English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol. 22, No. 4 Winter 2016

EFL Learners' English Writing Performance in Different Writing Task Types

Kyeong-ok Yoon[*]
(Republic of Korea Air Force Academy)
Jeong-Won Lee[**]
(Chungnam National University)

Yoon, Kyeong-ok & Lee, Jeong-Won (2016). EFL learners' English writing performance in different writing task types. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 22*(4), 161-178.

The study aims at examining the effects of different writing task types on EFL learners' English writing performance. In this study, 18 college students (15 males and 3 females) were asked to write four different types of writing (descriptive, process, comparison/contrast and dialogue journal) with a pre- and post-writing tests. The writing samples were analyzed with three categories: writing performance, quantity (number of words), and complexity (number of words per T-unit, clause connectors per word, and number of *And* out of the connectors). The results are as follows: 1) a significant difference of the learners' English writing performance in the pre- and post-tests was revealed, while no difference was found across the four writing task types; 2) dialogue journals were significantly shorter, while the process essay was the most complex type of writing; and 3) significant differences were found in using clause connectors and *And* across the writing types. This suggests that the teacher needs to encourage her students to perform a variety of writing tasks to promote their writing ability as well as to measure it more accurately.

[writing task types/dialogue journal/descriptive/process/compare/contrast]

I. INTRODUCTION

With the era of highly advanced science and technology, people have been faced with much more information through diverse mass media than ever, and thus they have had

[*] First author
[**] Corresponding author

more and more opportunities to express their ideas and thoughts not only in oral but also in written form (Yoon & Lee, 2014). As needs and demands for English writing as a way of communication have been gradually increased, the importance of English writing instruction is being underscored in the field of EFL learning and teaching. Researchers and teachers in recent years have strived to put more stress on the development of effective pedagogical approach and methods for effective writing instruction since English writing has been perceived as a critical tool to interact with others beyond borders in the globe (Choi, 2006; Yoon & Lee, 2014)

Over the past several decades, with more interest in genre increased, it has also been claimed by researchers in the writing field that meaningful and practical practice with a wide variety of academic and vocational texts be made for English writing learners. Shaw and Liu (1998) added that more multi-functional language teaching and learning, which would be suited for the context or environment of language users, need to be done. That is the reason that different writing task types may enable L2 learners just only to learn different linguistic features, organization, and even proper forms but also to experience pragmatic writing task types, closely related to the real world (Choi, 2006).

In other words, benefits of genre-oriented approach in writing are mostly likely to help promote writing skills, such as enhancing the correct use of mechanics, understanding of rhetorical knowledge, or achieving specific purposes in social contexts (Badger & White, 2000; Bae, 2012; Hyland, 2003). In addition, Peyton, Staton, Richardson, and Wolfram (1993) emphasized the need of text variety arguing that with a single sample of text it would not be possible to elicit a complete picture of a student's writing ability. Accordingly, a wide variety of writing task types under varying conditions should be taken into consideration to help L2 learners improve their writing abilities, as well as motivate teachers to figure out the learners' authentic writing proficiency (Lee, 2012).

Despite the urgent need of applying meaningful writing instruction with a variety of writing task types to a class, teachers might have difficulty administering writing activities with diverse writing task types in their classes due to time constraint, lack of teachers' perception of writing, and exclusive focus on preparing the college scholastic ability test (Kim & Lee, 2012). Therefore, based on the related rationale and the suggestion that "language learning should be organized around the task, and the task should be the unit in the syllabus" (Skehan & Foster, 1997, p. 186), the current research was conducted with the aim of exploring whether four different writing task types—descriptive, process, comparison/contrast, and dialogue journal writings—elicit any different English writing performance form Korean EFL college students in terms of quantity and quality of their writings.

II. TASK TYPES IN L2 WRITING

Writing serves as an essential tool that enables L2 learners to accelerate mental development and motivate them to move forward for better language learning (Dunn & Lantolf, 1998). Their writing ability reflecting their language system can also be a crucial factor to measure general English proficiency (Kubota, 1998). In order to raise L2 learners writing ability and optimize effectiveness of their writing, teachers need to take into account providing them with various writing task types which are appropriate discourse modes for composing experience. It also enables learners to enhance their language learning since writing activities are carried through the "meaningful use of language and the engagement of more naturalistic acquisitional processes" (Skehan & Foster, 1997, p. 186).

Targeting young learners at low-level English proficiency, Firkins, Forey, and Sengupta (2007) compared two writing task types—a process- and an information-based report—while instructing the learners based on the genre-based approach. They reported that the learners could experience both genres and themes of their writings and also learn specific linguistic features as well as text organization of each genre. Accordingly, they proved that the genre-based approach could be an effective methodology for English writing instruction regardless of the learners' English writing proficiency.

Depending upon the argument that teachers should provide a relevant and appropriate writing program to help students identify their writing needs (Hedge, 2001), Hedge (1998) suggested a typology of writing as in Figure 1. The typology serves as a useful guideline when teachers design an English writing class based on the genre approach.

The writing task type is one of the task variables affecting students' writing performance in terms of quantity, quality, and other writing features (Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, & Schoer, 1963; Huot, 1990; Weigle, 2002). First, Way, Joiner, and Seaman (2000) investigated the effects of prompts and tasks on the development of writing proficiency of novice learners of French in the secondary foreign language classroom. In their study, writing quality was measured to attest to the effect of writing task types on L2 learners' writing performance in terms of syntactic complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF). They employed four measurement methods: holistic scoring, length of product, mean length of T-units, and percentage of correct T-units in order to assess CAF of three different types of writing task: descriptive, narrative, and expository. The results indicated that the descriptive task was the easiest one of the three task types, followed by the narrative one. The expository type was the most difficult one for the learners. This suggests that the writing task type plays a crucial role in L2 writing, especially at the beginning level of writing proficiency.

FIGURE 1

Typology of Writing Genre (Hedge, 1998, p. 322)

Personal writing	**Public writing**	**Creative writing**
diaries	letters of -inquiry	poems
journals	-complaint	stories
shopping lists	-request	rhymes
reminders for oneself	form filling	drama
packing lists	applications	songs
addresses	(for memberships)	autobiography
recipes		
Social writing	**Study writing**	**Institutional writing**
letters	making notes while reading	minutes, instructions
invitations	taking notes from lectures	memoranda, speeches
notes of -condolence	making a cared index	reports, applications
-thanks	summaries	reviews, curriculum vitae
-congratulations	synopses	contracts, specifications
cablegrams	reviews	business letters, public letters
telephone messages	reports of -experiments	note-taking, advertisements
instructions to -friends	-workshops	(doctors and other
-family	-visits	professionals)
	essays	
	bibliographies	

Another research was conducted by Crowhurst (1987) to examine whether there were any quality differences in the use of cohesive devices between arguments and narratives written by L1 students. The result revealed that the narrative task elicited higher use of conjunctive devices than the argumentative task did. Park (2013) also explored whether two writing tasks—narration and argument—used in Crowhurst (1987) elicit different use of cohesive devices in Korean EFL situation. As a result, it was found that the frequency and type of cohesive devices were affected by the different discourse mode, and a significant difference was found in the total number of connector types per essay depending upon their writing proficiency levels.

In the case of Lee's research (2012), three different writing task types—descriptive, comparison/contrast, and dialogue journal—were compared in terms of the four linguistic features of quantity, complexity, focus, and cohesive quality. In her findings, the length of the writings in dialogue journals were considerably shorter than the other two types of writing; the comparison/contrast essay was the most cognitively demanding and complex type; and clause connectors were most frequently used in the descriptive writing. One more finding to be mentioned is that the students preferred the personal-close focus in both the dialogue journal and descriptive writing to the

comparison/contrast writing. This signifies that different writing task types exert a significant effect on EFL college students' writing performance.

Judging from the studies mentioned above, it can be safely argued that the writing task type has a critical effect on L2 learners' English writing performance, especially in writing quality and quantity such as length of product, sentence cohesion, syntactic complexity, and number and type of connectors, just to name a few.

Besides the studies of the relationship between writing task types and writing performance, Ryoo (2005) investigated the effect of students' preferences for three different types of writing—journal writing, formal writing, and sentence translation—for their writing improvement. According to the findings, all the participants of 12 college students made significant improvement in accuracy in the translation task regardless of their preferences. However, it was also revealed through interviews conducted at the end of the course that most of them preferred the sentence translation task to the others since they could improve their linguistic abilities regarding grammar rules explicitly through the task. Reporting that some of the students showed improvement in the writing type they preferred, she suggested that teachers should consider learners' perception of and/or preference for writing task types when teaching writing as well.

To sum up, writing practice in a variety of task types is fairly needed in EFL situation in which language and context could be taught mostly in a separate pattern (Yasuda, 2011). Given that writing task types play a crucial role not only in L2 learners' writing performance in terms of quantity and quality but also production of authentic writing results (Braddock et al., 1963; Hudelson, 1986; Huot, 1990; Weigle, 2002), what is worth noting at this point is careful consideration of writing task types and the application of the types appropriately in L2 learners' writing performance.

On the basis of the research reviewed so far, the current study posed the following research questions:

1. Does writing practice in different writing task types affect EFL college students' L2 writing performance?
2. Do four different writing task types affect the students' writing performance in terms of quantity and quality of their writings?

III. METHOD

1. Participants

The participants in the study were 18 Korean university students (15 males and 3 females), who were all sophomores and enrolled in a required course of Academic English Writing during the fall semester in 2015. Six out of 18 students reported that they had some experience of learning English in English-speaking countries for one or two years. In addition, 61% of the participants had not received any form of writing instruction from both public schools and private institutes, while the rest (39%) said that they had an experience of writing instruction a little. Nevertheless, they were in the upper-intermediate level of overall English proficiency based on their TOEIC scores with 879.4 on average.

2. Instruments and Procedures

In the writing course, a textbook, *Blueprints 1* (Folse, Mahnke, Solomon, & Williams, 2003), was used which is focused on the process-based writing approach: pre-writing and planning, the first draft, teacher or partner feedback, self-editing, and the final draft. After receiving instruction in how to write in different genres, they were requested to submit the first draft in each genre. The drafts were photocopied for authentic data analysis for the current study before the teacher provided corrective feedback.

The current study clarified the students' writing proficiency through a pre-writing test with the topic of "Who am I?" At the end of the course, a post-writing test with the same topic was implemented in an effort to evaluate their quantitative and qualitative improvement between pre- and post-writing test scores.

In order to investigate the influence of different writing task types on the students' English writing performance, four kinds of writing task types—descriptive, process, comparison/contrast, and dialogue journal writing—were included in the current study. Each task type has been believed to elicit a different level of writing results due to their different features and cognitive demands; moreover, it could affect how to write and organize compositions (Crowhurst, 1987; Reid, 1994) according to its content, organization, style, and potential readers (Swales, 1990). The first three writing task types were chosen considering their different characteristics in writing composition and students' familiarity of the types because they were introduced in the textbook. Dialogue journal was added to the writing type the students had to perform since ongoing dialogue journal might play a significant role not only in enhancing their writing skills but also in making them active writers through collaborative work during the course (Lee, 2007; Newman & Holzman, 1993; Swain, 1997).

Different topics pertaining to the three task types were carefully selected in order to satisfy the detailed classification of the types. No specific topics were given for dialogue journal writing because of its diary-like characteristics. The four writing task types had

been instructed to the participants regarding what, why, and how to write based on the textbook during the course. Table 1 shows features of each writing task type.

TABLE 1
Features of Writing Task Types

Writing task type	Feature
Descriptive writing	Describe things in detail to make a good word picture (Hogue, 1996)
Process writing	Tell a sequence Logical and often chronological in order (Folse, Mahnke, Solomon, & Williams, 2003)
Compare/contrast writing	Require a writer's trained organizing ability in subject areas (Bander, 1978)
Dialogue journal writing	Represent natural, interactive written language acquisition process (Lee, 2007)

The three formal writing tasks were implemented in the test situation with the topics excerpted from the textbook as shown in Table 2. The students had completed each writing task for about one and a half hours to earn credits for their final test. They were not allowed to consult any type of dictionaries or reference materials while performing the writing tasks. All the writing samples collected from them were the first draft they had completed, without any corrections or changes done by the teacher or their peers for the purpose of providing feedback.

In case of dialogue journal writing, the students were allowed to write their dialogue journals, taking turns in pairs twice a week as an assignment throughout the course. They were also reminded that their writing results would be assessed and included in their credit at the end of the semester so as to booster their active participation in their writing. Any topics were welcomed to encourage them to actively participate in interaction and communication between pairs. The dialogue journal writing samples were collected once every week and consistently checked during the period. In the end of the semester, one piece from each student written at almost the same time period was selected for comparable data analysis.

TABLE 2
Topics in Different Writing Task Types

Writing task type	Topic
Descriptive writing	My First Day of School
Process writing	Profession You Are Interested in
Compare/contrast writing	Roles and Responsibilities of Women and Men at Home
Dialogue journal writing	Free topic

3. Data Analysis

A total of 108 writing samples were gleaned from the participants. An analytical scoring method was chosen to investigate the improvement of the students' writing ability since the scoring method has been believed to exclude a rater's subjectivity to a certain extent, as well as to help interpret students' more specific writing abilities (Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, & Hughey, 1981; Jeon & Min, 2009). Two raters participated in the scoring procedure: one was a native speaker who had taught English conversation and English writing more than 10 years at several tertiary institutions in Korea; and the other was one of the researchers who have almost 20 years of English teaching experience in colleges. The scoring manuals and rubric were distributed to each rater with detailed explanation. They were asked to score students' writing samples without any communication. Inter-rater reliability was calculated, and Cronbach α was .831.

For more precise investigation of how four different writing task types exert an effect on their writing performance in terms of the quantity aspect, the length of the writings was calculated. By counting the number of words, writers' writing fluency could be measured across the writing task types. According to Biber (1986), the higher average word length means the more "highly exact presentation of informational content in a text" (p. 394). That is, the ability to write longer can be perceived not only as an explicit proficiency but also as an indicator of fluency in writing (Henry, 1996; Koda, 1993; Lee, 2012; Reid, 1994).

As for the aspect of quality in writing, the mean length of T-units, the number of clause connectors including subordinate conjunctions, and the frequency of *And* were analyzed. The mean length of T-units was measured by dividing the number of T-units by the total number of words in each writing sample (Hunt, 1965), which has been widely known as a technique of demonstrating reliable syntactic complexity of the writing samples (Way et al., 2000). The calculation of both the number of clause connectors and frequency of *And* was followed to examine whether the students' ability to connecting sentences to improve text cohesiveness and coherence differs depending upon the writing task type while they perform their writing.

Once all the data were coded, they were analyzed using the statistical package of the SPSS 22.0 version. Especially, *t*-tests and one-way ANOVAs were carried out to compare the mean differences in the results of the writing samples to fulfill the research purposes of the current study.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Improvement of Writing Ability

In order to measure any change of the students' writing ability between the pre- and post-writing tests, their writing products were analyzed using paired *t*-tests. Significant mean differences were found in the two test scores in total and 5 criteria as in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Mean Differences in Pre/Post-writing Tests

		M	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Total	pre-test	85.361	10.285	-3.954	.001
	post-test	91.806	6.546		
Content	pre-test	26.667	3.638	-1.327	.202
	post-test	28.194	1.879		
Organization	pre-test	17.222	2.408	-4.123	.001
	post-test	19.722	.808		
Vocabulary	pre-test	16.944	2.357	-3.344	.004
	post-test	18.333	1.917		
Grammar	pre-test	16.250	3.237	-.294	.772
	post-test	16.389	2.872		
Mechanics	pre-test	8.278	1.691	-2.675	.016
	post-test	9.167	1.175		

The four different types of writing had a positive effect on the students' overall writing performance (Kubota, 1998; Lee, 2012; Weigle, 2002). That is, repetitive writing tasks seemed to make them accustomed to writing, which in turn lead them to get better scores. It can be interpreted as evidence of "practice effect" (Yoon, 2015). With each criterion—content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics—analyzed to investigate any differences between the pre- and post-tests, significant differences were uncovered in the three criteria: organization, vocabulary, and mechanics. It is presumed that iterated writing practice improved their ability to organize writing pieces by understanding distinct characteristics of the four different writing types and by learning how to organize their ideas. Moreover, it is considered that they had many chances to think and write words in their essays, which finally caused them to get a better score in the criterion of vocabulary.

However, there was not a significant difference between the pre- and post-tests in the two criteria of content and grammar. The same topic of the two tests assigned to the students to perform might disrupt them from expanding their thoughts or adding more

creative ideas in terms of content. When it comes to the grammar category, their overall English proficiency needs to be considered. Their average TOEIC score was 879.4 which can usually be interpreted as an upper-intermediate level in English proficiency. Thus it can be reasonably inferred that they already have acquired a certain level of grammatical knowledge to deal successfully with constructing sentences and paragraphs. Considering Yoon's (2015) study that failed to get a significant result from those with a high level of language proficiency, however, further research should be extended to different English proficiency levels for better investigation on any developmental change in grammatical knowledge in writing performance according to students' level of English proficiency.

Interestingly, any significant differences of the post-writing test results across the four writing task types were not found in the five scoring criterion—content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. This signifies that the students' English writing performance was not different across the different writing task types, although each writing type bears distinct features such as rhetoric, organization, process of writing, etc. (Reid, 1994).

The students' writing samples were analyzed through calculating the number of words, T-units, connectors, and *And* between the pre- and post-tests to check their improvement of writing proficiency. As shown in Table 4, they achieved fairly higher scores in the three aspects—the number of words, T-units, and connectors—of the post-test than those of the pre-test, excluding *And*. That is, the students produced longer compositions using more words and adding more clauses with more clause connectors in their writings, but there was no statistical difference in using one of the simplest connectors, *And*. They were likely to perform better in the aspect of quantity after receiving writing instruction and performing several times of writing practices in that syntactically more complex and longer writing can be identified as better quality writing (Henry, 1996; Koda, 1993; Lee, 2012; Reid, 1994).

TABLE 4

Mean Differences in Pre/Post-writing Tests in Number of Words, T-units, Connectors, and *And*

		M	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Words	pre-test	194.78	73.054	-6.198	.000
	post-test	299.44	54.648		
T-units	pre-test	21.89	8.415	-3.623	.002
	post-test	28.67	5.156		
Connectors	pre-test	11.94	4.478	-3.742	.002
	post-test	17.83	6.447		
And	pre-test	3.50	1.724	-1.334	.200
	post-test	4.39	2.547		

2. Quantity in Four Types of Writing

In an effort to examine any difference in quantity across the four writing task types, the mean number of words was analyzed using the one-way ANOVA. As shown in Table 5, there was a statistically significant difference in the number of words the students used in the four different writing task types (F = 7.700, p = .000). The students wrote longest in descriptive writing, followed by comparison/contrast and process writing, whereas they produced the least quantity of writing in dialogue journals. In other words, the students seemed to have paid more careful attention to the three formal essays than the dialogue journal writing (Lee, 2012). In case of dialogue journal writing, they were asked to write it as homework, twice a week, taking turns between pairs, unlike the other essays which were asked to be performed in the test situation. While writing dialogue journals, therefore, they seemed to comparatively feel free from any burden in term of the length of writing they had when writing the three formal essays which required them to complete the task successfully in the test situation.

TABLE 5
Mean Number of Words in Four Types of Writing

	Writing task type	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Mean number of words	Descriptive	230.56	60.377	7.700	.000
	Process	188.72	41.796		
	Compare/contrast	213.44	47.932		
	Dialogue journal	152.83	54.333		

According to the post-hoc test, there were statistically significant differences between the dialogue journal writing and two other essay writings (p = .000 with descriptive writing and p = .004 with comparison/contrast writing) (Lee, 2012; Way et al., 2000). However, there was no significant difference between dialogue journal and process writing probably because the students could demonstrate their thoughts clearly as well as concisely, using transition words like *first*, *next*, *then*, and *finally* to organize process paragraphs logically (Folse et al., 2003). This might possibly lead them to write a comparatively short essay in process writing.

3. Syntactic Complexity in Four Types of Writing

As for syntactic complexity, the mean length of T-units across the four writing task types was first analyzed as in Table 6. Syntactic complexity of the four types was significantly different (F = 4.155, p = .009). The process writing ranked top among the four types,

followed by comparison/contrast and descriptive writing. And dialogue journal writing was the least complex writing task type (Lee, 2012).

TABLE 6
Mean Length of T-units in Four Types of Writing

	Writing task type	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Mean length of T-units	Descriptive	11.352	2.593	4.155	.009
	Process	13.146	2.828		
	Compare/contrast	11.887	2.452		
	Dialogue journal	10.159	2.423		

The result from the post-hoc test manifests that there were significant differences between process writing and dialogue journals (p = .005). Process writing reached the highest mean score of syntactic complexity among the four writing types, indicating that it includes the most complex sentence structures among the writing types. Considering the nature of process writing, which is described logically and in chronological order, the students might have to include as much information as possible using adverbials in a sentence and/or a clause in order to explain certain processes related to their topics. Such a strategy seemed to be taken for the purpose of delivering their ideas completely and systematically to their potential readers (Folse et al., 2003).

In comparison with process writing, the students seemed to write somewhat simple and short sentences in their dialogue journals performed in less stressful situations, with free topics, without any time limit. In Lee's (2012) study conducted with three writing types of descriptive, comparison/contrast, and dialogue journal, the comparison/contrast writing task was the most complex one across the three writing types. From these results, it is clearly demonstrated that syntactic complexity of writing must depend upon writing task types.

The mean number of clause connectors is well known as one of the indices representing syntactic complexity in writing because assigned writings to the students in the current study mostly require syntactically complex structures with a considerable number of clause embedding and clause connectors (Chafe, 1982; Clancy, 1982). In addition, clause connectors are likely to come into play in writing as a clue to draw students' attention to and increase their cohesive writing (McClure & Steffensen, 1985). As shown in Table 7, there was a statistically significant difference in the mean number of clause connectors across the four writing task types (F = 5.104, p = .003). This signifies that the students used clause connectors most frequently in descriptive writing and least frequently in process writing.

TABLE 7
Mean Number of Clause Connectors in Four Types of Writing

	Writing task type	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Mean number of clause connectors	Descriptive	13.17	4.743	5.104	.003
	Process	8.61	2.913		
	Compare/contrast	10.94	3.811		
	Dialogue journal	9.00	4.015		

According to the post-hoc test, there were significant differences between descriptive and process writing (p = .005) and between descriptive and dialogue journal writing (p = .011). When engaged in descriptive writing, the students might try to arrange and organize their ideas tightly and clearly they wanted to deliver using clause connectors. On the other hand, they used significantly less clause connectors in process writing in which adverbials could safely substitute for the role of connectors to deliver the message logically, and so did they in dialogue journal writing in which they might not pay much attention to cohesion and coherence of their writing in the discourse level because of its informal features. Accordingly, the use of clause connectors may resort considerably to the distinct features that characterize the writing task type (Crowhurst, 1987).

As for the simplest connector, *And*, there was a significant difference in the mean number across the four writing task types (F = 5.688, p = .002) as shown in Table 8. The order of frequency is the same as that of the aforementioned clause connectors: descriptive writing was the highest, followed by comparison/contrast and dialogue journal; and lastly, process writing was the lowest. In accordance with the post-hoc test result, there were significant differences between the descriptive and process writing (p = .004) and between descriptive and dialogue journal writing (p = .013) unlike Lee's (2012) result that showed no significant differences across the three writing task types of descriptive, comparison/contrast, and dialogue journal writing. Though *And* generally seems to be more easily seen in informal writings like dialogue journal writings (Lee, 2012; McClure & Steffensen, 1985), its use in writing might be influenced by other variables that need to be identified through further studies.

TABLE 8
Mean Number of *And* in Four Types of Writing

	Writing Task Type	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Mean number of *And*	Descriptive	4.00	2.497	5.688	.002
	Process	1.67	1.283		
	Compare/contrast	3.28	2.218		
	Dialogue journal	1.94	1.626		

V. CONCLUSION

The current study explored whether four different writing task types—descriptive, process, compare/contrast, and dialogue journal writing—elicit Korean EFL college students' writing performance in terms of quantity and quality in L2 writing. To fulfill this purpose, the improvement of the participants' writing ability between the pre- and post-writing tests was measured, and then the mean number of words for writing quantity, and the mean length of T-units, the frequency of clause connectors, and the frequency of *And* for writing quality—syntactic complexity, in particular—were analyzed.

The research findings are as follows: 1) significant differences of the learners' English writing performance in the pre- and post-writing tests were found, while no difference between the two tests was found across the four writing task types (Yoon & Lee, 2014); 2) dialogue journal writing was significantly shorter than two writings of descriptive and comparison/contrast (Lee, 2012), whereas process writing was the most complex type of writing; and 3) significant differences were found in using clause connectors and *And* across the four writing task types.

Based on the findings of the current study, a pedagogical suggestion for those who are interested in teaching English writing especially in EFL settings could be made: a wide variety of writing tasks should be provided considering features in writing such as length, syntactic complexity, and textual cohesion because "the enhanced awareness of choices and variations facilitates not only how they write but also what they write" (Yasuda, 2011. p. 125). For example, process writing would serve the purpose of enhancing EFL learners' writing proficiency in terms of syntactic complexity. When teaching or assessing writing, therefore, types of writing task, educational purposes, and learners' perception of the writing task types should carefully be examined to help them improve their L2 writing proficiency (Hudelson, 1986; Peyton et al., 1993).

Lastly, to supplement some limitations of the current study, further studies need to be conducted with a greater number of writing samples gleaned from subjects in different levels of English proficiency, which can contribute to provide more conclusive evidence to the issue in question. In addition, a wider variety of discourse modes—writing task types, for instance—and various writing features as criteria for data analysis need to be investigated for broader pedagogical considerations in teaching and assessing L2 writing (Lee, 2012; Peyton et al., 1993; Weigle, 2002). Such attempts will help clearer identification of nature and distinct functions of writing task types, which will, in turn, be conducive to fully understand the role of task types in L2 writing.

REFERENCES

Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160.

Bae, H. J. (2012). The effectiveness of genre-based L2 writing instruction on Korean middle school students' writing ability. *English Teaching, 67*(3), 147-160.

Bander, R. G. (1978). *American English rhetoric: A writing program in English as a second language* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Biber, D. (1986). Spoken and written textual dimensions in English: Resolving the contradictory findings. *Language, 62*(2), 384-414.

Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. (1963). *Research in written composition*. Urbana-Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Chafe, W. L. (1982). Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy* (pp. 35-53). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Clancy, P. M. (1982). Written and spoken styles in Japanese narratives. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy* (pp. 55-76). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Choi, Y. H (2006). *Teaching of writing in English as a foreign language: Principles and classroom applications.* Seoul: Hankookmunwhasa.

Crowhurst, M. (1987). Cohesion in argument and narration at three grade levels. *Research in the Teaching of English, 21*(2), 185-201.

Dunn, W. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (1998). Vigotsky's Zone of Proximal Development and Krashen's *i*+1: Incommensurable constructs; Incommensurable theories. *Language Learning, 48*(3), 411-442.

Firkins, A., Forey, G., & Sengupta, S. (2007). Teaching writing to low proficiency FFL students. *ELT Journal, 61*, 341-352.

Folse, K. S., Mahnke, M. K., Solomon, E. V., & Williams, L. (2003). *Blueprints 1: Composition skills for academic writing*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Hedge, T. (1998). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hedge, T. (2001) *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Henry, K. (1996). Early L2 writing development: A study of autobiographical essays by university-level students of Russian. *Modern Language Journal, 80*, 309-326.

Hogue, A. (1996). *First steps in academic writing*. New York: Addison-Wesley.

Hudelson, S. (1986). ESL children's writing: What we've learned, what we're learning. In P. Rigg & D. S. Enright (Eds.), *Children and ESL: Integrating perspectives* (pp. 25-54).

Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Hunt, K. W. (1965). *Grammatical structures written at three grade levels* (Research Report No. 3). Champaign, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Huot, B. (1990). The literature of direct writing assessment: Major concerns about prevailing trends. *Review of Educational Research, 60*(2), 237-263.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Teaching and researching writing*. Cambridge, UK.

Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. V., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). ESL composition scoring profile. In S. C. Weigle (Ed.), *Assessing writing* (pp. 108-139). Cambridge, UK.

Jeon, E. G., & Min, C. K. (2009). The effect of the teachers' feedback types on students' writing in English journal writing. *English Language Teaching, 21*(4), 293-313.

Kim, S. W., & Lee, J.-W. (2012). Effects of collaborative writing on middle school students' English writing proficiency. *Journal of Studies in Language, 28*(1), 51-71.

Koda, K. (1993). Task-induced variability in FL composition: Language-specific perspective. *Foreign Language Annals, 26*, 332-346.

Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of L1-L2 transfer in writing among Japanese university students: Implication for contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7(*1), 69-100.

Lee, J.-W. (2007). A case study on written language use and interactions in dialogue journals. *English Teaching, 62*(2), 79-101.

Lee, J.-W. (2012). The effects of writing task types on EFL students' English writing performance. *English Language Teaching, 24*(1), 75-93.

McClure, E. F., & Steffensen, M. S. (1985). A study of the use of conjunctions across grades and ethnic groups. *Research in the Teaching of English, 19*(3), 217-236.

Newman, F., & Holzman, L. (1993). *Lev Vygotsky: Revolutionary scientist.* London: Routledge.

Park, S. K. (2013). Korean EFL learners' use of cohesive devices in narrative and argumentative essays. *Studies in English Education, 18*(2), 51-81.

Peyton, J. K., Staton, J., Richardson, G., & Wolfram, W. (1993). The influence of the writing task on ESL students' written production. In J. K. Peyton & J. Staton (Eds.), *Dialogue journals in the multilingual classroom: Building language fluency and writing skill through written interaction* (pp. 196-229). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Reid, J. M. (1994). *The process of paragraph writing* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ryoo, Y. S. (2005). Do student preferences for different types of writing affect writing improvement? *English Language Teaching, 17*(3), 83-105.

Shaw, P., & Liu, E. (1998). What develops in the development of second-language writing? *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 225-254.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance. *Language Teaching Research, 1*, 185-212.

Swain, M. (1997). Collaborative dialogue: Its contribution to second language learning. *Revista Canaria de Estudios, 34*, 115-132.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Way, D., Joiner, E., & Seaman, M. (2000). Writing in the secondary foreign language classroom: The effects of prompts and tasks on novice learners of French. *Modern Language Journal, 84*(2), 171-184.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing.* Cambridge, UK.

Yasuda, S. (2011). Genre-based tasks in foreign language writing: Developing writers' genre awareness, linguistic knowledge, and writing competence. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 20*(2), 111-133.

Yoon, K.-O. (2015). Effects of prompts on EFL students' English writing performance based on their writing proficiency. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society, 14*(4), 47-65.

Yoon, K.-O., & Lee, J.-W. (2014). Effects of writing prompts on EFL learners' English writing performance. *Modern English Education, 15*(1), 173-194.

Examples in: English
Applicable Language: English
Applicable Level: Tertiary

Kyeong-ok Yoon
Dept. of Foreign Studies (English Education)
Republic of Korea Air Force Academy
28187 Saseoham 335-1, Namil-myeon, Sangdang-gu
Cheongju, Chungbuk, Korea
Email: yk8302@hanmail.net

Jeong-Won Lee
Dept. of English Education
Chungnam National University

34134 Daehang-no 99, Yuseong-gu
Daejeon, Korea
Email: jeongwon@cnu.ac.kr

Received in October 15th, 2016
Reviewed in November 26th, 2016
Revised version received in December 5th, 2016