

## **Enhancing English Reading and Writing Proficiency of Korean University Students Through Copying Activity Training\***

**Yoo-Jean Lee**

Dankook University

**Lee, Yoo-Jean. (2014). Enhancing English reading and writing proficiency of Korean university students through copying activity training. *Modern English Education*, 15(4), 23-51.**

The present study is intended to investigate how copying training in English would affect various proficiency levels of EFL learners in their reading and writing. Two groups of 50 Korean university students (i.e. copying-training and non-training groups of 25 each) who had enrolled in an English reading and writing course were recruited for this study. Based on the pre-test results, each group was divided again into higher and lower proficiency levels. Their pre- and post-tests scores were compared, and their reading and writing processes during a think-aloud task were observed. Both higher and lower level students in the copying-training group were found to show much more improvement in their overall areas of reading and writing than those in the non-training group. Additionally, even though the higher level students who received copying training were more well aware of what strategies to use and how to use them while reading and writing, it was observed that the overall students in the copying-training group were applying various strategies more effectively by consciously focusing on their weaknesses. These results suggest that copying training can help Korean EFL learners improve their reading and writing ability and achieve insight into their own reading and writing processes.

**[copying training/reading and writing proficiency/reading and writing process/  
배껴쓰기 훈련/읽기와 쓰기 능력/읽기와 쓰기 과정]**

---

\* This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2012S1A5A8022247).

## I. INTRODUCTION

In English as a first (L1) and second language (L2) teaching, reading and writing had been viewed as two independent skills, and thus were taught separately for a long time (S. Y. Kim, 2011; Tsai, 2006). However, since the 1980s, their close interrelationship has been emphasized in L1 contexts (Petrosky, 1982; Tierney & Pearson, 1983). Later, many L2 researchers and teachers also realized the contributions that reading can make to writing and vice versa (Hirvela, 2004; M. J. Yang & E. J. Lee, 2012). Accordingly, language teachers were urged to find ways of combining instruction in reading and writing to help students improve their reading and writing ability at the same time (Giesen, 2001; Lehr, 1981; Tsai, 2006). Tierney and Pearson (1983) considered reading and writing as “similar processes of meaning construction” (Tierney & Pearson, 1983, p. 568), and Tsai (2006) insisted that text plays an important role as a medium for these processes. She further noted that students interact with text meaningfully when reading and writing, and Giesen (2001) and Reid (1993) highlighted the fact that students would acquire vocabulary, sentence structure, and rhetorical structures of writing through reading, and they in turn would become effective writers. In the same vein, Giesen (2001) and Reid (1993) stated that students would improve their comprehension and the retention of what they read through writing. It is clear that reading and writing are interdependent, and thus should be taught together in language classroom.

As a means of teaching reading and writing in an integrative manner, copying activity has been used for a long time since it encourages students to 1) read and understand well-written texts, 2) learn complex sentence structures, vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, and rhetoric, 3) apply what they have learned to their own writing, and 4) produce a good writing (Currie, 1998; Joyce & Lundberg, 2013; Porte, 1993, 1995; Sowden, 2005). However, copying has been equated with plagiarism particularly in the West (Kolich, 1983) and considered as a survival strategy that only lower proficiency level students depend on when a summarizing task is given (Keck, 2006; Y. I. Moon, 2002). Due to negative perception of copying, very little research has been conducted which regarded copying as an independent and useful learning strategy. In addition, although positive aspects of copying for improving students' reading and writing skills were discussed in much research (Joyce & Lundberg, 2013; Sari, 2012; S. M. Yu, 2011), its effect has rarely been confirmed through the experiment. Therefore, this study will explore what advantages that copying, as one of the language learning tools, can possibly provide for various proficiency levels of Korean EFL learners to develop their reading and writing ability.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1. History of Using Copying in Education

The beginning of copying in the West goes back to ancient Athens when people realized the importance of writing for the purpose of describing their history. In ancient Greece and Rome, learners generally went through three educational stages: 1) practicing spelling, 2) getting pre-writing training to study for text of a speech, and 3) learning rhetoric. Instructors guided learners to use what was called ‘*imitating*’ (i.e. copying) strategy, and encouraged them not only to follow a well-written text’s writing style and content but also to understand the authors’ thoughts. The use of imitating strategy had continued to the medieval times in order to teach rhetoric which required good skills of writing a composition and developing a speech. Learners were thus trained to memorize and imitate a well-written text and speech. Later, they were also encouraged to read and analyze great works of literature (W. S. Park, 2005; S. M. Yu, 2011).

Copying had been continuously used as an effective learning strategy in ancient times, particularly in European countries. However, at the turn of the current century, copying has been criticized in the West, especially in countries with an Anglo-Saxon heritage, as many nescient learners tended to use it unconsciously to get a good grade (Currie, 1998; Y. I. Moon, 2002; Sowden, 2005). Copying thus has been perceived as plagiarism and a strategy that should be avoided. A number of scholars have believed that copying would be employed only by underachievers, and it would no longer be used as their proficiency levels get higher (Keck, 2006; Y. I. Moon, 2002; M. J. Song, 1998). In contrast, Joyce and Lundberg (2013) argued that copying should be differentiated from plagiarism in that it is an exercise for building knowledge and skill to produce a better writing, but not a means of passing an exam or receiving a good grade. Moreover, some other researchers and teachers pointed out that all people including themselves were unknowingly borrowing words, sentences, voices, arguments, and thoughts from existing texts (Hull & Rose, 1989; Pennycook, 1994; Scollon, 1994). They realized their dependence on copying and admitted the difference between copying and plagiarism. However, they were still skeptical about using copying as an educational tool.

On the other hand, in Asia, copying practice has been deeply entrenched in education as an essential means and an old custom for learning. As people were largely affected by Confucianism and collectivism, Asian scholars were very receptive to the theories and statements of acknowledged authorities (Mohan & Lo, 1985; Tsao, 1983; Yang, 1983). Also, they thought that those theories and statements were belonged to all people, and copying and reproducing them without referring to the original was worthwhile and even admirable (Y. I. Moon, 2002; Sowden, 2005). Particularly in Korea, ‘*transcribing*’ (i.e.

copying) a part of classics of humanities was used as a mandatory learning tool for reading and writing during the Chosun Dynasty from the late 14th to early 20th century (S. M. Yu, 2011). As S. M. Yu (2011) mentioned, Korean scholars were encouraged to transcribe the whole text of a literary work or only its important/famous parts. They were also instructed to memorize and recite what they had transcribed in order to express other recognized scholars' words and thoughts as their own. At present, copying practice is still supported strongly by language teachers and employed actively by learners in Korea.

## 2. Advantages of Copying for Learning and Teaching English Reading and Writing

As there has been a negative view on copying in the West, its positive aspects in language learning and teaching have rarely been discussed. On the contrary, in Asia, possible advantages that copying can provide for students to improve their second or foreign language reading and writing ability have been addressed a lot.

Porte (1993, 1995) defined copying as the most widely used learning strategy and explained about one of its basic benefits: Helping students particularly at the beginning proficiency level learn correct use of L2 spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and grammar. In Porte's (1995) study, 15 EFL university students were asked to copy a text line by line in the limited time. After copying, the instructor pointed out some mistakes that each student made and asked him/her to correct them. Porte (1995) mentioned that this type of training raised the students' consciousness by helping them focus on their mistakes which were made by mismatches between what they see or hear and what they have learned but not yet acquired.

Currie (1998) additionally presented some of the advantages of copying for EFL students at the lower proficiency level: Increasing awareness about awkward use of phrasing, grammatical errors, new vocabulary, and deductive reasoning. She believed that copying would be a valuable strategy for underachievers, but not for advanced level students. In her study, she observed an ESL university student, Diana, whose proficiency level was quite low. By consciously employing copying strategy, Diana was able to improve her linguistic skills and learning processes and gained much more confidence in writing. Currie (1998), Dryden (1999), Y. I. Moon (2002), and Pennycook (1994) insisted that copying is different from rote learning and short-term memorization as it helps students gain deep understanding of a text, internalize it, and finally produce a text which is going beyond the original.

Even though most of the research on copying focused on its benefits for lower proficiency level students, some other research suggested and highlighted the use of copying and its benefits for advanced level students. For example, S. M. Yu (2011)

summarized critical advantages that copying can provide for various proficiency level students. She mentioned that copying helps students increase comprehension of a text which includes understanding of vocabulary, sentences, content, and even the intention of the author. In addition, she stated that students can acquire good writing styles, idiomatic expressions, and text organizational skills through copying. Moreover, she highlighted that copying provides opportunity for students to develop their creativity as well as their application ability (i.e. applying what they have learned through copying such as new vocabulary, idiomatic expressions, and sentence structures appropriately to their own writing). Although S. M. Yu (2011) did not carry out an experimental study, she suggested specific ideas of teaching reading and writing by using copying strategy (e.g. how to select a text for copying, how to help students increase its understanding, etc.). Joyce and Lundberg (2013) also identified similar advantages of copying for various proficiency level students by using the two terms '*noticing*' (i.e. noticing one's mistakes and bad habits through copying) and '*absorbing*' (i.e. internalizing and absorbing the lessons one learned through copying). In addition, they presented some of the students' experiences and comments. Nevertheless, they had not undertaken an empirical research.

Meanwhile, in Y. J. Lee's (in press) paper, advantages of copying for various proficiency levels of EFL university students have been confirmed by an empirical study. She divided 60 students into two groups and then gave a copying task to one group and a summarizing task to the other. By observing the results of the students' reading and writing tests and the processes of copying and summarizing, she concluded that copying and summarizing should be viewed as two independent strategies. She also discovered that copying positively affected various proficiency level students, and consequently helped them improve their overall English reading and writing ability. Although different proficiency levels were considered in the study, copying and summarizing groups were compared rather than comparing copying and non-copying groups. Also, as copying task was given as an extra work, the students were never taught how to use copying strategy. Furthermore, rather than the students' general reading and writing processes, only their copying and summarizing processes were observed. Accordingly, how continuous copying training in class would help them read and write in English better was not identified.

So far, many of the previous studies have discovered benefits of copying for mostly beginning level students and/or presented only theories and teaching ideas. Therefore, the present study will attempt to find advantages of copying for various proficiency levels of Korean EFL university students by comparing reading and writing performance between the copying-training and non-training groups. More specifically, the following two research questions will be addressed:

- 1) How does copying training affect the students to develop their English reading and

- writing ability? Are there any differences between the higher and lower proficiency level groups?
- 2) How does copying training affect the students' English reading and writing processes? Are there any differences between the two proficiency level groups?

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### 1. Participants

Fifty Korean EFL students (20 males and 30 females) who enrolled for an elective English reading and writing course at a university located in Gyeonggi-do participated in this study. They were all sophomores between the ages of 20 and 23, and their majors varied including Business, Economics, Law, English Language and Literature, Chinese, Japanese, Social Science, Engineering, etc. They had taken two elective English courses which focused on listening and speaking in their freshman years, and it was their first semester to take a reading and writing course. They were taking the same course by the same instructor, but were divided into two class sections of 25 each. One class section was given copying training, whereas no training was provided to the other. The students in each class were divided into higher and lower proficiency level groups based on the pre-test results. However, they were never told about their proficiency levels. As for the copying training group, 11 belonged to the higher, and 14 belonged to the lower level group. In comparison, as for the non-training group, 13 were at higher level, and 12 were at lower level. The students' English reading and writing proficiency between the two higher level groups ( $t=.27, p=.790$ ) and between the two lower level groups ( $t=-.34, p=.737$ ) were respectively similar and statistically not significant at all.

#### 2. Data Collection

##### 1) Demographic Information Questionnaire

In the first week of the semester, a demographic information questionnaire was given which included several questions about the students' personal information such as name, age, major, topics of interests for reading and writing, experience of studying abroad, experience of learning English reading, writing, and grammar.

## 2) Pre-Test and Post-Test

In order to examine the students' changes in reading and writing proficiency, a pre-test and post-test were administered in the second week and the final week of the semester, respectively. The pre- and post-tests were identical and consisted of 20 reading comprehension questions and one essay writing question (Sample questions are provided in Appendix 1.). The passages and questions for the reading test were adapted from '*Hackers Reading Start*.' There were several types of questions: '*Main ideas*' (5 questions), '*Details*' (8), '*Inference*' (3), and '*Reading Vocabulary*' (4). All questions were multiple-choice except '*R-Vocab*' questions. For the '*R-Vocab*' questions, the students were supposed to first choose a synonym of a highlighted word in a passage and then create their own sentence by using the highlighted word. In comparison, for the writing test, the students were supposed to write about two important qualities of a good friend. They were also asked to provide some reasons and examples to support their arguments.

## 3) Copying Training Class and Non- Training Class Procedures

The English reading and writing course aimed at helping the students (1) read and understand texts on various topics, (2) develop abilities to find main ideas and important details of texts and make inferences while reading, (3) learn and use new words and expressions and (4) write an essay with good organization, content, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. The class met twice a week for three hours during the 15 week semester. Every two week, one chapter of the textbook, '*Q: Skills for Success—Reading and Writing 2*' was covered. In each chapter, two to three reading passages were introduced with comprehension and discussion questions, and writing exercises were also provided.

For both copying-training and non-training classes, the students were generally taught in the following ways. First, before reading a text, the course instructor activated the students' prior knowledge by asking some questions and showing some pictures or short video clips related to the text topic. In this way, she tried to help the students make connections to the text they read and enhance their comprehension. Second, when reading a text, the instructor taught the students how to identify the thesis, topic sentences, and important facts and supporting details. Also, some new words and expressions were introduced, and the students were asked to pick several words and make their own sentences by using them. The instructor asked each group to present some of the interesting sentences they created, and pointed out common mistakes they made. She additionally showed one or two good examples of sentences. Third, after reading, the students were given some discussion questions and talked about their opinions with their group members. Fourth, related to the text they had read, a writing topic which was included in the textbook was given. The

instructor often made some changes in a writing topic to make it clearer to the students. Before writing an essay, they were encouraged to make an outline including the thesis statement and two to three topic sentences. Finally, the students were given two writing topics in total during the semester and asked to submit about a one page essay for each topic. The instructor discussed common mistakes in the class and returned their essays with comments and scores. The students could revise and resubmit their essays only if they wanted.

Whereas the non-training group students did not receive any additional training, those in the copying training group were taught how to use copying strategy when reading and writing. First, before introducing coping strategy, the instructor had a whole class discussion and asked the students to share their experience and personal thoughts of copying in learning a language. Many of them mentioned that they had a lot of experience of copying down new English words and expressions with their Korean meanings in order to remember their spellings and meanings. However, they said that they rarely had an experience of copying a whole text. The instructor explained what things they should consider and what advantages they could get through copying activity. Second, after reading each text in the textbook and having a discussion of its content, the instructor asked the students to copy the whole text on a piece of paper. Yet, due to class time constraint, the students copied one or two paragraphs in the class and later copied the rest of the text. While copying, the students were encouraged to pay attention to the thesis, important details, topic sentences, concluding remarks, and new words and expressions. Also, they were asked to feel free to make notes or mark something important with different colors/shapes on the copied text. In addition, they were encouraged to use an English-English dictionary and check how new words/expressions were used in various sentences. Moreover, they were urged to continuously practice creating their own sentences by using those new words/expressions. Third, before and while writing an essay (The instructor always gave a writing prompt which was related to a topic of the copied text.), the instructor constantly reminded them to carefully monitor how the opening statement, thesis, topic sentences, closing remarks of the copied text were written. They were also encouraged to use some new words/expressions they had learned in their own writing. Finally, the instructor asked the students to put all of their copied texts and other additional notes into a portfolio and then submit it. She returned the students' portfolios with some comments and scores in the very last week of the semester.

#### 4) Think-aloud Reading and Writing Task and Follow-up Interview

In order to observe how the higher and lower level students in the copying-training and non-training groups similarly or differently read and write in English, eight students (i.e.

two from each group) were chosen for a think-aloud task by considering their availability of time and willingness. They were engaged in a think-aloud task in the 13th week of the semester. As Jääskeläinen (2010) noted, think-aloud protocol indicates that “subjects are asked to perform a task and to verbalize whatever crosses their mind during the task performance” (Jääskeläinen, 2010, p. 371). It is used as one of the research data elicitation methods and helps students to understand and analyze their own thinking processes.

The eight students individually met with the instructor for about 60 to 90 minutes. They were given a hardcopy newspaper article from the Korea Herald (“The staying power,” 2012) which was about a popular Korean celebrity, Psy. The article was selected as its topic was one of the students’ interests, and its content difficulty and organization complexity were, based on the instructor’s judgment, similar to those of the texts the students were learning in the class. While reading, each student was asked to say out loud what and why s/he was doing or thinking whenever s/he marks something on the text, writes down some notes, uses a dictionary, re-reads some sentences, etc. After reading, the instructor gave a writing prompt which was related to the topic of the article they had read (i.e. ‘Who is your favorite celebrity? What things do you like about him/her and why? Write about two to three things that you like about him/her and why.’), and then asked a student to write an essay. While writing, the instructor observed what s/he was doing, and constantly asked him/her to say what s/he was thinking. After the think-aloud task, the students were asked about their difficulties of reading and writing in English. Especially those who were in the copying-training group were asked to bring their portfolios and talk about how they read and copied various texts during the semester. Some of their positive and negative thoughts about copying activity were asked as well.

## 2. Data Analysis

To answer the first research question, the students’ pre- and post-tests results were analyzed. There were 20 questions in the reading section, and each was given 2 points. The highest score one could get was thus 40, and the lowest was 0. In comparison, for the writing section, a rubric which had five areas; ‘*Organization*,’ ‘*Content*,’ ‘*Grammar*,’ ‘*Writing Vocabulary*,’ and ‘*Mechanics*’; was used in order to assess the students’ essays (See Appendix 2). Each area ranged from ‘5’ (‘*Excellent*’) to ‘0’ (‘*Poor*’), and the total highest score that one could get was 25, and the lowest was 0. After grading the students’ pre- and post-tests, first, t-test was applied through SPSS to see if statistically significant differences were found between the pre- and post-tests scores. Also, it was examined if any statically significant differences were found between the copying training and non-training groups and between the higher and lower level groups. Then some of the students’ performance in different areas of reading and writing (e.g. ‘*Main Ideas*,’ ‘*Details*,’

'*Inference*,' etc.) was presented, and critical differences found between the two training groups and between the two proficiency level groups were explained.

To answer the second research question, all conversations between the instructor and the students during the think-aloud task were audio-recorded, transcribed, and checked by each student. Then the transcriptions were translated into English by the instructor. How the students read a text and wrote an essay (i.e. reading and writing processes) while engaged in the think-aloud task were described. Additionally, major differences between the two training groups and between the two proficiency level groups were discussed. Moreover, how the students in the copying-training had read and copied various texts throughout the semester was illustrated by reviewing the portfolios they submitted. Finally, some of the students' thoughts about copying activity and difficulties of reading and writing were described based on what they had stated in the follow-up interview (Note that in this paper, all students' real names were kept confidential and replaced by pseudonyms.).

#### **IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

##### **1. Copying Training and Its Effects on Different Proficiency Level Students' Reading and Writing Ability**

At the beginning of the semester, fifty students in the copying and non-training classes were given a demographic information questionnaire as well as a pre-test. According to the students' responses to the demographic information questionnaire, they had some experience of learning English reading, grammar, and writing short sentences during the secondary school years. However, they mentioned that they focused more on reading and grammar rather than writing. The only writing activity they did, as they reported, was summarizing main points of a text into three to five sentences in English, but they never experienced writing an essay with one or more paragraphs. Based on the pre-test results, the students in the two classes were respectively divided into two proficiency level groups, and the pre-test scores of the two higher and the two lower level groups were respectively similar and statistically not significant at all as shown in Table 1. That is, the two higher and the two lower level groups' reading and writing proficiency levels were respectively similar.

**TABLE 1**  
T-Test for the Pre-Test and Post-Test Mean Difference  
Between the Training and Non-training Groups

Proficiency Level	Group	Area	MD	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Higher	Copying-training	Reading pre-	-.05	-.06	22	.954
		Reading post-	4.92	4.11	22	.000**
		Writing pre-	.42	.70	22	.491
	Non-training	Writing post-	3.03	5.04	22	.000**
		Total pre-	.37	.27	22	.790
		Total post-	7.94	4.84	22	.000**
Lower	Copying-training	Reading pre-	-.96	-.87	24	.393
		Reading post-	4.31	3.46	24	.002**
		Writing pre-	.51	.76	24	.453
	Non-training	Writing post-	5.73	5.73	24	.000**
		Total pre-	-.45	-.34	24	.737
		Total post-	10.04	5.09	24	.000**

\**p*<.05, \*\**p*<.01

After a semester-long instruction, the students were given a post-test in order to find out their improvement in reading and writing. The scores that the students in each group received on the pre- and post-tests are presented in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**  
Comparison of the Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test Results

Proficiency Level	Group	Area	Mean	N	SD	MD	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Higher	Training	Reading pre-	22.91	11	2.02	-10.55	-18.25	10	.000**
		Reading post-	33.46	11	2.02				
		Writing pre-	7.73	11	1.56				
		Writing post-	23.18	11	.87	-15.46	-35.60	10	.000**
		Total pre-	30.64	11	3.25				
	Non-Training	Total post-	56.64	11	2.34	-26.00	-43.67	10	.000**
		Reading pre-	22.97	13	2.31	-5.58	-11.70	12	.000**
		Reading post-	28.54	13	3.50				
		Writing pre-	7.31	13	1.38				
		Writing post-	20.15	13	1.82	-12.85	-23.23	12	.000**
Lower	Training	Total pre-	30.27	13	3.38				
		Total post-	48.69	13	4.99	-18.42	-21.61	12	.000**
		Reading pre-	14.00	14	2.59	-12.39	-13.43	13	.000**
		Reading post-	26.39	14	2.06				
		Writing pre-	3.93	14	1.49				
	Non-Training	Writing post-	18.14	14	1.61	-14.21	-38.86	13	.000**
		Total pre-	17.93	14	3.19				
		Total post-	44.54	14	3.02	-26.61	-24.36	13	.000**
		Reading pre-	14.96	12	3.03	-7.13	-6.68	11	.000**
		Reading post-	22.08	12	4.10				
Non-Training	Writing pre-	3.42	12	1.93					
	Writing post-	12.42	12	3.32	-9.00	-12.19	11	.000**	
	Total pre-	18.38	12	3.52					
	Total post-	34.50	12	6.64	-16.13	-11.27	11	.000**	

\**p*<.05, \*\**p*<.01

Whether the students received copying training or not, and whether they were at the higher or lower level, the overall students showed statistically significant improvement in English reading and writing during the semester. However, those who received copying training showed much higher improvement. More specifically, the higher level students in the copying-training class showed about a twice higher improvement in the reading area (by gaining 10.55 points higher score on the post-test) than those in the non-training class. They also gained higher score (i.e. 2.61 points higher score) in the writing area than those in the non-training class on the post-test. Similar to the higher level students, the lower level students in the copying-training class gained 5.26 points higher score in the reading area and 5.21 points higher score in the writing area compared to those in the non-training class. When comparing the mean differences of the pre- and post-tests between the training and non-training groups (See Table 1.), statistically significant differences were found only for the post-test ( $t=4.84$ ,  $p<.001$  for the higher level;  $t=5.09$ ,  $p<.001$  for the lower level). This indicates that the higher and lower level students who received copying training showed statistically much greater improvement from the pre- to the post-test than those who received no training. At the same time, it can be inferred that copying training helped various proficiency levels of students develop their English reading and writing ability more. For more specific comparisons between the training and non-training groups and between the two proficiency level groups, some of the students' examples are presented in the next section.

#### 1) Comparison of the Two Higher Proficiency Level Groups' Changes in Reading and Writing Ability

The higher proficiency level students in the copying-training and non-training groups all showed improvement in the overall areas of reading and writing. When considering the four areas of reading on the pre-test (i.e. 'Main,' 'Details,' 'Inference,' and 'R-Vocab' areas), their ability to 'make inferences' was quite low compared to their abilities to 'find main ideas' and 'find important details.' Also, in terms of 'R-Vocab' area, they were generally good at finding a synonym of a new word, but seemed to have hard time creating their own sentences by using the new word.

One of the students in the copying-training group, Min-ju, for example, gained the following scores in each area: 6 points in the 'Main,' 12 in the 'Details,' 2 in the 'Inference,' and 4.5 in the 'R-Vocab' areas. She selected wrong answers for the two 'Inference' questions out of three. In addition, she picked correct synonyms of three new words out of four, but failed to make her own sentences by using them appropriately. For example, she selected 'decides' as the synonym of the word 'determines,' and made her own sentence as follows (Note that in this paper, grammatical and mechanical errors that

the students made and other awkward expressions that they used were not corrected.): *'She finally determine that she join the class.'* However, on the post-test, she received the following scores in each reading area: 8 points in the 'Main,' 14 in the 'Details,' 6 in the 'Inference,' and 7 in the 'R-Vocab' areas. By using the word 'determine,' she created a better sentence as follows: *'I was determined to go on a diet during my summer vacation.'*

In comparison, Soo Min who was in the non-training groups gained similar scores as Min-ju did on the pre-test: 6 in the 'Main,' 10 in the 'Details,' 2 in the 'Inference,' and 4 in the 'R-Vocab' areas. She correctly selected 'strong' as the synonym of the word 'tough,' and made contextually a quite well sentence as follows: *'Superman is tough.'* Yet, on the post-test, she created the following sentence: *'That is a tough challenge.'* The sentence itself was grammatically well-written, but contextually inappropriate since the meaning of the word 'tough' in her sentence was 'difficult.' Although she gained higher or the same score in each reading area on the post-test, she showed less improvement than those in the copying training group (She obtained 8 points in the 'Main,' 14 in the 'Details,' 4 in the 'Inference,' and 5.5 in the 'R-Vocab' areas.).

Meanwhile, when considering the five areas of writing on the pre-test (i.e. 'Content,' 'Org,' 'W-Vocab,' and 'Grammar,' and 'Mechanics' areas), the overall higher level seemed to know that they should discuss the content that only relates to the given writing prompt and present more than one topic sentence in one essay writing. However, they wrote only one or two body paragraphs, but not introductory and concluding paragraphs. In addition, they lacked the abilities to 'use various words and expressions appropriately' and 'use grammar and mechanics correctly.'

Jun-su, who was in the copying-training group, for example, gained 9 points in total on the pre-writing test (He gained 2 points in each area, but 1 in the 'Grammar' area.). He presented the following two topic sentences in the essay, but did not state the thesis: *'First, I think a good friend is a man who listen carefully what his friend's saying,'* and *'Another important quality of a good friend is honesty.'* He also added the following reasons to support his first topic sentence:

Because a good listener make others feel comfortable and happy, it is important to listen what his friends saying carefully. And he can also make others feel better when they are in trouble. Sometimes, just listening to other's difficulty can make them feel relax.

In Jun-su's writing, 1) many grammatical and mechanical mistakes were found, 2) the two topic sentences were not written with a consistent format, and 3) no introductory and concluding paragraphs were found. In contrast, on the post-test, he wrote a much more developed essay as follows:

There is an old saying, 'Having a good friend is much more worthwhile than having a lot of money.' Many people would have different opinions, but I agree that having one best friend would be better than having anything else. I personally think there are two important qualities of good friend.

First, a good friend must have a good listening skill because it makes you feel comfortable and relaxed. . . .

Second, a good friend needs to have positive mindset because it makes you become positive as well. For example, I felt very depressed after I got bad result on my final exam last semester. At that time, one of my good friends encouraged me and said that I would do well next time. His words cheered me up and helped me keep trying hard this semester.

To summarize, many people will have different thoughts about important qualities of a good friend, but I would say that two most important qualities are having good listening skills and positive mindset. If someone already has a friend who has these two qualities, he may obtain the most precious person in his life.

Jun-su received 24 points in total and had developed the 'Grammar,' 'W-Vocab,' and 'Mechanics' abilities a lot, but showed much greater improvement in 'Content' and 'Org' areas. He started the essay with a good opening statement and stated the thesis and topic sentences clearly. He also provided some reasons and personal experience to support his opinions, and summarized the important points effectively in the concluding paragraph.

Similar to Jun-su, Hye Eun in the non-training group gained 10 points in total on the pre-writing test (2 points in each area). She stated two topic sentences, but did not state the thesis as Jun-su did. Also, there were no introductory and concluding paragraphs. On the post-test, however, she wrote an essay as follows:

Many people would say differently when they are asked to talk about important qualities of good friend. They might say kindness and good understanding are important. But in my opinion, the two important qualities would be trust and common interests.

First, trust between friends is important. If one doesn't believe his friend, he cannot honestly talk about his feelings to his friend. Also he cannot ask for a help when he has difficulties.

Second, having common interests is important. If there are many common things to talk about, this will make relationship between friends much closer. Many topics can be produced when two people have same interests. Also, this will make them talk for long time.

In conclusion, I think trust and common interests are two important representatives that a good friend needs to have.

Although Hey Eun showed improvement on the post-writing test by gaining 21 points in total, she tended to use only simple words and expressions that she had already used on the pre-test. Even when she tried to use a bit more complicated word '*representatives*' instead of '*qualities*' in the concluding paragraph, for example, she failed to use it appropriately in the sentence. Moreover, she briefly stated some reasons to support the topic sentences, but did not provide other details such as evidence, examples, anecdotes, etc.

In sum, the higher level students who received copying training had become much more advanced than those in the non-training group particularly in the '*Inference*' and '*R-Vocab*' areas of reading as well as in the '*Content*,' '*Org*,' and '*W-Vocab*' areas of writing. Through copying down the whole text, they might have tried to personally and deeply engaged with the text, understand its purpose, and create their own meaning. Additionally, they might have paid much attention to not only the meanings of new words/expressions but also the appropriate uses of those words/expressions in various contexts. Moreover, by reading and copying many well-written texts, the students might have thought deeply about how they should organize paragraphs effectively, start and wrap up their writing, and provide supporting details logically. These may have led them to organize main ideas and supporting details much more logically in their own writing.

## 2) Comparison of the Two Lower Proficiency Level Groups' Changes in Reading and Writing Ability

Like the higher level students, the lower level students in the copying-training and non-training groups also showed great improvement in the overall reading and writing areas.

When considering the four areas of reading on the pre-test, they did not receive a good score for each area. They generally got wrong answers more than correct ones, and thus the highest score they obtained was 18, and the lowest was 8 (The maximum score one could attain was 40.). Particularly in '*R-Vocab*' area, many of them failed to choose a synonym of a new word and use it appropriately in a sentence. Some even wrote nothing for '*R-Vocab*' questions.

One of the lower level students in the copying-training group, Sang Won, gained 16.5 points in total (i.e. 4 in the '*Main*,' 8 in the '*Details*,' 2 in the '*Inference*,' and 2.5 in the '*R-Vocab*' areas). In one of the '*R-Vocab*' questions, he chose the wrong synonym '*prevents*' for '*determines*,' and wrote awkward sentence as follows: '*This determine is affect of your life.*' On the post-test, however, he correctly chose the synonym of the word '*determines*' as '*decides*,' and wrote a much more developed sentence as follows: '*I determine to buy a*

*cute cat.* Although *'determine'* would more likely to be used in the past tense, the sentence itself was grammatically well-written. His total score on the post-reading test had increased to 26.5 (i.e. 8 in the *'Main,'* 12 in the *'Details,'* 2 in the *'Inference,'* and 4.5 in the *'R-Vocab'* areas) by showing much greater improvement in the *'Main,'* *'Details,'* and *'R-Vocab'* areas than in the *'Inference'* area.

In comparison, Jin Hee who was in the non-training group obtained the same total score, 16.5, as Sang Won obtained on the pre-reading test (i.e. 4 in the *'Main,'* 8 in the *'Details,'* 2 in the *'Inference,'* and 2.5 in the *'R-Vocab'*). In one of the *'R-Vocab'* questions, she picked the wrong word *'degradation'* among three other choices; *'worsening,'* *'damaging,'* and *'promotion'*; which could not be replaced with the word *'deterioration.'* She also gave up making a sentence with it. On the post-test, she chose the correct answer *'promotion,'* and created the following sentence: *'Because water deterioration, smell not good.'* What she meant by *'water deterioration'* seemed to be *'water pollution.'* Also, the sentence was ungrammatical. Her total score on the post-reading test had increased to 23.5 (i.e. 6 in the *'Main,'* 12 in the *'Details,'* 2 in the *'Inference,'* and 3.5 in the *'R-Vocab'*), but it was quite lower than the score that Sang Won attained.

Meanwhile, when considering the five writing areas, the overall students were at the very beginning stage not only in the *'Content'* and *'Org'* areas but also in the *'W-Vocab,'* *'Grammar,'* and *'Mechanics'* areas. They tended to discuss the content which was irrelevant to the given writing prompt and wrote only one body paragraph without introductory and concluding paragraphs. In addition, many grammatical and mechanical errors as well as awkward use of vocabulary were found.

Jae Hyun who was in the copying-training group, for example, received 5 points in total on the pre-writing test (i.e. 1 for each area). She wrote an essay as follows:

I think that a good friend is talk about my secret her or him. And good freind is stay wit me always. For example sometimes I am happy, but sometimes very sad or sick. In that time, I need someone to share my emotions, but I don't want to share my emotions with every one. I want to share my emotions with my best friends.

Jae Hyun briefly mentioned about two qualities of a good friend, but they seemed to mean the same thing: *'trust'* (or *'belief'*). She also provided an example, but it was not very logical. In addition, she made a lot of grammatical and mechanical mistakes. However, on the post-writing test, her total score had increased to 17 (i.e. 3 for the *'Content,'* *'Org,'* and *'W-Vocab'* and 4 for the *'Grammar'* and *'Mechanics'*). She wrote an essay as follows:

What do you think about your good friend? I think a good friend must have

two qualities.

first, a good friend needs good listening skills because when we have big problem, we want talking about this problem. A good friend will listen to our talk rather than saying too much word and giving too much advice.

Second, a good friend has to be comfortable. When I want calling him or her, I can do that. If my friend is comfortable, I can *get in touch* him or her frequently, but if he or she is uncomfortable, I cannot call and ask him or her for a help.

In my thought, these two are important qualities of a good friend. Listening to me when I have problem and comfortable to me when I call are the two qualities.

Jae Hyun wrote not only two body paragraphs but also introductory and concluding paragraphs. She also divided the paragraphs appropriately. Still, in the introductory paragraph, the thesis did not seem to be stated clearly. Additionally, it seemed that one or two more sentences should be added in order to make a good connection between the first and the second sentences. Moreover, she tried to provide some explanations to support her opinions in the body paragraphs, but those explanations were often not convincing enough. Although she still needed more improvement in the ‘*Content*’ and ‘*Org*’ areas, she showed great improvement in ‘*Grammar*’ and ‘*Mechanics*’ areas. In terms of vocabulary, she tended to use mostly simple words and expressions, but she applied them appropriately in her sentences. She also tried her best to use one idiomatic expression, ‘*get in touch*,’ even though she failed to add the preposition ‘*with*’ at the end.

Like Jae Hyun, another lower level student, Soo Hyuk, who was in the non-training group gained only 5 points on the pre-writing test (i.e. 1 for each area). He wrote one brief body paragraph like Jae Hyun did:

my best friend’s qualification is mind and think. mind is very important to me. I hope my best friend have kind and activity mind. because I am very *out-minded* person, so my friend should react to my action or talking. and my friend should have *sound-thinking*. because I want to good listener and speaker. so, my friend should have sound thinking too.

He made a lot of grammatical and mechanical mistakes. He also tried to use such expressions as ‘*out-minded person*’ and ‘*sound-thinking*.’ What he meant by the former seemed ‘*outgoing person*,’ but the latter seemed unclear. Moreover, there was a lack of logic when he was explaining why he thought each quality was important. In contrast, on the post-test, he showed some improvement and obtained 14 points in total (i.e. 3 for the

'Content,' 'Org,' and 'W-Vocab' and 2 for the 'Grammar' and 'Mechanics'). He wrote an essay as follows:

I think good friend need many things, but two things are very important. I will talk about it now.

One of the important quality is good mind. Sometime I complain about many things. I complian about other friends and food and other things. When I am not good feeling, I used to talk about it to my good friend. It make me more happy.

And another one is good listener. If my friend listen to my complain and advice me that would be very thankful. I can contact my friend often if he listen to me.

I think two important qualities of good friend that good mind and good listener.

Even though he wrote introductory and concluding paragraphs, he neither included the thesis nor summarized important points. Additionally, he still made a lot of mistakes in grammar and mechanics. Furthermore, he tended to use only simple words, and many of their uses were not appropriate at all (The only one correct expression he used was 'used to'). Overall, Soo Hyuck' writing had somewhat improved from the pre- to the post-test, but not as much as Jae Hyun (particularly in the 'W-Vocab,' 'Grammar,' and 'Mechanics' areas).

In sum, the lower level students who received copying training showed much greater improvement than those in the non-training group particularly in the 'Main' and 'Details' areas of reading and in the 'W-Vocab,' 'Grammar,' and 'Mechanics' areas of writing. Since prior knowledge and clear understanding of textual information are prerequisites for L2 readers to successfully make inferences, the copying-training group students whose reading ability was very low might have paid much more attention to understanding main ideas and supporting details of a text rather than making inferences when they were doing copying activity. In terms of writing, as the students were not ready enough to think about larger units (i.e. text content and organization), they might have focused more on how vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics were correctly used (i.e. smaller units) when reading and copying well-written texts during the semester.

In short, it was found that the higher and lower proficiency level students had developed their English reading and writing ability from the pre- to the post-test. However, those who were trained to use copying strategy showed much greater improvement in the overall areas of reading and writing. The higher level students particularly were found to develop the 'Inference,' 'R-Vocab,' 'Org,' 'Content,' and 'W-Vocab' abilities more while the lower

level students were found to develop the ‘Main,’ ‘Details,’ ‘W-Vocab,’ ‘Grammar,’ and ‘Mechanics’ abilities more.

## 2. Effects of Copying Training on Different Proficiency Level Students’ Reading and Writing Processes

Towards the end of the semester, eight students, two from each proficiency level group and each training group, participated in a think-aloud reading and writing task. The students were asked read a given article and then write an essay for a given topic. Their personal information is presented in Table 3.

**TABLE 3**  
Personal Information of the Think-Aloud Task Participants

Level	Group	Name	Gender	Age	Major	Official TOEIC	Experience of copying
Higher	Training	Dayae	F	21	Chinese	630	Yes (Copying vocabulary)
		Min Kyu	M	22	Business	700	Yes (Copying vocabulary)
	Non-Training	Miju	F	21	English	740	Yes (Copying vocabulary)
		Su Hee	F	20	Engineering	640	No
Lower	Training	Hae-ri	F	20	Early Childhood Education	495	No
		Yong Hyun	M	20	Economics	550	No
	Non-Training	Yunju	F	21	Chinese	500	Yes (Copying old Korean poems)
		Bo-hye	F	20	Business	480	No

When comparing the two higher level groups’ reading and writing processes during the think-aloud task, much difference was found between them.

Frist, while reading the given text, the students who received copying training used several marks on it in order to remember some important information or to understand the content better, whereas those who did not receive training rarely used a mark. For example, Dayae and Min Kyu in the copying-training group used a slash mark before a relative pronoun or put parenthesis for a prepositional phrase in order to understand a long sentence better. However, Miju and Su Hee in the non-training group tended to read the text only with their eyes. In addition to observing what the copying-training group students did during the think-aloud task, the researcher also reviewed their portfolios which included the copied texts. It was found that they used different colors and shapes to mark something

important on the texts after copying them. Moreover, they wrote a short memo or summary in either English or Korean after every one to two paragraphs. Some even put a question mark next to their memos or summaries and thought about inferred meanings (e.g. One wrote a summary of a paragraph as follows: ‘*Social networking trend get great attention because they want to communicate with others.*’ He then put question marks and wrote as follows: ‘?? 나도 페이스북, 트위터 같은거 하는데 그럼 이것도 social networking 이라고 할 수 있는건가?’ (I am using Facebook and Twitter like others do. Is this a kind of social networking)’) He tried to think more deeply about the text by connecting his personal experience to the text content.) These learning processes might have helped many higher level students use different marks for specific learning purposes, understand text content better, and think about inferred meanings.

Second, when reading the text, the copying-training group students used a dictionary selectively and strategically to find the meanings and uses of confusing words within sentences, whereas the non-training group students used a dictionary immediately to check only the meanings of several words (i.e. Miju) or never used a dictionary (i.e. Su Hee). For example, both Dayae and Min Kyu in the former group used a dictionary only when unfamiliar words made them difficult to understand the content of the sentences. They reviewed and took notes of new words after reading the whole text as they believed that paying too much attention to those words while reading would make them lose their train of thought. When looking at the copying-training group students’ portfolios, it was also found that they took notes of the meanings of new words with sample sentences. Some even attempted to create their own sentences on a margin of a copied text by using some words that they thought as important or difficult. These practices might have helped them make good use of a dictionary and apply new words to their own sentences successfully.

Third, before writing an essay, the copying-training group students used the Internet for finding additional information to activate their prior knowledge and to understand their favorite celebrities better, whereas the non-training group never searched for information on the Internet. The students were never asked or taught to use the Internet to find more information related to a given writing prompt. However, the former group students might have been more motivated and willing to do so because they were constantly trained to monitor and understand the organization and content of a text they had read/copied before writing an essay about a similar topic of the text. In order to write a better essay, they might have wanted to collect more accurate and specific information.

Fourth, at the prewriting stage, the copying-training group students created an outline by listing two to three topic sentences with supporting details, whereas the non-training group students did not make an outline at all or simply wrote down two to three key words/phrases in Korean. For example, Dayae in the former group wrote the following two topic sentences in English in her outline: ‘*I like him because he tries to communicate with*

*his fans directly*’ and *‘I also like him because he keeps trying his best to play soccer well.’* In contrast, Su Hee in the latter group wrote some reasons why she liked her favorite celebrity, Joong-ki Song, in Korean as follows: ‘연기 잘함(good at action),’ ‘연예인이기도 하지만 잘생긴 외모(Handsome even if he is not an actor),’ and ‘공부도 잘함(studying hard and intelligent as well).’

Fifth, while writing an essay, the training group again used a dictionary, looked for an appropriate English word, checked its different uses in various sentences, and then tried to apply it to their own sentences. For example, Min Kyu found out that the word ‘run’ was used with the preposition ‘for’ and then wrote the following sentence: ‘...he decided to run for a proportional seat for the National Assembly...’ However, the non-training group students tended to use simple words they already knew rather than using a dictionary.

Finally, after writing, the training group students reviewed not only grammar and vocabulary, but also content and organization. In contrast, the non-training group students rarely reviewed and revised their essays once they finished writing their essays.

Meanwhile, when comparing the two lower level groups’ reading and writing processes during the think-aloud task, some distinctive differences were also found.

First, while reading the given text, the copying-training group students tended to mark some words/phrases/sentences with different colors or shapes to understand the content better as the higher level students did. Especially Young Hyun circled all the conjunctions by giving deliberate attention to their uses in various sentences (He said that because he always had hard time choosing an appropriate conjunction, he tried to focus on what kinds of conjunctions were used whenever he was reading and copying a well-written text.). In addition, the training-group students re-read some sentences and translated them into Korean to catch the main points. In contrast, the non-training group students tended to habitually underline all sentences without any specific purpose. Or, they re-read certain sentences many times, but did not use any further strategies to understand them better. When looking at the portfolios of the copying-training group students, many of them were found to use a translation strategy. They tried to translate several sentences into Korean which they thought were demanding. They seemed to focus on understanding the fact which was directly stated in a text (i.e. main ideas and supporting details) rather than thinking more deeply about inferred meanings. These learning processes might have helped them enhance their ability to understand important information of a text better.

Second, the students in the two groups equally gave the most attention to vocabulary, but employed different strategies. The copying-training group students first marked difficult words while reading, checked some of their meanings, went back to those words after reading the whole text, and studied more about them. They said that being obsessed with all unfamiliar words would hinder their comprehension of the text. Moreover, they used a dictionary to find not only the definitions but also the parts of speech and uses of

new vocabulary. In contrast, the non-training group students focused on checking only the meanings of new vocabulary. Yunju, for example, used a dictionary right away whenever she encountered a difficult word and wrote down its meaning(s) in Korean on the text. Another student, Bo-hye, also checked the meanings of new words through her cellphone dictionary, but never wrote any notes.

Third, when writing an essay, the copying-training group students, again, used a dictionary to find an appropriate English word and check its uses. In addition to giving much attention to vocabulary use, one of the students, Young Hyun, also focused on the appropriate use of conjunctions. However, the non-training group students used a dictionary only to find a proper English word.

Fourth, most students in the copying-training and non-training groups wrote an essay in English based on the outlines they had created (They had written their outlines mostly in Korean by listing several good things about their favorite celebrities.). However, one student in the training group, Hae-ri, used a very unique strategy. After writing an outline, she wrote a whole essay in Korean on a computer and then used a Google Language Translator to convert her Korean essay to English. She reviewed the translated English essay and revised some sentences which she thought were a little strange. Then she used a Google Translator again to convert her revised English essay into Korean. She felt satisfied when the final version of Korean essay (which was translated by the Google program) and the very first Korean essay (which she wrote for the first time) closely matched.

Finally, after writing, the copying-training group students reviewed and revised their essays by concentrating on their use of grammar and vocabulary, whereas the non-training group students rarely reviewed their essays. Although the former tended to spend much time using some unnecessary strategies (e.g. using a Google Translator many times, giving excessive attention to checking the correct use of conjunctions as well as that of grammar and vocabulary), they felt comfortable and satisfied with using those strategies. Also, in fact, their abilities of using proper grammar and vocabulary consequently had improved a lot throughout the semester.

In sum, it was found that the higher and lower level students who were given copying training employed various strategies appropriately compared to those who never received any training. As the higher level students' reading and writing ability was much more advanced than the lower level students, they might have thought more deeply about the text content by connecting its information to their background knowledge and their own experience. In addition, in a short follow-up interview after the think-aloud task, the two higher level students mentioned that they gave much attention to how a text was organized (e.g. how the thesis and topic sentences were stated, how paragraphs were divided, how examples, reasons, and evidence were presented, how opening and closing remarks were written, etc.) through copying activity. They also said that they thought it was important to

understand how the same word could be used differently in various contexts, and thus tried to check the meanings and uses of a new word from a dictionary. Moreover, they said that organizing their ideas clearly would be much more important than using correct grammar and mechanics. They responded that they thus tried to think much about how to write an essay with good organization whenever copying the well-written texts included the textbook. Additionally, they said that they put more emphasis on reviewing the content and organization of their essays.

In comparison, the lower level students who were given copying training seemed that they focused mostly on comprehending the important points of a text rather than thinking about its inferred meanings. During the think-aloud task, they re-read the text and used a translation strategy to find main ideas and supporting details of the text. Whereas those who did not get copying training used a dictionary to simply check the meanings of new words or never used it, those who received training went back to unfamiliar words after reading the text and studied for their meanings, parts of speech, and uses. When writing an essay, they also used a new word in their own sentences after checking its appropriate use. In a follow-up interview, they said that grammar and vocabulary were the biggest concerns for them. They mentioned that they were not proficient enough to think about the text organization. They responded that they would do it when they would become more proficient in grammar and vocabulary.

By observing the students' reading and writing processes, it was found which areas of reading and writing the higher and lower level students respectively focused on more and why. At the same time, it was revealed that the areas that the two proficiency level students respectively gave more attention had been improved more on the post-test. It is clear that copying training helped both higher and lower level students develop their reading and writing ability, become aware of their weaknesses, and choose and use appropriate strategies to overcome their weaknesses.

## V. CONCLUSION

The present study aimed at exploring how copying activity would help Korean EFL university students of different proficiency levels improve their reading and writing ability, and evaluate and develop their own reading and writing processes.

First, by comparing the copying-training and non-training groups' pre- and post-tests results, the researcher found that the students who received copying training had improved their overall reading and writing ability statistically much more than those who never received training. In addition, by observing some of their performance on the pre- and post-tests, the researcher discovered some differences between the two proficiency levels.

That is, the students at the higher and lower proficiency levels respectively showed more progress in certain areas of reading and writing. Those at the higher level had significantly improved their abilities to make inferences, understand the meanings of a new word and use it properly in a sentence, organize an essay effectively, and present information logically, whereas those at the lower level had greatly improved their abilities to identify main ideas and supporting details, use grammar and mechanics correctly, and use new vocabulary appropriately in writing.

Second, by comparing how the students in the copying-training and non-training groups read a text and wrote an essay in English during the think-aloud task, the researcher found that copying training affected the students to read and write more effectively. Both the higher and lower proficiency level students who were taught with copying were found to reflect on their own reading and writing processes more deeply. They were aware of what areas they needed more improvement, focused more on those areas, and attempted to use various strategies to make progress. Moreover, observing their portfolios and having a short interview with them allowed the researcher to understand why each proficiency level students focused more on certain areas of reading and writing and why they had showed more improvement in those areas from the pre- to the post-test.

In conclusion, it is convinced that using copying activity to teach English reading and writing would positively affect various proficiency level students to enhance their reading and writing ability and to achieve insight into their own reading and writing processes. At the same time, the roles of teachers are also found to be very important. In order to maximize the effect of copying, teachers would need to keep in mind that they should help students 1) understand the purpose of copying and its positive aspects before using it, 2) realize their weaknesses, and 3) apply copying strategy to their own learning and consequently develop their weaknesses into strengths.

## REFERENCES

- Currie, P. (1998). Staying out of trouble: Apparent plagiarism and academic survival. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(1), 1-18.
- Dryden, L. M. (1999). A distant mirror or through the looking glass? Plagiarism and intellectual property in Japanese education. In L. Buranen & A. M. Roy (Eds.), *Perspectives on plagiarism and intellectual property in a postmodern world* (pp. 75-85). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Giesen, L. (2001). *Activities for integrating reading and writing in the language classroom*. Unpublished master's thesis, School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont.

- Hirvela, A. (2004). *Connecting reading and writing in second language writing instruction*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Hull, G., & Rose, M. (1989). Rethinking remediation: Toward a social-cognitive understanding of problematic reading and writing. *Written Communication*, 6, 139-154.
- Jääskeläinen, R. (2010). Think aloud protocol. In Doorslaer, Luc van, & Gambier, Y. (Eds.), *Handbook of translation studies* (pp. 371-373). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Joyce, M., & Lundberg, A. (2013, December). *Copying to learn: Mimesis, plagiarism and 21st century English education*. Proceedings of the 2nd International Higher Education Teaching and Learning Conference, Curtin University, Sarawak, Malaysia.
- Keck, C. (2006). The use of paraphrase in summary writing: A comparison of L1 and L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 15, 261-278.
- Kim, Sun-Young. (2011). An examination of reading-writing integration: Perspectives, practices, and literacy development. *Modern English Education*, 12(3), 155-173.
- Kolich, A. M. (1983). Plagiarism: The worm of reason. *College English*, 45(2), 141-148.
- Lee, Yoo-Jean. (in press). An alternative approach—Copying: Can it be as effective as summarizing to improve EFL learners' reading and writing? *Asian EFL Journal*, 16(4).
- Lehr, F. (1981). Integrating reading and writing instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 34(8), 958-966.
- Mohan, B. A., & Lo, W. A. (1985). Academic writing and Chinese students: Transfer and developmental factors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 515-534.
- Moon, Young-in. (2002). Korean university students' awareness of plagiarism in summary writings. *Language Research*, 38(4), 1349-1365.
- Park, Woo Soo. (2005). A critical survey of Greco-Roman education in writing. *Studies in Foreign Literature*, 21, 109-128.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). The complex contexts of plagiarism: A reply to Deckert. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 277-284.
- Petrosky, A. R. (1982). From story to essay: Reading and writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 19-36.
- Porte, G. K. (1993). Mistakes, errors, and blank checks. *Forum*, 31(2), 42-46.
- Porte, G. K. (1995). Writing wrongs: Copying as a strategy for underachieving EFL writers. *ELT Journal*, 49(2), 144-151.
- Reid, J. (1993). Historical perspectives on reading and writing in the ESL classroom. In J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition class: Second language perspectives* (pp. 33-60). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Sari, D. A. (2012). Teaching writing by using copy change strategy for X grade students of

- senior high school. *E-Journal Mahasiswa Prodi Pend Bahasa Inggris*, 1(4), 1-6.
- Scollon, R. (1994). As a matter of fact: The changing ideology of authorship and responsibility in discourse. *World Englishes*, 13, 33-46.
- Song, Mi-jeong. (1998). Teaching reading strategies in an ongoing EFL university reading classroom. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8, 41-54.
- Sowden, C. (2005). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual students in higher education abroad. *ELT Journal*, 59(3), 226-233.
- The staying power of 'Gangnam style.' (2012, November 18). *The Korea Herald*. Retrieved November 20, 2012, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20121118000176>.
- Tierney, R. J., & Pearson, P. D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts*, 60, 568-580.
- Tsai, J. (2006). Connecting reading and writing in college EFL courses. *The Internet TESL Journal*, XII(12), Retrieved July 16, 2014, from the World Wide Web: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Tsai-ReadingWritingConnection.html>.
- Tsao, F. (1983). Linguistics and written discourse in particular languages: English and Mandarin. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 3, 99-117.
- Yang, Mun-Jung, & Lee, Eun-Joo. (2012). The effects of reading strategy instruction on the performance of integrated reading-to-write tasks, strategy use, and the attitude of Korean college EFL learners. *Modern English Education*, 13(2), 151-178.
- Yang, Z. (1983). The mirror and the jigsaw: A major difference between current Chinese and Western critical attitudes. *Representations*, 4, 101-107.
- Yu, Seung-Mi. (2011). A study about effective writing education based on text copy. *Korean College Composition and Communication*, 2, 219-242.

## APPENDIX 1

### Sample Pre-Test and Post-Test Questions

#### <Reading Test>

#### I. 다음 지문을 읽고 물음에 답하세요.

##### Natural Selection at Work

Why do some animals survive when others do not? **Biologists\*** say this is because of "natural selection." **Some animals have a feature – color, shape, or whatever – that protects them.** It helps them survive. Because it helps them survive, they live. They pass that feature on to their children. So, the feature survives along with the animals. We call this process "natural selection." It "selects," or **determines**, which animals are most likely to live.

We see this process at work in modern cities. Some cities were very dirty because of smoke. Dirt built up there and made **them** dark. The city's dirt helped some **moths\***. They had dark colors. They were harder for birds to see and eat. So, the dark moths lived, but light moths did not. Natural selection helped the dark moths.

Here is another example. Some insects are **tough**. Poison sprays that people use do not hurt them. The tough insects survive and pass their toughness on to their children. In this way, natural selection works again.

**Note. biologist: n. 생물학자 moth: n. 나방**

1. 첫 번째 문단에서 두 줄 그어진 문장과 같은 의미를 가진 문장은 다음 보기 중 어떤 것인가요?  
 (A) Some animals have hard shells.  
 (B) Some animals have natural protection.  
 (C) Some animals have protecting color.  
 (D) Some animals help other animals.
  
2. 1) 두 번째 문단에 있는 **determines**와 가장 비슷한 의미를 가진 단어는 무엇인가요?  
 (A) explains (B) prevents (C) helps (D) decides  
 2) **determine**을 사용하여 본인만의 문장을 작성해보세요.
  
3. 두 번째 문단의 **them**이 의미하는 것은 무엇인가요?  
 (A) dirt (B) cities (C) moths (D) smoke
  
4. 본문에 따르면, 무엇이 어두운 색을 띤 나방을 생존하게끔 도와주었나요?  
 (A) Pollution helped them.  
 (B) People tried to keep them.  
 (C) Warm weather helped them.  
 (D) There were no birds in the city.
  
5. 1) 세 번째 문단에 있는 **tough**와 가장 비슷한 의미를 가진 단어는 어떤 것인가요?  
 (A) strong (B) smart (C) lucky (D) many  
 2) **tough**을 사용하여 본인만의 문장을 작성해보세요.
  
6. 본문으로부터 유추해낼 수 있는 내용은 다음 중 어떤 것인가요?  
 (A) There are no dark moths in the country.  
 (B) Animals in a city need different ways of survival than animals in nature.

- (C) Many insects die because of poison spray.  
 (D) Pollution prevents natural selection from happening.

**<Writing Test>**

먼저 다음 질문에 대해서 한 번 생각해 보세요.

Who is your best friend, and why do you think so?

위의 질문에 대하여 충분히 생각을 해보았다면 본인이 생각하는 좋은 친구로서 요구되는 중요한 특성 **2가지**는 (성격 혹은 행동 등) 무엇이라 생각하는지, 왜 그렇게 생각하는지에 대해 2-3문단으로 써 보세요. 또한 구체적인 예를 들어 설명하도록 하세요. (What are **two** important qualities of a good friend? Use specific details and examples to explain why these qualities are important to you.)

**APPENDIX 2**

Rubric for the Pre- and Post-Writing Tests

Score Area	Excellent 5-4	Satisfactory 3-2	Needs Improvement 1-0	Points Eared
<b>Content</b>	The topic is clearly identified and introduced. Student provides information relevant to chosen topic. Student supports the topic with logical reasoning, clear main ideas, statements, and examples.	The topic is identified and introduced. Student provides some explanations, ideas, statements, and examples to support their topic choice.	The topic is not clearly identified nor introduced. Student struggles to provide clear explanations, ideas, statements, or examples why their topic meets the required criteria.	
<b>Organization</b>	Information is presented in a logical and interesting sequence. The audience can easily follow the flow of ideas.	Information is presented in logical sequence. The audience can follow the flow of ideas.	Information is presented out of sequence. The audience has difficulty following the flow of ideas.	
<b>Vocabulary Use</b>	Student uses wide range of vocabulary with high levels of accuracy.	Student uses a range of vocabulary, but with a few inaccuracies.	Student uses a limited range of vocabulary and has noticeable inaccuracies in	

			vocabulary use.	
<b>Grammar</b>	Grammar is extremely high quality with 3 or less errors in the manuscript.	Grammar is adequate with 4-6 errors in the manuscript.	Grammar is less than adequate with 7 or more errors in the manuscript.	
<b>Mechanics</b>	Mechanics is extremely high quality with 3 or less errors in the manuscript.	Mechanics is adequate with 4-6 errors in the manuscript.	Mechanics is less than adequate with 7 or more errors in the manuscript.	
<b>Gross Total Points</b>				

**Examples in: English**

**Applicable Languages: English**

**Applicable Levels: Secondary/Tertiary**

Yoo-Jean Lee

School of Liberal Arts and Sciences, General Education Center

Dankook University

152, Jukjeon-ro, Suji-gu, Yongin-si, Gyeonggi-do, 448-701, Korea

Tel: (031) 8005-3765/H.P.: (010)-5039-5340

Email: dabin8201@hotmail.com

Received 15 September 2014

Revised 14 November 2014

Accepted 21 November 2014