WRITING ABOUT WRITING: QUALITIES OF METACOGNITIVE L2 WRITING REFLECTIONS

MELISSA M. JOYCE KIM

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

ABSTRACT

This case study of two L2 writers in an intermediate English writing class examines each student's use of in-class opportunities for written, metacognitive reflection as part of a supplemental curriculum that also included the use of inventories, explicit explanation of relevant terms, and teacher modeling of metacognitive activity. Written reflections were completed throughout the course to facilitate metacognitive development and were used as the primary unit of analysis with the aim of gaining a deeper understanding of this development for the purpose of self-regulation. Flavell's (1979) categories of person, task, and strategic metacognitive knowledge were utilized in the analysis of data as well as Norman and Aron's (2003) concepts of availability, accessibility, and perceived control, proposed to affect motivation to achieve or avoid a possible future self. These ideas were used in order to examine the relationships between each individual's expressed writing goals and aspects of their metacognitive activities. One student's goal was available, accessible, and well-aligned to the course goals; this seemed to allow her to actively strategize to monitor her progress more effectively. Furthermore, she displayed a higher level of self-efficacy than the other student.

Degree of self-efficacy seemed to affect the students' level of perceived control; the other student's pre-occupation with his negative self-efficacy seemed to hinder the development of strategic knowledge and his ability to monitor his progress, in spite of his stated enjoyment of writing. Additionally, his goals were less available, less accessible, and less aligned to the purpose of the course. Although more research is needed, the results point to a need for L2 writing curricula to include effective L2 writing goal-setting strategies in metacognitive classroom activities because of the potential effect on student motivation as well as metacognitive development.

INTRODUCTION

Adult second language learning is a lifelong endeavor. As a result, strategies for developing greater autonomy and self-regulation in language learners have gained increasing popularity in research and in classrooms; whole issues of academic journals, such as *Language Learning & Technology* (2011), have taken up this theme in recent years. In the field of second language (L2) writing, strategies for self-regulation are particularly important to not just for furthering acquisition but to specific steps in the writing process, such as self-editing (Ferris, 1995). Navigating the writing process is already a demanding task which requires extensive linguistic and metacognitive capacities (Schoonen, Gelderen, Glopper, Hulstijn, Simis, Snellings, & Stevenson, 2003); for second language writers, it is considerably more demanding, as general L2 fluency affects L2 writing fluency in particular (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001). The additional mental capacity required to address the linguistic aspects of L2 writing may greatly affect an L2 writer's ability to fully utilize the metacognitive processes necessary to the writing process (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001; McCutchen, 2000). Therefore, further development of metacognitive awareness, knowledge and strategies have clear benefits to L2 learning and writing.

Background

The development of metacognition, or thinking about thinking, is clearly beneficial for second language writers of English in both enhancing writing achievement and increasing learner autonomy (Lu & Liu, 2011; Ruan, 2005; Yanyan, 2010). Metacognition has been defined as "any knowledge or cognitive activity that takes as its object, or regulates, any aspect of cognitive activity" (Flavell, 2004, p. 275). Schmidt (2001) attributes metacognition to a third level of "consciousness as awareness." This occurs when, having noticed some aspect of the environment, we can analyze it and compare it to what we have noticed on other occasions. We can reflect on the objects of consciousness and attempt to comprehend their significance, and we can experience insight and understanding. All of this mental activity—what we commonly think of as *thinking*—goes on within consciousness (Schmidt, 2001, p. 132).

Flavell (1979) identified three distinctive components of metacognitive knowledge: *person knowledge*, *task knowledge*, and *strategic knowledge*. Person knowledge refers to what the

individual knows about themselves as a learner, task knowledge refers to what the individual knows about the demands of the task they are attempting, and strategic knowledge refers to the knowledge that the individual has about strategies that may be useful for the task as well as when to use said strategies. Metacognitive strategies differ from cognitive strategies in that metacognitive strategies function to monitor the use of cognitive strategies, which are used to solve specific problems (Chien, 2006). In spite of individual differences that may result from cognitive diversity or circumstance, knowledge of cognition seems to increase with age and experience; adults and older children are more able than young children to accurately monitor and evaluate their cognitive processes (Flavell, 1979).

However, the development of metacognition is not the only factor in achieving higher levels of self-regulation; Zimmerman's (1995) social cognitive discussion of student failures to self-regulate pointed out the importance of aspects of self-concept, such as *self-efficacy*, which are deeply intertwined with issues of motivation. Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief about their capacity to achieve specific goals (Bandura, 1977), reflecting their level of confidence in their *perceived control* over their future. Perceived control, along with *availability* and *accessibility*, are three key qualities that Norman and Aron (2003) propose to affect an individual's motivation to achieve or avoid a specific mental representation of themselves in the future, or *possible future selves* (Higgins, 1987; Markus & Nurius, 1986). Higgins (1987) suggested that each individual has multiple possible future selves which exist simultaneously in their imagining of the future; these may include an "ideal self," an "ought" self, an "actual" self, and a "can" self, based on an individual's hopes, fears, and circumstances.

Ruvolo and Markus (1992) suggested that positive or desired future representations of oneself may lead to increased motivation and as a result, enhanced performance. Norman and Aron's (2003) model supports this conclusion and further specifies the connections between these mental representations and motivation. Availability refers to cognitive availability, or "the ease with which an outcome can be pictured or constructed" (p. 501). A more available possible self will be easier to imagine as well as more detailed in nature, and will therefore have more influence on behavior. Accessibility of a possible self refers to "activation potential" (Higgins, 1996), or "how easily a stored knowledge unit can be brought into one's awareness" (Norman & Aron, 2003, p. 501). A more accessible possible self will be more easily brought into awareness and therefore given more attention; as a result, it will have more influence on behavior than a

less accessible possible self. Finally, perceived control is "the degree to which individuals believe their behaviors can influence the attainment or avoidance of a possible self" (Norman & Aron, 2003, p. 501).

These important aspects of an individual's self-concept (Markus & Sentis, 1982) are "an important influence in regulating behavior, functioning to organize and individual's interpretation of the world, determining what stimuli are selected for attention, and what inferences are drawn" (Norman & Aron, 2003, p. 500). In the context of the supplemental metacognitive curriculum experienced by the adult L2 writers in this study, the concept of *learned* or *selective attention* was therefore considered relevant to the development of effective and accurate metacognitive processes. Learned attention plays a significant role and is a potentially limiting factor in the L2 acquisition process for adults (Ellis & Sagarra, 2011; Kruschke, 2006); this concept played a role in the supplemental curriculum experienced by the students in this case study. Krushke (2006) explains the concept of learned attention as a quality of the human learning process in which,

> When confronted by new things to learn, people can rapidly shift attention, thereby increasing speed of acquisition and decreasing interference with previous knowledge. The shift of attention is itself learned, so that attention is allocated to particular cues in particular contexts. While selective attention benefits acquisition, it can also lead to distortions of knowledge that are evident when the knowledge is transferred to novel situations. (p. 1)

Adult L2 writers have already learned that specific linguistic, cultural, and social cues are important (or unimportant) in their first language, making unfamiliar cues in the L2 more difficult to acquire. In this way, learned attention may actively inhibit the learning of novel cues (e.g., *blocking*) (Kruschke, 2006), although the ability of humans to quickly shift attention and selectively focus can enhance the learning of a language (e.g., *highlighting*) in other ways. This important aspect of L2 learning research is not often explicitly shared with L2 learners, even though it may be one of the main culprits behind limited adult second language acquisition (Ellis & Sagarra, 2011; Kruschke, 2006). In the development of the supplemental curriculum for the classroom in which this study took place, metacognitive awareness of these concepts may be very useful for developing a more accurate understanding of an individual's writing process and linguistic and cultural differences in writing. The development of this metacognitive awareness allows the learner to better strategize based on their declarative (what they know about

themselves and the task), procedural (how they can use what they know), and conditional (under which conditions they may use what they know) knowledge and then to monitor and evaluate their language learning more effectively through more explicit knowledge of themselves as a language learner and the task at hand (Tapinta, 2006).

Related Research: Metacognitive Classroom Interventions

L2 writing research on classroom interventions to encourage the development of metacognitive skills and strategies and consequently, higher levels of self-regulation, have been primarily with high school and college age students and tend to utilize Flavell's (1979) model, viewing metacognitive knowledge in terms of person, task, and strategy. Research done in this area suggests that metacognitive variables are at least equally as important as linguistic competence to success in second language writing (Devine, 1993). L2 writing researchers (Moran & Soiferman, 2010; Rogers, 2010) have subsequently made arguments for L2 writing classroom interventions which generally include explicit modeling of cognitive and metacognitive thought processes, explicit instructions, and ample opportunities for practice.

In a study of intermediate and advanced college L2 writing students, Kasper (1997) found a positive correlation between students' metacognitive growth and their writing performance using a combination of autobiographical writing and cognitive inventories. Yanyan (2010) used a similar approach with 120 non-English majors in EFL classes in a Chinese context and found metacognitive knowledge to be positively correlated with English writing performance as well as learner autonomy. Strategic knowledge was found to have the highest correlation and person knowledge the second highest. Furthermore, Lu and Liu (2011) found a statistically significant difference between more and less successful ESL university students in their use of metacognitive strategies, showing self-monitoring strategies to be a dominant factor in their success. The present study takes place in the context of a classroom intervention similar to these studies; however, whereas these studies use quantitative methods to determine the relationships of metacognitive knowledge to writing performance, this case study provides a more detailed examination of two L2 writing students' metacognitive reflection about their writing.

Purpose of the Present Study

The purpose of this case study analysis was to examine two students' processes of self-

regulation during an intensive English academic writing course in a short-term study abroad program. The analysis of these cases focuses particularly on identifying important themes in these students' reflective writings that may provide insight into the relationships between aspects of motivation, goal-setting, students' metacognitive knowledge of themselves, the tasks they undertake in the class, and the strategies they use to further develop their English writing skills for the purpose of more effective self-regulation. This analysis was generally guided by the following research questions:

1. How does each student use in-class opportunities for metacognitive reflection?
2. What are the most prominent qualities of each student's metacognitive reflections?
3. How do these qualities seem to relate to each other and to the process of monitoring their writing?
4. How do Norman and Aron's (2003) concepts of availability, accessibility, and perceived control to avoid or attain possible selves affect the quality of each student's written metacognitive reflections?

METHODS

Context

The two students in this case study were enrolled in an intensive academic English writing class for students studying English as a second language in a short-term study abroad program at a U.S. university. This program offers eight-week courses in English speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Many students attend these courses for the experience abroad, for TOEFL preparation, or for conditional acceptance to the associated U.S. university. Full-time students who attend this program are placed in local homestays, take four courses per term, and study for approximately twenty hours per week. Upon completion of their courses, students receive a certificate of completion.

The writing component of this program utilizes a process-oriented approach in which students receive feedback from teachers and peers at different stages in the writing process. The specific writing course in this study is designated as a high-intermediate level academic writing course and generally covers three or four primary types of essays; its focus is on the steps of the writing process for the purpose of writing short essays and academic writing conventions. In the

interest of facilitating metacognitive and self-regulatory gains in terms of students' English language learning and writing, one of the writing teachers and I collaboratively designed activities to supplement the existing curriculum based on the research done in this area.

The Supplemental Curriculum: "Learning about Learning"

The class in the present study was themed *Learning About Learning* and focused on metacognitive awareness building and focused written reflections throughout the writing process. The syllabus as well as the class activities reflected the metacognitive focus of the class. On the syllabus (Appendix A), the learning objectives and the grading schema included a metacognitive component, and explanations of metacognition and learned attention were provided. On the first day of class, the teacher reviewed the syllabus in detail and discussed explanations of *metacognition*, *attention*, *pay[ing] attention*, and *learned attention*, as well as other aspects of the syllabus. The metacognitive steps (Knapper, 2006; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) addressed in the syllabus were posted at the front of the classroom for the teacher to reference during activities and assignments in order to draw attention to the coordination of the reflective metacognitive process with the writing process.

The first week focused primarily on explanation of the concept of metacognition, attention as it relates to adult second language learners, and practical applications and benefits of understanding and utilizing these concepts through a variety of discussions and activities.

Students completed the Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI) (Schraw & Dennison, 1994) (Appendix B) and the Daly-Miller Test or Writing Apprehension Test (WAT) (Daly & Miller, 1975) (Appendix C)**,** and checked their own results; these were intended to provide students with ideas for strategies and future reflection on their writing process. To ensure understanding of items on these inventories, part of one class period was spent explaining and discussing the different categories and statements from the MAI. With the exception of Takeshi, who was absent for the first week and completed the inventories in the second week, the students did a focused free write, reflecting on their highest and lowest areas from the MAI. Although Takeshi was not able to participate in the group discussions during the first week, he did receive individual explanation from the teacher with regard to the inventories. Wenni and Takeshi's pre- and post-results for the MAI can be found in Appendix D.

This course used the same book as the other sections of the same course taught at the

program and similarly had units on a descriptive five-paragraph essay, the narrative essay, and the comparison-contrast essay. However, throughout each unit, students completed prompted, in-class, reflective free writes (Appendix E) at different stages of the writing process to address specific steps in the development of metacognitive awareness. The students were aware that these reflective writings were not graded or evaluated. Group and pair discussions throughout the writing process for each essay also asked the same types of questions as the reflective free writes.

Finally, as required by the course book, a timed writing was completed at the end of each of the three units, to practice the writing skills learned in that unit. The timed writing for the last unit (Comparison-Contrast) (Appendix F), however, was reflective in nature and focused on the class theme. Before completing the last timed writing, students completed the MAI and WAT a second time. While planning their essay, they were allowed to look at pre- and post- results from the inventories as well as their free writes and essays from the beginning and end of the semester. The topic of the timed writing was to compare and contrast their writing from the beginning of the eight-week course to their writing at the end of the course, utilizing and referring to their written "data" as evidence to support their arguments.

Based on two pilot studies done in the same course in previous terms, the teacher, Matt, and I had planned an increased amount of flexibility in the activity selection for each unit and regular incorporation of student input in the selection process. However, we encountered resistance to this from the students in this course that we had not experienced with the students from the pilot studies. Although some of the students enjoyed the added agency in the curriculum, others seemed to view it negatively and did not want to participate. As a result, we had to forgo the unit planning activities that we had used in previous sessions.

Participants

Eight students enrolled in this course. Two Korean students (one male, one female) were only able to stay three of the eight weeks. Of the remaining six students, there were two Chinese students (one male and one female), two Korean students (both female), and two Japanese students (one male and one female). Two students, Wenni and Takeshi, were chosen to examine in more detail for this case study because of their engagement with the curriculum in general and the reflective writing aspect in particular. Additionally, they were both identified by the teacher,

Matt, as students who thoughtfully revised their essays throughout the writing process (not common to all of the students in the course) and interestingly, provided the least amount of verbal participation.

The following student profiles primarily include information written by the students about themselves in an initial background survey (Appendix G) administered by the teacher at the beginning of the eight-week course. Secondarily, my own observations as the researcher are included. These profiles also include self-ratings from each student regarding their language proficiencies as well as specific academic skill areas in the English language (Table 1). They were asked to rate themselves on a scale from 1-10, with ten being the highest fluency in that language/area.

Wenni, a Chinese female working on her undergraduate degree, started learning English in primary school and did not enjoy it. From her perspective, "English is an exam in the end of semesters," and she thinks her English is just "so-so." She stated that her main purpose for studying English is to improve her TOEFL score, but she would also like to be able to communicate clearly with others. On the topic of writing, Wenni states, "I don't like to write anything. Because I prefer talking with my friends rather than writing down. My friends can give me some advices when I'm talking to them." Wenni rated herself as a 10 for fluency in Chinese, her native language, and a 5 for English.

Takeshi, a middle-aged Japanese male, was significantly older than the rest of the students in this particular class. Takeshi started learning English when he was thirteen years old and stated that he enjoyed it the first three years. After that, he studied it for his high school and university entrance exams. In 2011, Takeshi began to study English intensively in order to be able to speak English fluently; in the future, he would like to take the exam to earn his tour guide license and would like to use English to help English speakers in Japan. Takeshi wrote that he enjoyed writing in English because he "can say many things that [he] can't say in Japanese." Takeshi rated himself as a 10 for fluency in Japanese, his native language, a 5 for English and a 2 for Korean.

Table 1
Student Self-Ratings in English Skill Areas

English skill area	Wenni	Takeshi
Speaking	3	5
Listening	5	2
Reading	8	5
Writing	5	6

Wenni was present for the entirety of the course with one absence during the term. However, Takeshi missed the entire first week and the first reflective free write regarding his results on the MAI. Although he received individual explanation, he spent considerably less time discussing the terms presented in the syllabus than the rest of the class. After analysis, I believe it is possible that not taking part in the initial class activities affected his understanding of some of the key terms, as he does not address terms concerning metacognition or learned attention directly in his reflective writing, as Wenni often does. However, with the existing data, it is difficult to assess his understanding of the topic.

Data Collection

During the eight weeks of the course, I met with the instructor, Matt, daily and attended the class to observe and to take field notes. Each class was audio recorded, as were small group and pair discussions between students. As my recording resources were somewhat limited, not every student discussion was recorded during every class. Additionally, all student writing (from all process stages) and free-writing was collected to the best of my ability without being intrusive. This was limited in some ways by students forgetting to turn in assignments and on occasion by human error on the part of the instructor or myself, in terms of making sure I received each set of assignments and that they were scanned and returned. As a result, the completeness of the set of student writing that I was able to collect varies slightly from student to student. The reflective free writing and timed writings, however, were consistently turned in as they were all done in regular class time; along with small group and pair discussions regarding student reflection on their writing process, these are the primary focus of my analysis for these cases.

Analysis

The data from this course were organized first, chronologically, and then chronologically and by individual student and teacher. Although I chose to focus on the themes present in their reflective writings, all data from the course (verbal and written) that Takeshi and Wenni were involved in were considered for the analysis. Many of the classroom studies concerning the effects of metacognitive development on writing performance use quantitative analysis (Kasper, 1997; Lu & Liu, 2011; Yanyan, 2010). However, as this is a case study with the purpose of examining personal metacognitive reflection as opposed to writing performance, I felt that a qualitative, exploratory analysis would allow for a more complete picture to develop.

Additionally, because I observed and participated directly in the context in which the students' written reflections were situated, this analysis regards myself, the researcher, as the primary research instrument. Field notes, transcriptions of audio recordings, and student writing were coded first inductively and reiteratively, and then were looked at with a focus on the three designations of metacognitive knowledge (person, task, strategic) proposed in the literature and used by the aforementioned classroom studies.

FINDINGS

Person Knowledge: Self-Efficacy and Enjoyment

A sense of self-efficacy, greatly important to the successful development of self-regulation (Ruan, 2014; Zimmerman, 1995), was also a clear theme in the students' reflective writing. Direct statements about perceived competency were often accompanied by affective statements about learning English, writing, and writing in English. In these cases, student statements about their self-efficacy and statements regarding whether or not they enjoyed the task did not seem to parallel each other; instead, they were often used as a point of contrast. Takeshi often states that he likes writing in English yet does not seem to have a great deal of confidence in himself as a writing student, while Wenni states her dislike of English writing and yet expresses a high degree of self-efficacy.

Takeshi: "I like writing, but writing is difficult for me." In his language background survey as well as multiple reflective free writes and the third timed writing, Takeshi consistently states that he enjoys studying English, likes to write, and enjoys writing in English. On his background

survey, he stated that he liked writing in English because he "can say many things that [he] can't say in Japanese." However, in eight out of his ten reflective free writes, Takeshi makes a variety of definitive, negatively evaluative statements about his abilities as a student writer. For example, in an early free write about the challenges of writing the first draft of his five paragraph essay, Takeshi writes, "I wrote only two patterns, that is, question style or explaining style. I've learned three or four styles as hook. Maybe some of them, I can't write. I'm not good at survey style." This is characteristic of Takeshi's reflections; he consistently writes that he "can't" do something or "has no idea" about something. Additionally, in the free writes that prompt the student to suggest a way to improve on the challenge they experienced, Takeshi only addresses this prompt in two of his reflections, one of which does not include a specific suggestion ("Maybe I have no way but to practice, practice, practice."). This *suggestion* for improvement is more reflective of Takeshi's perception of himself in his learning than of his strategic knowledge.

In place of suggestions for improvement on the challenges that he experiences, Takeshi makes negative statements about himself, particularly in combination with statements about his effort in or enjoyment of writing. These statements occur at the end of free writes that prompt the student to think of a resource or strategy for the next time the challenge arises and are a variation of, "I like writing, but writing is difficult for me" or "Although I think hard, it is not easy for me." For instance, after submitting a draft of their narrative essay, the students wrote in response to the prompt, "What was the most challenging thing about writing the first draft of your narrative essay? What was challenging about it? How can you improve on this in the future?" Takeshi's response was,

```
1  This time, choosing a topic is difficult for me. What will I chose? I chose 4 topics
2  forcedly. But those are not interesting, maybe. Finally I chose about jobs experience
3  during in Japan. This time I confused again what I should write about. Building
4  organization of my story was very difficult for me. This part is necessary, this part is
5  unnecessary. In my mind, a kind of conflict happened. I like writing, but writing is
6  difficult for me.
```

Takeshi begins this free write by answering the first prompted question (line 1). He then goes onto describe his thought process (lines 1-3) revealing some detailed awareness of his own cognitive activity, though he is not yet utilizing this awareness to reach a goal. The statement,

"But those are not interesting, maybe," seems to illustrate some doubt in his ideas or his own ability choose interesting topics. Next, he points out another challenge that he had (lines 3-6). Again, he describes the process to illustrate the difficulty, which shows awareness of his thought processes. However, rather than address potential solutions or strategies to address either of the identified challenges by answering the third question in the prompt, Takeshi instead ends his free write with a evaluative statement about his affect and skill: "I like writing, but writing is difficult for me."

In his reflections, Takeshi does demonstrate knowledge of himself as an individual; he discusses his thought processes in detail and is able to identify tasks that were more or less difficult for him. However, he does not seem to have a great deal of confidence in himself, and his negative statements about his ability or past performance outnumber the positive. Although person knowledge is a key ingredient to building metacognitive thought processes for self-regulation, Yanyan (2010) found that strategic knowledge had the highest correlation. Takeshi's tendency to utilize opportunities for strategic reflection as a time for general personal evaluation seems to indicate that low self-efficacy may interfere with his ability to access other aspects of his metacognitive knowledge, particularly strategic knowledge. Additionally, he seems to have low self-efficacy in spite of *feeling* very positively toward writing in English. Although low self-confidence may affect his feelings of perceived control over the outcomes of his efforts and in turn, his motivation to develop in this area (Norman & Aron, 2003), his positive emotions about writing could have a counteractive effect (Bown & White, 2010).

Wenni: "For me, I think everything is easy to master but I still need practice about writing on the paper not thinking in my brain." In contrast to Takeshi, Wenni explicitly expresses her sustained dislike of studying English and of writing in her language background survey and occasionally in her reflective free writes. She also comments on concepts or tasks that were difficult for her, as the writing prompts request; however, she does not generally comment on whether or not she *can* do things. Furthermore, comments about challenges that she faced during the writing process are consistently paired with either a positive effect of the challenge that she experienced, a restatement of a goal, or suggestion for improvement for the future.

Although Wenni does not make a specific suggestion for improvement every time prompted, she only skips the prompt in one reflective free write.

Wenni only once comments definitively in a reflective writing on her dislike for writing and her ability as a student. In response to the prompt at the end of the third unit, "Did you think Unit 3 was interesting or useful? Why or why not? What is something you still don't understand very well or find difficult from Unit 3?" Wenni wrote,

```
7   Indeed, I don't like comparison essay, but unit 3 was useful. Teaching me many strategies
8   about brainstorm and outline. The structure of essay, the block or point-by-point, is very
9   methodic, which make me feel more clear about what I'm going to write. For me, I think
10  everything is easy to master, but I still need more practice about writing on the paper not
11  thinking in my brain. The connectors of a comparison essay are very useful. They make
12  the essay more comparable.
```

In response to the first prompt, Wenni states her dislike for the comparison essay; however, in spite of not enjoying it, she writes, "but unit 3 was useful." She answers the second prompt by giving a reason, "Teaching me many strategies about brainstorm and outline," both part of the planning goal that she repeatedly identified as challenging to her and that she had been working on for the entire term. She elaborates, "The structure of essay, the block or point-and-point, is very methodic, which make me feel more clear about what I'm going to write." Wenni is aware of what specifically made her feel more comfortable planning during this unit. Even though she did not enjoy the comparison essay, Wenni felt that it was useful because it helped her to brainstorm and outline in a more methodic way, and she realizes that having a more methodic way of dealing with the things that challenge her/developing a clear plan before writing makes her feel "more clear" about her writing. She then makes an evaluative statement about her abilities, the only one that occurs in any of her free writes: "For me, I think everything is easy to master, but I still need more practice about writing on the paper not thinking in my brain." Wenni seems to have a view of herself as an effective student; even though she has challenges, she feels she can master anything with practice. She also reflects that the actual practice of the skills that challenge her are better mastered by actually writing things down, rather than just thinking about them. This is also a rare free write for Wenni in that she skips the third prompt asking her to identify something that she still has questions about; rather than answering this question, she ends by commenting on the usefulness of the connectors in the comparison essay (something that she had addressed in a previous free write as something that she was confused about).

Unlike Takeshi, Wenni seems to have positive self-efficacy, feeling as though she can master anything if she works at it. Additionally, although she consistently acknowledges that she does not enjoy writing, it does not seem to affect her confidence in her abilities as a writer. Her perceived control over specific writing tasks and writing in English, in general, seems to be high.

Monitoring Progress on Writing Goals: Availability and Accessibility

Although Wenni and Takeshi acknowledged very different writing goals for this course, the negotiation of and progress on these goals was a consistent theme throughout their reflections. Their goals, however, varied dramatically in terms of *availability* and *accessibility* (Norman & Aron, 2010), which becomes apparent as they negotiate these goals through their reflective free writes.

Takeshi: "I think this structure is useful not only for academic, but also for daily lives in some meaning." Takeshi was the only non-traditional college student in the course, meaning that he was older than the other students, who were all in their early twenties. He also expressed English writing goals that were significantly different from those of the other students. Although Takeshi's main purpose for learning English was "to be able to speak English fluently," which was common in the class, his most likely future type of writing was "For the exam to get license for tour guide." In the future, he envisioned himself using English to "guide and help foreigners in Japan by using English." Takeshi's response to the question, "What do you want to learn or improve in this 8-week course? Do you have any ideas for class activities or things you would like to do in this class?" was quite vague, particularly in contrast with Wenni's; he responded simply, "I want to express correctly what I want to say." Takeshi completed the initial MAI free write, but never submitted it, so I do not know if he specified any goals in that writing assignment. From his results, his lowest scores were in the areas of Procedural and Declarative knowledge, and his highest were in Planning and Debugging Strategies (see Appendix D); these scores do seem to be reflective of his writings.

Although Takeshi has a long-term, bigger-picture goal, his reflective writing makes it clear that he has not developed a clear understanding of the specific pieces that make up his goal and the application of the concepts from this writing course might have for his goal. As a result, his goals of "expressing correctly what [he] wants to say" and preparing for the tour guide exam are much less *accessible* than they have the potential to be (Norman & Aron, 2010). Throughout

his free writes, Takeshi is regularly stuck on the topics of the structure of the essay and how to conclude his writing. Nevertheless, Takeshi does actively negotiate the differences between his goals and experiences writing with the academic course content, determinedly doing valuable metacognitive work in his free writes in spite of the fact that he does not often resolve the differences. During one of his free writes in the second unit (the Narrative Essay), Takeshi was able to specify one aspect of his long-term goal and also to negotiate his self-knowledge with his knowledge of the task. In response to the prompt, "Did you think Unit 2 was interesting or useful? Why or why not? What is something you still don't understand very well or find difficult from Unit 2?" Takeshi wrote,

```
13  The narrative essay was useful for me. Because when I want to convey my feeling and
14  experience to my friend by e-mail or letter, I need to use good and well-organized
15  struction. Of course, it is casual, not formal, but to tell my story properly and precisely, I
16  should write something clearly and chronologically. In fact, during this unit I e-mailed
17  my experience to old friend.
18  I don't understand yet about the body paragraph of the narrative essay. Usually it has
19  three paragraphs. However, I can't write three paragraphs as body. I want to say
20  something, but I can't imagine three parts. When I tell my experience I don't know how
21  many paragraphs there are in my body paragraph. If I write something chronologically, I
22  think three body paragraphs are not always necessary, I feel such a thing.
```

Takeshi answers the first question positively by writing, "The narrative essay was useful for me." He then explains, answering the second question (lines 13-17). This unit was useful to him *because* he was able to utilize skills learned during Unit 2 in his daily life to e-mail his friend; he was able to actively apply the material to a specific skill that is applicable to one of his long-term goals. In so doing, his big-picture goal, or possible future self, that involves "being able to express correctly what he wants to say" (Language Background Survey, Appendix G), has become more available to him (Norman & Aron, 2003). This is a rare instance in which Takeshi identifies a specific writing skill that is useful to him in terms of a long-term goal in a written reflection. However, it is not possible to say definitively whether he did this systematically or whether he was able to consciously identify this as a step towards that goal.

In response to the third question, Takeshi returns to the issue of the three body paragraphs (that he had questions about in the first unit). He writes, "I don't understand yet about the body paragraph of narrative essay." As in the previous free write, he states his knowledge about the task (lines 18-19) before elaborating on the issue. He starts with a seemingly negative statement

about his ability (lines 19-20), but then specifies his confusion about the division of body paragraphs to the narrative unit by saying, "When I tell my experience I don't know how many paragraphs there are in my body paragraph." In contrast with his reflections from the first unit, in which he stated that the three points were difficult for him to find, Takeshi questions the formula of having specifically three body paragraphs based on his own experience writing his narrative essay: "If I write something chronologically, I think three body paragraphs are not always necessary, I feel such a thing." The internal negotiation in which Takeshi takes part in this section of his writing is important to note as it reveals more agency in his development as a writer than was apparent in his reflections from the first unit, or even in the third. The way in which he was able to purposefully *use* the skills from the narrative essay and the subsequent active engagement that he shows with the material in his reflection are unique to this unit.

At the end of the course, Takeshi also did some important metacognitive work in reflecting on the connections between the skills he has learned in the course and the future direction of his life. The prompt for the final reflective writing that the students did at the very end of the third unit was, "What are two things that you need to work on in the future?" Takeshi's response was,

```
23  To tell the truth, maybe I might not use any writing skills that I learned. I won't enter any
24  university to gain degree, and my future job might not require any writing skills.
25  However, It is very important to write something clearly, logically, and sometimes
26  chronologically to make essay easier to read. The structure of the essay are introduction,
27  body, and conclusion paragraph. I think this structure is useful not only for academic,
28  but also for daily lives in some meaning.
29  Also, to conclude the essay, I need to write some suggestion, opinion, etc. Not only in
30  essay, maybe almost everything needs to be added some comments to make writings
31  better.
32  I hope I will have some opportunities to be able to use these skills.
33  Thank you.
```

Takeshi's response to this prompt is very revealing; to some degree, he misinterprets the question. In the first paragraph of his response, rather than addressing skills that he might still need to improve, Takeshi acknowledges that he likely will not use the writing skills from the class in the context for which they were taught (primarily academic writing), as he will not be attending university and he does not plan to have a job that involves writing. However, he negotiates for himself the usefulness of taking the class and learning these skills because he considers it important to be able to write "clearly, logically, and sometimes chronologically," and

he considers the skills learned in the class as having some part in achieving this goal. He returns to the formal structure of a five-paragraph essay, as he had repeatedly throughout the class, pointing out that aspects of this type of structured writing can have use in his daily life. However, in some way, this structure may be something that he feels he still needs to work on (as he mentioned many times throughout his reflective free writing), as well as what he mentions second: the conclusion (line 29). This part about the conclusion is his knowledge about the task, but the following sentence is his negotiation between the task and his own goals: "Not only in essay, maybe almost everything needs to be added some comments to make writings better." Takeshi is taking the academic writing skills and working to translate their use to daily life, immediately after acknowledging that his writing in daily life may have no use with academic writing skills. Even though he has not reconciled these differences, he ends with a courteous and hopeful statement that acknowledges Matt as the audience of his writing: "I hope I will have some opportunity to be able to use these skills. Thank you."

It seems possible that Takeshi's efforts to resolve the disparity between his daily writing needs and the material from the writing course he had just finished are mediated by his enjoyment of and the value that he places on writing. Although his self-efficacy does not seem particularly high and the course content does not correspond directly to his writing needs, Takeshi consistently writes about his enjoyment of writing and the general value of writing skills. If his love of writing in English were the motivation for his enrollment in the course, his investment in the course being useful to his writing goals would be greater; the metacognitive negotiation that takes place in Takeshi's writing seems to be a personal effort to sustain his long-term motivation to write.

Wenni: "Actually I really don't know how to make a plan before writing something. Maybe I can make a good plan when I finish the semester." In her Language Background Survey, Wenni identified her main purpose for learning English as "Getting higher TOEFL score. And can communicate well with others." She identified the "TOEFL test, e-mails, [and] academic papers" as types of writing that she might use, and in the future, she envisions herself "maybe…speak English without thinking too much vocabularies grammar. Just speak straightly." However, Wenni also identified a more specific goal at the beginning of the course. In response to the question, "What do you want to learn or improve in this 8-week course? Do

you have any ideas for class activities or things you would like to do in this class?" Wenni wrote, "To improve my strategies about writing and learn how to make a plan before write papers. Giving a topic and write more and more idea or key words."

Additionally, in her first reflective free write regarding her highest and lowest score on the MAI, Wenni wrote, "Actually, I really don't know how to make a plan before writing something. Maybe I can make a good plan when I finish the semester," reinforcing her focus from the background survey. Although she maintains an even larger-spectrum goal of getting a higher TOEFL score and being able to communicate in English without thinking too much, this course goal reflects a higher degree of specificity, relating explicitly to particular steps in the writing process (brainstorming and outlining) as well as specific aspects of the metacognitive process. Because of this specificity, Wenni achieves a higher degree of availability and accessibility in her goals than Takeshi does.

Throughout her reflective writings, Wenni explores her knowledge about specific writing skills and her knowledge about herself as a writer while she works to monitor and evaluate her progress on her stated goal. As a result, she is able to focus her reflections to enhance her progress on her writing goal for the term. This is illustrated in Wenni's response to the reflective free write prompt, "Did you think Unit 2 was interesting or useful? Why or why not? What is something you still don't understand very well or find difficult from Unit 2?" in which she wrote,

```
34  For me, I think unit 2 is very interesting and useful. Because my shortage is about making
35  a plan and sentence. Narrative essay's suppose is to tell reader a story. Moreover, we
36  have to write the story as clear as possibly so that everyone can understand what were
37  you writing about and have the same feelings in others. So, I tried to make a plan for
38  myself. First time is very difficult. I waste too much time about think the story.
39  Fortunately, second time was better and faster than before. I had a good organization. I
40  think I will be more and more good at making a plan by practicing more.
```

Wenni answers the first question, "For me, I think Unit 2 is very interesting and useful." She refers back to her knowledge of herself as a writer in her second sentence (lines 34-35), focusing in on her goal and reminding herself of an area in which she desires improvement. She also reviews her knowledge about the task of writing a narrative essay (line 35) and considers the relationship between the writer and the audience in this type of writing task (lines 36-37); she seems to consider the audience an important consideration in a plan for a narrative. With these

things in mind, Wenni reviews and reflects on her progress: "So, I tried to make a plan for myself. First time is very difficult. I waste too much time about think the story. Fortunately, second time was better and faster than before. I had a good organization." In contemplating the difficulty that she had the "first time," she identifies the problem of "wasting too much time about think the story." Although she does not elaborate on the strategy she used to improve the second time, she seems to feel good about her efforts, evaluating herself positively on her task performance (lines 39-40).

In this reflective writing, Wenni does valuable metacognitive work; she is able to articulate her focus on planning, to identify important aspects of the task that she has been working on, and to review her progression and improvement. Her success, in part, is due to the narrowness of her focus for the course. Planning is a specific pre-writing skill that she had identified in herself as a "shortage" and had been able to focus on in more detail as a result its role in the MAI; it also clearly related to the brainstorming and outlining steps in the writing process taught in the course and was modeled by Matt in class. Wenni's possible future self that was able to plan well before writing an essay was available due to the specificity and had high activation potential, being easily brought into awareness in class. As a result, Wenni was able to more easily focus her attention and to identify strategic knowledge that would be helpful to her goal. Furthermore, her high sense of self-efficacy evident in her reflective writings likely not only reinforced her motivation to attain this "possible self" that makes good writing plans, but her motivation to metacognitively reflect as a necessary step on the way to achieving this goal as well.

Building Strategic Knowledge: Reflection for Understanding and Planning

Wenni and Takeshi's second to last reflective writing was the timed writing for the third unit, which was the Comparison and Contrast essay. Unlike the timed writing for the previous two units, the students were given additional time to plan for this essay, as we wanted them to reflect on their work over the term based on their writing, which we termed *data* or *evidence*. The day before the timed writing, the students were given their pre- and post-results from the MAI and WAT and their reflective and timed writings to review overnight and refer to in their essay the next day. Although both students turned in thoughtful reflective essays (Appendix F), they were surprisingly different.

They both used organizational strategies learned in the unit. Wenni used the point-by-point

method, comparing and contrasting herself on skills from the MAI in which she had exhibited the most change; Takeshi, in contrast, used the block method, the first section on similarities and the second on differences. Furthermore, he chose to refer to his WAT results and did not refer to the MAI at all. As a result, although there were differences in Takeshi's MAI pre- and post-results, his essay maintains a focus on his attitude towards writing and perceptions of himself as a writer; he gives some supporting thoughts but makes no mention of specific writing skill examples or strategies used to attain those skills. In contrast, Wenni's essay focuses on the specific metacognitive areas that she found she had progressed in (declarative knowledge, conditional knowledge, and planning) and she supports her MAI results with examples and strategies that she developed throughout the term to support these areas.

The similarities and differences that each student chose to identify reflect their writing throughout the semester. Takeshi wrote that he still feels positively about writing, enjoys it, and does not worry much about being evaluated. The differences he identified are as follows:

```
41  Although I can see several similarities, there are also several differences between them.
42  For example, at the beginning of session, I was uncertain to feel that it is easy. I think I
43  realized difficulties of writing through the session. The other one is that at the beginning,
44  I agreed to expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them. However,
45  at the end, I strongly disagreed it.
```

Takeshi's first difference is that he "realized difficulties of writing through the session" (line 43). He does not specify the difficulties that he experienced, but the difficulties that he mentioned in his free writes were most commonly structural components of the essay; these included difficulties in remembering the structure of the essay, identifying main ideas to discuss in body paragraphs, and providing sufficient commentary in the conclusion. His second most frequently discussed difficulties had to do with organizing his ideas. However, in his writing about these difficulties, his focus was often his knowledge of the task (e.g., how many body paragraphs were typically expected) and the difficulty that he experienced. Similarly, he maintains this focus in his second difference, which was his expectation to do poorly in writing courses. He does not comment further, but writes that he no longer expects to do poorly, which is a rare positive statement of his self-efficacy. Nevertheless, in spite of this possible gain in

confidence, Takeshi makes no mention of strategic writing knowledge that he has considered or gained in the course.

The differences that Wenni identifies about herself are primarily focused on strategic knowledge. Each of her paragraphs identifies a specific type of knowledge mentioned on the MAI that she has improved on, gives an example of a problem in the area from the beginning of the course, identifies a strategy that she utilized, and states the results of using the strategy. Her first paragraph on declarative knowledge identifies strategies that she uses to improve her skills in summarizing and identifying main points. Her second body paragraph on conditional knowledge specifically discusses realizing why it is important to build her strategic knowledge, identified in the literature to have the highest correlation with learner autonomy and writing performance (Yanyan, 2010). She writes, "Before the class, I never care about which strategies is more effective for my essay. However, now I save many time to finish my essay, because I know when each strategy I use will be most effective." Her final body paragraph is about planning, the goal most frequently mentioned in her free writing.

```
46  The last thing I want to talk is planning. For me, it is a very difficult part. Before, I don't
47  read instructions carefully before I begin a task, so I sometime write a article out of
48  topic. Now, when I begin a task, the first thing I will do is read instruction, and then
49  choosing a topic and analyze carefully to avoid writing something out of topic.
```

Wenni refers to the difficulty that she has with planning (line 46) and gives some reasoning, which generally refers to rushing or carelessness. She feels that she sometimes fails to maintain focus in her writing, a problem that she attributes to not reading instructions carefully enough before beginning a task. She presents the strategy of carefully reading the instructions and then "choosing a topic and analyze carefully" before writing. Although this is a simple strategy, it is an important way in which Wenni has strategized to purposefully direct her attention, a clear example of self-regulation in her planning process. Although she still feels she needs work in this area, she has identified an issue in her writing process, tried a corresponding strategy, and is working to monitor her progress in this area.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Although Wenni and Takeshi both did important metacognitive work, they used the reflective writing opportunities in this course very differently. Norman and Aron's (2003) concepts of perceived control, availability, and accessibility in the attainment or avoidance of possible future selves are useful in the discussion of these differences and their potential influence on the development of metacognition and self-regulation.

Wenni, who seemed to have a high level of confidence in herself as a writer and a student, used the reflective time primarily to reflect on the specific writing tasks that she was attempting, their relationship to her writing goals, and to monitor her progress on these goals. When she reflects, she connects her knowledge about herself and her knowledge of the task in order to formulate a strategy to address her quest for improvement. At the beginning of the course, she identified a narrower goal (to improve her planning skills before writing) that would contribute to her long-term goals of getting a higher score on the TOEFL and being able to communicate clearly in English; as a result, she is able to break down her objective even further and to identify specific skills that she would like to improve and the strategies that will assist her. A combination of a high degree of perceived control, as well as strategic moves to increase the availability and accessibility of Wenni's goals seem to have increased her motivation and capacity to achieve specific aspects of her goals, or possible future English writing self.

Takeshi, on the other hand, spends a great deal of time in his reflective writings doing metacognitive negotiation with himself, first negotiating his love of writing with the fact that he finds it to be difficult, and then negotiating the differences between his personal goals and opinions and the course objectives. These negotiations seem to be successful on occasion, as in the example from the narrative unit, but oftentimes, a challenge. Although he seems to have fairly thorough knowledge of the writing tasks and is able to identify aspects that are challenging to him, he only occasionally addresses a strategy or solution to an identified difficulty. This seems to reveal a shortage of strategic knowledge, or some kind of interference in the access or development of the involved thought processes. From the data examined in this case, it seems possible that low self-efficacy and perceived control, or goals that lack aspects of availability and accessibility, or a combination of these, might interfere with motivation to improve as well as the development of strategic metacognitive knowledge. Another possibility present in Takeshi's

writing was the lack of alignment between his personal goals and the goals of the course; because Takeshi could not always identify the relevance of specific writing skills to his life or writing goals, he seemed to rely on his enjoyment of writing to sustain his motivation to improve his skills.

In this case study, it is clear that valuable metacognitive reflection took place when opportunities were provided, and that the supplemental information and tools (e.g., discussion of metacognition and its value, discussion of learned attention, MAI, WAT, etc.) provided to the students were useful in facilitating these reflections. Providing focused, in-class opportunities for written reflection ensured that students recorded their thoughts as soon as possible after completing the task in question, and providing explicit discussion and reminders about metacognition in a systematic way allowed the teacher to model thought processes and maintain a metacognitive focus throughout the course. The analysis of Wenni and Takeshi's writing seemed to reveal the prominence of self-efficacy in personal reflection when self-efficacy was low or when challenges were present; it also seemed to be related to the amount of perceived control the students felt they had. The influence of personal and course goal alignment also seemed to be important to the development of metacognitive thought processes and greater self-regulation. When these goals were less aligned, as in Takeshi's case, it seemed to provoke more difficulty in visualizing a possible self and forming writing goals that were available and accessible. In general, this analysis utilized Norman and Aron's (2003) terms of perceived control, availability, and accessibility, postulated to affect motivation in the pursuit of a possible future self, to long- and short-term writing goals (selves). These terms proved useful in the discussion of goal-setting and metacognitive reflection in the context of an L2 writing course, suggesting a complex connection between aspects of L2 writing goals, motivation, and metacognitive development that would be worth pursuing in future research.

Limitations

A variety of factors limit a case study. However, there are a few particular limitations that are worth mentioning in this one. First, the sample size was small. Eight students attended the course, and only two were chosen to examine in greater detail for this study. However, although the small number of students limits the amount of generalization that can be generated from the results, the case study genre offers greater depth of analysis, allowing a more fine-grained

individual analysis of each student than would be possible otherwise. I also experienced some limitations as a researcher; the fact that I am culturally American while they are culturally Chinese and Japanese limits my analysis to a certain extent because I am not able to incorporate the sociocultural nuances of being a middle-aged, unmarried Japanese man or a young Chinese woman studying for the TOEFL into my considerations of their writing.

Nevertheless, the comprehensive nature of the data collected and the level of my participation in this particular context help to mitigate the potential effects of cultural differences in this analysis. Furthermore, although I am the best person to analyze the data from this case, as I was present for the entirety of the course, I was the only person to systematically examine it. Lastly, I no longer have contact with these students and am not able to ask for their meta-reflections after completing the course, or to examine their writing or language learning habits in the future.

Another level of insight into their metacognitive activity and the effect of such writing activities might be gained by asking students to further reflect on their reflections. Thus, in future studies, more longitudinal data would be useful.

CONCLUSION

Because of the lifelong nature of adult L2 learning and the skills necessary to academic writing success, the quest for greater self-regulation in L2 writing classrooms is a necessary one. To this end, the development of metacognitive knowledge and strategy must be considered.

Individuals' knowledge of themselves, or person knowledge, encompasses self-efficacy, motivation, and writing apprehension (Ruan, 2014), all of which must be considered in relation to their knowledge of the writing task in order to develop higher levels of strategic knowledge. The visualization of an available, accessible *future writing self*, the achievement of which the student feels is within their control (Norman & Aron, 2003), and the ability to connect that *future self* to the attainment of specific writing skills and short-term goals are essential to sustaining motivation but may also directly affect the student's ability to self-regulate.

This case study analysis supports the relevance of these concepts, which have been examined in past research, and explores the connected nature of metacognitive development, self-efficacy, and aspects of possible future selves or goals that may affect student motivation in an L2 writing

class. However, they also indicate the need to further explore the role of goal-setting in L2 writing curricula. A student's possible future selves, or goals, and the motivation to achieve or avoid them need to be considered not only in terms of availability, accessibility, and perceived control, but also in terms of alignment to the specific context. For instance, in this context, Takeshi seemed to have greater difficulty making progress for reasons previously discussed in the literature (negative self-efficacy and unavailable, inaccessible possible future selves), but also because his future writing goals were not well-aligned with the purposes of an academic writing course. It seems, therefore, that L2 writing curricula and instruction must take a much more nuanced approach to implementing strategies for the facilitation of individual development of metacognitive and self-regulatory processes in the future. By including these other aspects of language learning in the L2 writing classroom more explicitly, self-regulation among L2 writing students may become a more available and accessible goal.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), 191-215. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bown, J., & White, C. J. (2010). Affect in a self-regulatory framework for language learning. *System*, *38*(3), 432-443. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2010.03.016

Chenoweth, N.A., & Hayes, J. R. (2001). Fluency in writing generating text in L1 and L2. *Written Communication*, *18*(1), 80-98. doi: 10.1177/0741088301018001004

Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. *Research in Teaching of English, 9*(3), 242-249.

Devine, J. (1993). The role of metacognition in second language reading and writing. In J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.). *Reading in the composition classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp.105-127). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Ellis, N. C., & Sagarra, N. (2011). The bounds of adult language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(04), 553-580. doi: 10.1017/S0272263110000264

Ferris, D. (1995). Teaching students to self-edit. *TESOL Journal*, *4*(4), 18-22.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, *34*(10), 906-911. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906

Flavell, J. H. (2004). Theory-of-mind development: Retrospect and prospect. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *50*(3), 274-290.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, *94*(3), 319-340. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.94.3.319

Higgins, E. T. (1996). Knowledge activation: Accessibility, applicability, and salience. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 133–168). New York: Guilford.

Kasper, L. F. (1997). Assessing the metacognitive growth of ESL student writers. *TESL-EJ*, *3*(1), 1-20.

Kruschke, J. K. (2006, June). *Learned attention*. Paper presented at the Fifth International Conference on Development and Learning, Bloomington, IN.

Lu, Z., & Liu, M. (2011). Foreign language anxiety and strategy use: A study with Chinese

undergraduate EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *2*(6), 1298-1305. doi: 10.4304/jltr.2.6.1298-1305

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible Selves. *American Psychologist*, *41*(9), 954-969. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.41.9.954

Markus, H., & Sentis, K. (1982). The self in social information processing. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (pp. 41-70). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

McCutchen, D. (2000). Knowledge, processing, and working memory: Implications for a theory of writing. *Educational Psychologist*, *35*(1), 13-23. doi: 10.1207/S1532985EP3501_3

Norman, C. C., & Aron, A. (2003). Aspects of possible self that predict motivation to achieve or avoid it. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39*(5), 500-507. doi: 10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00029-5

Rogers, R. J. (2010). Incorporating metacognitive strategy training in ESP writing instruction: English for lawyers. *English Language Teaching*, *3*(4), 3-6.

O'Brien-Moran, M., & Soiferman, L. K. (2010, March). How an understanding of cognition and metacognition translates into more effective writing instruction. In L. Martin (Chair). *Theories and theorizing*. 11th Annual Education Graduate Student Symposium conducted at the University of Manitoba in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University.

Ruan, Z. (2005). A metacognitive perspective on the growth of self-regulated EFL student writers. *Reading Working Papers in Linguistics*, *8*, 175-202.

Ruan, Z. (2014). Metacognitive awareness of EFL student writers in a Chinese ELT context. *Language Awareness, 23*(1-2), 76-91. doi: 10.1080/09658416.2013.863901

Ruvolo, A. P., & Markus, H. R. (1992). Possible selves and performance: The power of self-relevant imagery. *Social cognition*, *10*(1), 95-124.

Schmidt, R. W. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). New York: Cambridge University.

Schoonen, R., Gelderen, A. V., Glopper, K. D., Hulstijn, J., Simis, A., Snellings, P., & Stevenson, M. (2003). First language and second language writing: The role of linguistic knowledge, speed of processing, and metacognitive knowledge. *Language Learning*, *53*(1), 165-202. doi: 10.1111/1467-9922.00213

Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *19*(4), 460-475. doi: 10.1006/ceps.1994.1033

Yanyan, Z. (2010). Investigating the role of metacognitive knowledge in English writing. *HKBU Papers in Applied Language Studies*, *14*, 25-46.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-regulation involves more than metacognition: A social cognitive perspective. *Educational psychologist*, *30*(4), 217-221.

APPENDIX A:

COURSE SYLLABUS [XXX] COURSE SYLLABUS

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to build your skills in writing and revising for an academic audience as well as your ability to improve these skills independently. You will learn all the steps of the writing process—brainstorming and outlining, drafting, revising, and peer/self editing—as well as the conventions of standard academic-paper formatting. You will also learn a metacognitive process to help you become a more independent, capable language learner and writer. By the end of this course, you will be able to use metacognitive strategies to help you better achieve a specific learning goal as well as write a standard five-paragraph essay.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Understand and apply the five metacognitive steps to an academic writing goal
2. Write well-developed and well-organized multi-paragraph essays with clear and appropriate thesis statements
3. Write in a variety of rhetorical modes, e.g. narrative, cause and effect, comparison-contrast, and argumentative
4. Demonstrate understanding of the concept of plagiarism by citing sources
5. Summarize material from authentic texts
6. Identify and maintain focus on the audience of the writing

COURSE MATERIALS

Required Text: *Great Essays*, 3rd edition (Folse, Muchmore-Vokoun, Solomon), 2010.

Supplementary Materials: Additional handouts distributed by the instructor

Teacher Resources: CD (Teacher's Guide, Answer Key, Rubrics)

GRADING:

Attendance and Participation	30%
Big Writing Assignments	40%
Homework and other Assignments	30%
	100%

Metacognition for better language learning

Metacognition, or "thinking about thinking", is an important part of taking charge of *your* language learning process. You will be using strategies in class that help you think about the way *you* think and learn in order to understand and manage *your* learning process better. To do this, we will be following these 5 metacognitive steps:

1. Assess the demands of the task
2. Evaluate your own knowledge and skills
3. Plan your approach
4. Monitor your progress
5. Adjust your strategies as needed

Accurately evaluating your own learning is very difficult for most language learners. Therefore, Steps 2 and 5 are the most difficult of these 5 steps. Because of this difficulty, we will be studying the concept of **Learned Attention**.

Learned Attention as a tool for better self-evaluation

Learned Attention is a concept from second language learning research. Learned Attention refers to the way that your past experiences can affect and guide what you pay attention to in the future. Because you have been speaking your native language for your whole life, you have learned that certain features of language are more important than others. However, the important features that you need to pay attention to when learning your second language may be very different from the important features of your native language. Your experience with your native language may make these differences very challenging to learn. Understanding the concept of Learned Attention can help you to think about these differences and evaluate your own knowledge and progress when studying your second language.

Attendance

There are **no** excused absences from [XXX] classes. Any hour that you are not in class will be counted as an absence. This includes illness, TOEFL or other exams, religious services, visits from friends and relatives, etc. If you have more than five hours of absences in any one class, you will receive a letter of probation. If you have any additional absences, you receive a letter of imminent dismissal.

Tardiness

Please make every effort to be on time for every class. Your teacher keeps a record of each minute you are late. Your tardies may accumulate to one full class absence in the following ways:

- Three tardies equals one absence.
- If you are more than 30 minutes late to a class, either at the beginning or at the end, you will also receive one absence.

English-Only Policy

In order to ensure that students make the best use of their time at [XXX], all students must speak, write, listen to, and read ONLY in English at school and on school activities.

APPENDIX B:

METACOGNITIVE AWARENESS INVENTORY (MAI)

(Schraw & Dennison, 1994)

Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI)

Check True or False as appropriate. Use the Scoring Guide after completing the inventory.

	True	False
1. I ask myself periodically if I am meeting my goals.		
2. I consider several alternatives to a problem before I answer.		
3. I try to use strategies that have worked in the past.		
4. I pace myself while learning in order to have enough time.		
5. I understand my intellectual strengths and weaknesses.		
6. I think about what I really need to learn before I begin a task		
7. I know how well I did once I finish a test.		
8. I set specific goals before I begin a task.		
9. I slow down when I encounter important information.		
10. I know what kind of information is most important to learn.		
11. I ask myself if I have considered all options when solving a problem.		
12. I am good at organizing information.		
13. I consciously focus my attention on important information.		
14. I have a specific purpose for each strategy I use.		
15. I learn best when I know something about the topic.		
16. I know what the teacher expects me to learn.		
17. I am good at remembering information.		
18. I use different learning strategies depending on the situation.		
19. I ask myself if there was an easier way to do things after I finish a task.		
20. I have control over how well I learn.		
21. I periodically review to help me understand important relationships.		
22. I ask myself questions about the material before I begin.		
23. I think of several ways to solve a problem and choose the best one.		
24. I summarize what I've learned after I finish.		
25. I ask others for help when I don't understand something.		

26. I can motivate myself to learn when I need to		
27. I am aware of what strategies I use when I study.		
28. I find myself analyzing the usefulness of strategies while I study.		
29. I use my intellectual strengths to compensate for my weaknesses.		
30. I focus on the meaning and significance of new information.		
31. I create my own examples to make information more meaningful.		
32. I am a good judge of how well I understand something.		
33. I find myself using helpful learning strategies automatically.		
34. I find myself pausing regularly to check my comprehension.		
35. I know when each strategy I use will be most effective.		
36. I ask myself how well I accomplish my goals once I'm finished.		
37. I draw pictures or diagrams to help me understand while learning.		
38. I ask myself if I have considered all options after I solve a problem.		
39. I try to translate new information into my own words.		
40. I change strategies when I fail to understand.		
41. I use the organizational structure of the text to help me learn.		
42. I read instructions carefully before I begin a task.		
43. I ask myself if what I'm reading is related to what I already know.		
44. I reevaluate my assumptions when I get confused.		
45. I organize my time to best accomplish my goals.		
46. I learn more when I am interested in the topic.		
47. I try to break studying down into smaller steps.		
48. I focus on overall meaning rather than specifics.		
49. I ask myself questions about how well I am doing while I am learning something new.		
50. I ask myself if I learned as much as I could have once I finish a task.		
51. I stop and go back over new information that is not clear.		
52. I stop and reread when I get confused.		

Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI) Scoring Guide

Directions – For each True on the MAI give yourself 1 point on the following charts. For each False, give yourself 0 points in the Score column. Total the score of each category and place in box.

KNOWLEDGE ABOUT COGNITION

DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE	DECLARATIVE KNOWLEDGE	SCORE
– The factual knowledge the learner needs before being able to process or use critical thinking related to the topic – Knowing *about, what, or that* – Knowledge of one's skills, intellectual resources, and abilities as a learner – Students can obtain knowledge through presentations, demonstrations, discussions	5. I understand my intellectual strengths and weaknesses.	
	10. I know what kind of information is most important to learn.	
	12. I am good at organizing information.	
PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE	16. I know what the teacher expects me to learn.	
– The application of knowledge for the purposes of completing a procedure or process	17. I am good at remembering information.	
– Knowledge about *how* to implement learning procedures (e.g. strategies)	20. I have control over how well I learn.	
– Requires students know the process as well as when to apply process in various situations	32. I am a good judge of how well I understand something.	
– Students can obtain knowledge through discovery, cooperative learning, and problem solving	46. I learn more when I am interested in the topic.	
CONDITIONAL KNOWLEDGE – The determination under what circumstances specific processes or skills should transfer – Knowledge about *when* and *why* to use learning procedures – Application of declarative and procedural knowledge with certain conditions presented		
– Students can obtain knowledge through simulation	TOTAL	8

PROCEDURAL KNOWLEDGE	SCORE	CONDITIONAL KNOWLEDGE	SCORE
3. I try to use strategies that have worked in the past.		15. I learn best when I know something about the topic.	
14. I have a specific purpose for each strategy I use.		18. I use different learning strategies depending on the situation.	
27. I am aware of what strategies I use when I study.		26. I can motivate myself to learn when I need to.	
33. I find myself using helpful learning strategies automatically.		29. I use my intellectual strengths to compensate for my weaknesses.	
		35. I know when each strategy I use will be most effective.	
TOTAL	4	TOTAL	5

REGULATION OF COGNITION

PLANNING	PLANNING	SCORE
–Planning, goal setting, and allocating resources *prior* to learning **INFORMATION MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES** –Skills and strategy sequences used to process information more efficiently (e.g., organizing, elaborating, summarizing, selective focusing) **COMPREHENSION MONITORING** –Assessment of one's learning or strategy use **DEBUGGING STRATEGIES** –Strategies used to correct comprehension and performance errors **EVALUATION** –Analysis of performance and strategy effectiveness after a learning episode	4. I pace myself while learning in order to have enough time.	
	6. I think about what I really need to learn before I begin a task.	
	8. I set specific goals before I begin a task.	
	22. I ask myself questions about the material before I begin.	
	23. I think of several ways to solve a problem and choose the best one.	
	42. I read instructions carefully before I begin a task.	
	45. I organize my time to best accomplish my goals.	
	TOTAL	7

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES	SCORE	COMPREHENSION MONITORING	SCORE
9. I slow down when I encounter important information.		1. I ask myself periodically if I am meeting my goals.	
13. I consciously focus my attention on important information.		2. I consider several alternatives to a problem before I answer.	
30. I focus on the meaning and significance of new information.		11. I ask myself if I have considered all options when solving a problem.	
31. I create my own examples to make information more meaningful.		21. I periodically review to help me understand important relationships.	
37. I draw pictures or diagrams to help me understand while learning.		28. I find myself analyzing the usefulness of strategies while I study.	
39. I try to translate new information into my own words.		34. I find myself pausing regularly to check my comprehension.	
41. I use the organizational structure of the text to help me learn		49. I ask myself questions about how well I am doing while learning something new.	
43. I ask myself if what I'm reading is related to what I already know.			
47. I try to break studying down into smaller steps.			
48. I focus on overall meaning rather than specifics.			
TOTAL	10	TOTAL	7

DEBUGGING STRATEGIES	SCORE	EVALUATION	SCORE
25. I ask others for help when I don't understand something.		7. I know how well I did once I finish a test.	
40. I change strategies when I fail to understand.		18. I ask myself if there was an easier way to do things after I finish a task.	
44. I re-evaluate my assumptions when I get confused.		24. I summarize what I've learned after I finish.	
51. I stop and go back over new information that is not clear.		36. I ask myself how well I accomplish my goals once I'm finished.	
52. I stop and reread when I get confused.		38. I ask myself if I have considered all options after I solve a problem.	
		49. I ask myself if I learned as much as I could have once I finish a task.	
TOTAL	5	TOTAL	6

APPENDIX C:

THE DALY-MILLER TEST (WRITING APPREHENSION TEST/WAT)

(Daly & Miller, 1975)

The Daly-Miller Test

Name: _____

Select the response from 1 to 5 that best suits your feelings about the following statements. Remember: There are no correct

answers, only give your honest response to each item. Thank you for your participation.

----

1 Strongly Agree - 2 Agree - 3 Uncertain - 4 Disagree - 5 Strongly Disagree

----

1. I avoid writing. (+)	1 2 3 4 5
2. I have no fear of my writing's being evaluated. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
4. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated. (+)	1 2 3 4 5
5. Taking a composition course is a very frightening experience.(+)	1 2 3 4 5
6. Handing in a composition makes me feel good. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
7. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on my composition. (+)	1 2 3 4 5
8. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time. (+)	1 2 3 4 5
9. I would enjoy submitting my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
10. I like to write down my ideas. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
11. I feel confident in my ability to express my ideas clearly in writing. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
12. I like to have my friends read what I have written. (-)	1 2 3 4 5

13. I'm nervous about writing. (+)	1 2 3 4 5
14. People seem to enjoy what I write. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
15. I enjoy writing. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
16. I never seem to be able to write down my ideas clearly. (+)	1 2 3 4 5
17. Writing is a lot of fun.(-)	1 2 3 4 5
18. I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them. (+)	1 2 3 4 5
19. I like seeing my thoughts on paper. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
20. Discussing my writing with others is enjoyable. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
21. I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course. (+)	1 2 3 4 5
22. When I hand in a composition, I know I'm going to do poorly. (+)	1 2 3 4 5
23. It's easy for me to write good compositions. (-)	1 2 3 4 5
24. I don't think I write as well as most other people. (+)	1 2 3 4 5
25. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated. (+)	1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX D:

PRE- AND POST- RESULTS FROM MAI

Metacognitive Awareness Inventory (MAI) Pre- and Post- Results: Wenni and
Takeshi

	Wenni		Takeshi	
Procedural Knowledge	**Pre**	**Post**	**Pre**	**Post**
I try to use strategies that have worked in the past.	1	1	1	1
I have a specific purpose for each strategy I use.	1	0	1	0
I am aware of what strategies I use when I study.	1	1	0	1
I find myself using helpful learning strategies automatically.	1	1	0	0
TOTAL:	4	3	2	2
PERCENTAGE:	100%	75%	50%	50%
DIFFERENCE:		-25%		0%
Declarative Knowledge				
I understand my intellectual strengths and weaknesses.	1	1	1	1
I know what kind of information is most important to learn.	0	1	1	1
I am good at organizing information.	0	1	0	0
I know what the teacher expects me to learn.	0	1	0	1
I am good at remembering information.	1	1	0	0
I have control over how well I learn.	0	0	1	1
I am a good judge of how well I understand something.	1	0	0	0
I learn more when I am interested in the topic.	1	1	1	1
TOTAL:	4	6	4	5
PERCENTAGE:	50%	75%	50%	63%
DIFFERENCE:		25%		13%

	Wenni		Takeshi	
Conditional Knowledge	**Pre**	**Post**	**Pre**	**Post**
I learn best when I know something about the topic.	1	1	1	1
I use different learning strategies depending on the situation.	0	1	1	1
I can motivate myself to learn when I need to.	1	1	0	1
I use my intellectual strengths to compensate for my weaknesses.	1	1	0	0
I know when each strategy I use will be most effective.	0	1	1	0
TOTAL:	3	5	3	3
PERCENTAGE:	60%	100%	60%	60%
DIFFERENCE:		40%		0%
Planning				
I pace myself while learning in order to have enough time.	0	1	1	1
I think about what I really need to learn before I begin a task.	0	1	1	1
I set specific goals before I begin a task.	0	1	1	1
I ask myself questions about the material before I begin.	0	1	1	1
I think of several ways to solve a problem and choose the best one.	1	0	1	1
I read instructions carefully before I begin a task.	0	1	1	1
I organize my time to best accomplish my goals.	0	0	1	1
TOTAL:	1	5	7	7
PERCENTAGE:	14%	71%	100%	100%
DIFFERENCE:		57%		0%

	Wenni		Takeshi	
Information Management Strategies	**Pre**	**Post**	**Pre**	**Post**
I slow down when I encounter important information.	1	1	1	1
I consciously focus my attention on important information.	1	1	1	1
I focus on the meaning and significance of new information.	1	1	1	1
I create my own examples to make information more meaningful.	0	1	0	1
I draw pictures or diagrams to help me understand while learning.	0	0	1	1
I try to translate new information into my own words.	1	1	1	1
I use the organizational structure of the text to help me learn.	1	1	0	1
I ask myself if what I'm reading is related to what I already know.	1	1	1	1
I try to break studying down into smaller steps.	0	1	1	1
I focus on overall meaning rather than specifics.	1	0	0	0
TOTAL:	7	8	7	9
PERCENTAGE:	70%	80%	70%	90%
DIFFERENCE:		10%		20%
Comprehension Monitoring Strategies				
I ask myself periodically if I am meeting my goals.	1	1	0	0
I consider several alternatives to a problem before I answer.	1	1	1	1
I ask myself if I have considered all options when solving a problem.	1	1	1	1
I periodically review to help me understand important relationships.	1	1	1	1
I find myself analyzing the usefulness of strategies while I study.	0	0	0	1
I find myself pausing regularly to check my comprehension.	0	1	1	1
I ask myself questions about how well I am doing while I am learning something new.	1	0	1	1
TOTAL:	5	5	5	6
PERCENTAGE:	71%	71%	71%	86%
DIFFERENCE:		0%		14%

	Wenni		Takeshi	
Debugging Strategies	**Pre**	**Post**	**Pre**	**Post**
I ask others for help when I don't understand something.	1	1	1	1
I change strategies when I fail to understand.	1	1	1	1
I reevaluate my assumptions when I get confused.	1	1	1	1
I stop and go back over new information that is not clear.	1	1	1	1
I stop and reread when I get confused.	1	1	1	1
TOTAL:	5	5	5	5
PERCENTAGE:	100%	100%	100%	100%
DIFFERENCE:		0%		0%
Evaluation				
I know how well I did once I finish a test.	0	0	1	1
I ask myself if there was an easier way to do things after I finish a task.	0	1	1	1
I summarize what I've learned after I finish.	1	1	0	1
I ask myself how well I accomplish my goals once I'm finished.	1	1	1	1
I ask myself if I have considered all options after I solve a problem.	1	1	1	0
I ask myself if I learned as much as I could have once I finish a task.	1	0	1	1
TOTAL:	4	4	5	5
PERCENTAGE:	67%	67%	83%	83%
DIFFERENCE:		0%		0%

APPENDIX E:

REFLECTIVE FREE WRITES (IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER)

Wenni

1a. In which are of regulation did you score the highest? 1b. What is a personal experience in which these skills were helpful?
2a. In which area of regulation did you score the lowest? 2b. What is a personal experience in which being better at these skills would have helped?

My highest score is debugging strategies. In China, people are going to learn some vocabularies. They will go to the bookstore and choose a good vocabulary book to recite every words.
Honestly, I did the same motherd [method], too. But, I found I can't remember all of the words I'd recited yesterday. If I learned 100 new words yesterday, I can remember only about 3 words today. And it is so boring when you just stare at the new words again and again. In this way you'll lose interest. So I found another good way to improve my vocabulary. When you're reading the book or doing a reading article, you will find some difficult words you don't understand. Don't check it on your dictionary immediately, just guess the word's meaning by connection of the context. And then you can use your dictionary find the correct meaning. It's a very method to learn new words and improve your reading skill at the same time.

Secondly, my lowest score is planning, and it's only one score I got. Actually, I really don't know how to make a plan before writing something. Maybe I can make a good plan when I finish the semester.

What was the biggest challenge when writing your first draft [of Essay 1]? Why was it challenging?

Collecting and summarizing informations are the biggest challenge in my first draft. Each university have too much history and different kinds of version of stories…However, the stories of the universities are very interesting. In other words, it is a good way to enhance my knowledge.

What are the benefits of peer review?

The peer review is fair to everybody. My partner, Takeshi, gave me very useful advice about my essay…I learned some different things in Japan from his essay. Moreover, the structure of his essay is very explicit. Topic sentence, supporting sentences and the signal of conclusion is very easy to find. Next time, I'll pay more attention to these details in my essay.

What is something you still have questions about from Unit 1? What are those questions? Where can you look for answers?

The connectors. How to use the connectors more accuracy? Such as, when I can use "in addition"? Or, when I can use "Also"? I have been confusion for a long time. Maybe I will understand the different among the connectors by reading more articles.

What was the biggest challenge when writing the first draft of your narrative essay? Why was

it challenging?

Actually, I have a big problem for my narrative essay. I changed my topic three times. And I think narrative essay is more difficult to me than the first essay. I try to make story more vivid and explicit, so when I finished three or four sentence, then I will review or add some other details into the sentences I wrote before. Therefore, it waste too much time.

What did you think of Unit 2? Was it interesting or useful? Why?

For me, I think unit 2 is very interesting and useful. Because my shortage is about making a plan and sentence. Narrative essay's suppose is to tell reader a story. Moreover, we have to write the story as clear as possibly so that everyone can understand what were you writing about and have the same feelings in others. So, I tried to make a plan for myself. First time is very difficult. I waste too much time about think the story. Fortunately, second time was better and faster than before. I had a good organization. I think I will be more and more good at making a plan by practicing more.

What was the biggest challenge in writing your first draft of your comparison-contrast essay? Why was it challenging?

For me, I think the most challenging is figure out the points of the topic. It took me long time to think about it. Actually, this problem throughout all kinds of essay for me. Brainstorming and outline, these are big challenge to me. I think I should practice more writing, especially, the part of brainstorm and outline. I wish I will speed up the pace of writing after practicing.

What did you think of Unit 3? Was it interesting or useful? Why?

Indeed, I don't like comparison essay, but unit 3 was useful. Teaching me many strategies about brainstorm and outline. The structure of the essay, the block or point-by-point, is very methodic, which make me feel more clear about what I'm going to write. For me, I think everything is easy to master but I still need more practice about writing on the paper not thinking in my brain. The connectors of a comparison essay are very useful. They make the essay more comparable.

What are the two most important things that you learned during this class?

For me, it is very important to organized our essay. Whatever the type of essay is, I should arrange what I want to write first. An organized outline can help us finish a perfect essay. Clarify our thoughts and let readers understand what we wrote about. Before the class, I don't make an outline or a arrangement for my essay, as a result, I often forget the topic and my thesis. Now I feel I can handle the essay I learned so far. At least, I figure out what is the benefit of the outline and organization.

What are two skills that you need to work on in the future? Why?

For me, listing Brainstorm and Outline are the things I need to work on in the future. The writing time is about 30 minutes. I had to use 15 minutes to think about my brainstorm and outline.
Although I make a well-organized outline, I don't have enough time to write down what I want to say. It is horrible to me that I can't finish the essay on time. I know the difference between unfinished essays and not well-organized essays. Unfinished essays will get lower scores than not well-organized essays will get. I think I have to practice more in the future.

Takeshi

1a. In which are of regulation did you score the highest? 1b. What is a personal experience in which these skills were helpful?
2a. In which area of regulation did you score the lowest? 2b. What is a personal experience in which being better at these skills would have helped?

(Takeshi completed this free write, but did not turn it in.)

What was the biggest challenge when writing your first draft [of Essay 1]? Why was it challenging?

Hook of my essay is the biggest challenge, I think. This time I used famous quote in Japan. I've never written the hook like this. I didn't know that. I wrote only two patterns, that is, question style or explaining style. I've learned three or four styles as hook. Maybe some of them, I can't write. I'm not good at survey style. Anyway, I used quote for the first time. I hope my essay will improve gradually.

What are the benefits of peer review?

By doing peer review, I can correct my each sentences. I can check my mistakes, miss-spelling, and odd sentence structure.
And also, if someone read my essay, I can know what is wrong with my essay. And if I read others essay, I can learn another way of writing.
By peer review, I can check all of sentence structure.
Topic sentence is ok?
Thesis statement is ok?
Body 1 is ok?
Body 2 is ok?
Body 3 is ok?
Conclusion is enough?
I can check all of these things.
That's why peer review after writing is very useful for me.

What is something you still have questions about from Unit 1? What are those questions? Where can you look for answers?

I feel difficult to create conclusion. After I restate thesis statements, I have to write additional sentences. They might be suggestion, question, or prospective views. I have no idea about conclusion.
And also, I feel difficult to think over three points. Usually body paragraph requires three bodys. These three points are difficult for me to find.
Maybe, I have no way but to practice, practice, and practice.

What was the biggest challenge when writing the first draft of your narrative essay? Why was it challenging?

This time, choosing topic is difficult for me. What will I choose? I chose 4 topics forcedly. But those are not interesting, maybe. Finally I chose about jobs experience during in Japan. This time I confused again what I should write about. Building organization of my story was

very difficult for me. This part is necessary, this part is unnecessary. In my mind, a kind of conflicts happened. I like writing, but writing is difficult for me.

What did you think of Unit 2? Was it interesting or useful? Why?

The narrative essay was useful for me. Because when I want to convey my feeling and experience to my friend by email or letter, I need to use good and well-organized struction. Of course, it is casual, not formal, but to tell my story properly and precisely, I should write something clearly and chronologically. In fact, during this unit I e-mailed my experience to old friend.

I don't understand yet about the body paragraph of narrative essay. Usually it has three paragraphs. However, I can't write three paragraphs as body. I want to say something, but I can't imagine three parts. When I tell my experience I don't know how many paragraphs there are in my body paragraph. If I write something chronologically, I think three body paragraphs are not always necessary, I feel such a thing.

What was the biggest challenge in writing your first draft of your comparison-contrast essay? Why was it challenging?

It was organization that I felt the most difficult while I was writing. I created outline, Venn Diagram, and I thought I could write if I look at these things again. However it was not easy for me. To organize the comparison essay is very difficult. At first, I thought I would write point-by-point essay, but I thought it was not suitable for me. Therefor I changed to block essay And conclusion is also difficult. I have no idea how to say, what to write at the last part. I like writing, but it is not easy for me.

What did you think of Unit 3? Was it interesting or useful? Why?

The most difficult thing that I feel is thesis statement in comparison essay. I can't find main idea after comparing two things I have no idea what to write as thesis. I should write only comparison comment or some ideas after comparing. I'm not sure about that. Finding topics is not difficult for me, however thinking some comments after compared with another is not easy for me. Now, I can't catch the way of writing comparison essay well yet. Anyway, comparison essay is a little bit interesting, because I don't usually compare with two things in my daily life.

What are the two most important things that you learned during this class?

I have learned the structure of essay so far, however, sometimes I become forgettable about that. I realized it again during this session. Introduction, three body paragraph, and conclusion. Before I know, I am tend to write one or two body paragraphs only. To support my essay, I need to mention three points of my essay, but I get to forget it. And also, it is difficult to find out three major points even though I remember its necessity. Although I think hard, it is not easy for me. But to make my essay clear and well-organized, it is necessary for me to find out three points.

What are two skills that you need to work on in the future? Why?

To tell the truth, maybe I might not use any writing skills that I learned. I won't enter any

university to gain degree, and my future job might not require any writing skills.
However, it is very important to write something clearly, logically, and sometimes chronologically to make essay easier to read. The structure of essay are introduction, body, and conclusion paragraph. I think this structure is useful not only for academic, but also for daily lives in some meaning.
Also, to conclude the essay, I need to write some suggestion, opinion, etc. Not only in essay, maybe almost everything needs to be added some comments to make writings better.
I hope I will have some opportunities to be able to use these skills.
Thank you.

APPENDIX F:

UNIT 3 (COMPARISON-CONTRAST) TIMED WRITING

Wenni

"I have progressed rapidly through this period of studying. I don't like to write my idea on a paper because it is a little difficult for me. However, I don't avoid writing anymore, it is possible for me to write a methodic essay. During study, I'm aware of what are my problems about composition. For me, the most progressive parts are Declarative knowledge, Conditional knowledge and Planning.

Declarative knowledge in one of the problems for me before, but now, I use strategies to improve my ability of declarative knowledge. For instant, I don't know which parts of information is the most important. Usually, I just look through the whole article and then if you ask me to tell me main idea of the article, it is a little bite difficult for me to summarize the whole thing. However now, I will highlight the sentences when I was reading the article. When I finished a article, it is very easy to find the important parts where I've already commented. In addition, when teachers say something, I will catch the main point that teachers are supposed to say. All of these make me feel more effective during the class or reading the article.

Conditional knowledge is other aspects I will discussed. During the classes, I learned many strategies, so I try to use my new strategies in my composition. Such as block and point- by-point, both of them are good ways to organize a comparison essay. I use different learning strategies depending on the situation. Before the class, I never care about which strategies is more effective for my essay. However, now I save many time to finish my essay, because I know when each strategy I use will be most effective. Indeed, I have to practice more to improve my ability of conditional knowledge.

The last thing I want to talk is planning. For me, it is a very difficult part. Before, I don't read instructions carefully before I begin a task, so I sometime write a article out of topic. Now, when I begin a task, the first thing I will do is read instruction, and then choosing a topic and analyse carefully to avoid writing something out of topic.

Declarative knowledge, Conditional knowledge and planning are the most progressive aspects for me during these days, and all of them are very helpful for me. In the future, I will evaluate myself usually, to make me get more progressive."

Takeshi

"I think I could learn and realize many things during this session at [XXX]. Even though I learned something at earlier session, I'm tend to forget or not to remember them sometimes. I compared self-reflection by looking at the one I checked at the beginning of this session and the other one I checked at the end of this session. As a result, there are several similarities and differences between before and after self-reflection.

First of all, there are several similarities between before and after self-reflection. One thing is that I'm positive of writing essay. I feel that writing essay is not waste of time. Also, being evaluated is fine for me. The other one is that I enjoy writing. For example, I feel lots of fun when I write something, and I enjoy it.

Although I can see several similarities, there are also several differences between them.

For example, at the beginning of session, I was uncertain to feel it is easy to write good composition, however at the end of this session I don't feel that it is easy. I think I realized difficulties of writing through the session. The other one is that at the beginning, I agreed to expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them. However, at the end, I strongly disagreed it.

To conclude, I can see some similarities and differences between before and after self-reflection. I hope I will be able to improve my writing skills and the things I learned will be helpful for my writing."

APPENDIX G:

LANGUAGE BACKGROUND SURVEY RESPONSES

Day 1 Assessment

Name: **Wenni**
Nickname (optional):

1. What languages do you know? Please list in order of competence and rate from 1 to 10. (Your native language should be first and rated 10!):
      Chinese: 10
      English: 5

2. Please rate your English level in the four skill areas listed below from 1 (absolute beginner) to 10 (near native).

Speaking:	3	*Reading:*	8
Listening:	5	*Writing:*	5

3. In a short paragraph please describe your English learning history. Make sure to answer these questions: When did you start learning English? Did you enjoy it? Over the years how intensive has your study been?
      I started learning English when I went to primary school. Factually, I didn't enjoy it. For me, English is an exam in the end of semesters. I think my English is just so-so.

4. What is your main purpose for learning English?
      Getting a higher TOEFL score. And can communicate well with others.

5. How do you envision yourself using English in the future?
      In the future, maybe I can speak English without thinking too much vocabularies grammar. Just speak straightly.

6. Who do you usually communicate with in English and for what purposes?
      I usually communicate with my friend in English in order to practice my listening skills and speaking.

7. Do you enjoy writing (in your native language or in English)? Why or why not?
      I don't like to write anything. Because I prefer talking with my friends rather than writing down. My friends can give me some advices when I'm talking to them.

8. What are your favorite topics to write about (in any language)?
      1. Music. But I don't know many terms about music.
      2. Daily life. After many year ago, I'll recall my memories through the diaries.

9. What types or forms of writing in English do you think you might use in your future? (Ex: TOEFL test, academic papers, business reports, letters, emails, job or college applications)

     TOEFL test, emails, academic papers.

10. What do you want to learn or improve in this 8 week course? Do you have any ideas for class activities or things you would like to do in this class?

     To improve my strategies about writing and to learn how to make a plan before write papers. Giving a topic and write more and more idea or key words.

11. If you have any additional comments or things you think I should know please use this space to tell me!

Day 1 Assessment

Name: **Takeshi**
Nickname (optional):

1. *What languages do you know? Please list in order of competence and rate from 1 to 10. (Your native language should be first and rated 10!):*
  Japanese: 10
  English: 5
  Korean: 2

2. *Please rate your English level in the four skill areas listed below from 1 (absolute beginner) to 10 (near native).*

Speaking:	5	*Reading:*	5
Listening:	2	*Writing:*	6

3. *In a short paragraph please describe your English learning history. Make sure to answer these questions: When did you start learning English? Did you enjoy it? Over the years how intensive has your study been?*
  I started learning English since 13 year old. I enjoyed it first three years. After that I studied it for the entrance examination to high school and university. I'm studying English intensively since 2011.

4. *What is your main purpose for learning English?*
  It is to be able to speak English fluently.

5. *How do you envision yourself using English in the future?*
  If possible, I want to guide and help foreigners in Japan by using English.

6. *Who do you usually communicate with in English and for what purposes?*
  I communicate with my host family every day, by I feel its time is very short because I return home at 6pm and I have to do homework. I don't have enough time.

7. *Do you enjoy writing (in your native language or in English)? Why or why not?*
  I enjoy writing in English because I can say many things that I can't say in Japanese.

8. *What are your favorite topics to write about (in any language)?*
  Traveling

9. *What types or forms of writing in English do you think you might use in your future? (Ex: TOEFL test, academic papers, business reports, letters, emails, job or college applications)*
  For the exam to get license for tour guide.

10. *What do you want to learn or improve in this 8 week course? Do you have any ideas for class activities or things you would like to do in this class?*
  I want to express correctly what I want to say.

11. *If you have any additional comments or things you think I should know please use this space to tell me!*

      Nothing special.