar conditions. Inferential statistics such as correlation and one sample T-tests were also used to test the research hypotheses.

Results and Discussions
Descriptive statistics on quantitative aspects of L1 and L2 writing Samples

Descriptive statistics including number of words per sample, number of sentences per sample, mean number of words per sentence, number of T-units and number of spelling errors for both Persian and English writing samples (P-task and E-task) are summarized in Table 1 below. As the table shows, the total number of words, mean number of words per sentence, and total number of T-units were higher when the learners wrote in their mother tongue, Persian. When writing in English, the participants wrote shorter sentences with more spelling errors.

Table 1. Number of words, sentences, mean words per sentence, T-units, and spelling errors (N=30)

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
words (E-task)	52.00	177.00	111.07	29.62
words (P-task)	69.00	218.00	**144.97**	34.08
sentences (E-task)	3.00	10.00	**6.2**	1.85
sentences (P-task)	3.00	10.00	5.8	2.03
word per sentence(E-task)	12.00	41.00	18.6	5.73
word per sentence(P-task)	15.50	62.00	**27.04**	9.97
T-units (E-task)	2.00	9.00	4.6	1.97
T-units (P-task)	2.00	9.00	**5.07**	1.76
spelling errors (E-task)	.00	5.00	**1.4**	1.45
spelling errors (P-_task)	.00	4.00	0.2	0.805

The relationship between holistic writing scores on Persian and English tasks
To answer the first research question on the relationship between writing performance on Persian and English tasks, Pearson Product Moment correlation analysis was performed. The results showed that the correlation between participants' total score on the English task and the total scores on the Persian task was 0.47 (p= 0.009, r=0.47). It can be inferred that higher ability in L1 writing can somehow predict better performance in L2 writing. In other words, there is a relatively high positive relationship between the scores of participants in L1 and L2 writing. This finding is in line with the findings of DeJesus (1984), Cook (1988), Hirose & Sasaki (1994) and Kamimura (2001) who through statistical analysis confirmed a positive linear association between L1 and L2 writing total scores.

The differences between tasks written in Persian and English
In order to answer research questions 2, 3, 4, and 5 about the significance of differences between the participants performance on the Persian task and the English task in terms of the total number of words per sample, the number of sentences in samples, mean words per sentence, and T-units one sample T-tests were performed. Table 2 shows the results of the T-tests for the variables of focus in L1 and L2 writing samples.

For the second research question, the mean number of words for L2 was 111 (SD=29.6) and 145 for the L1 samples (SD=34.1). As shown in Table 2, this mean difference was significant (p<0.05). In other words, the length of Persian compositions was more than that of English compositions, and the students could write more in Persian and had higher mastery in conjunction with the topic and the required lexical items in Persian. This finding confirms the findings of Benson et al., (1992), Cummings (1990), Hall (1990), Lux (1991), Silva (1990) and Tagong (1991) who found that L2 texts were shorter and contained fewer words. It is in sharp contrast with the findings of Dennett (1990) and Hu et al., (1982) who concluded that L2 texts were longer than L1 texts.

Table 2. Results of One Sample T-test analyses comparing different aspects of performance on E-task and P-task (number of words and sentences, mean words per sentence, and T-units)

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean Difference	SD	Df	t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
words (E-task)	52.00	177.00	111.07	29.62	29	20.53	.000
words (P-task)	69.00	218.00	144.97	34.08	29	23.29	.000
sentences (E-task)	3.00	10.00	6.2	1.85	29	18.44	.000
sentences (P-task)	3.00	10.00	5.8	2.03	29	15.69	.000
word per sentence (E-task)	12.00	41.00	18.6	5.73	29	14.85	.000
word per sentence (P-task)	15.50	62.00	27.04	9.97	29	17.74	.000
T-units (E-task)	2.00	9.00	4.6	1.97	29	12.96	.000
T-units (P-task)	2.00	9.00	5.07	1.76	29	5.76	.000

In order to answers research question three on the possible significant differences between the total numbers of sentences per writing sample in Persian and English, another one-sample T-test value was calculated and the results included in table 2 (rows four and five) showed that students produced a significantly higher number of sentences when they wrote in English.

The means of the number of words per sentence for the Persian and English samples produced by the learners were 27.4 and 18.6 respectively (see Table 2). As the T-test results summarized in the table show, this difference was significant. In other words, when writing in their mother tongue, the participants in this study produced significantly longer sentences. Similarly, The number of T-units produced by these EFL learners was 4.6 for the English samples and 5.07 for the Persian samples with standard deviations of 1.97 and 1.86 respectively. T-test results showed that this difference was significant.

As mentioned before, the number of T-units represents the complexity of the sentences and the students' writing in Persian is more complex because of the higher number of T-units, higher number of words per sentence, and longer texts. These findings confirm the findings of Park (1986) and Benson et al., (1992) who reported that L2 written products were less complex. With regard to the higher number of T-units in L 1 writing of Persian EFL students in this study, the result is in contrast with that of Gates (1976) and Silva (1990) reporting higher number of T-units in L2 writing of their participants.

Conclusion
To sum up, in this study the focus was on linguistic or rhetorical aspects of L1 and L2 writing of Persian EFL students studying English at the undergraduate level. Number of words per written sample, number of sentences, mean number of words per sentences, number of T-units, and spelling errors were compared in L1 and L2 texts written by these students and significant differences were found in all these areas in favor of writing in the first language.
The Pearson correlation between participants' total E-scores and total P-scorers was 0.47. It can be concluded that better L1 writing is associated with better L2 writing and this is in line with the claims of those scholars of second language writing who believe in the positive effects of L1

writing on L2 writing (e.g. DeJesus, 1984); Cook, 1988; Hirose & Sasaki, 1996; and Kamimura, 2001). At least some of the sub-skills of L1 writing may be transferable to L2 writing.

The result of the T-test implied that the difference between the total number of words produced for the E-task and the P-task as well as the difference in the number of sentences per sample was significant, showing that L1 texts were longer than L2 texts. This finding confirms the results reported by Benson et al. (1992), Cummings (1990), and Hall (1990). When writing in their mother tongue, the participants in this study seemed to have more linguistic resources at their disposal because under the same conditions and within the same settings and time limitations they wrote more the same topic when it was given in Persian. The mere presentation of the topic in English to the learners may place some burden on their shoulders (such an affective reaction) that blocks the generation and organization of ideas when writing. Moreover, On the P-task and the E-task, EFL learners produced different mean number of words per sentence. As Park (1986) also reported, sentences are longer when learners write in their mother tongue. The significant difference between the number of T-units in the E-task and the P-task represents the complexity of the sentences written in Persian because of the higher number of T-units and more words per sentence.

With regard to fluency in second language writing, some researchers (e.g. Benson, Daeming, Denzer & Valeri Gold, 1992; Cummings, 1990; Hall, 1990; Lux, 1991; Morangne & Silva, 1991; Siva, 1990; and Tagong, 1991) suggest that L2 writing is a less fluent process than L1 writing and that L2 texts are shorter and contain fewer words. Other researchers (e.g. Dennet, 1985, 1990) report longer L2 texts than L1 texts. Still others like Frodesen (1991) conclude that L1 and L2 texts are of similar lengths. The findings of this study are in line with those of the first group. For Persian EFL students, texts written in L1 were longer than those written in L2. In terms of accuracy, research clearly shows that L2 writers make more errors overall and that L2 texts receive lower holistic scores (Silva, 1993; Benson et al., 1992, Frodesen, 1991; and Silva, 1990). L2 writing of Persian EFL students is less complex, more erroneous, and shorter and usually receives lower holistic score, which confirms findings of the previous studies.

From the findings of this study, it can be concluded that Iranian EFL writers will not perform as well as L1 writers on writing tests in English and they are not completely able to meet standard developed for L1 writers. Texts written in Persian by Persian EFL students were quantitatively very different from those written in English. At least with regard to the selected linguistic and rhetorical aspects, the claim of researchers such as Bitcher & Basturkman (2006), Hinkel (2004), Lee(2005), McCarthy et al. (2005), Silva (1993) and Thorson (2000) who believe in different writing processes for L1 and L2 writing is reinforced. As Silva (1993) asserts, the research comparing L1 and L2 writing strongly suggests that, inspite of similarities in broad outlines, they are different in numerous and important ways, some of which have been highlighted in the present research. To conclude, it should be emphasized that L1 and L2 writing abilities can be correlated in many ways and may share many processes; however, there are significant differences in terms of possible length, structural complexity, erroneousness, and other morphosyntactic properties which can have inescapable consequences for understanding, teaching, assessing, and theorizing L2 writing. One of the limitations of the present study was that the participants were limited to intermediate learners of English at an English department. Different results may be found with different larger student populations. The study also looked at

one writing task and did not control the effect of differences in tasks. Further studies are with more participants and more tasks for the better understanding of quantitative differences. Future research can also devote more attention to issues like organizational patterns, sociocultural factors, transfer, and gender differences in L1 and L2 writing of Persian EFL learners to enable Iranian EFL learners and teacher to improve EFL writing instruction

References

Beare, S. (2000). *Differences in content generating and planning processes of adult L1 and L2 proficient writers*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario.

Benson, B. (1980). A qualitative analysis of language structures in compositions written by first and second language learners. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41 (5), 1984A.

Benson, B., Deming, M., Denzer, D., & Valeri-Gold, M. (1992). A combined basic writing/English as a second language class: Melting pot or mishmash? *Journal of Basic Writing*, 11 (1), 58–59.

Bitcher, J., & Basturkmen, H. (2006). Perceptions of the difficulties of postgraduate L2 thesis students writing the discussion section. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1-15.

Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Integrative Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education.

Campbell, C. (1990). Writing with others' words: Using background reading text in academic compositions. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 211–230). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Carson, J. E., Carrell, P. L., Silberstein, S., Kroll, B., & Kuehn, P. A. (1990). Reading-writing relationships in first and second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 245-266.

Casanava, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Cook, M. L. (1988). The validity of the contrastive rhetoric hypothesis as it relates to Spanish-speaking advanced ESL students. (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1988). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49(9), 2567 SA: Addison-Wesley.

Cummings, V. (1990). Speech and writing: An analysis of expository texts compared by native and non-native speakers of English at The City University of New York. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51 (7), 2296A.

De Jesus, S. (1984). *Predictors of English writing performance of native Spanish-speaking college freshmen*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 184).

Dennett, J. (1985). Writing Technical English: A comparison of the process of native English and native Japanese speakers. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 46 (11), 3275A.

Dennett, J. (1990). *ESL technical writing: Process and rhetorical differences*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322713).

Frodesen, J. (1991). Aspects of coherence in a writing assessment context: Linguistic and rhetorical features of native and non-native English essays. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52 (1), 150A.

Gates, R. (1976). An analysis of grammatical structures in compositions written by four groups of students at Southern Technical Institute: Indo-Iranian, Latin-Romance, Sino-Tibetan, and American. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 39 (4), 2026A.

Gutierrez, K.D. (1992). A comparison of instructional contexts in writing process classrooms with Latino children. *Education and Urban Society* 24 (2), 244–262.

Hafernick, J. (1990). Relationships among English writing experience, contrastive rhetoric, and English expository prose of L1 and L2 college writers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51 (12), 4007A.

Hall, C. (1990). Managing the complexity of revising across languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24 (1), 43–60.

Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Hirose, K. (2003). Comparing L1 and L2 writing processes of advanced Japanese EFL students: An exploratory study. *The Journal of the Faculty of Foreign Studies, Aichi Prefectural University (Language and Literature)*, 35, 1–36.

Hirose, K., & Sasaki, M. (1994). Explanatory variables for Japanese students' expository writing in English: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 203-229.

Hu, Z., Brown, D., & Brown, L. (1982). Some linguistic differences in the written English of Chinese and Australian students. *Language Learning and Communication*, 1 (1), 39–49.

Jacobs, V. et. al. (1981). *ESL Composition Profile*. Newbury House Publisher.

Kamel, G. (1989). Argumentative writing by Arab learners of English as a foreign and second language: An empirical investigation of contrastive rhetoric. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 50 (3), 677A.

Kamimura, T. (2001). Japanese students' L1-L2 writing connections: Written texts, writing competence, composing processes, and writing attitudes. *The Bulletin of the Kanto-Koshin-Etsu English Language Education Society*, 15, 165-183.

Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, 16 (1), 1–20.

Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of L1-L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 69–100.

Lee, S.-Y. (2005). Facilitating and inhibiting factors in English as a foreign language writing performance: A model testing with structural equation modelling. *Language learning*, 55 (2), 335-374.

Lux, P. (1991). Styles of Anglo and Latin American college student writers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52 (6), 2128A.

Martínez, I. A. (2005). Native and non-native writers' use of first person pronouns in the different sections of biology research articles in English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14 (3), 174-190.

Matsumoto, K. (1995). Research paper writing strategies of professional Japanese EFL writers. *TESL Canada Journal*, 13 (1), 17-27.

McCarthey, S. J., Guo, Y.-H., & Cummins, S. (2005). Understanding changes in elementary Mandarin students' L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14 (2), 71-104.

Morangne, E. Silva, M. (1991). Cognitive, affective, social, and cultural aspects of composing in a first and second language: A case study of one adult writer. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52 (12), 4249A.

Mu, C. & Carrigton, S. (2007). An Investigation of Three Chinese Students' English Writing Strategies. *TESL-EJ,* 11 (1).

Park, Y. (1988). Academic and ethnic background as factors affecting writing performance. In A. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 261–272). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pennington, M. & So, S. (1993). Comparing writing process and product across two languages: a studty of six Singaporean University student writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2, 41-63.

Ramanathan, V. & Atkinson, D. (1999) . Individualism, academic writing and ESL writers*, Journal of Second Language Writing* 8 (1), 45–74.

Richards J. C. & Schmidt R. (2002). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning*, 46, 137-174.

Silva, T. (1990). A comparative study of the composing of selected ESL and native English speaking freshman writers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51 (10), 3397A.

Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27 (4), 657-677.

Tagong, K. (1991). Revising strategies of Thai students: Text-level changes in essays written in Thai and English. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 52 (8), 2849A.

Thorson, H. (2000). Using the computer to compare foreign and native language writing process: A statistical and case study approach. *The Modern Language Journal*, ii (84), 155-169.

Valdes, G. (1999). Incipient bilingualism and the development of English language writing abilities in the secondary school. In: C.J. Faltis and P.M. Wolfe, Editors. *So much to say: Adolescents, bilingualism, and ESL in the secondary school*. Teachers College Press, New York, 138–175.

Xu, G. (1990). An ex post facto study of differences in the structure of the standard expository paragraphs between written compositions by native and nonnative speakers of English at the college level. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51 (6), 1942A.

Yau, M. (1989, March). *A quantitative comparison of L1 and L2 writing processes*. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual TESOL Convention, San Antonio, Texas.

Yu, V., & Atkinson, P. (1988). An investigation of the language difficulties experienced by Hong Kong secondary school students in English medium schools: Pt. 1. The problems. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 9 (3), 267–284.

APPENDIX
ESL COMPOSITION PROFILE

SCORE	RANGE	CONTENT CRITERIA
	30-27	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: knowledgeable • substantive • thorough development of thesis • relevant to assigned topic
	26-22	GOOD TO AVERAGE: some knowledge of subject • adequate range • limited development of thesis • mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail
	21-17	FAIR TO POOR: limited knowledge of subject • little substance • inadequate development of topic
	16-13	VERY POOR: does not show knowledge of subject • non-substantive • not pertinent • OR not enough to evaluate
		ORGANIZATION CRITERIA
	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: fluent expression • ideas clearly stated/ supported • succinct • well-organized • logical sequencing • cohesive
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: somewhat choppy • loosely organized but main ideas stand out • limited support • logical but incomplete sequencing
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: non-fluent • ideas confused or disconnected • lacks logical sequencing and development
	9-7	VERY POOR: does not communicate • no organization • OR not enough to evaluate
		VOCABULARY CRITERIA
	20-18	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: sophisticated range • effective word/idiom choice and usage • word form mastery • appropriate register
	17-14	GOOD TO AVERAGE: adequate range • occasional errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage but meaning not obscured
	13-10	FAIR TO POOR: limited range • frequent errors of word/idiom form, choice, usage • meaning confused or obscured
	9-7	VERY POOR: essentially translation • little knowledge of English vocabulary, idioms, word form • OR not enough to evaluate
		LANGUAGE USE CRITERIA
	25-22	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: effective complex constructions • few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions
	21-18	GOOD TO AVERAGE: effective but simple constructions • minor problems in complex constructions • several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured
	17-11	FAIR TO POOR: major problems in simple/complex constructions • frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions • meaning confused or obscured
	10-5	VERY POOR: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules • dominated by errors • does not communicate • OR not enough to evaluate
		MECHANICS CRITERIA
	5	EXCELLENT TO VERY GOOD: demonstrates mastery of conventions • few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing
	4	GOOD TO AVERAGE: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing but meaning not obscured
	3	FAIR TO POOR: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • poor handwriting • meaning confused or obscured
	2	VERY POOR: no mastery of conventions • dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing • handwriting illegible • OR not enough to evaluate