

**BI-DIRECTIONAL RHETORICAL TRANSFER  
IN THE WRITING OF KOREAN LEARNERS OF ENGLISH:  
A CASE STUDY OF THREE GROUPS**

**HYE YOON CHO**

*University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

**ABSTRACT**

Contrastive rhetoric (Kaplan, 1966) holds that rhetorical aspects of second language (L2) writing are strongly influenced by the writers' first language (L1) and culture, causing negative transfer. However, Scollon (1997), Spack (1997), and Zamel (1997) have expressed concern with the difficulty of identifying the direction of L1-L2 transfer because of intercultural and interlinguistic influences that derive from globalization (Kubota & Lehner, 2004).

The present study employs critical contrastive rhetoric in a partial replication of Kubota (1998) and Yoon (2008), investigating the direction of the rhetorical transfer occurring in Korean students' essays in Korean (L1) and English (L2). The current study contributes to the comparative study of Korean and English because existing studies on Korean L2 writers of English (e.g., Choi, 2006; Ryu, 2006) are primarily focused on transfer from L1 to L2. This study investigates not only differences in individuals' L1 and L2 writings but also differences among three groups divided by their writing and learning experiences. These three groups were asked to write two argumentative essays on the same topic, one in their L1 and another in their L2, with a week interval between the two essays. The analysis of the study was conducted in terms of: (a) location of the main idea, (b) macro level patterns, and (c) text units of organizational patterns (Choi, 2006; Kubota 1998). A textual analysis of the data was undertaken and triangulated with the writers' responses to a questionnaire.

The current study mainly explored the group differences in (a) the similarity between L1 and L2 essays; (b) the directionality of transfer, either from the L1 or from the L2; and (c) the causes of the transfer. By investigating groups of students with different amounts of previous writing instruction, this study is able to argue that Korean L2 writers of English are influenced in their rhetorical choices more by their learning experiences than by negative L1 to L2 transfer.

## INTRODUCTION

In the field of second language writing, cross-linguistic influence has been an issue for several decades. Kaplan (1966), who is a pioneer in the field of contrastive rhetoric (hereafter, CR), proposed that while English writing follows a linear development in its structure, other language groups (which he called Semitic, Oriental, Romance, and Russian) have non-linear constructions of development, which affect English as second language (ESL) students' writing negatively. Kaplan's (1966) innovative work triggered many studies that examined the differences in rhetoric patterns across languages and cultures (Choi, 1988; Connor, 1996; Eggington, 1987; Hinds, 1983a, 1987, 1990; Purves, 1998). Most of these studies supported the existence of rhetorical structure differences and the influence they exert on L2 writing.

Traditional CR has provided opportunities for L2 learners to recognize the dominant structure forms of languages so that they can access social and cultural power. On the other hand, CR has been criticized because it has emphasized cultural differences between English and the English learners' first languages and conceptualized L2 learners as culturally deficient (Kubota & Lehner, 2004). Many studies show that English is typically illustrated as linear, direct, logical and deductive, while other languages, especially Asian languages (e.g., Korean, Japanese, and Chinese) are defined as non-linear, indirect, illogical, and inductive (e.g., Hinds, 1983a, 1983b, 1990). This gives L2 learners an impression that English rhetoric is superior, and they may think that their L2 writing is doomed to be deficient due to transfer from their L1 rhetorical patterns.

Several studies (e.g., as early as Berman, 1994; and as recently as Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002; 2004) have investigated the direction of transfer, whether from L1 to L2 or from L2 to L1. These studies discovered that the transfer of writing skills could occur in both directions depending on learners' experiences and training in L1 and L2 writing. This means that transfer may have effects on how L2 writers construct their writing in both languages.

The present study investigates how bidirectional transfer occurs in the writing (both in English and Korean) of Korean learners of English. The study focuses on L2 to L1 transfer, because compared to studies on the existence of distinct L1 rhetorical structures and their influence on L2 writing, which are common (Choi, 1988; Connor, 1996; Eggington, 1987; Hinds, 1983a, 1987, 1990; Purves, 1998), this is an area that has been less studied.

### ***Questioning Traditional Contrastive Rhetoric***

In the years following Kaplan's (1966) study, a number of studies began to offer empirical evidence against his claims. Mohan and Lo (1985) claimed that the "Oriental" writing style (e.g., indirect and inductive style), defined and named by Kaplan (1966), was not an issue for Chinese students when organizing English essays. Rather, it was a matter of the emphasis in the English instruction that students were exposed to. They found that English writing teachers in Hong Kong tended to focus more on sentence correctness, rather than the organization of the essay, compared to teachers in Canada. They also pointed out that even for native writers of English, the development of rhetorical organization ability occurs later and is significantly affected by past learning experience.

In 1997, three scholars criticized CR due to its intensive emphasis on cultural differences: Scollon (1997), Spack (1997), and Zamel (1997). Scollon (1997) argued that many researchers focusing on CR were concerned about the structure of the language, but not the content of the text (e.g., strategies of persuasion, audience influences). He claimed that there should be a clearer distinction between structural studies (contrastive poetics) and rhetoric studies (contrastive rhetoric). According to Scollon, as researchers and teachers, we need to be more clearly aware of reader interactions and interpretive processes, not just the structure of the text. Spack (1997) pointed out that teachers and researchers should see students as individuals, not members of cultural communities, in order to understand their processes of learning how to write, rather than generalizing about learners based on their cultural identities. Zamel (1997) also claimed that teachers who see "L2 learners as bound by their cultures could be trapped by their own cultural tendency to reduce, categorize, and generalize" (p. 342). This generalization or categorization, according to Zamel, constrains teachers' understanding of students as L2 writers. She pointed out that teachers and researchers need to attend to the complexity, variability, and unpredictability of cultures.

Around the same time, Kubota (1997, 1998) also contributed a critical view on the cultural dichotomy between East and West by contributing empirical studies on English and Japanese writing. In one study (1997), she showed that the Japanese writing organization (*ki-shoo-ten-ketsu*) noted by Hinds (1983a) was no longer preferred in Japanese writing, due to linguistic and educational influences from the West since the mid-nineteenth century. In a second study, she examined whether Japanese university students use the same patterns of rhetoric in their English

and Japanese persuasive and expository essays and how those patterns affect their writings.<sup>1</sup> Her results showed that not all of the writers used similar patterns in their L1 and L2. Furthermore, there was a tendency for L1-L2 transfer of writing skills rather than negative transfer from L1-specific rhetoric.

The critique of traditional CR was made more explicit by Kubota and Lehner (2004). These authors revisited critical CR studies that “incorporate key concepts drawn from postmodernism, poststructuralism, postcolonialism, and critical pedagogy which are already being integrated in the larger field of applied linguistics” (p. 9). This alternative perspective challenged the assumption that English is superior to other languages and that writing is a shadow of cultural thought patterns rather than social practices. They charged that traditional CR has a “reductionist, deterministic, prescriptive and essentialist orientation” (p. 10). Kubota and Lehner also suggested that researchers and teachers need to consider plurality, complexity, hybridity, and unpredictability in their research and teaching. However, Connor (2005) responded to this suggestion, insisting that Kubota and Lehner underestimated the concept of traditional CR and failed to recognize that it has provided L2 writers a diverse range of rhetorical approaches, rather than simply replacing the writing styles of their mother tongues and cultures. In their response to Connor, Kubota and Lehner (2005) recognized the growing diversity and evolving nature of traditional CR, but they claimed that it still relied on the concept of cultural difference and its negative effects on L2 writers. It seems that we are still in a battlefield where many discussions of traditional CR and critical CR are ongoing.

### ***Bi-directional Transfer***

When people learn new languages, they rely on their previous language learning experiences, a crucial factor that affects learners’ L2 acquisition and applies to all L2 learners (Ortega, 2009). Between the 1960s and 1980, the term *transfer*, which originated in behaviorist psychology, was criticized due to its “unwanted association” with behaviorism (Ringbom, 2006, p. 30). Cross-

---

<sup>1</sup> *ki-shoo-ten-ketsu* is a rhetorical organization which is claimed to be pervasive in Japanese writing. Hinds (1983a, p. 188) described its four steps as follows:

*ki*: First begin one’s argument.

*shoo*: Next, develop that.

*ten*: At the point where this development is finished, turn the idea to a subtheme where there is a connection, but not directly connected association (to the major theme).

*ketsu*: Last, bring all of this together and reach a conclusion.

linguistic influence could be a better term, but since “the word transfer still is the most commonly used term, and today appears to have lost at least most of its associations to structuralism and behaviourism” (Ringbom, 2006, p. 30), researchers in SLA use both terms interchangeably.

Many of the studies that have explored cross-linguistic influence on writing (Choi, 1988; Connor, 1996; Eggington, 1987; Hinds, 1983a, 1987, 1990; Purves, 1998) have focused on the influence on the L2, based on traditional SLA approaches to transfer that usually investigate the unidirectional influence of L1 knowledge on the acquisition and use of an L2. However, there are some studies that focus on bi-directional transfer. Bi-directional transfer may be approached from two perspectives: the SLA and grammar and lexis-specific point of view (Kecskes & Papp, 2003) and the viewpoint of L2 writing and literacy (Berman, 1994; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002, 2004, 2008; Shi, 2003).

Kecskes and Papp (2003) proposed that bi-directional transfer could occur depending on social contexts, for which they offered the following six categories:

1. L2 or foreign language (FL) serves as lingua franca, for instance, in countries such as Nigeria (English) or Senegal (French);
2. pidgin and creole;
3. immigrants studying the language of their new L2 community, which affects the use of their L1 significantly;
4. bilingual L1 acquisition: the child is exposed to two languages from birth, (e.g., De Houwer, 1990);
5. both languages are present in the same country or community, but one is dominant (Swedish or Finnish in Finland or English or Gaelic in Ireland);
6. instructed foreign language in a relatively homogeneous language community.

(pp. 247–248)

Focusing on the last case in their chapter, Kecskes and Papp (2003) mentioned that L1 performance could be affected by the L2 if “exposure to the target language is intensive but is not supported by the constant presence of the target language culture” (p. 248). To support this argument, they refer to research (Cunningham & Graham, 2000; Kecskes & Papp, 1995, 2000a, 2000b) that illustrates that “the emerging FL influences the use of the L1 in the foreign language environment, and that this process may lead to the development of multi-competence (Cook,

1991, 1992)” (cited in Kecskes & Papp, 2003, p. 248). As a result of these studies, they proposed that intensive foreign language learning as well as bilingual development might cause the appearance of a Common Underlying Conceptual Base (CUCB) that is responsible for the operation of two language channels (Kecskes & Papp, 2003).

From the viewpoint of L2 writing and literacy, bi-directional transfer occurs depending on learners’ experiences and training in L1 and L2 writing. Berman (1994) compared the effect of instruction in English (L2) and Icelandic (L1) in secondary school. The researcher found that after 14 essay writing classes in either one of the two languages, students were graded equally on their persuasive writing in both languages. Berman (1994) reported that instruction in persuasive writing was similar in both languages regarding structural elements such as thesis statement, argument, and conclusion. It is possible that the similar textual features in English and Icelandic, along with similar writing instruction, would support the transferability of writing skills between the two languages. Shi (2003) investigated the biliterate/bicultural intellectual identity of Chinese scholars who had been awarded graduate degrees in the West. By interviewing returning scholars, she illustrated the issue of the “washback” effect of L2 training on L1 writing. Almost all of the participants were promoting an English approach, which could be classified as direct and linear, not only in their own writing, but also in their teaching in both Chinese and English. Also, in an analysis of Japanese exam-preparatory essay training, Kobayashi and Rinnert (2002, 2004) found that there were similarities between English and Japanese writing in argumentative and persuasive writing regarding the logic of organizing ideas, initial position of the main idea, and development of details in the body after the thesis statement. This finding shows that transfer of writing skills can occur in both directions, and opens the possibility that either language may have an effect on L2 writers’ construction of their writing in the two languages.

### ***Previous Studies on Korean and English***

According to Kaplan’s (1966, 1972) categorization of rhetoric, Korean is identified as one of the languages that uses an “Oriental” rhetoric style that is characterized by an indirect approach to a theme. According to Yoon (2008), CR studies in Korean have been of two distinctive types: (a) those that examine ESL writing by Korean learners of English and look at whether and how L1 transfer occurs and (b) those that investigate Korean L1 writing and its culture-specific rhetorical features. Most studies are in the first category and have been conducted by native

Korean researchers who examined culturally specific rhetorical features that may influence L2 writing (Che Pyun, 2001; Choi, 2006; Choi, 1988; Kim, 2005; Ryu, 2006).

Most recently, Yoon (2008) investigated the directional transfer of rhetorical organization in L1 and L2 argumentative essays written by a group of sixteen Korean graduate students who were enrolled at two different schools in the U.S. He found that while the English essays followed the so-called Western rhetorical pattern recommended for the genre, the Korean essays showed no dominant patterns. He also reported that the transfer occurred bi-directionally. He suggested that L2 writers could be affected by previous writing instruction and writing experience. In the present research, the focus is on bi-directional transfer, and especially transfer from the L2 to the L1.

### ***Purpose of the Study***

Ortega (2009) pointed out that more research is needed on bidirectional transfer in order to draw conclusions about crosslinguistic influence. As discussed above, Kecskes and Papp (2003) also suggested that extensive research was needed to investigate bidirectional transfer in specific circumstances. In addition, the existing studies on Korean L2 writers of English (Che Pyun, 2001; Choi, 2006; Choi, 1988; Kim, 2005; Ok, 1991; Ryu, 2006) are all primarily focused on L1 to L2 transfer. As bidirectional transfer has not been a common object of inquiry, the present study attempts to fill this gap by examining how bidirectional transfer occurs in the English and Korean writing of Korean students. The study specifically focuses on L2 to L1 transfer, since studies on the existence of distinct rhetorical structures and its influence on L2 writing are frequent (Choi, 1988; Connor, 1996; Eggington, 1987; Hinds, 1983a, 1987, 1990; Purves, 1998).

The current study involves three different groups. Group 1 was comprised of Korean university students who were in an EFL context and did not have intensive English writing experience but had sufficient English knowledge to write a reasonably well developed argumentative essay in the L2. Group 2 included undergraduate exchange students from Korea in the U.S. who had been exposed to academic English for at least one semester (16 weeks) in their L2 academic settings but no more than two semesters (32 weeks). Group 3 was made up of Korean graduate students who had experiences of one year or longer of engagement with writing in English in their L2 academic context.

The present study is a partial replication of Kubota's (1998) and Yoon's (2008) studies. It

also models its textual-analytical procedures on Kubota (1998), Yoon (2008), and Choi (2006) in terms of the three aspects of organizational patterns (location of the main idea, macro level patterns, and text units), and it adapts the questionnaire from Yoon (2008). The purpose of the study is to investigate the following three research questions:

1. How similar or dissimilar are the L1 and L2 essays written by the three groups, with regard to three textual-rhetorical dimensions?
2. If there is any transfer, what directions for transfer are observed? and
3. If rhetorical transfers are found in the essays by any or all of the groups, how can these transfers, especially L2 to L1 transfer, be explained?

## METHODOLOGY

### *Participants*

As mentioned, the study investigated three groups of participants who were all L2 English learners from an L1 Korean background and differed systematically in their relative experience with L2 writing. Each group had 10 people and the total number of the participants was thirty. Tables 1 through 3 display the profiles of each group. Each participant was assigned a two-digit ID with W (abbreviated from writer), where the first digit classifies the group the participants belong to and the second digit indicates the random assignment of the 10 participants within that group. For example, if a participant's ID is W21, it indicates she is the first writer in Group 2.

Group 1 consisted of ten undergraduate students who were majoring in English language and linguistics at a large Korean university in the Seoul area. Despite their major being English, they had little need for writing in English, as their courses were based mostly on reading and listening. Their profiles are shown in Table 1. Most of the students were juniors and only one student was in his or her senior year. The participants in Group 1 did not have intensive English writing instruction or experience, nor did they have previous experience studying English abroad. Six participants had official English test scores. Four of them had taken the TOEIC, which does not have a required writing test, and two (W12 and W18) of them had taken the TOEFL. For the sake of comparison, all of the TOEIC scores were converted to equivalent TOEFL scores.

Table 1  
*Profiles of Group 1 (n=10)*

Participant ID	Age	Academic Status	Self-reported English Proficiency Score (TOEFL)*	Previous English Abroad Experience	Counter-balancing of Language	
					First Task	Second Task
W11	28	Senior	519	0	Korean	English
W12	20	Junior	590	0	English	Korean
W13	20	Junior	575	0	English	Korean
W14	22	Junior	555	0	Korean	English
W15	27	Junior	565	0	Korean	English
W16	24	Junior	None	0	English	Korean
W17	24	Junior	None	0	English	Korean
W18	23	Junior	567	0	Korean	English
W19	24	Junior	None	0	English	Korean
W10	25	Junior	None	0	Korean	English

\* TOEFL scores of W11, W13, W14, and W15 were converted from their TOEIC scores (W11: 675, W13: 815, W14: 765, W15: 790) based on ETS' score range comparison table between TOEFL and TOEIC (<http://www.etscanada.ca/teachers/compare.php>). All TOEFL scores were converted from CBT or iBT to PBT test scores.

It was important to ascertain that all participants in Group 1 had only minimal experience with and instruction in L2 English writing. The questionnaire survey revealed that W12 had not had any instruction before taking the TOEFL. He reported that he had tried to memorize the model essays and imitate them. W18 took a preparation class that met twice a week for two hours over a two-month period. I decided to include these two participants because W12 had not received any writing instruction in an educational setting, and while W18 had taken a writing class for two months, the amount of instruction received in that class was less than in a one semester class that met twice a week for sixteen weeks.

Table 2  
*Profiles of Group 2 (n=10)*

Participant ID	Age	Academic Status	Self-reported English Proficiency Score (TOEFL)*	Length of Stay in the U.S. (Months)		Counter-balancing of Language	
				As Exchange Student	Previous English Abroad Experience	First Task	Second Task
W21	21	Junior	573	9	0	Korean	English
W22	22	Senior	560	4	0	English	Korean
W23	27	Junior	563	8	0	English	Korean
W24	22	Senior	590	4	1	English	Korean
W25	22	Senior	573	5	0	Korean	English
W26	22	Senior	567	4	0	English	Korean
W27	21	Junior	593	5	0	English	Korean
W28	21	Junior	553	4	2	Korean	English
W29	20	Junior	573	4	0	Korean	English
W20	26	Senior	553	4	0	English	Korean

\* All TOEFL scores were converted from CBT or iBT to PBT test.

Ten Korean undergraduate exchange students in the United States participated as Group 2, whose profiles are presented in Table 2. They majored in a variety of unrelated fields such as computer science, tourism, and education. Five of the participants were juniors while the remaining five were seniors. All participants had stayed in the U.S. for at least one semester of experience within their L2 academic setting. Their average period of stay (including previous studying English abroad experience) in English speaking countries was 5.2 months. All of them had TOEFL scores (Average 567 in PBT), since it is a requirement for exchange students at the institution.

In Group 3, ten Korean graduate students in the United States participated. Their profiles are shown in Table 3. Seven of the participants were majoring in applied linguistics, one of them was in the linguistics department, and two of them were philosophy majors. They had stayed in the U.S. for at least one year in the academic setting. Even though one of the participants (W31) was a first-year master's student, he had had a previous eight-month experience as an exchange student. Therefore, I decided to include his writing in the analysis. The participants had a TOEFL score average of 639 on the PBT. Three of them were doctoral students while the others were master's students.

Table 3  
*Profiles of Group 3 (n=10)*

Participant ID	Age	Academic Status	Self-reported English Proficiency Score (TOEFL)*	Length of Stay in the U.S. (Months)		Counter-balancing of Language	
				Graduate Level	Previous English Abroad Experience	First Task	Second Task
W31	27	MA	633	4	8	Korean	English
W32	32	MA	637	24	0	English	Korean
W33	24	MA	653	15	0	English	Korean
W34	30	MA	624	14	6	English	Korean
W35	28	MA	637	16	0	English	Korean
W36	38	PhD	637	60	0	Korean	English
W37	26	PhD	670	30	16	Korean	English
W38	27	MA	650	34	12	English	Korean
W39	31	MA	637	24	0	Korean	English
W30	30	PhD	613	12	0	Korean	English

\* All TOEFL scores were converted from CBT or iBT to PBT test.

### **Data Collection**

Participants were asked to write two argumentative essays,<sup>2</sup> one in Korean and one in English, taking a position in favor of or against a statement claiming that the best way to learn English is through studying in English-speaking countries such as the United States, Canada, and Australia (for prompts, see Appendix A). Attaining high proficiency in English is highly valued in Korea, and this value may have been influential on the majors chosen by Groups 1 and 3. The topic was chosen based on an assumption that if the topic is of personal relevance to the participants, they may be motivated to write more. The writing prompt was adapted from Kubota (1998). The essays were submitted by e-mail, as in Yoon (2008). Between the first and second tasks, there was an interval of at least a week to prevent direct translation from one essay to the other (Kubota, 1998). For counterbalancing the order of the languages, half of the participants across the groups wrote in English first and the other half wrote in Korean first, and then vice versa in the second task. Immediately after the completion of the second task, the participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire adapted from Yoon (2008) (see Appendix B for the English and Korean versions of the questionnaire). The questionnaire is composed of four parts: the

<sup>2</sup>Argumentative writing aims to convince readers to agree with the writer's side of an issue. It is not new to Korean college students since they frequently compose argumentative essays as part of their course assignments (Choi, 1988). In argumentative writing, it would be beneficial to investigate not only bi-directional transfer but also other factors (instruction, language proficiency, etc.) that might influence their writing.

participants' demographic information; their former learning experience in L1 and L2 writing; difficulties in L2 writing and their perception of L1 writing; and their perception of the similarity or dissimilarity between L1 and L2 writing in terms of rhetorical aspects.

### *Analysis*

The essays were analyzed based on models from Choi (2006), Kubota (1998), Uysal (2008), and Yoon (2008). Originally, Kubota (1998) used two dimensions of the organizational patterns of the essay; the location of the main ideas and several macro level patterns. The analysis of the macro level pattern relies on the location of the main ideas because the types of macro level patterns are decided depending on where main ideas are placed.

However, Uysal (2008) and Yoon (2008) added a third dimension, namely, the organization of text units into introduction, body, and conclusion. Since traditional CR sees Korean writing as “Oriental” writing that “turn[s] and turn[s] in a widening gyre” (Kaplan, 1966, p. 10), it is important to investigate whether there is a tendency to have a new claim or topic added between the body and conclusion in Korean students' English writing. This is because of a structure called *ki-swung-cen-kyel* (the Korean equivalent of *ki-shoo-ten-ketsu* in Japanese), which Eggington (1987) discovered that Korean texts share with Japanese texts. *Ki-swung-cen-kyel* can be translated into English as introduction-supporting idea-more supporting idea-conclusion (Choi, 2006; Choi, 1988; Grabe, 1987; Matsuda, 1997; Noor, 2001; Reid, 1984; Simson, 2000). If a new claim or idea is added between the body and conclusion, and the writer creates the step of *cen* (or *ten* in Japanese; see footnote 1), then it can be claimed that she or he uses the Korean rhetoric pattern. This feature is one of the indicators used to identify dominant factors of bi-directional transfer.

Accordingly, in the current study the text data were analyzed as follows. First, the texts were investigated for the location of the main ideas. Following Kubota (1998), there were five categories for location of the main ideas: initial, middle, final, collection, and obscure (see Appendix C for definitions).

Second, the macro level rhetorical structures were investigated by using Kubota's (1998) pattern categorization: Collection (Col), Comparison (Comp), Explanation (Exp), Induction following Comparison (Comp → Ind), Specification (Spec), and Induction (Ind) (see Appendix D for definitions). Lastly, following Yoon (2008), in terms of the overall organization of texts,

the essays were examined to find whether they follow the pattern of having three structural units (introduction, body, and conclusion), together with more fine-grained definitions of Textual Organization Subtypes provided by J. Choi (2006; see Appendix E). In the process of analysis, the researcher trained and worked with another rater in order to strengthen the reliability of the coding.

The responses to the questionnaire were used to include information about participants' former instruction in L1 and L2 writing and their writing experience in the analysis.

## RESULTS

### *Research Question 1: Similarity vs. Dissimilarity of L1 and L2 Essays Across the Groups*

Eleven participants across the groups wrote their essays similarly in both English and Korean. Tables 4 through 6 present the overall findings of the textual-rhetorical analysis, along the three dimensions of writing (location of the main idea, macro level pattern, and organization of text units), in both English and Korean, across the three groups.

In Group 1 (shown in Table 4), four of the participants (W11, W16, W18, and W10) wrote their English and Korean essays in a similar way. The other six (W12, W13, W14, W15, W17, and W19) wrote their English and Korean essays somewhat differently. Table 5 illustrates the analysis of Group 2. Five participants (W21, W22, W25, W27, and W29) wrote their English and Korean essays in a similar way in all three aspects. The remaining five participants (W23, W24, W26, W28, and W20) wrote the two essays a little differently. For Group 3 (Table 6), two participants (W31 and W36) wrote their English and Korean essays in a similar way in all three aspects, while the remaining eight wrote their two essays differently.

It is of interest that all of the 11 participants who wrote both essays in a similar way followed the rhetoric pattern that is recommended in English writing. It is possible that the similarity between the two essays of these 11 participants across the groups could be explained by content retention of their first writings and transfer to the second writings (Hirose, 2003) since they wrote on the same topic within an interval of a week. In terms of language order, eight of these participants wrote Korean essays first and the remaining three participants wrote English essays first.

Among the participants who wrote differently, some participants mixed aspects of Korean

and English rhetoric. They usually used two aspects of English rhetoric and one of Korean rhetoric style. For example, in his Korean essay, W17 put the main idea in the initial position, and constructed the essay with an introduction, body, and conclusion (English rhetoric).

However, he wrote paragraphs mostly in Comp → Ind, which is specified as an inductive style (Kubota, 1998) of writing (Korean rhetoric). These patterns will become clear in the next sections, where there is a more detailed description of the textual analyses.

Table 4

*Analysis of Main Idea, Patterns, and Structure Unit of Group 1 (n = 10)*

Participant	Main Idea		Pattern		Unit	
	English	Korean	English	Korean	English	Korean
W11	Initial	Initial	Exp (Col)/ Exp	Exp (Comp)	(Intro-Body-Con)	(Intro-Body-Con)
W12	Initial	Initial (Obscure)	Exp (Comp)	Obscure	(Intro-Body-Con)	Intro-Body
W13	Initial	Middle	Exp (Col)	Exp/ Exp (Comp)	Intro-Body-Con	Intro-Body-Con
W14	Initial	Initial	Exp (Comp)/ Comp->Exp	Col	Intro-Body-Con	Ki-Swung-(Cen-Kyel)
W15	Initial	Initial	Exp	Exp/ Comp->Exp	(Intro-Body)	Ki-Swung-(Cen-Kyel)
W16	Initial	Initial	Exp	Exp (Comp)	(Intro-Body-Con)	(Intro-Body-Con)
W17	Initial	Initial	Exp (Comp)	Comp->Ind	(Intro-Body-Con)	(Intro-Body-Con)
W18	Initial	Initial	Exp	Exp	Intro-Body-Con	Intro-Body-Con
W19	Initial	Initial	Col	Col	Intro-Body-Con	Ki-Swung-(Cen-Kyel)
W10	Initial	Initial	Com->Exp	Exp	(Intro-Body)	(Intro-Body)

*Note.* Obscure indicates that the writer's opinion on learning English abroad is not clearly stated. (See appendices C, D, and E for more details.)

Table 5  
*Analysis of Main Idea, Patterns, and Structure Unit of Group 2 (n = 10)*

Participant	Main Idea		Pattern		Unit	
	English	Korean	English	Korean	English	Korean
W21	Initial	Initial	Exp (Comp) /Spec (Col)	Exp / Exp (Comp)	Intro-Body- Con	Intro-Body- Con
W22	Initial	Initial	Col	Exp/Exp (Comp)	Intro-Body	Intro-Body
W23	Initial	Initial	Col	Exp (Com)/ Spec(Comp)	Intro-Body- Con	Ki-Swung- Cen-Kyel
W24	Initial	Initial	Comp->Ind/ Ind	Comp-> Exp	Intro-Body- Con	Intro-Body- Con
W25	Initial	Initial (Obscure)	Exp(Col)/ Exp (comp)	Comp->Exp/ Comp	(Intro-Body- Con)	(Intro-Body)
W26	Initial	Middle	Comp-> Exp	Comp-> Exp	Intro-Body- (Con)	Ki-Swung- Cen-Kyel
W27	Initial	Initial	Exp (Comp)/Exp	Exp (Col)	(Intro-Body- Con)	(Intro-Body- Con)
W28	Initial	Middle	Ind (Col)	Ind	Intro-Body- Con	Intro-Body- Con
W29	Initial	Initial	Col	Col	(Intro-Body- Con)	(Intro-Body- Con)
W20	Initial	Initial	Comp	Comp-> Ind	Intro- Body-(Con)	(Intro-Body- Con)

*Note.* Obscure indicates that the writer's opinion on learning English abroad is not clearly stated.  
 (See appendices C, D, and E for more details.)

Table 6  
*Analysis of Main Idea, Patterns, and Structure Unit of Group 3 (n = 10)*

Participant	Main Idea		Pattern		Unit	
	English	Korean	English	Korean	English	Korean
W31	Initial (Obscure)	Initial (Obscure)	Comp-> Exp Exp (Col)	Col	Intro-Body- (Con)	(Intro-Body- Con)
W32	Initial	Initial	Spec	Col	Ki-Swung- (Cen-Kyel)	(Intro-Body- Con)
W33	Initial	Initial (Obscure)	Ind /Exp	Comp-> Exp/ /Spec	Intro-Body- (Con)	Ki-Swung- (Cen-Kyel)
W34	Initial	Middle	Col	Col	Intro-Body- Con	Intro-Body- Con
W35	Initial	Middle	Exp(comp)/ Spec	Ind (Col)/ Exp	Intro-Body- Con	Intro-Body- Con
W36	Initial	Initial	Spec (Col)	Comp-> Exp	Intro-Body- Con	Intro-Body- Con
W37	Initial	Initial	Exp (Col)/ Exp	Ind (Col)	(Intro-Body- Con)	(Intro-Body- Con)
W38	Initial	Initial	Col	Exp (Comp)/Exp	Intro-Body- Con	Ki-Swung- (Cen-Kyel)
W39	Middle	Initial	Spec (Col)	Exp (Col)	Intro-Body	(Intro-Body)
W30	Initial	Initial	Exp (Comp)/ Comp->Exp	Comp->Exp	Ki-Swung- (Cen-Kyel)	Intro-Body- (Con)

*Note.* Obscure indicates that the writer's opinion on learning English abroad is not clearly stated.  
 (See appendices C, D, and E for more details.)

**1. Location of the main idea.** Almost all of the participants, across the three groups, placed their main idea at the beginning of both the English and Korean essays (see Tables 4, 5, and 6). In Group 1, all of the participants put their main ideas in the initial position in their English essays and nine out of ten put their main idea in the initial position in the Korean essays. In Group 2, nine participants put the main idea in the initial position in the Korean essays and eight participants placed the main idea in the initial position in the English essays. In Group 3, the main idea was put in the initial position in nine English essays and eight Korean essays. This is similar to the results from other recent CR studies on the writing of Korean students (Choi, 2006; Kim, 2005; Ryu, 2006 and Japanese students (Hirose, 2003). These studies reported that the participants mostly put the main idea in the initial position both in their L1s and English.

One of the participants (W39) placed his main idea in the middle in the English essay and five (W13, W26, W28, W34, and W35) put their main idea in the middle in their Korean essays. This pattern was also reported in Kubota's (1998) study. In the current study, the participants who did this placed their main idea in the middle position in their Korean essays after using rhetorical questions in the introduction part and presenting their opinion in the first body paragraph. For instance, in her Korean essay, W13 asked the question "Is going abroad to learn English the best way to learn English?" at the end of her introduction. Hirose (2003) reported that one of her participants who was classified as a good writer in her study wrote the very last sentence of the introduction in the form of a type of rhetorical question called *hango* in Japanese. In Japanese rhetoric, finishing with the main idea in the form of a rhetorical question is considered a good writing strategy. Since Korean and Japanese rhetoric share some writing conventions, it makes sense that the participants in the present study used *hango* in the introductions of their essays.

No participant placed the main idea in final position in the current study. In the text analysis, in a few cases it was difficult to ascertain what constituted the main idea due to the indirectness of the arguments. When the two raters tried to reach an agreement for the analysis, there were more occasions when the raters disagreed on the location of the main ideas for the essays of Group 3 (three cases) than for those of Group 1 and Group 2 (one case for each group).

**2. Macro level pattern.** The analysis of the macro level pattern heavily relied on the location of the main ideas because the types of the macro level patterns are decided depending on where the main ideas are placed. Kubota (1998) defines two patterns: inductive and deductive styles.

She also reports that the expected matches between style and location of main ideas occurred usually but not always. Yoon (2008) reports that the inductive and deductive styles and the location of the main ideas exactly match in his study. For example, if the main idea was located initially, the essay tended to be either the explanation or the specification type. Conversely, if the main idea was placed in the final position, an essay seemed to be either of the induction or comparison to induction type.

In the present study, the deductive style (explanation and specification) was dominant in both the English and Korean essays, a result that was similar to Yoon's (2008) claim. However, in the current study there were also some cases of less than perfect matches. In Group 1, W13 put the main idea in the middle in the Korean essay, but wrote the essay deductively. W17's Korean essays did not fit either deduction or induction types, as he placed the main idea in the initial position but he wrote the essay inductively. In Group 2, four participants (W24(E), W26(K), W28(E,K), W20(K)) wrote their essays as mixes of deduction and induction types. For example, while W24 put the main idea in the beginning of the English essay, she constructed two body paragraphs of the induction type (Comp → Ind and Ind<sup>3</sup>). For Group 3, half of the participants (W33(E), W34(K), W35(K), W37(K), W39(E)) mixed elements of the two types in their essays.

**3. Organization of text units.** As can be seen in Tables 4, 5, and 6, most of the participants, across the groups, wrote both essays in three parts: Introduction-body-conclusion. Choi (2006) reported that participants in her research wrote mostly with the introduction-body-conclusion structure and they made their claim in the introduction, provided some specification in the body, and summarized what had been discussed previously in the conclusion.

The present research yielded similar results to Choi's (2006). In terms of organization, forty-two essays out of sixty (70%) were written using an introduction-body-conclusion format. However, nine essays (15%) were structured as *ki-swung-cen-kyel*. The other nine (15%) had no conclusion part. Within the introduction-body-conclusion organizational type, a number of textual organization subtypes were identified following Choi (2006; see Appendix E). The analyses of the essay parts into these subtypes yielded interesting insights.

---

<sup>3</sup> The previous studies (Kubota, 1998; Yoon, 2008) looked at the overall pattern of the essays. In the current study, this pattern analysis has been done at the paragraph level. Two raters rated the body paragraphs in the essays. For example, if the essay has two body parts and one of them is specified as Exp and the other is Spec, those two categories were directly reported in Tables 4 to 6. These are considered as the deductive style of writing (English recommended rhetoric).

Table 7  
*Textual Organization Subtypes of Group 1*

Participant	Subtypes (the number of them in each essay)	
	English	Korean
W11	Claim Justification, Exemplification (2) Solution	Claim Justification (2), Exemplification Conclusion, Repetition
W12	Claim Evaluation, Justification (2) Repetition	Claim Justification, Evaluation, Problem Conclusion
W13	Claim, Metastatement Justification, Exemplification, Addition Conclusion	Situation Justification (2) Conclusion
W14	Claim, Metastatement Justification (2) Conclusion, Solution	Situation, Claim Justification (2) Claim Conclusion, Solution
W15	Situation, Claim Justification (2)	Claim Justification (2), Evaluation Conclusion, Solution
W16	Situation, Metastatement Problem (2), Justification	Claim Justification (2), Exemplification (2) Claim Conclusion, Solution
W17	Claim Justification (2), Problem, Exemplification Conclusion, Repetition	Claim Justification Conclusion
W18	Claim, Metastatement Exemplification, Problem Conclusion	Situation, Claim Exemplification, Justification Conclusion
W19	Claim, Metastatement Justification (3) Repetition	Claim Justification (2) Claim Repetition
W10	Claim Justification, Exemplification, Problem	Claim Justification (2), Problem, Exemplification Conclusion, Evaluation

*Note.* The table for textual organization shows the participants' uses of subunits for both essays. Subunit is a criterion for judging an introduction-body-conclusion structure. If there is a new claim in the body or conclusion, it was defined as *ki-swung-cen-kyul* structure. Tables for textual organization subtypes of Group 2 and Group 3 are in Appendix F.

For example, in his Korean essay, W14 provided a situational background (see Table 7 and Appendix E) of the issue by stating that English is already an official language of the world. After that, he argued that Koreans do not need to go abroad to study English, which formed the *ki* section where W14 began his argument. He then stated two reasons that Korean learners of

English can study English in Korea (*swung*). In the *cen* section, W14 argued that English is one kind of language that human beings can learn if they study hard no matter where they are. This is a new idea that is identified as *cen* because the idea was somewhat connected to a subtheme but not directly associated with the main idea (Hinds, 1983a). Finally, he reached the conclusion that the most important factor in learning English was not the methods but the individual's effort (*kyel*). In contrast to the Korean essay, W14's English writing consisted of an introduction, body, and conclusion. He seemed to integrate the *kyel* part in his Korean essay, which he wrote first, into the conclusion in his English essay by repeating the main idea and suggesting solutions. Among nine participants who constructed their essays in the *ki-swung-cen-kyel* structure, two participants wrote this way in English and seven of them wrote this way in Korean. Across the groups, no participant wrote both essays in *ki-swung-cen-kyel*.

Some of the participants did not leave margins or spaces between paragraphs in their essays. Therefore, the researcher and the rater had to divide these participants' essays according to Choi's (2006) definition for Textual Organization Subtypes (see Appendix E) without the benefit of paragraphing. Some of the participants did not have clear conclusions, a fact that is shown in Tables 4, 5, and 6 with parentheses around "conclusion." All these phenomena can be explained by the writing task setting. In the current study, the task was given to the participants by e-mail, so they did not have a specific time limit. Also the participants expected that the writing would not be evaluated. These elements may have affected the participants, causing them to attend to organization less than they would have in a test setting.

### ***Research Question 2: Directions of the Transfer in Rhetoric Styles***

In the present study, the category of transfer was classified into four types following Yoon (2008): L1 to L2 transfer, L2 to L1 transfer (or learned L1 transfer), no transfer, and "backward" transfer. The latter category occurs when the participants write their English essay with a Korean rhetoric style, and their Korean essay with an English rhetoric style. Among the four patterns, the dominant pattern was L2 to L1 (or learned L1) transfer. However, this did not necessarily mean that every individual participant fit perfectly into a single category among the four types. Also, if the essays followed one or two aspects of Korean rhetoric, they were identified as Korean rhetoric since there were no cases when the participants' essays fell into the Korean rhetoric style for all three aspects.

**1. L1 to L2 transfer.** If a writer applies L1 rhetoric styles to both L1 and L2 essays, this is considered a case of L1 to L2 transfer. Across the groups, only two writers were found to fit into this category: W28 and W33. There were two rhetorical features shared by these participants' essays, both in Korean and English, that showed this pattern of L1 to L2 transfer: an inductive structure pattern and an indirect development of arguments.

The order of the languages used for the writing does not seem to account for the two cases of L1 to L2 transfer found in the data, as W28 wrote the Korean essay first and W33 wrote the English essay first. W28 located the main idea in the initial position in the English essay and in the middle in the Korean essay, something which is not a distinctive feature in deciding whether writers wrote in the Korean rhetorical style or the English one and which has been reported in recent CR studies on the writing of Korean students (Choi, 2006; Kim, 2005; Ryu, 2006). Meanwhile, the macro level patterns in both essays were considered Korean rhetoric patterns (Ind (Col) / Ind). In the case of W33, she put the main idea in the initial position in both essays. However, she wrote the first body paragraph of the English essay in an inductive way. She presented the benefits of studying English abroad in the beginning of the paragraph, but she denied all of the benefits in the end by stating the importance of considering each learners' purposes of learning, goals, and learning types. In her Korean essay, she wrote deductively to construct the essay but the essay turned out to be *ki-swung-cen-kyel* because of the occurrence of a new idea between the body and the conclusion. Even though too few cases of L1 to L2 transfer were found in this study to draw conclusions, the evidence is suggestive of the idea that inductive development is preferred in Korean rhetoric but not in that of English.

**2. L2 to L1 transfer: Use of learned L2 and/or L1 rhetoric.** As was mentioned in the beginning of this section, L2 to L1 transfer is the dominant pattern of the participants' writing. Rather than L1 to L2 transfer, both the English and Korean essays written by fourteen participants showed the features identified as English rhetoric.

Among the fourteen participants who fell into this category, six were from Group 1 (W11, W12, W13, W16, W18, W10). Of these, all but W12 put the main idea in the initial position in both essays, followed by explanation or specification macro level patterns. W12 placed the main idea in the middle section in his Korean essay. Except for W12 and W10, these writers all wrote using the introduction-body-conclusion structure. W12 had only an introduction and body in his

Korean writing, and W10 had only an introduction and body in both essays. In Group 2, five people (W21, W22, W25, W27, and W29) were in this category. Each of these participants put the main idea in the initial position and wrote their essays using explanation and specification. Also, almost everybody in Group 2 used a three-part organizational unit for their essays. Only two participants (W22(E, K) and W25(K)) used only an introduction and body while omitting a conclusion. In Group 3, W31, W36, and W39 put their main ideas in the initial position, followed by explanation or specification macro level patterns. Two of these (W31 and W36) also constructed introduction-body-conclusion structures in both of their essays; again, this is considered the English rhetorical style. W39 had only the introduction and the body in both of his essays.

Intensive experience in L1 writing instruction or training from L2 writing classes, or both of these, may cause L2 to L1 transfer (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2008). Yoon (2008) referred to this as “L2-L1 transfer vs. learned L1 rhetoric” (p. 26), because Korean rhetoric shares some aspects with English rhetoric (Ryu, 2006) in terms of genre. Therefore, learning experience from L1 and/or L2 could contribute to this transfer categorization. L2 and L1 writing instruction that the participants had may help to explain this pattern of results. This will further be discussed when addressing Research Question 3.

**3. No transfer: Each language “leads” writers to write in its unique rhetorical style.** Essay pairs that belong to this group were those that had distinctive differences in rhetoric aspects in the two languages. In other words, these writers wrote the Korean essay with Korean rhetoric and the English essay with English rhetoric. Eleven writers (W14, W15, W17, W19, W23, W26, W20, W34, W35, W37, and W38) across the groups were found to be in this category. However, even though some essays were identified as being in the Korean traditional rhetoric style, not all of the aspects matched because the essays that were written in Korean rhetoric style still follow some aspects of English rhetoric. For example, some of the essays were written using the *ki-swung-cen-kyel* structure even though the main ideas were in the initial position and followed by explanation or specification macro level patterns. The essays in this category have either inductive macro level patterns (Comp → Ind, Ind) in the body paragraphs or *ki-swung-cen-kyel* as their textual organization unit. W17, W20, W35, and W37 fell into the first category (inductive macro level patterns). On the other hand, three participants (W14, W15, and W19) from Group 1, two (W23 and W26) from Group 2, and W38 from Group 3 followed *ki-swung-*

*cen-kyel* textual organization. None of the essays contained both of these two characteristics.

4. ***“Backward” transfer: Crossrhetorical preferences at odds with languages.*** There were three participants (W24, W32, and W30) who did not fit into any of the three categories discussed thus far. The essays of these three writers form a new category, showing the opposite of no transfer: the English essay uses Korean rhetoric, and the Korean essay uses English rhetoric. For example, W32 constructed her English essay using *ki-swung-cen-kyel* organization, but she wrote her Korean essay by organizing it according to English rhetoric (see Table 6).

It is difficult, however, to know if these writers really show backward transfer from what they have learned, because only W30 had learned both Korean and English essay writing, and the other two participants had only received one kind of instruction (W24: Korean essay writing instruction; W32: English essay writing instruction).

### ***Research Question 3: How Can the Textual Results Be Explained?***

As mentioned in the methodology section, after they had completed the second writing task, the participants were asked to answer a questionnaire that was designed to help explain possible transfer from instructed L2 and/or L1 rhetoric. Their answers help to shed light on the textual patterns reported for Research Questions 1 and 2.

1. ***Participants’ former learning experience in L1 and L2 writing.*** The participants’ responses about their learning experiences (see Appendix B, Questions 5–8) in both English and Korean writing are summarized in Tables 10 through 12.

Table 10  
 Participants' Writing Instruction in L1 and L2 (Group 1)

ID	Writing Instruction	Korean		English		
		Argumentative Instruction	Essay Exam ( <i>Nonsul</i> )	Writing Instruction	Argumentative Instruction	Writing Test (TWE/GRE)
W11	High school	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies			
W12						
W13	High school		took a course; tutoring; group studies	Univ.	No	studied writing guide
W14				High school	No	
W15	Univ.	Yes		Univ.	Yes	
W16				Univ.	Yes	
W17						
W18	Univ.	No	took a course; tutoring; group studies	Univ.	No	took a course; tutoring; group studies
W19	Univ.	Yes				
W10						

*Note.* Cells that are blank indicate there is no instruction reported for those items.

Table 11  
*Participants' Writing Instruction in L1 and L2 (Group 2)*

ID	Korean			English		
	Writing Instruction	Argumentative Instruction	Essay Exam ( <i>Nonsul</i> )	Writing Instruction	Argumentative Instruction	Writing Test (TWE/GRE)
W21	Univ.	Yes		Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies
W22	High school		took a course; tutoring; group studies	Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies
W23	Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies	Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies
W24	Univ.	Yes	no preparation			studied writing guide
W25	Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies	Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies
W26	High school	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies	Univ.	No	took a course; tutoring; group studies
W27	Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies	Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies
W28	Elementary, Middle, High school, Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies	Middle school	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies
W29				Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies
W20	Univ.	No	no preparation	Univ.	No	took a course; tutoring; group studies

*Note.* Cells that are blank indicate there is no instruction reported for those items.

It was found that many of the participants had had learning experience with English and Korean writing or both. Across the groups, participants' learning experiences were found to fall into four categories: there were those who had received instruction in Korean writing ( $n=5$ ), English writing ( $n=6$ ), both ( $n=16$ ), and neither ( $n=3$ ). Among the three groups, Group 2 had more individual participants who had each had writing instruction in both English and Korean writing (see Tables 10 through 12). It would be dangerous to oversimplify, but there may be some correlation between possible directions of transfer and participants' learning experiences in

both English and Korean writing (see Tables 10 through 12). L2 and L1 writing instruction may help to explain the pattern of results.

Table 12  
*Participants' Writing Instruction in L1 and L2 (Group 3)*

ID	Korean			English		
	Writing Instruction	Argumentative Instruction	Essay Exam ( <i>Nonsul</i> )	Writing Instruction	Argumentative Instruction	Writing Test (TWE/GRE)
W31	High school	Yes	No preparation	Univ.	Yes	guidebooks; took a course
W32				Univ.	Yes	studied writing guides
W33	Univ.	No	No preparation	Univ.	No	no preparation
W34	High school	No				no preparation
W35			studied writing guides	Univ.		studied writing guide
W36	Univ.	No				no preparation
W37				High school, Univ.	No	
W38	Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies	Univ.	Yes	studied writing guide
W39	High school	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies	Univ.	No	took a course; tutoring; group studies
W30	High school	Yes		Univ.	Yes	took a course; tutoring; group studies

*Note.* Cells that are blank indicate there is no instruction reported for those items.

Participants who had only received Korean writing instruction (W11, W34, and W36) might apply their L1 knowledge of argumentative writing to that of their L2 writing. Participants who only had learned English writing skills (W16, W22, and W29) might transfer their knowledge to their L1. For students who had writing instruction in both languages (W13, W18, W21, W25, W27, W31, and W39) and for students who had not received any writing instruction, (W12 and W10) the direction of transfer, if any, would be hard to track. Indeed, many other factors may have worked together to influence how the participants wrote their essays.

**2. Participants' perceptions of L1 and L2 writing.** Participants' perceptions of Korean rhetorical features in comparison to those of English (see Appendix B, Question 10) are shown in Table 13.

Table 13  
*Participants' Perception of Korean writing*

Compared to English texts, Korean texts	Group 1	Group 1	Group 2	Group 2	Group 3	Group 3
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Tend to be indirect in delivering intended messages	3.40	1.17	2.90	1.10	3.40	0.84
Tend to be non-linear	2.30	1.16	1.80	0.42	2.30	1.06
Tend to lack logic	3.10	1.10	2.50	0.97	2.60	1.27
Tend to put the main idea at the end	2.20	1.23	1.90	0.74	3.50	0.97
Have no differences other than in linguistic features	2.40	1.17	2.10	0.57	2.60	1.17

*Note.* Measured on a Likert scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

As can be seen in Table 13, the participants' perception of Korean writing seems to be somewhat similar among groups, but their levels of agreement to the propositions stated did vary to some degree by group. To the idea that Korean writing tends to be indirect, Group 1 (3.40) and Group 3 ( $M=3.40$  with narrow  $SD=0.84$ ) mostly agreed, but Group 2 ( $M=2.90$ ) agreed less. This may be related to the participants' learning experiences. Group 2 had more participants with instruction in both English and Korean writing, and they may have realized that Korean argumentative writing is not so different from English argumentative writing.

For the location of the main idea, the three groups had different opinions. Yoon (2008) reported that most of the participants in his study agreed that the main idea is located in the final position in Korean writing. However, in the current study, the number of agreeing and disagreeing responses to this proposition were quite different across the groups. Group 1 ( $M=2.20$ ) and Group 2 ( $M=1.90$ ) disagreed with this statement, while Group 3 ( $M=3.50$ ) tended to agree with it. It was interesting that thirteen participants across the groups answered that Korean writing tends to put the main idea at the end, but in practice, in their essays, they mostly put the main idea in the initial position. In fact, none of the participants put the main idea at the end in their Korean essays in the present study.

For the last statement, claiming that English and Korean essays have no differences other than linguistic features, all three groups responded that they recognized differences between English and Korean rhetoric features.

W31 was the only person who provided a written comment in the "Others" category of question 10 (see Appendix B for more detail). He mentioned that Korean texts tended not to present ideas point by point (e.g., using transition words such as *first*, *second*).

It is also important to look at the dissimilarity or similarity of participants' own L1 and L2 writing. To collect more in-depth information on differences between the two essays, the last section of the questionnaire (see Appendix B, Questions 11 and 12) asked the participants (a) whether they tried to write the English and Korean essays differently in content and in organization; and (b) whether there are differences between the two essays that they wrote other than the fact that they are written in different languages.

In Group 1, four participants (W17, W18, W19, and W10) reported that they wrote the two essays differently in terms of contents and organization. Two of the participants said that they forgot what they wrote in the first essay. The other two mentioned that they felt freer to express their opinion in Korean than in English because they had limited English proficiency. For the second question, four of the participants (W13, W16, W17, and W18) answered that the English and Korean essays that they wrote were different from each other. They said that the two essays were written differently since the grammars and expressions in the languages are different. Also, they felt that it was much easier to write in Korean because their ideas and opinions were not limited to what they could write in English in terms of expression.

Three participants (W22, W25, and W26) in Group 2 answered positively to question 10. Their reasons were the different sentence patterns in the two languages, their different degrees of familiarity with the languages, and cultural differences between the languages. In question 11, eight people—that is, all participants except for W21 and W27—reported that their English and Korean essays were different because they thought that their Korean essays were more well-structured, logical, and accurate, with more examples.

In Group 3, three participants (W34, W38, and W30) stated that their two essays were different because they tried to write differently since the readers of English and Korean have different ways of thinking and understanding texts. Also, they thought that it was easier to write differently in the two languages since each language has a different way to write essays. For question 11, six people (W31, W33, W34, W35, W38, and W30) reported that they thought their two essays were different because they tried to explain more details in their Korean essays and they were knowledgeable of differences between English and Korean rhetoric.

Across the groups, most of the participants responded that they wrote English and Korean essays similarly (n=20). Eighteen participants answered that there were no differences between the two languages besides linguistics features. A very small majority in Group 3 (n=6) agreed

that there were differences between the two essays.

It was found that there were differences for some of the participants between their reported perceptions or knowledge and their actual performance. Among eleven participants who wrote both essays in a similar way, four of them (W18, W10, W22, and W25) reported that they wrote the two essays differently, and five (W16, W18, W22, W25, and W31) responded that English and Korean writing are different from each other. Thirteen out of 19 participants (W12, W13, W14, W15, W23, W24, W28, W20, W32, W33, W35, W37, and W39) who wrote their two essays differently responded that they wrote the essays similarly, and seven of the nineteen reported that there were no differences between their two essays.

Finally, W24 made an interesting comment in the questionnaire. She mentioned that she was aware of the difference between English and Korean writing styles but she followed English writing style when she wrote in Korean because she thought that it was a better way to write essays. However, in both essays, W24 tended to address her opinion directly. Also, she wrote both essays inductively, which is specified as a Korean way of writing (see Table 5).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the current study, many participants constructed their L1 and L2 essays similarly by using English rhetoric (as defined by Kaplan, 1966), and this echoes recent CR studies on the writing of Korean students (Choi, 2006; Kim, 2005; Ryu, 2006; Yoon, 2008) and Japanese students (Hirose, 2003). Eleven participants across all three groups wrote the two essays similarly, and the remaining 19 participants wrote them differently. The number of participants who wrote their essays differently according to the analysis used in this study is larger than the number of participants who wrote the essays similarly. However, the essays specified as Korean rhetoric in the current study only had one aspect of Korean rhetoric and two aspects of English rhetoric. If this is taken into consideration, the participants wrote their essays quite similarly, using recommended English rhetoric. With respect to the directionality of rhetorical transfer, the dominant direction of transfer was L2 to L1 transfer (or learned L1 rhetoric) that is identified as recommended English rhetoric.

In the questionnaire, Group 1 and Group 3 agreed more than Group 2 to the proposition that Korean writing is more indirect than English writing. As mentioned earlier, in a few cases, what

constituted the main idea was difficult to ascertain due to the indirectness of the arguments. With regard to indirectness of the argument, it seems that Kaplan's (1966) claim of culture or language specific patterns was somewhat supported in the results. Nevertheless, the L1 to L2 rhetorical transfer was not as dominant as he claimed.

The questionnaire survey revealed that many of the participants had learning experiences with English and/or Korean writing. The specifics of their previous instruction may help to explain the directionality of the transfer (Kobayashi and Rinnert, 2008). Based on the questionnaire, four categories of participants' learning experiences were discovered across the groups. For example, participants who had only received Korean writing instruction might apply L1 knowledge of argumentative writing to their L2 writing. It might be risky to overgeneralize the result of the current study, since many other factors, such as participants' majors, topic of the essays, and genre of the essays, may have interacted with each other to influence the construction of the essay.

However, there seem to be no differences in argumentative writing across EFL (Group 1) and ESL writers (Group 2 and Group 3) in the current study, even though each group had increasingly more experience in writing academic L2 texts. Since Korean rhetoric shares some aspects with English rhetoric (Ryu, 2006) in terms of genre, learning experience from L1 and/or L2 could be attributed to L2 to L1 transfer (use of learned L2 and/or L1 rhetoric). Also, Korean argumentative essays seem to be taught explicitly in both Korean language arts classes and extracurricular writing classes in Korea (Kim, 2009). Therefore, EFL writers can be expected to know how to write an argumentative essay in general.

Even though there is no clear-cut answer to whether the same patterns in both essays are the result of L2 to L1 transfer, or are the use of an instructed L1 rhetorical genre, or both, the results of the current study imply that Korean L2 writers of English are more influenced in their rhetorical choices by their learning experiences than by negative L1 to L2 transfer.

The present study has some limitations that can be addressed in future research. First, the current study did not evaluate the participants' writing, as was done in Kubota's study (1998). This additional step would help to investigate how transfer or lack of transfer of rhetorical aspects between L1 and L2 affects organization quality. Second, the questionnaire might not provide rich enough information. Some of the questions simply asked what the participants had learned but did not probe into the qualities and contents of their writing instruction. Also, the

questionnaire relied heavily on participants' self-reported information on their learning experiences. Some crucial information might have been missed. For example, discrepancies between the participants' perceptions of writing and their actual performance were found. It would be desirable in further studies to consider having more enriched qualitative data such as in-depth interviews about their learning experiences and perceptions of English and Korean writing. Finally, the division of the three groups was based on an impressionistic characterization of their likely writing and learning experiences given the amount of instruction in a foreign or a second language context.

Future research can also include essays written by native speakers of English (Choi, 1988) to see differences or similarities between L2 English writers' essays and those of L1 English writers. Furthermore, other variables such as participants' majors and the genre of writing can be examined. It would also be desirable to investigate Korean multilingual writers' writings to see how they transfer their knowledge of writing, and from where to where, as done in the work of Kobayashi and Rinnert (2010).

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

First, I would like to thank all of the participants for their time- and energy-consuming efforts. This research could not have happened without them. I also would like to extend special thanks to Dr. Lourdes Ortega for her thoughtful support and encouragement and to Dr. Richard Day for his precious feedback on the paper. I would like to thank JuA Hwang, who is one of my close friends and colleagues, for being the other text rater in this research project. Last but not least, I thank my parents for their love and support. Mahalo nui loa.

## REFERENCES

- Berman, R. (1994). Learners' transfer of writing skills between languages. *TESL Canada Journal*, 12, 29–46.
- Che Pyun, O. (2001). Crosscultural variations in personal essays: Second language writing by American learners of Korean as compared to native Koreans' writing. *The Korean Language in America*, 6, 309–324.
- Choi, J. (2006). A contrastive analysis of argumentative essays written in English by Korean ESL students and by native English-speaking students (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(11), 3907.
- Choi, Y. (1988). Text structure of Korean speakers' argumentative essays in English. *World Englishes*, 7(2), 129–142.
- Cook, V. J. (1991). The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument and multi-competence. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 103–117.
- Cook, V. J. (1992). Evidence for multi-competence. *Language Learning*, 42(4), 557–591.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Connor, U. (2005). Dialogue: Comment by Ulla Connor. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 132–136.
- Cunningham, T. H., & Graham, C. R. (2000). Increasing native English vocabulary recognition through Spanish immersion: Cognate transfer from foreign to first language. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(1), 37–49.
- De Houwer, A. (1990). *The acquisition of two languages from birth: A case study*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Eggington, W. G. (1987). Written academic discourse in Korean: Implications for effective communication, In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 153–168). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Grabe, W. (1987). Contrastive rhetoric and text-type research. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 115–138). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hinds, J. (1983a). Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English. *Text*, 3, 183–195.

- Hinds, J. (1983b). Linguistics and written discourse in English and Japanese: A contrastive study (1978–1982). In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Annual review of applied linguistics*, III (pp. 78–84). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141–152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese and Thai. In U. Connor & A. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in writing* (pp. 87–109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Hirose, K. (2003). Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 181–209.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16, 1–20.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1972). *The anatomy of rhetoric: Prolegomena to a functional theory of rhetoric*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (1995). The linguistic effect of foreign language learning on the development of mother tongue skills. In M. Haggstrom, L. Morgan, & J. Wiczorek (Eds.), *The foreign language classroom: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 163–181). New York: Garland.
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (2000a). *Foreign language and mother tongue*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (2000b). Metaphorical competence in trilingual language production. In J. Cenoz & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Acquisition of English as a third language* (pp. 99–120). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kecskes, I., & Papp, T. (2003). How to demonstrate the conceptual effect of L2 on L1? Methods and techniques. In V. J. Cook (Ed.), *Effects of the second language on the first* (pp. 247–265). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kim, S. (2005). The effects of L1 rhetorical styles on L2 writing quality. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 11(3), 39–56.
- Kim, T. (2009). *Korean L2 writers' previous writing experience: L1 literacy development in school*. Unpublished MA scholarly paper, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu.

- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2002). High school student perceptions of first language literacy instruction: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*, 91–116.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2004). Composing competence: How L1 and L2 writing experience interact. In M. Baynham, A. Deignan, & G. White (Eds.), *Applied linguistics at the interface* (pp. 105–118). London: Equinox.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2008). Task response and text construction across L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 7–29.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2010, March). Understanding L2 writing development from the perspective of multicompetent literacy development. In R. M. Manchon (Chair), *Focusing on L2 writing development: Multiple perspectives*. Invited colloquia at Association of American Applied Linguistics (AAAL) 2010 Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Kubota, R. (1997). A reevaluation of the uniqueness of Japanese written discourse. *Written Communication, 14*, 460–480.
- 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.
- Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 7–27.
- Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2005). Response to Ulla Connor's comments. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 137–143.
- Matsuda, P. K. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric in context: A dynamic model of L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*, 41–69.
- Mohan, B., & Lo, W. A.-Y. (1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: Transfer developmental factors. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 515–534.
- Noor, R. (2001). Contrastive rhetoric in expository prose: Approaches and achievements. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 255–269.
- Ok, J. (1991). *Korean and English expository prose: A study in contrastive discourse*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Hodder Education.
- Purves, A. (Ed.). (1998). *Writing across languages and cultures: Issues in contrastive rhetoric*.

Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Reid, J. M. (1984). ESL composition: The linear product of American thought. *College Composition and Communication*, 35, 449–452.
- Ringbom, H. (2006). *Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ryu, H. (2006). Rhetorical patterns in Korean college students' English writing. *English Teaching*, 61(3), 273–292.
- Scollon, R. (1997). Contrastive rhetoric, contrastive poetics, or perhaps something else? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 352–363.
- Shi, L. (2003). Writing in two cultures: Chinese professors return from the West. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59, 369–389.
- Simson, J. M. (2000). Topical structure analysis of academic paragraphs in English and Spanish. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 293–309.
- Spack, R. (1997). The rhetorical construction of multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 765–774.
- Uysal, H. (2008). Tracing the culture behind writing: Rhetorical patterns and bidirectional transfer in L1 and L2 essays of Turkish writers in relation to educational context. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 183–207.
- Yoon, C. (2008). *Transfer of rhetorical organization? A within-subject exploration of Korean students' argumentative essays in Korean and English*. Unpublished MA scholarly paper, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu.
- Zamel, V. (1997). Toward a model of transculturation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 341–343.

## Appendix A

### Prompt for Korean writing task

여러분은 K 대학교 신문사 독자의견란에 다음 주제로 기고를 청탁 받았습니다. 다음을 읽고 기고문을 한글로 작성해 주세요.

다음의 의견에 동의하나요, 반대하나요? 영어를 잘하기 위한 최고의 방법은 미국, 캐나다, 호주 등의 영어권 국가로 어학연수를 가는 것이다. 이 문장에 대한 본인의 입장은 어떻습니까? 본인의 입장을 취해서 독자에게 의견을 설득해 보세요.

### Translated version

You have been asked to write your opinion on the following issue for a column in K newspaper:

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? The best way to learn English is studying in the English-speaking countries such as United States, Canada, and Australia. Take a position and try to persuade people of your point of view.

Write 600~ 700 characters.

### Prompt for English writing task

You have been asked to write your opinion on the following issue for a column in K Annals:

Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? The best way to learn English is studying in the English-speaking countries such as United States, Canada, and Australia. Take a position and try to persuade people of your point of view.

Write 250~300 words.

## Appendix B

## QUESTIONNAIRE (adapted from Yoon, 2008, pp.41-43)

Please fill out the blanks and check the item that apply to you best

(You may check more than one box for a question). E.g., (Yes  No )

1) Name (**Pseudonym that you used for essays**): \_\_\_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Sex : \_\_\_\_\_

Educational level: MA \_\_\_\_\_ PhD \_\_\_\_\_ Undergraduate \_\_\_\_\_

2) How long have you stayed in the United States? (e.g., six months) \_\_\_\_\_

3) Have you stayed in English speaking countries other than Hawaii, US?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, 1) country: \_\_\_\_\_ the length of staying: \_\_\_\_\_

2) country: \_\_\_\_\_ the length of staying: \_\_\_\_\_

4) I had scores of English proficiency tests such as TOEFL, TOEIC, and TEPS.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, name of the test: \_\_\_\_\_ score of the test: \_\_\_\_\_

If you have more that one, name of the test: \_\_\_\_\_ score of the test: \_\_\_\_\_

5) I took any Korean writing/composition courses. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, when? \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., at high school)

How long? \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., six months)

Please describe the course(s) or training briefly.

5-1) I have learned how to write a persuasive/argumentative essay in Korean. Yes\_\_ No \_\_

6) I took a Korean essay exam (Nonsul) for college admission. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, how did you prepare for it?

\_\_\_\_\_ studied writing guides (books, online resources, etc.) on your own

\_\_\_\_\_ took a writing course/ received tutoring/ studied in a group

\_\_\_\_\_ did nothing particular

\_\_\_\_\_ other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

7) I took any English writing/composition courses. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, when? \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., at high school)

How long? \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., six months)

Please describe the course(s) and training briefly.

7-1) I have learned how to write a persuasive/argumentative essay in English. Yes\_\_ No \_\_

8) I had taken English essay tests such as TWE (Test for Written English - TOEFL essay test)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, how did you prepare for it?

\_\_\_\_\_ studied writing guides (books, online resources, etc.) on your own

\_\_\_\_\_ took a writing course/ received tutoring/ studied in a group

\_\_\_\_\_ did nothing particular

\_\_\_\_\_ other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

9) The following are the problems you may have in English composition. How serious is each of them? (Circle the numbers that apply to you best.)

	no problem			very serious	
- insufficient vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5
- grammatical inaccuracy	1	2	3	4	5
- lack of variety in sentence patterns	1	2	3	4	5
- content (not enough ideas to write about)	1	2	3	4	5
-connection and transition between sentences and between paragraphs	1	2	3	4	5
- text organization (e.g., introduction – body – conclusion)	1	2	3	4	5
-other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5

10) How much would you agree to each of the following statements?

Compared to English texts, Korean texts ....

	strongly disagree			strongly agree	
- tend to be <u>indirect</u> in delivering their intended messages	1	2	3	4	5
- tend to be <u>non-linear</u> (abrupt change of topics, digressive)	1	2	3	4	5
- tend to <u>lack of logic</u>	1	2	3	4	5
- tend to <u>put the main idea at the end</u>	1	2	3	4	5
- have no differences other than in linguistic features	1	2	3	4	5
- other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4	5

11) With respect to the present writing tasks, did you consciously try to write your English and Korean essays differently in terms of content and/or text organization?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, why? \_\_\_\_\_

12) In retrospect, do you think there are differences in your English and Korean essays other than the fact that they are written in a different language? (e.g., in terms of organization or any other aspects?) If so, can you briefly specify them?

\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you very much.

## 설문지 (Korean Version Questionnaire)

\* 설문지의 질문 형태는 빈칸 채우기와 객관식 답변으로 구성되어 있습니다. 질문을 정확하게 읽으신 후, 본인이 해당되는 곳에 체크해 주세요. (예  아니오 ). 만약에 해당사항이 하나 이상일 경우 모두 체크해 주세요.

1) 이름 (가명- 작문시 사용한 이름을 기재해 주세요): \_\_\_\_\_

나이: (만) \_\_\_\_\_ 세 출생년도 \_\_\_\_\_ 년

성별: 여자  / 남자

학년: \_\_\_\_\_

2) 토플, 토익, 텡스 등의 공인 영어 시험점수를 가지고 있습니까? 예  아니오

만약 공인영어 시험 점수가 있다면, 다음사항을 기재해 주세요, (만약 하나 이상이면 해당 사항을 모두 적어 주세요.)

\_\_\_\_\_ 시험 \_\_\_\_\_ 점

\_\_\_\_\_ 시험 \_\_\_\_\_ 점

3) 영어권 국가에서 살거나 어학연수를 한 경험이 있습니까?

예  아니오

만약 있으시면, 영어권 국가의 이름과 체류기간을 적어주세요.

1) 국가명: \_\_\_\_\_ 체류기간(예: 6 개월): \_\_\_\_\_년 \_\_\_\_\_ 개월

2) 국가명 : \_\_\_\_\_ 체류기간(예: 6 개월): \_\_\_\_\_년 \_\_\_\_\_ 개월

4) 국어작문에 관련된 수업(학교/학원 모두 포함)을 들은 경험이 있습니까?

예  아니오

만약 있다면, 언제 수업을 들으셨습니까? \_\_\_\_\_ (예: 고등학교 때)

기간은 얼마나 됩니까? \_\_\_\_\_ (예: 6 개월)

4-1) 국어작문 수업에서 논설문(설득/주장)을 쓰는 법을 배운 적이있습니까? 예  아니오

5) 대학 입학시험시 논술시험을 본 경험이 있습니까?

예  아니오

만약 있으시다면 어떻게 준비하엿습니까?

\_\_\_\_\_ 혼자서 책이나 인터넷을 통해 공부했다. \_\_\_\_\_ 학원/과외/스터디

\_\_\_\_\_ 특별히 준비하지 않았다.

\_\_\_\_\_ 기타 (예: \_\_\_\_\_)

6) 영어 작문 수업 (학교/학원 모두 포함)을 들은 경험이 있습니까?

예  아니오

만약 있으시다면 언제쯤 입니까? \_\_\_\_\_ (예: 고등학교 때)

기간은 얼마나 됩니까? \_\_\_\_\_ (예: 6 개월)

과목명과 수업에 관해서 간단히 설명해주세요.

(예:토플라이팅-토플 에세이 시험을 준비하는 수업)

6-1) 영어작문 수업에서 논설문(설득/주장)을 쓰는 법을 배운 적이있습니까? 예 \_\_\_\_ 아니오 \_\_\_\_

7) 공인 영어 작문시험(예: TWE (Test for Written English - TOEFL essay test) )을 본 적이 있습니까?  
예 \_\_\_\_ 아니오 \_\_\_\_

만약 있다면 언제입니까? \_\_\_\_\_

공인 영어 작문 시험을 위해서 영어 작문에 관련된 공부는 어떻게 했나요?

- \_\_\_\_ 혼자 책이나 인터넷을 참조                      \_\_\_\_ 학원/과외/스터디
- \_\_\_\_ 특별히 준비하지 않았다.
- \_\_\_\_ 기타 (예:\_\_\_\_\_)

8) 다음은 영어 작문을 할 때 학습자가 겪는 어려움에 관련된 사항들입니다. 본인에게 얼마나 영향을 미치는지에 대해서 각 항목마다 해당되는 숫자에 동그라미를 하세요.

	문제없다		보통		
	심각하다				
- 어휘가 부족하다.	1	2	3	4	5
- 문법이 부정확하다.	1	2	3	4	5
- 문장패턴이 다양하지 못하다.	1	2	3	4	5
- 내용이 빈약하다	1	2	3	4	5
- 문장과 문장,단락과단락사이 연결이매끄럽지 못하다	1	2	3	4	5
- 글전체 구성(예:서론- 본 론- 결론)이 체계적이지 못하다	1	2	3	4	5
- 기타 _____	1	2	3	4	5

9) 다음 항목마다 본인이 얼마나 동의하는지에 따라 해당되는 숫자에 동그라미를 하세요.

영어로 쓰여진 글과 비교하였을 때 한국어로 쓰여진 글은...

	강하게 반대			강하게 동의	
	1	2	3	4	5
- 주장하는 바를 <u>간접적으로</u> 전달하는 경향이 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
- 갑작스런 내용의 전환이나, 주제에서 벗어나는 내용이 전개되는 경향이 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
- 주제문이 문단의 맨 뒤에 나오는 경향이 있다.	1	2	3	4	5
- 논리적이지 못하다.	1	2	3	4	5
- 언어적 차이를 제외하고는 영어로 쓰여진 글과 차이가 없다.	1	2	3	4	5
- 기타 _____	1	2	3	4	5

10) 두 에세이(국문/영문)를 쓸 때, 내용이나 구성면에서 국문 에세이와 영문 에세이를 다르게

작성하려고 하였습니까?  
만약 응답이 예라면, 그 이유에 대해서 설명해 주세요.

예 \_\_\_\_ 아니오 \_\_\_\_

11) 본인이 작성한 두 에세이가 다른 언어로 작성되었는데, 그 이외의 차이점이 있다고 생각하십니까?

예 \_\_\_\_ 아니오 \_\_\_\_

만약 응답이 예라면, 그 이유에 대해서 설명해 주세요.

---

설문에 답변해 주셔서 감사합니다.

## Appendix C

Location of main idea(s): *Argumentative/Persuasive* (adapted from Kubota, 1998, pp. 98-99)

1. Initial: The writer's opinion on learning English abroad is stated in the introduction.
2. Middle: The writer's opinion on learning English abroad is stated in the middle section.
3. Final: The writer's opinion on learning English abroad is stated in the conclusion.
4. Collection: There is no encompassing statement of the writer's opinion on learning English abroad, but the opinion is expressed in more than one location.
5. Obscure: The writer's opinion on learning English abroad is not clearly stated.

## Appendix D

Macro-level patterns: *Argumentative/Persuasive* (from Kubota, 1998, p.100)

1. Col: Equally weighted arguments on the topic are juxtaposed.
2. Comp: Two elements are stated in a relationship of compare/contrast, adversative or alternative.
3. Explanation
  - Exp: The writer's opinion on the topic is presented and then a supporting reason is stated.
  - Exp(Col): The writer's opinion on the topic is presented and then supporting reasons are enumerated.
  - Exp(Comp): The writer's opinion on the topic is presented and then a supporting reason is presented by comparing or contrasting two elements.
4. Specification
  - Spec: The writer's opinion and a preview statement of a supporting reason or a point of view for the subsequent argument are presented, and then it is explained in more detail.
  - Spec(Co1): The writer's opinion and a preview statement of supporting reasons or a point of view for the subsequent arguments are presented, and then the reasons or arguments are explained in more detail by enumeration.
  - Spec(Comp): The writer's opinion and a preview statement of supporting reasons or a point of view for the subsequent arguments are presented, and then the reasons or arguments are explained in more detail by comparing/contrasting two elements.
5. Comp→Exp: After an opinion, which is against the writer's, is presented, the writer's opinion is stated and it is supported by a reason.
6. Induction
  - Ind: The main idea is placed at the end and preceding arguments constitute supporting reason(s) for it.
  - Ind(Co1): The writer's opinion is realized in the final section; the preceding arguments constitute premises or reasons which are arranged in a form of enumeration.
  - Comp→Ind: After two elements are stated in a relationship of compare/contrast, adversative or alternative, the writer's opinion is drawn at the end.
7. Other: None of the above.

## Appendix E

Definition for Textual Organization Subtypes (from J. Choi, 2006, pp.114-115)

### **Introduction**

Claim is the assertion of the writer, which is the thesis statement of the essay.

Situation states facts and circumstances which serve as background information to the problem.

Metastatement is to make explicit the relationship of the subsequent statement, such as I will discuss X, and X has expressed the following idea

### **Body**

Exemplification exemplifies an aspect of the state of affairs or a proposition expressed in the preceding statement (*for example, for instance, etc.*).

Justification gives reasons for acts or actions (*e.g., first, second, third, etc.*).

Addition refers to the all kind of statement added to explain or to support the writer's argument (*in addition, moreover, etc.*)

Problem (Counter Claim) is an assertion, which the writer does not expect the reader to believe in the validity of the prepositions expressed. Sometimes it is the opposite side of the argument that the writer has already mentioned. It often includes a negative evaluation of facts and circumstances. This role is often marked by an adversative conjunction (*e.g., but, yet, however, on the other hand, etc.*).

Evaluation consists of a positive evaluation or a negative evaluation. This function is frequently marked by quality-attributing adjectives (*e.g., good, bad, important, etc.*).

### **Conclusion**

Conclusion presents an assertion or a statement which is justified or explained by the preceding statement (*in conclusion, to sum up, therefore, as a result, etc.*).

Summarization occurs when the writer summarizes all the arguments that have been made so far. Repetition of the claim means the writer repeats the claim mentioned already in the introduction.

Solution puts forward recommendations and proposals as to how the problem should be solved.

## Appendix F

\*Tables for Textual organization subtypes of Group 2 and Group 3

Table 8. Textual organization subtypes of Group 2

Participant	Subtypes (the number of them in each essay)	
	English	Korean
W21	Claim, Situation Justification(2), Problem Conclusion, Solution	Situation, Claim Justification, Evaluation, Exemplification Conclusion, Solution
W22	Situation, Claim Exemplification(2), Justification(2), Evaluation Conclusion	Situation, Claim Justification(3) Conclusion
W23	Situation, Claim, Metastatement Justification(3), Evaluation(2), Exemplification(3), Problem Conclusion	Situation, Claim Justification(3), Exemplification, Addition, Problem(2) Conclusion, Summarization, Solution
W24	Situation, Claim Problem, Justification(2), Addition Conclusion	Situation, Claim Justification(2), Evaluation, Addition Conclusion, Claim, Solution
W25	Claim, Justification(2) Addition, Evaluation Solution	Situation, Claim Justification(3)
W26	Situation, Claim Exemplification(2), Justification, Evaluation Conclusion, Repetition	Situation Justification(2), Exemplification, Addition Conclusion, Claim, Summarization
W27	Claim Justification, Exemplification(2), Addition Repetition	Claim Justification(2), Problem(2) Repetition
W28	Situation, Claim Justification Conclusion	Situation Justification, Exemplification, Evaluation Solution, Conclusion
W29	Claim, Situation Justification(3), Addition Repetition	Claim Justification(2), Exemplification, Evaluation Repetition
W20	Claim Exemplification(2) Conclusion	Claim Exemplification Conclusion

*Note.* The table for textual organization shows the participants uses of subunits for both essays. Subunit is a criterion for judging an introduction-body-conclusion structure. If there is a new claim in the body and conclusion, it was defined as *ki-swung-cen-kyul* structure. Table for Textual organization subtypes of Group 2 and Group 3 are in Appendix F.

Table 9. Textual organization subtypes of Group 3

Participant	Subtypes (the number of them in each essay)	
	English	Korean
W31	Situation, Claim Justification(2), Problem, Evaluation Conclusion	Situation, Claim Justification(3), Evaluation Conclusion
W32	Claim, Metastatement Exemplification, Problem Evaluation Conclusion, Repetition, Solution	Claim Justification(2), Evaluation Conclusion
W33	Situation, Claim Rhetorical Question Justification, Evaluation, Exemplification Conclusion, Solution	Claim, Metastatement Justification(4), Evaluation(4), Problem, Addition Conclusion, Claim
W34	Situation Justification(2), Problem, Addition Conclusion, Solution	Situation Justification(3), Problem(2), Evaluation Conclusion, Solution
W35	Situation, Claim, Metastatement Exemplification, Problem, Evaluation Conclusion	Situation, Rhetorical Question Problem, Justification(2), Addition, Evaluation Conclusion, Solution
W36	Metastatement, Claim Justification, Exemplification(2), Addition, Problem Repetition, Conclusion	Metastatement, Claim Exemplification(3), Problem Conclusion
W37	Claim Justification(2), Exemplification, Addition, Problem Repetition	Claim Justification(2), Exemplification Repetition, Conclusion, Solution
W38	Claim, Metastatement Justification(2), Exemplification, Evaluation Conclusion, Summarization	Claim Problem, Exemplification(3) Conclusion, Claim
W39	Situation, Claim Problem, Metastatement, Justification(3)	Situation, Claim, Metastatement Justification(3)
W30	Claim Justification, Problem Repetition	Claim Justification(2), Exemplification Conclusion, Summarization, Repetition

*Note.* The table for textual organization shows the participants uses of subunits for both essays. Subunit is a criterion for judging an introduction-body-conclusion structure. If there is a new claim in the body and conclusion, it was defined as *ki-swung-cen-kyul* structure.

## Appendix G

### Participant Sample Essays

#### W21's English essay

One of the best ways to learn a language is learning in the country the language is spoken. However, this is not the only best way and this is not always effective. When learning language, above all, the learners are the most important factor. They should have a motivation to learn a language and can find appropriate ways to learn even though they are not study in the English-speaking countries.

As people need an objective to achieve their goal when they do something, this principle can apply to studying and to learning language. When learners have reasons why they want to learn a language, this motivation can help learners acquire the language. If learners do not have a motivation, a reason, or a goal, even if they go abroad to learn English, their learning might be slowly improved.

Learners should know their levels and find out effective ways to learn the language as well as have motivations. They can study with English speaking teacher or friend regardless of their levels. They also can find other different strategies such as online program for listening or speaking.

I would like to recommend language learners to learn the language in their home country as low as their level is and as young as they are. It is effective for the learners of those cases to do in their country rather than abroad as I considering to some factors such as economical and psychological. It needs more time and more money for those learners to learn a language and also it is possible for them to be unstable psychologically.

#### W21's Korean Essay (Translated version)

Studying English abroad is still popular even though high exchange rate of dollar cause by economic devastation of Korea. However, the learners of English in Korea (mostly university students) consider going abroad with extra care since it would be burdensome for their parents. It is not a bad idea to study English abroad but the purpose to go abroad is only to improve your language skills, I would suggest finding good English program in Korea and staying in Korea, rather than go abroad.

First of all, an attitude of a learner is important in terms of learning. This would also apply to language learning. The language learners need to be motivated for their learning and it plays crucial role for their learning process. It doesn't matter how brilliant the learners are if they are not motivated to learn something. Also, it doesn't matter how good a language program is, if the learners are not motivated.

Next, it is a good idea to find a good English program that is comparable to study abroad program. There are many foreigners live in Korea already and most of them are native speakers of English. It would be beneficial, if the learners of English could find a circumstance where they have many chances to use English in their daily lives. However, it is hard to find such an environment. Therefore, the learners of English may have more chances to use English by going

to private English institutes, taking English conversation classes, and joining English discussion groups. Learning a language means not only learning language itself but also a process of getting to know the culture of language. Using media that contain languages and socio-cultural context, such as TV series, movies, newspapers, and novels, will help learners learn both a language and the culture.

It is hard to tell that students will improve their English skill if they study abroad. Rather than studying abroad, going abroad as exchange students or working abroad after they reach certain levels of English fluency would be more beneficial for improving English skills.