A Contrastive Study between L1 and L2 Compositions: Focusing on Global Text Structure, Composition Quality, and Variables in L2 Writing

YOSHIFUMI KOHRO

（Kyushu International University）

Abstract

Recent contrastive studies between L1 and L2 compositions have depicted transfer of discoursal features, employing a within-subject design, while taking variables affecting L2 compositions into account. Following this research direction, the present study attempted to portray how college freshmen at a Japanese college transferred discoursal features in L1 represented by global text structure into L2 compositions. It also tried to clarify the relationships between the clarity of global text structure, the composition quality and other variables claimed to affect L2 composition, using a correlational analysis. The results revealed that clarity of global text structures in personal experience narratives (hereafter PEN) was highly correlated with composition quality in both L1 and L2 compositions, but that clarity of global structure in L1 was not correlated with that in L2. It was assumed that writers in L1 were not able to transfer L1 global text structures into L2 compositions for some reason including relatively low English proficiency.

Key Words   global text structure, transfer, personal experience narrative, variables in L2 writing

1. Introduction

Second language writing involves three major research orientations: text analytic, composing process, and social constructionist views of writing, and when viewed from the perspective of second language education, diverse biliterate situations need to be

considered such as the differences in individuals' histories and proficiency in L1 and L2, and SL writing shaped in education (Cumming, 1998). With such complicated theoretical perspectives, it is almost impossible to elucidate even one feature of L2 writing without taking into account the whole vision of the phenomena. With this premise in mind, the present study attempts to elucidate the relationships between global text structure and text quality of L2 compositions and variables affecting L2 compositions.

1.1. Background

Studies on global text structure in second language writing emerged in earlier contrastive rhetoric studies (Kaplan, 1966, 1972) where culture-specific rhetorical features in L2 were assumed to be derived from L1 rhetorical conventions, resulting in L1 interference in L2 writing. However, some studies have identified interference resulting from L1-L2 textual similarities (e.g. Mohan & Lo, 1985; Kubota, 1998), while others have not confirmed L1-L2 transfer. Yet, other studies have contended that it is difficult to generalize a typical rhetorical pattern of a language using a limited number of texts written by L2 learners on the ground that L2 texts reflect such complicated factors as L2 writing ability and proficiency, as well as writing ability, instructional background and writing experience (Kubota, 1992, 1998).

Because of such complex factors, later studies have employed a within-subject design, in which examination of both L1 texts and L2 texts written by the same writers is conducted, in order to elucidate the phenomenon of discoursal transfer from L1 to L2 (Indrasta, 1988; Cook, 1988; Kamel, 1989; Dunkelblau, 1990; Kamimura, 1996; Kubota, 1992, 1998; Hirose, 2001). Thus, these studies contrasting L1 and L2 writing in a within-subject design have revealed unique features of L2 compositions including their text structures, as represented by global text structure.

It is true, as Brown & Yule (1983) maintain, that coherence of text is assumed to be essentially the creation of the reader rather than a product of the text. However, as evidence in research in cognitive psychology suggests, it is also certain that the impact of text structuring itself is a contributing factor in the coherence of texts (van Diik & Kintsch, 1983; Anderson, 1990; Beck et al., 1991). As in Grabe & Kaplan's (1996) definition of text-based features of coherence (p.71), it is quite reasonable that text-based coherence is evident from the level of the sentence to the top-level

structuring of a text.

The following three distinct but interrelated levels of textual features have been investigated in contrastive rhetoric studies conduced so far: 1) cohesion, 2) coherence, and 3) super structure or global structure (Connor, 1996), and many contrastive studies mentioned above have investigated macro-level rhetorical features in the last category. The present study also focuses on such macro- or global textual features as those in 'ki-sho-ten-ketsu,' a typical Japanese organization pattern claimed to be evident in traditional Japanese writing, the location of a main idea or a summary statement, and inductive or deductive organization patterns. Thus, macro-structure realized in the relationships of adjacent sentence topics, as in the topical structure (Lautamatti, 1987), is out of the scope of the present study.

Earlier contrastive studies between Japanese and English argued that negative transfer of L1 rhetorical features was distinct in L2 compositions (Kaplan, 1966; Hinds, 1983, 1987, 1990). However, these arguments were not fully supported by empirical evidence but were based on their linguistic reflection or intuition, with probable variables not sufficiently taken into account.

In contrast, later studies such as Kubota (1992, 1998), Kamimura (1996), and Hirose (2001) have revealed unique features of rhetorical transfer, employing a within-subject design and taking into consideration critical variables influencing L2 writing such as L2 proficiency, L1 writing ability, metaknowledge on writing, writer's background, and writing process as portrayed by Hirose & Sasaki (1994) and Sasaki & Hirose (1996). For example, Kubota (1992) revealed transfer of writing skills rather than L1 rhetorical interference, indicating that students' use of similar or dissimilar rhetorical structures in the two languages investigated, Japanese and English, were dependent upon their varying conceptions about L1 and L2 rhetoric, their amount of experience in writing in English, and English proficiency. Also, Kamimura (1996) contrasted two versions of narrative compositions, Japanese and English, written by college sophomores in Japan in order to examine whether or not these two versions were interrelated in terms of syntactic complexity, idea units, and quality. Her results indicated that the Japanese compositions were generally correlated with English ones regarding these points, and that English compositions written by learners with high L2 proficiency had more features similar to their L1 compositions. Kamimura suggests that there may be a threshold English proficiency level at which composing in English

becomes similar to that in Japanese, and that one should have both writing expertise and an adequate level of L2 proficiency so that he or she can become an effective L2 writer. She also reports that well-written narrative compositions involved a clear narrative structure of story grammar in both languages. Kubota's (1998) later study, which contrasted L1 and L2 compositions, focusing on discourse patters such as an inductive style, reported that half of the writers employed similar patterns in L1 and L2, and that there was a positive correlation between Japanese and ESL organization scores but no negative transfer of culturally unique rhetorical patterns. She also maintains that L1 writing ability, English proficiency, and writing experience in English influenced the quality of ESL compositions. Furthermore, Hirose (2001) investigated rhetorical organizations of L1 and L2 texts written by two groups of Japanese learners of English, while writers' writing processes taken into account and their L2 proficiency levels controlled. The text structures examined were the location of main ideas and the macro-level rhetorical patterns such as explanation, specification, and introduction, and presence or absence of a summary statement. Her major findings are: 1) students with higher L2 proficiency are better writers both in L1 and L2; 2) most subjects employed deductive type rhetorical patterns in L2 compositions regardless of their L2 proficiency levels; 3) both groups used similar writing strategies; and 4) there was no clear relation between L2 proficiency level and organization patterns employed.

Based on the findings of these contrastive studies, the following key points must be confirmed for the present study. First, in deliberating the issue of rhetorical transfer, critical variables claimed to affect L2 writing must be taken into account: these are L2 proficiency, L1 writing ability, metaknowledge about writing, educational backgrounds in L1 and L2, and the writing process. Secondly, it is crucial to contrast only reasonable pairs of compositions written by subjects with comparable backgrounds. L1 narrative compositions written by one group with diverse backgrounds cannot be contrasted with L2 expository essays composed by the other with different backgrounds and varying L2 proficiency. The third point is that modes or genres that are more likely to produce similar global text structures both in L1 and L2 compositions would be promising in considering the relationships between such variables and rhetorical transfer. Many previous studies have analyzed expository writing on the assumption that subjects prefer particular structures in one language and different ones in the

other, as in the case of inductive and deductive patterns. However, if subjects preferred the same text structure in both languages, the differences in text structure to be found in their written products could be attributed to factors other than their cultural preference of a particular style. Finally, since applications of solid discourse theories on global text structure have been quite limited (Connor, 1996), it is mandatory to employ a well-known and solid theory.

Given these critical points concerning studies on global text structure done in contrastive perspectives, the present study seeks to clarify the relationships between composition quality in L1 and L2, clarity of global text structure, and variables claimed to affect L2 writing such as L2 proficiency, writing ability in L1, metaknowledge about writing, writing process in L1 and L2, and writers' backgrounds in L1 and L2 writing.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

The participants for the current study were 19 freshmen English majors (three males and 16 females) at a Japanese local private college. Their English proficiency was in the range of 332 to 440 in the Institutional TOEFL, and their experience of writing English was quite limited; translation of a few Japanese sentences into English, which is usually the case with 'English Composition' in Japanese high schools. Most of the students had not experienced writing English paragraphs or essays at the time of this data collection. This point seems especially important for the present study because the way they compose and the text structures to be produced may be affected by the instruction which the students have received. The researcher asked students to volunteer for the study, explaining to them about the purpose of this research. They were notified beforehand that extra points would be given for their tasks affecting the final grade of the course.

2.2. Procedure for Data Collection
2.2.1. Writing task

The following is the English translation of the prompts and directions provided for the subjects who were required to write two personal experience narrative compositions: one in English and the other in Japanese.

Directions:

(1) Describe the scariest experience you have ever had in English within 300 to 400 English words.

(2) Describe the funniest experience you have ever had in Japanese within 800 to 1000 Japanese letters.

(3) Start with the English composition first.

(4) The use of English-Japanese and Japanese-English dictionaries is permitted, but write the compositions by yourself. Do not ask for any assistance.

(5) Those who cannot type are permitted to use a pencil with soft lead.

The participants were given about 10 days around Golden Week to write the two compositions. It seemed unrealistic for college freshmen to finish two compositions in class unless they were in a testing condition. Instead, the researcher gave them sufficient time, 10 days, which is the usual amount of time given to freshmen in Japan to complete two compositions for homework. The topics for the two assignments were determined on the basis of the topic which Labov & Waletzky (1967) adopted in collecting personal experience narrative stories. The first topic was almost the same as the one they used, and the students were assumed to write PENs with typical PEN structures because of the similarity of the topics. Then, the second topic was decided on the grounds that this topic was also suited for generating PENs. Repetition of the same topic was avoided so that students' second compositions might not be influenced by the way they wrote the first. The length of the English composition was determined on the basis of the researcher's intuition about the freshmen's ability to compose essays in English based on previous experiences, taking into account the fact that most of them had never experienced composing in English. The participants were also instructed to follow the third direction, the order of two compositions, from English to Japanese. This was to avoid the influence of the Japanese composition on the English one. The use of English dictionaries was permitted, taking into account that the students' English proficiency was not necessarily sufficient. In addition, they were not allowed to ask for any assistance in writing their compositions.

2.2.2. Questionnaires

The participants were asked to fill in the following two questionnaires: 1)

Questionnaire on Participants' Backgrounds and 2) Post-writing Questionnaire on Composing Process.   Both questionnaires were filled out in a class hour on the day right after Golden Week, when the participants handed in their two versions of personal narrative compositions.   The latter one, asking about their composing processes, needed to be completed immediately after their submission while their memories were clear.

Questions of the former questionnaire were almost the same as those used in Sasaki & Hirose (1996).   It asked about participants' experience in studying in English-speaking countries, writing education received there, and what they had learned with respect to writing in Japanese and English.   In addition, the researcher added to the original several questions relating to the time spent on writing each composition, the use of dictionaries, the difficulty students felt in writing the compositions, and previous experience writing this type of composition.

The latter questionnaire was also adopted from Sasaki & Hirose (1996) but a minor revision was made so that the questions could effectively elicit responses from those who composed personal narrative compositions.   Most of the questions asked about the participants' memories of their composing processes or behaviors in writing Japanese and English compositions before, during and after writing.   The questionnaire was administered while their memories were clear.

2.2.3.   Metaknowledge test

Using questions in the questionnaires created by Sasaki & Hirose (1996), Hirose & Sasaki (2000), and Kitao & Kitao (1990), a metaknowledge test with 50 true-or-false type questions was designed so that learners' metaknowledge about English writing could be measured with a numerical value.   The original questionnaires asked students to provide written explanations, but such questions were excluded from the present metaknowledge test.   Also, several items were added to check students' metaknowledge about narrative compositions.

2.2.4.   English proficiency test

The students taking Freshmen Intensive English at the college had been required to take the Institutional TOEFL Test at the beginning and at the end of the academic year so that the scores could be used to assess their improvement in English proficiency.

2.3. Analytic Evaluation of Narrative Compositions

All the personal experience narrative compositions written by the participants, both in L1 and L2, were analytically evaluated in terms of the quality of the compositions.

2.3.1. Analytic scale for measuring composition quality

For the present study, the following composition evaluation criteria designed by Sasaki & Hirose (1999) was employed: 1) clarity of the theme (10 points); 2) appeal to the readers (10 points); 3) expression (10 points); 4) organization (10 points); 5) knowledge of language forms (10 points); and 6) social awareness (10 points). The original evaluation criteria were designed for evaluating Japanese compositions written by Japanese students, but an English translation was also available. For the present study, the original Japanese version was used for evaluating Japanese compositions and the English translation was used for English compositions.

2.3.2. Raters

Personal experience narrative compositions were analytically evaluated by two Japanese native evaluators and two American counterparts. One of the evaluators for the Japanese compositions was a professor teaching Japanese composition at the college, and the other was also a professor and professional writer. As for American evaluators, one was a professor with a Ph.D. teaching English including composition and rhetoric at colleges in and outside Japan. The other was also a professor with a Ph.D. who had worked as an editor for a newspaper in America. Judging from their careers and teaching experiences, all four evaluators were qualified as experienced raters.

2.3.3. Scoring procedure

The researcher explained the criteria to all the raters and provided a brief practice session for each rater. They all agreed on the validity of the evaluation criteria. The raters were asked to select one point out of the score range of 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest) for each item of the evaluation criteria. Since there were six evaluation items in the criteria, the highest possible score was 60 points. All the evaluators did their evaluation work at home.

2.4. Text Analysis

2.4.1. Labov & Waletzky's PEN model

In order to operationalize global text structure observed in PEN compositions, Labov & Waletzky's (1967, 1997) narrative theory needs to be clarified here. Through their extensive interviews conducted for sociolinguistic research, they found that a well-developed narrative had an overall structure which contained fairly fixed ordered sets of clauses with specific functions, as in the following descriptions: (See Johnstone (2002) for a developed version.)

1) Orientation

A group of free clauses which comes before the first narrative and functions to orient listeners in terms of person, place, time and behavioral situation.

2) Complication

The main body of narrative clauses consisting of a series of events which lead to their climax or the point of suspense, and the complications are usually ended with a result.

3) Evaluation

Statements of what is interesting or unusual about the story or of why the audience should keep listening, often appearing before the result or resolution or throughout the narrative.

4) Resolution

Defining the result of a narrative while releasing tension.

5) Coda

The coda functions as a device for returning the verbal perspective to the present moment, showing that the story is over.

On the basis of this narrative theory, it was assumed that the writers would provide such narrative structures as above when they composed PENs, which was reported in Martin & Rothery's (1986) L1 composition study.

2.4.2. Scoring procedure

In the present study, the global structure of the participants' compositions was analyzed not by the researcher but by the raters who evaluated the quality of the compositions. This was to avoid the researcher's subjective evaluations on the global

text structure in the participants' compositions.   The following PEN Global Structure Evaluation Sheet was provided for the evaluators, together with the sheet explaining the PEN features described above.   A brief practice session to make them familiar with the PEN features was provided for each evaluator.   The raters evaluated the narrative structures of the compositions after they analytically evaluated the quality of the compositions.

PEN Global Structure Evaluation Sheet (English Version)

Please choose the number that corresponds to the characteristic of the composition for each component of PEN features.

Orientation	1	2	3	4	5
Complication	1	2	3	4	5
Resolution	1	2	3	4	5
Coda	1	2	3	4	5

Scoring Guideline
1.   The feature is not present at all.
2.   The feature is present to some extent but weak.
3.   The feature is present.
4.   The feature is evident.
5.   The feature is quite strong and evident.

Labov & Waletzky's original model included a narrative component named 'evaluation' which referred to narrators' comment on what was interesting or unusual about the story or on why the audience should keep listening.   However, this commentary tends to appear in isolation in different places, before the result or resolution or throughout the narrative, and it is quite difficult to pinpoint its existence in relation to the global text structure of the personal experience narrative.   Therefore, it was intentionally excluded from the study.

2.5. Data Analysis Procedure

For the present correlation analysis, the following scores were obtained from the subjects:

1) Composition evaluation score (Japanese and English) (60 possible points each)

2) Metaknowledge test score (50 points)

3) English proficiency score

4) Global text structure scores for two compositions (Japanese and English) (20 points)

5) Scores on the composing process (Japanese and English) (20 points for each)
   Scores representing the number of items marked as behaviors done in the composing process in the Post-writing Questionnaire on Composing Process

6) Scores on Educational background concerning writing (Japanese and English) (11 points for Japanese and 12 points for English)
   Scores representing the numbers of items which the participants reported they learned concerning L1 and L2 writing

7) Time spent on composing L1 and L2 personal experience narratives

Regarding 1) and 4), inter-rater reliability of over 0.8 was achieved, since the researcher worked as the third rater when discrepancy between the two raters was wide.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

There are a few points to be noted about the descriptive statistics of the variables for the analysis (See Table 1). The first point is the subjects' TOEFL scores. The researcher selected the freshmen for the study so that the influence of English writing education at college could be minimal, but their mean score achieved right after their entrance was 385.5, which may not be high enough for college freshmen. The second point is fairly low scores in educational backgrounds in Japanese and English composition. This fact may reflect that educational emphases in high school English composition had not been placed on composing, and that the subjects had not been trained to compose even in Japanese. The third point is the time taken for the two compositions. As is expected, the subject took over twice as much time in writing

English as they took in writing Japanese.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Med.	SD	SE Mean
TOEFL	385.5	387	32.9	7.6
Metaknowledge	38.4	39	3.7	0.9
J comp. score	34.5	34.5	6.6	1.5
E comp. score	32.6	32	7.8	1.8
J structure	13.6	13.5	2.1	0.5
E structure	12.7	12	3.4	0.8
J background	4	4	2.1	0.5
E background	3.7	4	1.7	0.4
J revision	6	4	4.3	1
E revision	7.2	7	3.9	0.9
J time	1.6	1	1.3	0.3
E time	3.4	3	2.2	0.5

$N = 19$

3.2. *t*-tests

The following results from the *t*-tests between Japanese PEN compositions and English PENs indicate that there was no statistically significant difference between the means of the pairs investigated, except for one variable, time spent for the compositions.

Table 2. *t*–test Results between Japanese and English

	J. Mean (SD)	E. Mean (SD)	t-value
Comp. score	34.5 (1.5)	32.6 (1.8)	0.82
Global Text St.	3.6 (2.1)	12.7 (3.4)	0.97
Background	4.0 (2.1)	3.7 (1.7)	0.5
Revision	6.0 (4.3)	7.2 (3.9)	-0.87
Time spent	1.6 (1.3)	3.4 (2.2)	-3.00**

$N = 19$,   ** $p <$ .01

3.3. Correlation Analysis

Table 3 shows the results of the correlation analysis between variables regarding L1 and L2 PENs written by the subjects.

High levels of correlation were detected between the following pairs: 1) Japanese composition score and Japanese structure; 2) English composition score and English structure; and 3) Japanese revision and English revision.   It is noteworthy, concerning 2) and 3), that ratings of clarity of narrative structure are highly correlated with composition evaluation scores not only in L1 but also in L2.   In other words, compositions with clear PEN structures correlate highly with high composition quality in L1 and L2.   Also, for some reason, the number of items checked as 'done' in participants' process of revising Japanese compositions, not English ones, correlate highly with that of English compositions.

Moderate levels of correlation were found between the following pairs: 1) TOEFL and Japanese composition scores/ Japanese composition background (negative); 2) English composition score and time spent on Japanese compositions and on English compositions; 3) English structure and time spent on English compositions; 4) Japanese composition background and English composition background; 5) Japanese revisions and time spent on Japanese compositions; and 6) English revision and time spent on Japanese compositions.   It should be noted that TOEFL scores were correlated neither with English composition scores nor with English structure evaluation scores, which is different from the results in earlier studies.   Relatively low English proficiency might be related to these facts.

Also, there was no correlation between L1 structures and L2 structures.   It could be possible that L1 writers were not able to transfer their PEN structures in L1 into L2 compositions for some reason.   In relation to this point, Table 4 illustrates the patterns of transfer in terms of PEN structure observed in two versions of compositions.   The two versions of compositions were divided into the following three categories: those with very clear PEN features, fairly clear PEN features, and unclear PEN features, depending on the evaluation scores.   That is, scores over 0.5 *SD* points higher than the mean are labeled as 'very clear,' those under 0.5 *SD* points lower than the mean as 'unclear,' and those in the middle as 'fair.'   Using these categories, their transfer patterns were portrayed, but no special concentration on a particular pattern was observed.   However, the following two subjects showed interesting patterns: Pattern

(1) in Negative Patterns and Pattern (6) in Positive Patterns.   The former ranked 4th in TOEFL was not able to transfer her clear PEN structure in Japanese into English, but the latter ranked 1st in TOEFL was able to transfer the clear structure into Japanese into English successfully.   Thus, English proficiency may not be the only factor that can explain their success or failure in their transfer.

Table 3. Inter-correlations between Variables concerning PEN Compositions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	—											
2	.35	—										
3	.48*	.33	—									
4	.17	.06	.30	—								
5	.24	.32	.77***	−.06	—							
6	.09	−.03	.37	.83***	.10	—						
7	−.46*	−.32	−.31	−.18	−.24	−.13	—					
8	−.04	−.08	−.13	−.04	−.17	−.06	.68***	—				
9	−.14	.20	−.28	.14	−.33	−.01	−.01	.02	—			
10	.07	.34	−.15	.32	−.29	.01	−.13	.17	.73***	—		
11	−.08	−.06	−.22	.47*	−.40	.26	.08	.31	.57**	.47*	—	
12	−.01	−.13	.11	.61***	−.26	.52*	.25	.39	.09	.15	.43	—

$N = 19$,   *$p <$ .05,   **$p <$ .02,   ***$p <$ .01

Each number represents variables as follows:

1. TOEFL   2. Metaknowledge   3. Japanese Comp. Score   4. English Comp. Score

5. Japanese Structure   6. English Structure   7. Japanese Comp. Background

8. English Comp. Background   9. Japanese Revisions   10. English Revisions

11. Time spent on J. Comp.   12. Time spent on E. Comp.

Table 4. Patterns of PEN structure transfer

Negative Patterns

(1) Very Clear PEN features in L1 but unclear in L2	1
(2) Very Clear PEN features in L1 but fair in L2	2
(3) Unclear PEN features in L1 but very clear in L2	2
(4) Unclear PEN features in L1 but fair in L2	3
(5) Fairly clear PEN in L1 but unclear in L2	3

Positive Patterns

(6) Very Clear PEN features in both L1 and L2	1
(7) Fairly clear PEN features in both L1 and L2	3
(8) Fairly clear PEN features in L1 and very clear in L2	3
(9) Unclear PEN features in both L1 and L2	1

$N = 19$

The present study is exploratory in nature and cannot generate any conclusive remarks on the research findings but it might provide some future research topics and directions. The following points could be argued on the basis of the results of the present study.

The first point is that the PEN textual features, which were claimed to be present in oral narratives by native speakers and L1 compositions, are evident in L1 and L2 PEN compositions written by Japanese college students. PENs are fundamental and universal in many cultures, putting memories in order while providing meanings to each event and the whole personal history. Thus, similar findings could be detected in compositions in other L2s as well.

Secondly, a clear PEN structure tends to be observed in highly rated compositions, although the fact does not ensure even a causal relationship between the two. Similar findings on top-level discourse structures were reported in L1 composition studies (e.g. Martin & Rothery, 1987) and L2 studies such as Kubota (1998) and Connor (1987). For example, Connor's (1987) study on argumentative essays revealed that compositions with higher evaluations tended to follow a specific organization pattern across the languages investigated. Also, when viewed from the aspect of L2 reading, the fact was confirmed in such studies as Carrell (1984, 1985) that clear top-level

rhetorical structures facilitated readers' text comprehension. This fact may have contributed to high evaluations of compositions with clear PEN structures in the present study. The finding from the present study seems to correspond to these studies.

The third point is that L1 writers did not transfer their clear PEN structures in L1 compositions into L2 compositions. The researcher selected freshmen for the study so that the influence of L2 writing education in college on their transfer of global text structure could be minimal, but their English proficiency was not high enough. It may be possible that the subjects were not able to transfer the PEN structure for such reasons as their relatively low English proficiency, as suggested by Kamimura (1996) that there might be a threshold level of English proficiency at which composing in English is similar to that in Japanese.

4. Conclusion

The present study investigated the relationships between clarity of global text structure, composition quality and other variables affecting L2 composition, using a correlational analysis. It revealed that the clarity of global structures was highly correlated with composition quality in both L1 and L2. It also showed that L2 proficiency was not correlated with composition quality for some reason. It was also observed that writers in L1 were not able to transfer L1 global text structures into L2 compositions.

The present study has attempted to include variables affecting L2 writing, but it lacks a perspective of writing as a social construction. Also, facts assumed from a correlation analysis on the basis of marks in questionnaires, tests and analytic ratings must be supplemented by qualitative text analyses, investigations of the actual writing process, and detailed surveys of learners' backgrounds. Furthermore, subjects with higher L2 proficiency could have produced different results. Finally, the present study could be conducted with other modes or genres including expository or argumentative essays, which are more frequent and desired in college English writing than PENs, and with other levels of text structures such as topical structure and cohesive device as well. Thus, the whole picture of discoursal transfer in L2 writing could be clearer.

Unlike the pedagogical orientation in the process approach, where formal features

were less emphatic and composing freely was encouraged, sensitivity to and knowledge of formal text features on the global discourse level have been more emphasized in the recent L2 writing education (Johns, 1997; Swales, 1990; Hyland, 2003).   The present study may have provided supporting findings for such pedagogical directions.

References

Anderson. J. (1990). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. Oxford and New York: Freeman.

Beck, I., McKeown, M., Sinatra, G., & Loxterman, J. (1991). Revising social studies text from a text-processing perspective: Evidence of improved comprehensibility. *Reading Research Quarterly 26*, 251-276.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge, England and New York: Cambridge UP.

Carrell, P. (1984). Evidence of a formal schema in second language comprehension. *Language Learning*, *34* (2), 87-112.

Carrel, P. (1985). Facilitating ESL reading by teaching text structure. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19* (4), 727-753.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric*. Cambridge and NY: Cambridge UP.

Connor, U. (1987). Argumentative patterns in student essays: Cross-cultural differences. In U. Connor and R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts* (pp. 57-71). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Cook, M. (1988). The validity of the contrastive rhetoric hypothesis as it relates to Spanish-speaking advanced ESL students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *49* (9), 2567A.

Cumming, A. (1998). Theoretical perspectives on writing. *Annual Review of Applied*

Linguistics, *18*, 61-78.

Dunkelblau, H. (1990). A contrastive study of the organizational structure and stylistic elements of Chinese and English expository writing by Chinese high school students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *51* (4), 1143A.

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. London and New York: Longman.

Hinds, J. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, *3* (2), 183-195.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor and R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141-152). Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai. In U. Connor & A. M. Jones (Eds.), *Coherence in writing: Research and pedagogical perspective* (pp. 87-110). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Hirose, K. (2001). Persuasive writing in L1 and L2: A look at Japanese EFL students' rhetorical organization strategies. *JACET Bulletin*, *33*, 43-56.

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

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP.

Indrasuta, C. (1988). Narrative styles in the writing of Thai and American students. In A. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages and cultures* (pp. 206-226). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Johns, A. M. (1997). *Text, Role, and Context.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP.

Johnstone, B. (2002). *Discourse Analysis*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

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. (1996). Composing in Japanese as a first language and English as a foreign language: A study of narrative writing. *RELC Journal*, *27*, 47-69.

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

Kaplan, R. B. (1972). *The anatomy of rhetoric: Prolegomena to a functional theory to rhetoric*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.

Kitao, K., & Kitao, K. (1990). *Understanding English paragraphs.* Tokyo: Eichosha.

Kubota, R. (1992). *Contrastive rhetoric of Japanese and English: A critical approach.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.

Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of L1-L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, (1), 69-100.

Lautamatti, L. (1987). Observation in the development of the topic in simplified discourse. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 87-114). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analyses: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts: Proceedings of the 1996 annual spring meeting of the American Ethnography Society* (pp. 12-44). Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press.

Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1997). Narrative analyses: Oral versions of personal experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, *7* (1-4), 3-38.

Martin, J. R., & Rothery, J. (1986). What a functional approach can show teachers. In B. Couture (Ed.), *Functional approach to writing: Research perspectives* (pp. 241-265). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Mohan, B., & Lo, W. (1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: Transfer and developmental factors. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19* (3), 515-534.

Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning*, *46* (1), 137-174.

Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1999). Development of an analytic rating scale for Japanese L1 writing. *Language Testing*, *16* (4), 457-478.

Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP.

van Diik, T., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension.* London and New York: Academic Press.