

Changes in EFL Students' Perceptions and Approaches to Writing in a Process-Oriented Writing Class

Hye Yeong Kim

Sungkyunkwan University

Kim, Hye Yeong. (2016). Changes in EFL students' perceptions and approaches to writing in a process-oriented writing class. *Modern English Education*, 17(1), 49-67.

Exploring how a process-oriented approach can be adopted within the English as a foreign language curriculum, this present study examines the impact of process-oriented approach to writing on EFL students' learning of writing in English. In particular, this qualitative case study delineates the extent to which fifty-seven students change their perceptions of writing and the writing process while participating in a one semester process-oriented English language writing class at a university in Korea. Data was collected through weekly reflective journals, informal interviews and writing portfolios. The process of data analysis was informed by interpretive analysis. Findings show that the process-oriented approach fostered a fuller and more sophisticated understanding of writing. Students were able to develop a sense of audience, an appreciation for feedback, and confidence as an EFL writer. These findings also show that application of new writing approach brought some sites for negotiation between the teacher and students, and call attention to the importance of the sharing of expectations and goals between students and teachers in the course of adopting a process-oriented writing approach.

[process-oriented approach/writing instruction/TEFL/
/ /]

I. INTRODUCTION

“Love and hatred.” That is how I defined my relationship with writing in English. Writing was what I turned to when I was depressed and exhausted since I was young. Nonetheless, after failing every university entrance exam due to my poor writing skills, I believed I had no talent in writing. During

my time in the university, I still turned to writing whenever I had hard time. But I never thought I could get confidence as a writer. (Minsun, Weekly Reflective Journal, June)

Writing in English does not have to be an unfulfilling experience for English learners. The pervasive frustration and negative attitude of English as a foreign language (EFL) learners toward English writing may be a result of negative experiences in traditional, product-oriented writing classes. To promote students' positive attitudes toward English writing and motivate them to build their writing skills in a second/foreign language, students first need to change their perceptions about writing and to recognize the value of the writing process.

In theory, the focus of writing instruction recently has shifted from the product of writing to the process of the writing (Badger & White, 2000). The process-oriented approach has been adopted in many first- and some second-language (L2) classes. However, in many EFL classes, teachers still teach "finished writing" rather than teach "unfinished writing and glory in its unfinishedness" (Murray, 1972, p. 4). Writing activities in EFL classes are often limited to the reproduction of prescribed sentence exercises. Foreign language teachers often focus on teaching grammar during writing class with the emphasis on the grammatical accuracy of the students' writing. The writing lesson often ends up with a single-draft essay. It is hard to find writing classes that promote a student's sense of writing as a process. Consequently, students are not prepared to produce extended written discourse (Matsuda, 2003) and are frustrated by the traditional product-based approach to writing.

Developing student writing skills through emphasizing process within a foreign language context can be a challenging task due to the limited class time, competing curricular demands, larger class sizes, product-oriented standardized tests, and lack of teacher training in writing instruction. Above all, lack of appreciation for the value of writing as a process on the part of teachers and students may have contributed to the current state of writing practice in EFL classrooms. In discussing the importance of changing teachers' views on teaching writing as a process, Murray (1972) states, "Once you look at your composition program with the realization you are teaching a process, you may be able to design a curriculum which works" (p. 89). To support teachers of writing in EFL classes, this study attempts to explain how process-oriented writing instruction could be applied within EFL teaching situations and understand the benefits that students could take away from such efforts. In particular, this study delineates how a process-oriented approach to writing helps EFL students change their perceptions of writing in English and their writing practices.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Process-oriented Approaches to the Teaching of Writing

The variety of instructional approaches based on process-oriented writing instruction all consistently support the notion that writing is a process through which writers create, develop, and express their ideas. Cohen (1994) states that the process approach “emphasizes the notion that writing is a process wherein the finished product emerges after a series of drafts. The process approach puts emphasis on an incubation period, in which the written piece takes shape” (p. 305). This approach emphasizes the need to develop students’ abilities to go through multiple drafts, from planning to revising (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Seow, 2002). This writing process is not a non-linear, but a recursive one; each stage interacts with each other and they even occur concurrently (Raimes, 1992).

While there are different ways to adopt a process-oriented approach, feedback—peer- or self-directed feedback—is a common component of the process-approach to facilitate the revision process. In the process-oriented approach, the feedback would focus on meaning, rather than grammar. Although the effects of feedback may vary depending on the goal of the instruction, a considerable amount of process-oriented writing studies have reported the positive effects of peer-feedback (e.g., Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Kern & Schultz, 1992), self-directed feedback (Myers, 2001), and teacher feedback (Kepner, 1991). Peer feedback is believed to provide students with chances to negotiate meaning in a non-threatening atmosphere (Flower, 1994). Likewise, self-directed feedback is considered another important practice to help students to develop their writing. Ross, Rolheiser and Hogaboam-Gray (1999) reported that students who received training in self-assessment performed better on self-evaluations and on their narrative writing. Similarly, Myers (2001) showed that students reflecting on their writing and writing processes through journaling, became more conscious of their writing process and gained autonomy.

The adoption and discussion of the process-oriented approach has been productive in the field of writing assessment, where evaluating student ability to engage in the whole process of composition finds emphasis, rather than emphasis on the measurement of an individual’s cognitive traits through a time-constrained, single-draft essay. For example, after comparing the writing performance of two ESL groups, one each from both a portfolio group and a non-portfolio group, Song and August (2002) have suggested that portfolio assessment showed that twice as many ESL students were likely to pass their first semester English course when they were evaluated through their portfolios, rather than through their standardized test scores. Studies (e.g., Aydin, 2010; Mathews & Hansen, 2004; Ozturk & Cecen, 2007; Song & August, 2002) reporting the benefits of portfolios imply that writing should be taught and evaluated as a process and support the value of

extensive revision in developing students' writing skills.

2. Benefits of Process-oriented Approach

As a process-oriented approach views writing as a series of problem-solving activities, it implies autonomy for students in the course of their learning and writing. Good writers tend to use metacognitive strategies to monitor their own performance and successfully regulate their own writing processes (e.g., Baker & Boonkit, 2004; Negretti, 2012). For example, skilled L2 writers spend more time on planning and revising than unskilled writers (e.g., Raimes, 1992; Zamel, 1983), demonstrating their broad concept of what constitutes writing. In other words, better L2 writers treat writing as a process, exploring and explaining their ideas before focusing on grammatical accuracy. Flower and Hayes (1981) suggested that understanding the process of writing can help students realize how each step differs and how the process needs to adapt according to the demands of the task at hand. Therefore, teachers from this approach prioritize fostering the development of students' metacognitive awareness of strategies to reflect on their individual writing process (Hyland, 2003; Negretti & Kuteeva, 2011). A recent study (Nicolás-Conesa, Roca de Larios, & Coyle, 2014) also offered empirical evidence suggesting that students who held a process-oriented approach were more likely to set more sophisticated subgoals for writing and achieved higher written performance, than those who held product-oriented approach to writing.

In addition, keeping with the constructivist view of learning, some studies (e.g., Urzua, 1987) have stressed personal growth and the expression of individuality through the writing process. Ozturk and Cecen (2007) reported that writing multiple drafts on a topic and receiving peer-feedback to complete a portfolio could help students overcome writing anxiety. Urzua (1987) also strongly suggested that the process-oriented approach could be effective in L2 classrooms so that ESL students could develop both the cognitive and social aspects of literacy just as L1 students do.

As many studies show positive effects of the process-oriented approach in L2 writing classrooms, an increasing number of studies have examined the process-oriented approach in order to test its efficacy to develop students' writing and language skills in FL context (O'Brien, 2004; Reichelt, 2001). For example, positive effects of process-oriented writing course in Korea were reported by A. J. Kim (2013). In a study with 35 college students, Kim found that students' fluency and grammatical accuracy of the writings improved after completing a one semester process-oriented writing course. Supporting the process-oriented approach in EFL context, recent studies (Butterfield & C. K. Jung, 2013; Y. Kim & J. Kim, 2005) suggested ways to adopt process-oriented writing instruction in Korea to promote both accuracy and fluency development. These studies call for the development of

effective writing lessons by taking into account of the unique situation of EFL. Discussing various contextual factors that affect teaching and learning practices of writing in EFL contexts, Bhowmik (2009) also called for an integration of various context-specific research findings to take the field of writing education forward.

Despite the growing literature in approaches to process-oriented EFL writing, much still remains to be understood about the role of these process-oriented writing approaches. In particular, many studies have investigated the development of EFL learners in accuracy or overall writing fluency but have neglected the students' development as writers. Although process-oriented instruction aims at developing a wide range of learner writing skills, developing a sense of autonomy as a writer would be the most unique strengths of this approach. Consequently, curriculum and classroom practices in EFL writing classrooms often lag behind the basic understanding regarding the role of the process-oriented approach for foreign language writing. Therefore, this study explores how a process-oriented approach can be adopted within the EFL curriculum and delineates the extent to which a process orientation to writing helps students change their perceptions of writing in English. Qualitative analysis of this study will help us gain a more refined and developed understanding of the impact of process-oriented approach on EFL students. Guiding research questions are as follows:

- 1) In what ways does the process-oriented approach to writing influence EFL students' perceptions and their approaches to writing?
- 2) What changes are perceived by students in their writing practices during and after the process-oriented approach to writing?

III. METHOD

This study uses a case study approach. Qualitative case studies attempt to gain an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon and meaning for the people involved. The focus of study is on "process, rather than outcomes, in context, rather than a specific variable, in discovery, rather than confirmation" (Merriam, 1998, p. 19). In this light, the decision to focus on qualitative case studies stems from this study's interest in gaining insight into how EFL learners perceive their experience of the process-oriented writing class and what they take away from it within the context. The bounded unit is a university writing class in Korea. This study focuses on both how a process-oriented writing class can be used in an EFL context and how such a class can bring positive changes to students as writers.

Case studies aim to provide a highly detailed, contextualized analysis (MacDonald & Walker, 1977). Hence, it is important for events and situations to be allowed to speak for

themselves, rather than to be interpreted, evaluated, or judged largely by the researcher (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000). In other words, seeking out *emic* meanings held by the people within the case is the ethos of interpretive study. In reporting findings, this study provides raw data to help readers to understand the phenomenon and to allow subsequent reinterpretation. I delineated the *instances*, students' changes in their perception, while defining them in general terms, but teasing out the particularities.

1. Study Participants and Research Site

This study was carried out in an undergraduate writing class at a university in Korea. The class was not a mandatory class. Fifty-seven students participated, all who were from different majors in Human science (English literature, economics, political science). Based on class observations and student writing samples, all participants were characterized as the intermediate-mid level and advanced-low level according to ACTFL guidelines (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL], 2012). In other words, participants were able to successfully compose simple paragraphs on familiar topics. However, the students still demonstrated minimal control of low-frequency structures and struggled to express both general and specialized vocabulary appropriately. Thirty-five students were female and the rest were male. All of the participants had experienced learning English writing previously, either in high school or at their university. The students' description of their writing classes indicated that their instruction had been based on the product-based writing approach.

2. The Class

Each week, the class met twice for sessions that lasted 90 minutes. The students wrote seven different essays throughout the semester (see Appendix for topics). Each essay was completed using multiple drafting processes within a planning-writing-reviewing framework. The class spent 4 sessions on average to complete one essay as shown in Table 1. The class worked through 7 cycles of the same writing process to complete essays on 7 different topics. The writing process did not occur in a clear linear sequence. Students were encouraged to review and edit their writing at any point. When starting to write about a topic, the class discussed and debated issues relating to it. After students had become familiar with the topic, the pre-writing stage was begun, as individuals brainstormed what they would like to write about. Then, students composed the first draft. After completing the first draft, students had a chance to receive peer feedback. The teacher's role during the peer-review training was to guide students through the writing process to develop student strategies for planning, drafting, and revising. The teacher also provided feedback on the

drafts of two or three students in front of the whole group. Feedback was given on the content and structure, seeking text-level revisions, and avoiding an emphasis on form. This teacher feedback, as a whole, worked to model how students would be asked to provide peer feedback. It also played an important role in setting a tone that indicated to the students that revising was both expected and necessary. At the end of semester, the portfolios were completed with cover letters, tables of contents, drafts and reflections. Each final essay was rated in terms of its content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics for their final grade.

TABLE 1
Process of Writing One Essay

Session	Writing Activity
Session 1	Introduction to a New Topic
	Reading Materials/Discussion on the Topics
	Brainstorm
	Planning/Structuring
Session 2	1st Drafting
Session 3	Teacher and Peer Feedback
	2nd Drafting
Session 4	Teacher Feedback
	Final Drafting
Session 5	Sharing the Essay (Optional)

3. Data Collection

The data for this study was collected over a one-semester period (16 weeks). Data was collected from multiple sources: 1) weekly reflective journals; 2) informal interviews; and 3) writing portfolios. In addition to the required essay writing in class, the students were to write reflections weekly. The topic for reflection could be derived from any area of the writing tasks, learning processes, or lessons gained. Students made note of what they felt, learned, and noticed in relation to the writing class and their own writing process. Informal interviews, lasting from about 10 to 30 minutes, were conducted with the students several times. The first interview included questions about their background and their perceptions on English writing and on the course. When information from their reflective writings was found to be pertinent to the research, additional informational interviews were conducted. These later interviews also addressed the question of how the course had impacted their writing practice; participants were encouraged to respond freely. All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. Student writing portfolios were used to check students' selective perceptions illuminated from their reflective writings and interviews and served as the glue that cements the interpretation of data. The multiple sources of data were useful for answering various research questions, as well as helpful in improving the

understanding and credibility of the findings.

4. Data Analysis

The nature of the enquiry of this study required a considerable amount of rich and deep data. Although qualitative study does not aim to reduce data to statistical evidence, qualitative data nevertheless requires systematic analysis (Creswell, 2009). Data Analysis involved an ongoing procedure in which any newly collected data was compared with the previously collected data. Accordingly, the analysis and data collection continually informed each other. The process, in general, started by an initial data collection using a combination of methods and a write-up for review. Then, the text was broken into units of analysis. The interpreted meanings among the units came to be represented as categories. The categories themselves were compared, in turn, leading to more abstract categories. The collection and analysis of data were conducted simultaneously and informed each other. This analysis procedure led to the themes discussed in the findings.

IV. FINDINGS

1. Shifting Focus of Writing from Product to Process

The implementation of a process-oriented approach brought some sites for negotiation between the teacher and students. The most significant sites of negotiation for this writing class were found at the beginning of the semester when the class members dealt with competing expectations regarding the writing course. Students' expectations for the writing course echoed the traditional English language courses that emphasized grammar instruction but deemphasized writing. Although students expressed frustration with writing in English and with their previous negative experience with writing, they did not directly relate their negative perception on writing in English with their previous writing classes. Rather, they appeared to believe that writing in English is a fundamentally frustrating process, one which leaves little room for new writing practices and instruction. Students tended to perceive writing as a tool for demonstrating the grammar and vocabulary skills that they had practiced in product-oriented classes. However, the current writing course of this study held contrasting goals, based on the belief that emphasis on grammar should not be the focus of the instruction. In practice, instruction on grammatical and mechanical problems was discussed in the class as an informal, secondary goal.

The conflicted views on the writing course were negotiated in the class. At the beginning of the semester, students who were not familiar with the multiple drafting

process asked the teacher how many times the teacher planned to ask them to rewrite. Some students appeared feeling bored with multiple revising and wanted to move on to the next topic. The students, who appreciated the multiple drafting processes, appreciated the extra chances to correct their own grammatical mistakes in order to get a better grade, as one student states "This class provides opportunities to write over and over so that I could correct my sentences to improve and get a better grade." However, this initial view on drafting as having an extra chance for grade improvement, gradually faded, shifting to an engagement in the process of recovering ideas through recursive processes. As students became familiar with the process-oriented writing, they appeared to understand what elements were more valued in the course. The most important change in students' attitude toward writing was that students began to see that writing requires a multiple-stage drafting process, with a consciousness of the process, as shown in this excerpt:

Someone has said that writing is a process of revising. That's really true...It [revising] was very boredom at first, but later it was getting interesting because I got to have expectation of what my essay will be. (Jain,¹ Informal Interview, May)

These students' recognition of writing as a process has led to changes in several aspects of their writing practices. The most significant change of student writing practice was that they began to spend more time on the planning stages. At first, students did not appear to value the planning stages. It was often observed that students spent little time on planning and began to write the first draft without much thinking. Students appeared unfamiliar with the planning stages, as they stated that they "did not know what to do at first" during the planning stage. Moreover, it appeared that they did see planning as a part of the writing process, because they felt the time spent as wasted and so they "felt like to start writing any sentence rather than planning" because planning activity could make them feel they were "doing nothing" when they were supposed to "write something." However, the students gradually learn the value of planning as a student states that "Now, I spend much more time mind-mapping than actually writing." This realization is a positive sign of skilled L2 writers, considering that much of the research reported that skilled L2 writers spend more time on planning and revising (e.g., Raimes, 1992; Zamel, 1983):

It occurs me that writing is a process that can help you to form a good habit of making a good plan before you doing something. For instance, if you want to write a good essay, you should have a brainstorming to think of the

¹ All students' names are pseudonyms.

organization and then consider how to explain the points you have in a persuasive way. (Yuna, Informal Interview, May)

2. Development of a Sense of Audience and Purpose of Writing

Students began to view writing as a process of expressing their opinions, rather than the process of producing a series of error-free sentences. This shift of perception was found in their feedback performance. The most common student response was that students realized that they had been focusing on the quality of the essay to understand the idea, rather than judging the grammaticality of the sentences. Students reported that at the beginning of the semester, they had focused only on the grammar features and selection of vocabulary while reading their peers' writing. Later, students started to realize that their feedback could expand its foci to include a range of writing characteristics other than grammatical errors:

It is interesting that revision scale has improved significantly. At the very beginning of the class, I was only capable of correcting grammatical mistakes and sometimes, organization of the essay. However, after practicing revision from in-class peer review, I am now able to find contradictory reasoning in my own writing that I could not find before. I often find errors, such as subjective idea and lacking information to back up the opinion. (Hajin, Weekly Reflective Journal, May)

Considering the previous research findings (e.g., Kasper, 1997; Zamel, 1983) that reported that emphasizing the fluency and clarity of their writing as an important characteristic of skilled writers, the students' shift of focus on these areas suggests a positive product of process-oriented writing approach in this EFL writing class.

The shift of focus in giving feedback appears to have come from students' awareness of the audience. Because students knew that other students would read their writing, they viewed the writing process as a means of communication. Students paid more attention to their logic and the methods to convey their meaning effectively:

When you start to revise your essay, you will think of how to make it more persuasive to the others and which word should be chosen. You will never get satisfied because you will think that there must be a better word or better expression. (Jin, Weekly Reflective Journal, May)

After some feedback, I tried to change my writing style more concisely and it helped me to write essays in a more logical way. (Minho, Informal

Interview, April)

As these excerpts illustrate, the audience was at the center of the revision. Students were consciously aware of the audience and revised their essays to communicate effectively with the audience. This finding corresponds to the previous findings on the value of peer-feedback in promoting students' sense of audience (Tsui & Ng, 2000). Recognizing their peers as audience, helped students to place a greater value on peer response and to begin to take audience more seriously. This is a notable change, considering that students tend to prefer teacher feedback to peer or self-directed feedback (Zhang, 1995) and may not trust their peers' feedback (Nelson & Murphy, 1993). Although analyzing the changes in students' subsequent writing, which may be due to peer feedback is a topic beyond the scope of this study, seemingly, peer feedback during process based writing has raised the students' awareness of what makes for effective writing, as shown the following excerpt:

Before I took this class, I thought showing my writing to my friend was embarrassing. And arrogantly I thought, [peer feedback] would not help me. However, every time I got comments from my peers, I was very surprised for their critical and useful comments. What seemed logical and flawless when I was writing and self-revising, was an illusion. Even if I revised my work before submitting it, there were always more mistakes, errors, and confusions, and these were only detectable through the others. (Jain, Weekly Reflective Journal, June)

I could read many of writings of our classmates. It is a precious time to share various opinions and learn good ways of writing. Others' ways of writing were refreshing and stimulated me to think about my writing skills. I think it is very helpful to have more chances to get feedback from classmates and to share ideas and skills using peer-review time. (Yeun, Weekly Reflective Journal, June)

Another contribution of a process-oriented approach is that students learned the benefits of giving and receiving feedback. Students realized that learning to review others' writing could help them to become better self-reviewers. For example, a student shares her experience with peer feedback:

Until taking this course, I thought peer review is helpful only the one who are being evaluated—my classmates in this case. However, throughout the

course, I realized that most of the errors that I pointed out in my peer's draft were found in my writings as well. For instance, I pointed out to one of my classmates that she is having a jump in her thinking process; making the essay illogical. In my second draft of compare and contrast essay, however, I found the same mistake. Thus, to make it easier for readers to read my writing, I changed a whole first body paragraph in the third draft. (Insu, Weekly Reflective Journal, May)

The practice of reviewing their peers' papers apparently helped them become better writers (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Min, 2008; Rollinson, 2005; J. Yi, 2010) by making them aware of the audience and by giving them chances to think about their writing while reading both the effective and ineffective writing of others. The difficulties of the writing process might stem from the fact that it is a one-way communication. Writers often become so preoccupied with their own thought that distinguishing between what they intend to say and what they actually say is difficult. The multiple drafting processes helped the students to read their writing with the reader in mind. The recursive process helps students gauge their effort, and self-evaluate within "a less threatening and more supportive activity" (Hamp-Lyons, 1994, p. 54).

3. Development of an Identity as a Writer

A large number of student responses reflected, in general, the student's own affective and social changes. Learners showed a growth in their confidence as writers, in their sense of accomplishment, and of their personal development. For example, in reflecting on their experience of keeping a portfolio, students showed their sense of accomplishment:

Making portfolio is also good experience to check my achievement in this course...I am satisfied to make my works into one as a portfolio in a formal way. Moreover, taking this opportunity, I made a decision to make portfolios for other course works after this semester. (Sangyoon, Writing Portfolio, June)

In addition to the sense of accomplishment, students' awareness of writing as a process rather than a product was also observed in the images and texts students selected to design their portfolios. For example, the titles of students' portfolios showed a sense of development and progression as in "Long Journey of Writing," "Steady Progress of My Writing," "Memories from the Past Four Months," and "Development Process of Writing

during One Semester.” Many students also used images on the covers of their portfolios, although the teacher did not require it. Noticeably, many students used images that implied progress, as shown in Figure 1. The images show that students were viewing their writing experience as a long development process, rather than knowledge transfer. These images also imply that the student’s journeys or efforts to become better L2 writers would continue.



Figure 1 Student Choice of Images for the Cover of Portfolios

These encouraging changes in students’ attitudes toward writing were also found in their final reflective journals. Students shared their future plans to continue to develop their writing skills as in the following: “After this semester is over, I plan to make a study group for English writing once a week” and “I am planning to make a study group to write together... I started to like writing after seeing the progress in my writing.” These personal goals indicate that students had moved away from an extrinsic motivation to write for the grade onto a more intrinsic motivation through the process-oriented writing. In addition to increasing motivation in writing, the findings also reveal that process-oriented classes could empower students to become active learners and decision makers for their own learning:

Among the four part of English language, writing was the only one that I was never good at. I had no confidence in writing and I was actually hated my writing... However, through the course of the semester, my thoughts have changed. I have realized that my writing is not bad. It is the well-organized logic that is important in writing. (Gisung, Informal Interview, June)

This experience taught me the lesson that Korean students in Korean universities could also have critical and strong arguments of themselves, not some thoughts given by the teachers. (Jain, Weekly Reflective Journal, June)

This student's statement shows that the process-oriented approach can enhance students' autonomy to change their views about the teachers' and students' roles, to take responsibility for their own learning process. For some students, the writing course became a chance for personal reflection:

Then it [my journal writing] became an essay not only on the English writing aspects but also on rethinking of myself, such as what I had done in the past 3 years and what I want to do in the future. (Hansun, Writing Portfolio, June)

The potential benefits that contributed to the student's personal growth corroborate other studies' findings, those that have reported students "changing as a person" (Marton, Dall'Alba, & Beaty, 1993) and a "growth in being" (Katznelson, Perpignan, & Rubin, 2001) through the academic writing courses. Each student in this study might have varying reasons for recognizing a personal growth during the writing course. Through multiple discursive practices, students chose topics, positioned themselves, and presented their ideas to others. This process might have helped some students reflect on broader and critical issues and supported their intra- and inter-persona development. Newly derived developments in writing skills, satisfaction in the writing process, and confidence in relationships with others in the class might have boosted their self-esteem.

V. CONCLUSION

This qualitative case study investigated how a process-oriented approach can be adopted within an EFL context where product-oriented approach permeates. It sought to explore how students perceived the impacts and benefits of process-oriented approach to L2 writing. The findings presented in this study are encouraging. During the process-oriented writing, students gained an appreciation for the value of the writing process. As a result, students began to draw their attention to various features that contributed to good writing. They were able to develop a sense of audience, and the autonomy to regulate the process of writing to gain confidence as an L2 writer. Moreover, the most fruitful change is that many students have developed their identity as a writer and plan to continue to write in English on their own even after the class is finished.

One of the important factors that contributed to the positive shift of students' attitude to the writing process was the peer-feedback. Given a chance to share with others, students were able to experience the power of their writing to impact their peers. They experienced incongruity between their own purpose for writing and the effect of writing, which led to a realization of the differences between effective and ineffective writing. The students

discovered better ways to convey their intentions to readers through writing. Thus, the observable change to students' attitude about writing was that the process-oriented approach fostered a fuller and more sophisticated understanding of writing. Providing the sense of audience through the appropriate use of peer-feedback is believed to be a good step for teachers to consider in process-oriented classes.

The finding of this study also draws our attention to the importance of sharing the expectations and goals between the students and the teacher. Although the instructor clearly explained the course requirements and expectations, some students initially appeared to be unable to understand the value of some writing practices and seemed to expect writing instructions to resemble those previously encountered in traditional, product-oriented writing classes. While students were able to adjust their attitudes and practices while participating in the process, teachers would have to plan ahead in order to anticipate how to negotiate and manage the conflicted expectations between the teacher and students. In order to help learners better understand the goal of the class, instructors might foster the concept of process-oriented approach by setting appropriate goals together for each step of the writing practices.

These findings could not show how students' perceptions changed and their growth as a writer impacted the quality of their writing due to the qualitative nature of this study. Further studies should be conducted to examine student writing to see how students' perception changes are reflected in their writing.

REFERENCES

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines*. Alexandria, VA: ACTFL, Inc. Retrieved from the World Wide Web: <http://actflproficiencyguidelines2012.org>.
- Aydin, S. (2010). EFL writers' perceptions of portfolio keeping. *Assessing Writing*, 15(3), 194-203.
- Badger, R. G., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160.
- Baker, W., & Boonkit, K. (2004). Learning strategies in reading and writing: EAP contexts. *RELC Journal*, 35(3), 299-328.
- Bhowmik, S. K. (2009). L2 writing pedagogy in EFL contexts: An exploration of salient practices in teaching and learning. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 6(3), 351-373.
- Butterfield, A. L., & Jung, Chae Kwan. (2013). An hybrid approach to second language writing. *Journal of the Korean English Education Society*, 12(1), 123-139.
- Cohen, D. (1994). *Assessing language ability in the classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London & New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Flower, L. (1994). *The construction of negotiated meaning: A social-cognitive theory of writing*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (1994). Interweaving assessment and instruction in college ESL writing classes. *College ESL*, 4(1), 43-55.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3(2), 141-163.
- Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 17-29.
- Kasper, L. F. (1997). Assessing the metacognitive growth of ESL student writers. *TESL EJ*, 3(1), 1-20.
- Katznelson, H., Perpignan, H., & Rubin, B. (2001). What develops along with the development of second language writing? Exploring the 'by-product'. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 141-159.
- Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. *Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 305-313.
- Kern, R. G., & Schultz, J. M. (1992). The effects of composition instruction on intermediate level French students' writing performance: Some preliminary findings. *Modern Language Journal*, 76 (1), 1-13.
- Kim, Ae Ju. (2013). The effects of process-oriented English composition instruction on English writing performance. *Journal of the English Language and Literature*, 55(3), 115-135.
- Kim, Yanghee, & Kim, Jiyoun. (2005). Teaching Korean university writing class: Balancing the process and the genre approach. *Asian EFL Journal*, 7(2), 1-15.
- Lundstorm, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 30-43.
- MacDonald, B., & Walker, R. (1977). Case study and the social philosophy of educational research. In D. Hamilton (Ed.), *Beyond the numbers game: A reader in educational*

- evaluation* (pp. 181-189). Basingstoke, UK: MacMillan.
- Marton, F., Dall'Alba, G., & Beaty, E. (1993). Conceptions of learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 19(3), 277-300.
- Mathews, T. F., & Hansen, C. M. (2004). Ongoing assessment of a university foreign language program. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(4), 630-640.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 15-34). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Min, H. (2008). Reviewer stances and writer perceptions in EFL peer review training. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(3), 285-305.
- Murray, D. (1972). Teaching writing as a process not product. In V. Villanueva & K. Arola (Eds.), *Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader* (pp. 3-6). Urbana, IL: NCTE Press.
- Myers, J. L. (2001). Self-evaluations of the "stream of thought" in journal writing. *System*, 29(4), 481-488.
- Negretti, R. (2012). Metacognition in student academic writing: A longitudinal study of metacognitive awareness and its relation to task perception, self-regulation, and evaluation of performance. *Written Communication*, 29(2), 142-179.
- Negretti, R., & Kuteeva, M. (2011). Fostering metacognitive genre awareness in L2 academic reading and writing: A case study of pre-service English teachers. *Second Language Writing*, 20(2), 95-110.
- Nelson, G., & Murphy, J. (1993). Peer response groups: Do L2 writers use peer comments in revising their drafts? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27(1), 135-142.
- Nicolás-Conesa, F., Roca de Larios, J., & Coyle, Y. (2014). Development of EFL students' mental models of writing and their effects on performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 23, 1-19.
- O'Brien, T. (2004). Writing in a foreign language: Teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 37(1), 1-28.
- Ozturk, H., & Cecen, S. (2007). The effects of portfolio keeping on writing anxiety of EFL students. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 3(2), 218-236.
- Raimes, A. (1992). *Exploring through writing: A process approach to ESL composition* (2nd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Reichelt, M. (2001). A critical review of foreign language writing research on pedagogical approaches. *Modern Language Journal*, 85(4), 578-598.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30.
- Ross, J. A., Rolheiser, C., & Hogaboam-Gray, A. (1999). Effects of self-evaluation

- training on narrative writing. *Assessing Writing*, 6(1), 107-132.
- Seow, A. (2002). The writing process and process writing. In J. C. Richards & W. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 315-320). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Song, B., & August, B. (2002). Using portfolios to assess writing of ESL students: A powerful alternative? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(1), 49-72.
- Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do second L2 writers benefit from peer comments. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-170.
- Urzua, C. (1987). "You stopped too soon": Second language children composing and revising. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21(2), 279-304.
- Yi, Jyi-yeon. (2010). The characteristics of Korean EFL college students' peer feedback to English writing and their perception of the peer feedback. *Modern English Education*, 11(3), 134-161.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing process of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 6-28.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222.

APPENDIX

Seven Topics

- Topic 1. Study alone vs. Group study?
- Topic 2. Should students be allowed to use mobile devices in class?
- Topic 3. Should smoking be banned in public places?
- Topic 4. Should politician's private lives be public?
- Topic 5. Teachers should be paid according to how much their students learn.
- Topic 6. Tattoo: Pride or Prejudice?
- Topic 7. Letter to the editor and article responses

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Hye Yeong Kim
 Department of English Language and Literature
 Sungkyunkwan University

25-2 Sungkyunkwan-ro, Jongro-gu, Seoul (03063)

Tel: 02-760-0246

Email: hyeyeongkim@gmail.com

Received 6 October 2015

Revised 27 January 2016

Accepted 12 February 2016