

JOURNAL OF MODERN LANGUAGES

FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA

VOLUME 22

ISSN NO. 1675-526X

2012

Assessing and Giving Feedback to Students' Written Work: Closing the Gap Between Expert and Novice Raters

Clarence Jerry, Jariah Mohd. Jan & Moses Samuel

The Relation of Meaning to Wording in Mandela's Speech of Inauguration as President: A Systemic Functional Analysis of Rhetorical Devices, Marked Syntax and Appraisal

María Martínez Lirola

The Effects of L1 on L2 Writing and Translation: A Case Study

Yasunari Fujii

Building Morphological Analyzer for Nepali

Shahid Mushtaq Bhat & Rupesh Rai

Downshifting Discourse: Revitalizing BASIC ENGLISH 850 as a Learner Lingua Franca in Global Working-Class Literacy

Bill Templer



FACULTY OF LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA

Journal of Modern Languages

Jurnal Bahasa Moden

Faculty of Languages and Linguistics
University of Malaya

Editor-in-Chief

Professor Dr. Zuraidah Mohd Don

Associate Editors

Dr David Yoong

Associate Professor Dr Toshiko Yamaguchi

Editorial Board

Associate Professor Dr Mohana K. Nambiar

Associate Professor Dr Jariah Mohd Jan

Dr Jagdish Kaur

Dr Sheena Kaur

The Effects of L1 on L2 Writing and Translation: A Case Study¹

Yasunari Fujii
Daito Bunka University

Abstract

This article examines the perceptions and attitudes of Japanese university students regarding two types of writing tasks: writing directly in L2 and translating from L1 into L2. A total of 128 Japanese undergraduate students participated in the study and completed two activities – composition in English and translation of a passage from Japanese into English – followed by a questionnaire. An analysis of performance and results leads to the following conclusions: (1) while L2 writing was perceived to be more difficult, it received a higher preference rating, (2) when writing in L2, participants rely heavily on L1 during the drafting stage and translate their ideas from L1 into L2 in the composing stage, and (3) most participants draft in L1 and then translate into L2, restricting their choices to shorter sentences. The implications of the findings are applied to alternative teaching strategies to help learners succeed in their L2 writing endeavors.

Keywords: L2 writing, translation from L1 into L2, affective factors, writing process, text quality, writing instruction

1. Introduction

Second language (L2) writing research has provided valuable insights into the nature of non-native speakers' writing from a number of theoretical and practical perspectives (Matsuda & Silva, 2010; Ransdell & Barbier, 2002), including learner composing and revision strategies (Silva, 1993; Soven, 1999), contrastive rhetoric (Connor, 2002, 2008; Kubota, 1998; Kubota & Lehner, 2004), learner preferences regarding teacher and peer commentary on written drafts (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996; K. Hyland & F. Hyland, 2006; Lee, 2004, 2009), teachers' self-assessments of teacher-written feedback (Montgomery & Baker, 2007), the politics and philosophy of error (Truscott, 2007), assessments (B. Kroll, 1998, 2003), and the context and audience for the final written product (Thatcher, 2005). To date, a substantial body of L2 writing research has been concerned with the issue of the use of the writer's first language (L1), and therefore translation, in L2 writing (Katznelson, Perpignan, & Rubin, 2001; Swain & Lapkin, 2000). The effect of L1 on L2 writing has been studied at both product level (i.e., the transfer of L1 rhetorical patterns into L2 writing; Casanave, 2004) and process level (i.e., when and how L1 is used by writers at different stages in

¹ The author thanks Stephanie Clauson and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions.

L2 writing; Woodall, 2002); hence, translation becomes a key issue in L2 writing.

While empirical studies focusing on text quality and writing processes are necessary and meaningful (Cumming, 2001), it is at least as important, if not more so, to understand the student's learning experiences in terms of cognitive and affective factors such as perceptions, feelings, and attitudes. An examination of second language acquisition (SLA) from a neurobiological perspective shows that the achievement of success in a second language is emotionally driven, and L2 writing is not an exception (Schumann, 1997). As Sasaki (2000, p. 283) notes, adding the affect component would make the target writing process model more comprehensive. In the light of the foregoing, the aim of this article is to provide insight into Japanese university students' perceptions and attitudes toward L2 English writing and translation into L2 (Campbell, 1998), in an attempt to elucidate the extent to which mental translation is integral to the process of L2 writing. Japanese students of English primarily use direct translation because it is the method traditionally taught in the L2 classroom. Thus, no distinction is made in this article between direct translation and other types of translation such as literary translation.

2. Literature Review

Research on the phenomenon of L1 transfer to L2 writing has revealed mixed results, which can be divided into three main classes of arguments: (1) translation has little relevance to L2 writing, (2) the degree of reliance on L1 differs with the proficiency levels of students, and (3) the L1 plays a supportive role in L2 writing even for advanced learners. The group of researchers associated with the first argument point to the possibility that the production of text in L2 is not a simple process of translating ideas from one language to another. Jones and Tetroe (1987) focused on the planning strategies of six Spanish speakers learning English. The study found that there is some decrease in performance when using an L2, and that working in an unfamiliar language does take up cognitive capacity that would be used for other tasks in L1 composing (e.g., monitoring and revising the plan; p. 53), but that the use of L1 while composing in L2 does not appear to facilitate L2 composing. In an investigation of the English writing process of 23 French-speaking college students, Cumming (1989) and Cumming and Mellow (1996) found that students with advanced English as a second language (ESL) proficiency perform better than those with intermediate proficiency, but not to a statistically significant degree. Writing expertise in L1 is the primary factor, and L2 proficiency does not visibly affect the process of composing in L2.

The second group of researchers propose that the extent of dependence on L1 correlates to the level of language proficiency of each student; that is, that advanced L2 writers do not depend as much on L1 while writing in L2. In a study conducted in the German context, Zimmerman (2000) demonstrated that the process of L2 writing is in many ways distinct from that of L1 writing. Zimmerman found that while writers with low levels of L2 proficiency often rely heavily on their L1 resources, advanced learners are able to easily shift

between languages and produce highly literate written pieces in both L1 and L2. Wang and Wen (2002) investigated how L1 Chinese affects the L2 English writing of Chinese university students and examined whether their reliance on Chinese is related to their English proficiency. They found that, when writing in English, students with higher English proficiency rely less on Chinese than those with lower English proficiency. The evidence further indicated that students are more likely to rely on L1 when generating and organizing ideas but more likely to rely on L2 when actually writing down these ideas.

The third group of researchers claim that not only lower proficiency students but also competent writers use their L1 as a communication strategy to help them successfully learn and use L2. Cohen and Brooks-Carson (2001) conducted a case study exploring qualitative differences between direct writing in French and translation from English (or Spanish) into French by 39 intermediate students at the University of Miami. They found that, by allowing writers to first express concepts in L1 and then translate to L2 rather than move directly from concepts to their L2 representations, the use of L1 serves to reduce the load on working memory (p. 181). In another study, van Weijen, van den Bergh, Rijlaarsdam, and Sanders (2009) examined whether L1 use varies between writers and tasks and whether that use is related to general writing proficiency, L2 proficiency, and/or L2 text quality. Twenty students each wrote four short argumentative essays in their L1 (Dutch) and four in their L2 (English) under think-aloud conditions. The analysis focused on the occurrence of a number of conceptual creative activities. They found that all students use L1 while writing in L2 to some extent, although that use varies for different conceptual activities; students' self-instructions are more likely to be in L1 than in L2 when writing versus when performing other activities (i.e., those other activities are more likely to be associated with L2).

More directly relevant to the present study is research conducted with Japanese subjects (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1992, 2002, 2008; Kubota, 1998; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2005; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996; Uzawa, 1994, 1996). In a process-oriented SLA study, Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992) analyzed the point of translation in L2 writing for 48 Japanese university students. The students were instructed to write their essays in two different ways: (1) writing in Japanese and translating into English and (2) writing directly in English. The comparative analysis showed that the translations rate better than the direct essays in content, organization, and style for the lower proficiency students, but that the direct essays contain fewer errors than the translations for the higher proficiency students. Kobayashi and Rinnert asked their students to report on how much Japanese they thought they were using mentally when they were writing directly in English. Approximately 48% reported using 50-70% Japanese, 27% reported using 25-50% Japanese, 17% reported using 75% Japanese, and 8% reported using less than 25% Japanese. The students also reported that they are able to express their thoughts more lucidly when they write in L1 and use an L1-L2 dictionary to translate than when they write directly in L2.

In a similar vein, Uzawa (1994, 1996) conducted a comparative study that examined the writing and translation processes, attention patterns, and scores on language use among 22 Japanese ESL students attending a Canadian college. The students performed three tasks individually: (1) writing an essay in L1 Japanese, (2) writing an essay in L2 English on a different topic, and (3) translating a short journal article from Japanese into English. This study resulted in three major findings. First, most students use a “what next” approach in both the L1 and L2 writing tasks and a “sentence by sentence” approach in the translation task. Second, attention patterns are very similar in the L1 and L2 writing tasks, but quite different in the translation task; attention to language use in the translation task is significantly higher than in the L1 and L2 writing tasks. Third, the scores on language use are similar in the L1 and L2 writing tasks and significantly higher than both in the translation task. Uzawa concluded that lower proficiency students would benefit most from the translation task. Careful attention to language use during the translation process helps students become more accurate in their production, as they are expected to use skills and knowledge that go beyond their linguistic competence (Swain, 1985, 1995). These studies involving Japanese students support the view that translation has a positive effect on the L2 writing process, particularly for those with lower levels of English proficiency.

Despite the valuable knowledge gleaned from these previous studies on the influences of L1 on Japanese students’ L2 writing, several methodological problems still need to be solved (Kuiken & Vedder, 2008). Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992) instructed their subjects to write English compositions by (1) writing in Japanese and translating into English and (2) writing directly in English. This approach makes it difficult to measure the precise extent of the effect of mental translation on L2 writing processes. Uzawa (1994, 1996) used the so-called “think-aloud” protocols, one of the most common methods used in L2 writing studies. Think-alouds are a type of verbal report in which an individual expresses everything he/she is thinking while performing a given task (Almasi, 2003, p. 26). This procedure is often used to examine the cognitive processing that occurs during a social interaction (Kucan & Beck, 1997). However, Hönig (1991, p. 82) observed that think-aloud protocols may actually inhibit the mental process when it is at work. Subjects often only verbalize the conscious part of their thought processes and thus are only inclined to say what they think they are expected to say, often neglecting important subconscious aspects of the thought process. To this end, this study attempts to develop a survey method to tap into the uncontrolled, unconscious, and intuitive mental translation processes of L2 writers.

3. Methodology

A total of 128 19 to 21 year old undergraduate students majoring in science and engineering at a university in Japan participated in this study. Prior to entering the university, these students finished twelve years of mainstream education in Japan between the ages of 6 and 18. The students have a solid foundation in mathematics and science, but their English proficiency is relatively low.

The material for the L2 writing component (Appendix 1) was prepared by the author. The material for translation into L2 was adopted from the translator certification test administered by the Japan Translation Association (*Nihon Honyaku Kyōkai*, 2000). In consideration of the participants' academic background and competence level in English, test questions were drawn from the area of humanities in the fourth (introductory) level.

The participants were assigned two tasks, a composition in English and translation of a Japanese passage into English. Both tasks were completed, separately, within one hour. The use of dictionaries, either paper or electronic, was permitted. Immediately thereafter, the participants completed a written questionnaire (Appendix 2). The written questionnaire was designed for use instead of verbal reports because of the previously discussed shortcomings of verbal reports. The questionnaire, which was carefully prepared with sub-sections included for clarity, made use of both closed-ended and open-ended questions. Closed-ended questions generate easily quantifiable data, allowing for comparison of respondents' answers, while open-ended questions provide deeper insights into respondents' views and experiences. The questionnaire and the student responses were translated from Japanese into English for this article.

4. Results and Discussion

Of the participants in this study, 55% felt that L2 writing is more difficult than translation into L2, as it requires creative thinking and organization of thoughts into a logical sequence, although 63% of the participants expressed a preference for L2 writing over translation into L2. A vast majority (94%) acknowledged that, when writing in English, they first form Japanese sentences and then translate their ideas into English. In doing so, they deliberately construct simple and uncomplicated Japanese sentences that can be easily translated.

4.1. The Issue of Perceived Difficulty and Preference

On the questionnaire, 55% of the participants indicated that writing in L2 writing is more difficult than translating from L1 to L2. The main reason why L2 writing is perceived as more difficult is the increased cognitive effort of formulating and expressing ideas in proper operational terms. The other 45% of the participants found translation into L2 to be more difficult than L2 writing because the conceptual mapping between languages is generally not one-to-one and because translating someone else's writing is not a creative process. However, perceived difficulty does not necessarily hinder participants' enjoyment of the L2 writing task; 63% of the participants indicated that they prefer L2 writing over translation into L2, stating that composition (1) allows for more freedom of expression, (2) is more enjoyable, (3) is more difficult but nevertheless rewarding, and (4) is more interesting and less mechanical. The other 37% of participants, who favor translation into L2 over L2 writing, commented that even in L1 they do not enjoy developing ideas and arguments in an appropriate order to produce a coherent essay/paragraph and instead prefer working on and translating a prewritten text. These participants also stated that translation (1) is less stressful, (2) provides a sense of achievement on

completion, (3) allows for the translator's rendition of the text to be appreciated by the reader, and (4) is beneficial to language learning.

4.2. The Process of L2 Writing

The results indicated that only 1.5% of the participants try to write in English from the start of the writing process, while 94% of the participants first generate ideas in Japanese and then translate them. Another 4.5% of the participants responded that they use both L1 and L2 in English composition. Participants who feel they are competent enough to conceptualize, plan, and execute writing directly in L2 described the process as follows:

- "I try to express my thoughts in English directly. Whatever concept I want to express, the English words pop into my mind. I then arrange these words in the right order. That is how I usually write in English."

Conversely, comments from participants who reported that they first generate ideas in Japanese and then translate these ideas into English include the following:

- "I make Japanese sentences first and modify these sentences so that they can be written in English within the bounds of my linguistic competence. When I feel that the Japanese sentences are getting too long, I divide them up into shorter sentences for easier translation into English."
- "I start by putting Japanese sentences together in my head. I can organize my thoughts more effectively that way. I end up producing incomprehensible English sentences if I try to organize my thoughts in English all the way through."
- "The word order of the resulting English sentences gets messed up and even resembles the Japanese word order if I am forced to think in English from the beginning. English words just don't come naturally to me. By thinking in Japanese, I can go through the whole process in a rational way."
- "I mentally construct Japanese sentences first and then translate them into English. I do pay attention to the subject and the verb of the English sentences that I write. I rewrite my Japanese sentences many times until they are translatable."
- "I form a Japanese sentence in my head and divide it up into smaller segments. I translate these parts into English and then put them back together to form an English sentence."

Those who stated that they use both L1 and L2 with the help of dictionaries in English composition explained the process this way:

- "As far as the task at hand is concerned, I have an image in Japanese, something like *shakaika* (social studies), in my head first. I do not form a full Japanese sentence like '*watashi wa shakaika da to omoimasu* (I think it is social studies).' What I do is flesh out an image in English, as in something like 'I think...' When I don't know how to say something in English, I use Japanese for that part of the idea, for example, 'I think *shakaika*...' and then complete a fully structured sentence in English."
- "I try to create an image for what I want to write about in my mind. Sometimes it is like a motion picture, and other times it is more like a still image. I write directly in English when I know the right word for that image. I use a dictionary when necessary. For example, picturing myself eating an *onigiri* (rice ball), I might say something like 'I eat *onigiri*,' but when picturing myself getting first place in a race, which is more complex syntactically, I develop the idea in Japanese as in '*watashi wa rēsu de ichiban de gōrūshita* (I came first place in a race)' and then translate it into English."

The process of thinking in Japanese and translating those thoughts into English is time-consuming and error-prone, and the resulting product often reads like Japanese-like English. Thinking and writing in English requires focus, concentration, and sustained energy, but students can ultimately save time and learn more by doing so (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). In this light, the key objective of writing instruction should be for students to acquire the fundamental structural patterns of L2 that will allow them to transition from planning predominantly in L1 to staying more in L2 and less in L1.

4.3. Quality of Work

Writing is a type of performance, an actual working instance of producing written language in real time. There are three elements involved when assessing performance (McNamara, 1996): (1) the actual performance, (2) a method for assessment, and (3) the rater. Cumming, Kantor, Powers, Santos, and Taylor (2000, p. 18) noted that there are two dimensions to L2 English writing ability: (1) organization of discourse, ideas, and other substantive content to fulfill a specific writing task, and (2) accurate and appropriate use of the English language and conventions of written English to deliver the communication. This view is in line with Bachman (1990), Bachman and Cohen (1998), and Bachman and Palmer (2009), all of whom claimed that, in addition to the personal characteristics of the individual language user, communicative language ability consists of (1) language competence, (2) strategic competence, and (3) psychophysiological mechanisms. Consistent with the foregoing, all writing samples collected in this study were evaluated by the author and two native English-speaking editors using the following criteria: for the L2 writing component, (1) content, (2) organization, (3) style, (4) grammar, and (5) vocabulary; for the translation component, (1) understanding of the meaning of the source text, (2) matters relating to typographical errors, omissions, and numerical notations, (3) accuracy, (4) grammar, and (5) word choice.

The principal results obtained are as follows. Of the participants, 43% scored higher on L2 writing, while 20% scored higher on translation into L2. The remaining 37% had roughly the same level of competence in the two tasks. The L2 writings are found to be lexically and grammatically more accurate, but the ideas are not organized in accordance with the provisions of paragraph writing in the English language. This problem could be caused partly by the transference of a conventionalized Japanese discourse structure called *ki-shou-ten-ketsu* into English composition. *Ki-shou-ten-ketsu* is a rhetorical movement in Japanese discourse where *ki* offers the topic, *shou* develops the topic, *ten* adds a surprise turn, and finally, *ketsu* offers the conclusion (Maynard, 2002, p. 428). This differs from the more general notion of cohesion in English, which refers to the non-structural text-forming relations that tie parts of discourse together (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 7). Meanwhile, the translations into L2 result in ungraceful and in some cases incomprehensible prose in which the word orders adheres closely to the L1 syntax. Below are a few representative samples of the participants' work to illustrate this discussion more concretely. Each sample contains four sections in the following order: (a) the participant's L2 writing, (b)

the selected source text for the translation task, (c) the participant's translation of the source text into L2, and (d) a model L2 translation of the source text.

Participant 1

- i. I think we should take subject of communication instead of English. Because, the communication ability will be very important for us in the future. For example, we must do presentation when we develop the new machine. If we couldn't communicate the data to everyone properly, we can't develop good machine.
- ii. *nikōru kiddoman wa, jibun to otto no tomu kurūzu ga haiyūgyō kara no intai wo kangaete iru to zasshi rōringu sutōn ni katatta. kazoku to motto ooku no jikan wo sugosu no da to iu.*
- iii. Nicole Kidman told Rolling Stone that she and Tom Cruise think retiring actor. They say that they spend with their family more time.
- iv. Nicole Kidman told Rolling Stone magazine that she and her husband Tom Cruise are thinking of retiring from acting to spend more time with their family.

Participant 2

- i. I think that synthetic psychology is good to study, because the present society is filled with stupid crimes. If we study child psychology, child crimes may reduce. If we study social psychology, social crimes may reduce. I think that if mob psychology turn to good, society turn to good.
- ii. *sekaijuu no minzoku ga kamen wo tsukutte ori, kamen wa minzoku no kokoro no shinsou ni aru kao wo arawasu. nihon no noumen ga hoka no kamen to chigau tokoro wo tokutei dekireba, nihon bunka dokutoku no kao wo hakken dekiru darou.*
- iii. Mask what are made people on earth show their face that their the bottom of one's heart. If judge of point that Japanese mask differ to others mask, we might find to face of peculiar to Japanese culture.
- iv. All the peoples of the world have produced masks that represent the true face that lies at the heart of that culture. If we can isolate what makes the Japanese mask different from all other masks, we should be able to discover the unique face of Japanese culture.

Participant 3

- i. I think it is historical science. It is important to know the present of the world. If we learn about many history of the world, we can know what are the problems in the present of the world. In addition, if we know the happens of the people in the past, we can know what are the wrong actions. To learn the historical science is not only to know the past happening but also to learn what we should do in the future.
- ii. *ongaku wa ningen ga tsukuru mono de ari, ningen ga hiku mono de aru. sainou wa mochiron hitsuyōu na jouken de aru ga, soredake de wa geijutsu wa seiritsu shinai. geijutsu wa, tsune ni sore ni kakawaru hito no ningensei wo hanei suru.*
- iii. Music is produced and played by the human. This ability is of course requirement, but art isn't conclusion only that. Art is reflect human natural of the person have to do with it.
- iv. People create music, and people play music. Of course talent is necessary, but ability alone is not enough to achieve art. Art always reflects the nature of the person who creates it.

It is evident from these examples that, though the participants' L2 writings may be immature and conversational (Hinkel, 2002, p. 250), their access to grammatical resources is greater in their compositions than in their translations into L2, despite the paucity of language sophistication such as lexical diversity and syntactic complexity. In the L2 writing task, the participants generated their ideas in L1 and identified the linguistic structures that would transfer their ideas into L2, which allowed them to generate additional ideas without being hindered by confusion between the linguistic information and ideas on the topic (Scott,

1996). In their translations into L2, the participants had considerable difficulty in putting the English words together in a proper syntax. Evidently, the L1 to L2 direction is particularly difficult for less proficient language students for whom the concept-to-L2 links are relatively weak (J. Kroll, Michael, Tokowicz, & Dufour, 2002), with the result that the translated pieces are actually not really translations at all but rather meaningless strings of words; many sentences are substantially ungrammatical and awkwardly constructed, while others are imply unintelligible.

5. Conclusion

This study investigated Japanese university students' perceptions and attitudes toward L2 writing and translation into L2, as well as the effect of L1 on L2 writing and the quality of work produced. While the participants consider L2 writing to be more difficult than translation into L2, they nonetheless prefer L2 writing over translation into L2. When writing in L2, participants form syntactically uncomplicated Japanese sentences and translate those ideas into English. The comparative analysis showed that participants write in clearer, more logical, and more grammatical sentences in L2 writing than in translation into L2. In the translation task, the work produced is more or less a word-for-word substitution, with a word in the target language mechanically assigned for each word in the source language; this is not really translation at all and destroys as much meaning as it conveys.

It is of interest to mention here that Japanese students of English receive very little training in the principles of English paragraph writing. Learning to write logically organized and connected discourse is of particular importance for Japanese-speaking writers, whose rhetorical pattern is different from that of English-speaking writers. It is often assumed that Japanese-speaking writers prefer inductive organization, where the details and/or evidence presented in the writing lead to a conclusion, whereas English-speaking writers prefer deductive organization, where the writing begins with a general claim and then supports the assertion with evidence (although in reality English writing uses both formats quite often). Perhaps this assumption results from Japanese teachers' awareness of the five-paragraph essay used often in English. The five-paragraph essay is a good start for learning English rhetorical style, but it is not the only style format that works well in English writing.

Based on the evidence presented here, it is reasonable to conclude that grammatical competence is an indisputably essential element of ESL writing instruction; however, integrating grammar into ESL composition teaching is a complex task regardless of instructional approach (Frodesen & Holten, 2003). Several pedagogical implications may be suggested to increase the interest, attention, and motivation of linguistically less advanced students such as the ones who took part in this study. In the initial drafting stage, students should be allowed to consult dictionaries (Bruton, 2007) but should be encouraged to use them intelligently (e.g., use dictionaries with usage examples). Students have to be taught – and reminded – of the importance of forming skeleton structures in English early in the writing process and keeping the basic sentential framework

as close to the English sentence structure as possible. Numerous grammatical structures may be used, although most sentence and clause structures in English depend on the s-v-o orientation. From that basic structure, the format expands considerably and in many complex ways. An L2 writer should be able to write respectable English if he/she has a collection of models consisting of about 100 context-free sentence patterns. It is also essential for students to learn more formal structures to avoid confusion and the use of too much slang construction, but these structures can be introduced later, when L2 writers feel more comfortable with the use of L2 in writing.

This study provided updated information and insightful observations about L2 writings and translation issues for L2 learning as well as for L2 teaching methodology. The findings of this study could serve as a foundation upon which researchers, teachers, and material developers to meet the needs of those language students wishing to practice and develop their L2 writing ability. Future research could compare the performance of students who have received customized training in L2 writing with an emphasis on fostering the ability to write with less reliance on L1 with students who have undertaken traditional grammar translation exercises in the writing classroom.

References

- Almasi, J. F. (2003). *Teaching strategic processes in reading*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford, UK/New York, NY: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Bachman, L. F., & Cohen, A. D. (1998). Language testing – SLA interfaces: An update. In L. F. Bachman & A. D. Cohen (eds.). *Interfaces between second language acquisition and language testing research* (pp. 1-31). Cambridge, UK/New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (2009). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford, UK/New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 14(3), 191-205.
- Bruton, A. (2007). Vocabulary learning from dictionary referencing and language feedback in EFL translational writing. *Language Teaching Research* 11(4), 413-431.
- Campbell, S. (1998). *Translation into the second language*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemmas and decisions in research and instruction*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Cohen, A. D., & Brooks-Carson, A. (2001). Research on direct versus translated writing: Students' strategies and their results. *The Modern Language Journal* 85(2), 169-188.
- Connor, U. (2002). New directions in contrastive rhetoric. *TESOL Quarterly* 36(4), 493-510.
- Connor, U. (2008). Mapping multidimensional aspects of research: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric. In U. Connor, E. Nagelhout, & W. V. Rozycki (eds.). *Contrastive rhetoric: Reaching to intercultural rhetoric* (pp. 299-315). Amsterdam, The Netherlands/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. *Language Learning* 39(1), 81-135.
- Cumming, A. (2001). Learning to write in a second language: Two decades of research. *International Journal of English Studies* 1(2), 1-23.
- Cumming, A., & Mellow, D. (1996). An investigation into the validity of written indicators of second language proficiency. In A. Cumming & R. Berwick (eds.). *Validation in language testing* (pp. 72-93). Clevedon, UK/Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.

- Cumming, A., Kantor, R., Powers, D. E., Santos, T., & Taylor, C. (2000). *TOEFL® 2000 writing framework: A working paper* (TOEFL Monograph No. Ms-18). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10(3), 161-184.
- Frodesen, J., & Holten, C. (2003). Grammar in the ESL writing class. In B. Kroll (ed.). *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 141-161). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London, UK: Longman.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback in L2 writing. *The Modern Language Journal* 80(3), 287-308.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writers' text: Linguistic and rhetorical features*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hönig, H. G. (1991). Holmes' "mapping theory" and the landscape of mental translation processes. In K. M. van Leuven-Zwart & T. Naaijken (eds.). *Translation studies: The state of the art: Proceedings of the first James S. Holmes symposium on translation studies* (pp. 77-89). Amsterdam, The Netherlands/Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching* 39(2), 83-101.
- Jones, S., & Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A. Matsushashi (ed.). *Writing in real time: Modelling production processes* (pp. 34-57). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Katznelson, H., Perpignan, H., & Rubin, B. (2001). What develops along with the development of second language writing? Exploring the "by-products." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10(3), 141-159.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (1992). Effects of first language on second language writing: Translation versus direct composition. *Language Learning* 42(2), 183-215.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2002). High school student perceptions of first language literacy instruction: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 11(2), 91-116.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2008). Task response and text construction across L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 17(1), 7-29.
- Kroll, B. (1998). Assessing writing abilities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 18, 219-240.
- Kroll, B. (2003). Introduction: Teaching the next generation of second language writers. In B. Kroll (ed.). *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 1-10). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kroll, J. F., Michael, E., Tokowicz, N., & Dufour, R. (2002). The development of lexical fluency in a second language. *Second Language Research* 18(2), 137-171.
- Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of L1-L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implications for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 7(1), 69-100.
- Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13(1), 7-27.
- Kucan, L., & Beck, I. L. (1997). Thinking aloud and reading comprehension research: Inquiry, instruction, and social interaction. *Review of Educational Research* 67(3), 271-299.
- Kuiken, F., & Vedder, I. (2008). Cognitive task complexity and written output in Italian and French as a foreign language. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 17(1), 48-60.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13(4), 285-312.
- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal* 63(1), 13-22.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. M. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- McNamara, T. F. (1996). *Measuring second language performance*. London, UK/New York, NY: Longman.
- Matsuda, P. K., & Silva, T. (2010). Writing. In N. Schmitt (ed.). *An introduction to applied linguistics* (2nd ed.) (pp. 232-246). London, UK: Hodder Education.

- Maynard, S. K. (2002). *Linguistic emotivity: Centrality of place, the topic-comment dynamic, and an ideology of pathos in Japanese discourse*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16(2), 82-99.
- Nihon Honyaku Kyōkai* (2000). *Honyaku kentei: mondai to kaitou 2000* [Translation certification test: questions and answers 2000]. Tokyo, Japan: Babel Press.
- Ransdell, S., & Barbier, M.-L. (2002). An introduction to new directions for research in L2 writing. In S. Ransdell & M.-L. Barbier (eds.). *Studies in writing: Vol. 11. New directions for research in L2 writing* (pp. 1-10). Dordrecht, The Netherlands/Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Rinnert, C., & Kobayashi, H. (2005). Borrowing words and ideas: Insights from Japanese L1 writers. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 15(1), 15-29.
- Sasaki, M. (2000). Toward an empirical model of EFL writing processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 9(3), 259-291.
- Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning* 46(1), 137-174.
- Schumann, J. C. (1997). *The neurobiology of affect in language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Scott, V. M. (1996). *Rethinking foreign language writing*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly* 27(4), 657-677.
- Soven, M. I. (1999). *Teaching writing in middle and secondary schools: Theory, research, and practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (eds.). *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (eds.). *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford, UK/New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research* 4(3), 251-274.
- Thatcher, B. (2005). Situating L2 writing in global communication technologies. *Computers and Composition* 22(3), 279-295.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 16(4), 255-272.
- Uzawa, K. (1994). Translation, L1 writing, and L2 writing of Japanese ESL learners. *Journal of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics* 16(2), 119-134.
- Uzawa, K. (1996). Second language learners' processes of L1 writing, L2 writing, and translation from L1 into L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 5(3), 271-294.
- van Weijen, D., van den Bergh, H., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Sanders, T. (2009). L1 use during L2 writing: An empirical study of a complex phenomenon. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 18(4), 235-250.
- Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 use in the L2 composing process: An exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 11(3), 225-246.
- Woodall, B. R. (2002). Language-switching: Using the first language while writing in a second language. *Journal of Second Language* 11(1), 7-28.
- Zimmerman, R. (2000). L2 writing: Subprocesses, a model of formulating and empirical findings. *Learning and Instruction* 10(1), 73-99.

Appendix 1. Instructions for the L2 Writing Task

What kind of subject would you find appealing if an English course were not available? Write a composition in English of 50 words or more to persuade your reader of your choice.

Appendix 2. The Questionnaire

This is a questionnaire about the tasks you have just completed. Please be as specific as possible in your responses to each question.

Q1. What are you currently studying in school?

Q2-a. Rate your agreement to the following statement: I enjoy writing in Japanese.

1. strongly agree 2. agree 3. neither agree nor disagree 4. disagree 5. strongly disagree

Q2-b. If your answer to Q2-a is 1 or 2, what types of writing do you enjoy (e.g., fiction, diaries, e-mails to friends, etc.)?

Q3. In today's class, you performed two different tasks, L2 writing and translation into L2. Which writing activity do you generally prefer? Please explain your reasons.

Q4. Which is more difficult for you, L2 writing or translation into L2? Please explain your reasons.

Q5. In L2 writing, do you construct Japanese sentences first and then translate these sentences into English? Or do you think in English from the beginning and all the way through the writing process? Please give a detailed description of your thinking process with examples.

Q6. Please explain how you completed today's tasks, both the L2 writing and the translation into L2.

Q7. How do you usually use dictionaries?

Q8. What is the brand name and/or edition of your current dictionary?

Q9. Are you doing something to improve your English writing ability? If there is anything else that you would like to add about your study habits, please do so here.

About the Author

Yasunari Fujii is a lecturer at Daito Bunka University, where he teaches translation and interpreting theory and practice. He has a PhD in linguistics from the Australian National University. His current research interests include legal translation and court interpreting.

E-mail: yasunarif@ic.daito.ac.jp