English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol.28, No.2 Summer 2022
https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2022.28.2.21

Effects of Planning and Revising Conditions on EFL Learners' Writing Quality

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

Lee, Jeong-Won & Yoon, Kyeong-Ok (2022). Effects of planning and revising conditions on EFL learners' writing quality. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 28*(2), 21-38.

The current study aimed at investigating the effects of the four different writing conditions (with-planning/without-planning conditions and initial-draft-accessible/ initial-draft-removed conditions) on EFL learners' writing quality. For the study 95 college freshmen were randomly assigned into four condition groups. They were asked to write an argumentative essay about the effects of Internet use, and then to revise the initial draft under the four different conditions. They were also required to respond the pre- and post-survey to find more information about them and what they thought about the experimental conditions. The findings of the study are as follows: 1) the with-planning condition turned out to be a better strategy than the without-planning (or free writing) one when the participants were engaged in the revision process, although the two strategies failed to play a different role in initial writing quality; that is planning holds out a fair chance of successful organization of the writing text, facilitative content retrieval, and lowered cognitive load for writing; and 2) those engaged in the initial-writing-accessible condition outperformed those in the initial-writing-removed condition, which suggests that the learners with their initial drafts in the revision process may write better quality of the revised drafts. Discussion and pedagogical implication were addressed.

[planning/free writing/revision task/writing quality]

* First Author, ** Corresponding Author

I. INTRODUCTION

The perception that writing is the most important skill for L2 learners has consistently stimulated the interest of researchers and teachers in writing instruction over the past decades (Hyland, 2003). The strong interest in L2 writing has given birth to tons of theories and approaches to teaching writing. Among them, process-based writing has been welcomed as an alternative approach since the early 1970s, when most of the writing instruction had mainly focused on the finished product (Widodo, 2008). Some advocates for the process-based writing even enumerate advantages that writers can gain by going through a series of stages such as planning, translating, and revising before producing a finished text (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Harmer, 2007). On top of that, it is asserted that the approach encourages learners to improve their writing skills, to think critically through the writing process, and consequently to become a better writer.

Many researchers have spurred to conduct research on writing process, in particular, planning, the first stage of the process. They carried out their studies with a bit different topics: planning conditions, planning strategies, and types of planning, including some empirical studies comparing differences between planned and unplanned conditions in writing (Elbow, 1973; Ellis, 1987; Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981; Hayes, 2006; Johnson, Mercado, & Acevedo, 2012; Kellogg, 1988; Ortega, 1999; Rahimpour & Nariman-Jahan, 2011; Rau & Sebrechts, 1996; Wason, 1980). However, some studies on the effects of planning and no-planning conditions on text quality reported conflicting results. In other words, some researchers claimed that planning produced a better written text so that the planning condition might be a critical factor in determining L2 learners' writing quality. On the other hand, others took a negative stance on the effects of planning. They maintained that planning might prevent writers from producing better texts in fluency and lexical complexity. They proposed free-writing as an alternative strategy in that the free-writing strategy could be cognitively less demanding and decrease writing difficulties.

Furthermore, revision, one of the basic components in writing process (Hayes & Flower, 1980), has also drawn many researchers' attention. The revision of writing was considered an essential process to develop L2 writers' text quality since revising (reviewing) gives a chance not just to read and edit the text, but to evaluate and modify it for the writers' goal achievement (Hayes, Flower, Schriver, Stratman, & Carey, 1987; Scardamilia & Bereiter, 1983). In order to verify the effects of revision conditions or revision strategies, a lot of studies have been conducted with the findings that low- and high-level writers showed different capability to revise their texts (Flower, Hayes, Carey, Schriver, & Stratman, 1986), and that the definition of revision (narrow or broad) was another influential factor to their writing revision (Ryu, 2014). It was concluded, accordingly, that a higher priority should

be placed on writers' positive perception on revision and good writing. In addition, Galbraith and Torrance (2004) made a suggestion that careful consideration should be taken into the form of initial draft as well as the environment of the revision task for L2 writers' effective revision. They even pointed out a scarcity of the related research conducted in EFL context (Ong & Zhang, 2013).

In an effort to meet the research needs, therefore, the present study aims at examining the effects of different writing conditions on writing quality under the context of EFL. The four conditions are as follows: with planning/without planning conditions and initial draft accessible/initial draft removed conditions. The participants' perceptions on the writing conditions are also examined through the post-survey. The following research questions are posed for the study.

1) Which planning condition (with/without planning) is more effective in EFL learners′ writing quality?
2) Which revising condition (initial-draft-accessible/removed) is more effective in EFL learners′ writing quality?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Planning Conditions in Writing

Named as a pre-writing task in the process-based writing, planning has been considered a crucial task involved in the writing production, and even prioritized over other writing tasks such as execution and monitoring (Kellog, 1996). It is also commonly accepted that planning activities (for example, generating ideas, organizing, and setting the goals for writing) have the benefit of decreasing writers' huge cognitive demands, leading to a better quality of writing.

A lot of research has been conducted on the effects of planning conditions in terms of L1/L2 writing quality. For example, Ellis and Yuan (2004) examined the effects of three different types of planning conditions: no planning, pre-task planning, and unpressured online planning on 42 Chinese EFL writers' performance. They found that the pre-task planning group outperformed the other condition groups by producing greater fluency and syntactic variety, but not necessarily accuracy. They finally suggest that the marked results in writing fluency and linguistic complexity be attributed to the advantages of pre-task planning. That is, it facilitates writers' ability in text planning of content and organization and provides an opportunity to boost their confidence during writing performance. It is clear that the results supported many other researchers' positive stance on the effects of

planning on L2 writing (Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981; Johnson et al., 2012; Kellogg, 1988, 1990; Ong & Zhang, 2010, 2013).

Particularly in Korean settings, Kim (2017) also conducted a similarly-designed study to Ellis and Yuan's, examining the effects of different planning variants (no planning, pre-task planning, and online planning) on complexity, accuracy, and fluency in L2 writing tasks. The findings were rather mixed that no planning had a great effect on accuracy; pre-task planning led to fluency; and online planning enhanced better syntactic complexity. The results reiterated the argument that L2 writing performance could be positively affected by the attentional manipulation of pre-task planning.

On the other hand, an empirical study on the effects of planning conditions (planning, prolonged planning, free writing, and control) on the text quality, carried out by Ong and Zhang (2013), brought on controversial findings which are quite different from those of Ellis and Yuan's (2004). They reported that the free writing condition group produced better quality writings than any other groups, particularly in the component of the content score. The result can be surmised that the free writing condition seemed to help writers facilitate content retrieval and lower cognitive writing load, causing the improvement of the overall text quality. This assertion is in line with Elbow's (1973) and Wason's (1980) suggestion of free writing as an alternative to the planning strategy because the free writing condition can be substantially beneficial not just for reducing difficulties and cognitive demands, but helping to give coherence to writers' essay and create better ideas in the writing process.

Meanwhile, another issue came up in planning condition in writing. Several studies asserted that the effect of planning on text quality is largely attributable to planning time, demonstrating that "planning is neither more nor less valuable than other writing activities" (Hayes & Gradwohl Nash, 1996, p. 53). Moreover, it is strongly claimed that the more time writers have for planning, the better quality of writing they will produce (Grabe, 2001). According to Kroll's (1990) study on planning time, comparing two different time groups: One group was given a 60-minute time limit for written composition in class, and the other group was permitted to perform the same task without time limit at home. It was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups, but those who did work at home produced better written compositions with higher accuracy than its counterparts did. Overall, a tentative conclusion drawn from these studies is that pre-task planning provides writers more time to do the task, which stimulates them to produce better quality texts in the final outcome.

2. Revision Conditions in Writing

There seems to be, no doubt, a general consensus that revision is an essential step toward a better quality writing text (Lowenthal, 1980; Murray, 1978; Scadamalia & Bereiter, 1986). Revision can be defined as making any changes to a certain point in the existing text while writing (Flower et al., 1986). Namely, writers can detect and diagnose problems with the existing text, select a revision strategy, and then modify it for a good quality of the final text (Hayes, 1996). Revision has been categorized into a variety of conditions by a number of researchers in terms of the types and/or strategies of revision process. One example of the classifications is the types of local and global revision made by Hayes, Flower, Schriver, Stratman, and Carey (1987). They demonstrated that lower-level writers tend to focus on local problems below the sentence level, while advanced writers are more likely to focus on both local and global errors (Faigley & Witte, 1981; Wallace & Hayes, 1991). Another categorization proposed by Murray (1978) consists of two types of revision: internal and external one. Internal revision is involved in everything that writers do to discover and develop the content, form, language, or voice of the first written text. In contrast, external revision is a stage to edit and proofread the draft, focusing on the exterior conventions like language form, mechanics, and style.

In the Korean EFL setting, Kim (2012) and Ryu (2014) also categorized revision strategies respectively into five or six types for their own studies. Kim (2012) employed five strategies, such as change in surface features, change in style/expression, extension/reduction of existing idea, addition/deletion of new idea, and re-organization in order to investigate the difference between the two writing groups (the improve and non-improve groups). Ryu (2014) used the six revision types of additions, deletions, substitutions, permutations, distributions, and consolidations, in order to examine the strategies Korean student writers use in their writing process.

Meanwhile, a learner-centered approach has become widespread all over the educational fields, since constructivists such as John Dewey, Jean Piaget, and Lev Vygotsky added their strong voices to the progressive education for the 20th century. The approach was grounded on the theory that highlights the important role of responsibility in learners' learning path, so it encourages learners to become an autonomous and independent learner in their learning environment. To be more specific, by choosing what to learn, how to learn, and even how to assess their own learning, they can participate in learning as an active and responsible learner.

In line with this learner-centered approach, self-revision has been shed new light on writing research. Lalande (1982) conducted a research to examine whether there were any differences between the two groups' (self-revision and teacher-revision) composition errors. It was found that the errors made by the self-revision group had been significantly fewer

than those made by the teacher-revision group, which signifies that self-revision is more beneficial for L2 learners to improve their writing skills (Erfanian, 2002). Kim's (2015) study, conducted in Korean EFL context, partly supported the assertion about the positive role of self-revision in L2 writing. She reported that advanced L2 writers had more chances to detect their own errors and revise them, and consequently produced more accurate written products, although self-revision exerted a negative impact on low-level L2 learners' error correction. In fact, the low-level writers had considerable difficulty in noticing problems in their drafts and revising them due to a lack of appropriate grammatical knowledge (Ryu, 2014). Her findings suggest that more chances for learner self-revision should be provided considering of learners' writing proficiency.

A brand-new revision strategy adopted by Ong and Zhang (2013) was based on two self-revision conditions in which L2 writers' initial essay was accessible to them or not while revising. They performed a study with an interactional plot of planning and revising, and then investigated the interaction effect of the planning/free writing conditions and the initial-essay-accessible/initial-essay-removed conditions on text quality. They found that in free writing condition, the participants in the initial-essay-removed group produced better quality writings in the revised drafts than the initial-essay-accessible group, with statistically significant difference between the groups. These findings formed a very close alignment with Galbraith and Torrance's (2004) results that the absence of initial drafts brought better quality in the final drafts in an unorganized condition rather than the other group conditions (the organized, the sentence, and the notes conditions) did. These results suggest that without the accessibility of their initial essays, the participants seemed to have no choice but to do a global reorganization of the content and have much more extensive thoughts about the content while completing their finals, comparing to those who were allowed to refer to their initial ones. It seems likely that free writing condition without initial essays triggers writers to do their task proactively.

There have still been few empirical studies on the effects of the revision conditions over the past several decades (Ong & Zhang, 2013), especially on the accessibility of initial drafts to writers when revising. Further studies on the revision conditions should be performed to provide more practical evidence for both L2 writing teachers and researchers so that they could guide their students to become a better writer.

III. RESEARCH DESIGN

1. Participants

The present study was performed with 95 college freshmen in a college. All of the participants enrolled in the required English course, *College English* in the spring semester, 2021. They all came from the four first-year classes of the course, and each class consisted of 23 to 24 students. They were ranging from 19 to 24 years old, composing 86 male students (91%) and 9 female students (9%).

One of the researchers was in charge of the four classes as an English instructor. The students sat in the two-hour class per week. In the course, a reading textbook and a TOEIC speaking textbook were used together in order to improve the students' English reading and speaking skills.

Based on the participants' TOEIC test scores (684 on average) taken at the beginning of the semester, their English proficiency levels could be considered intermediate. According to the purpose of the study, each of the four classes was randomly assigned to the four different condition groups: the with-planning initial-writing-accessible group (n = 24), the without-planning initial-writing-accessible group (n = 23), the with-planning initial-writing-removed group (n = 24), and the without-planning initial-writing-removed group (n = 23).

2. Instruments

1) Writing Tasks

First of all, a pre-writing task was carried out to measure the participants' English writing proficiency. An argumentative writing topic was chosen for the task, and the writing direction was as follows (Lee, 2020; Yoon & Lee, 2018): "Nowadays smart phones are indispensable in our life. Some people think they bring us much convenience, while others argue they make more trouble. Which view do you agree on? Choose one view and support your argument in English." They were asked to complete the pre-writing task in 30 minutes.

Next, an initial writing task was implemented in order to investigate whether or not pre-task planning had any effects on the students' writing quality. An argumentative topic was selected for the initial writing task. The following writing topic was given to all the students with specific directions in Korean, such as writing topic, time limit, availability of dictionary, and so forth: "Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Overall, the widespread use of the Internet has a mostly positive effect on life in today's world."

Lastly, a revised writing task was conducted using the same topic of the initial writing task, to investigate the effects of the accessibility of the students' initial writing text on the quality of revised writing products.

For all the three writing tasks, each student received an A4-sized writing sheet, on which each writing topic was typed in English, and they were guided to finish their writing tasks within the time limit of each task and to submit their writing products as soon as finishing them. Either any references or dictionaries were not allowed during the writing process.

2) Experimental Conditions

In order to meet the study design, the four-class students were randomly assigned into four writing groups in accordance with the with-planning or without-planning conditions and the initial-writing-accessible or initial-writing-removed conditions.

In the planning conditions, first, the two with-planning groups were given 5 minutes to take a pre-task planning, and then 25 minutes were allocated for the completion of their initial drafts. In contrast, the two without-planning groups received 30 minutes for their initial writing with no planning time given. The same amount of time (30 minutes) was given to both condition groups to maintain a balance between the groups.

After having completely done their initial writing, the students were moved to the revision stage. According to the two revision conditions (initial-writing-accessible and initial-writing-removed) the students performed a different revision activity. The initial-writing-accessible groups received their initial writings, and they were requested to revise their writing for producing final outcome referring to their initial writings for 30 minutes. On the other hand, the initial-writing-removed groups were asked to complete their revision work without referring to their initial writings for 30 minutes.

3) Survey

A pre-survey was conducted at the beginning of the course to obtain the participants' background information, such as age, gender, TOEIC score, English proficiency including writing ability, and their preference for pre-task planning. Next, a post-survey was also conducted at the end of the course with the following questions: What were the advantages and disadvantages of pre-task planning, and were there any benefits of the accessibility of initial writing while revising? Closed and open-ended questions were adopted to the different question types. The whole procedure of the present study is shown below.

TABLE 1
Procedure of the Study

Week	With-planning Initial-writing-accessible	With-planning Initial-writing-removed	Without-planning Initial-writing-accessible	Without-planning Initial-writing-removed
1	Pre-survey			
2	Planning (5 min.)	Planning (5 min.)	Without planning	Without planning
3	Initial writing task (25 min.)		Initial writing task (30 min.)	
4	Revised writing Initial essay accessible (30 min.)	Revised writing Initial essay removed (30 min.)	Revised writing Initial essay accessible (30 min.)	Revised writing Initial essay removed (30 min.)
5	Post-survey			

4. Scoring and Data Analyses

To measure the participants' writing tasks, an analytical scoring method was adopted from Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, & Hughey's (1981) with a little modification for the purpose of the present study. All the collected written texts were assessed by the two researchers who had more than 20 years of teaching English, according to the writing categories, such as content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics (Jacobs et al., 1981; Lee & Yoon, 2017). The scoring rubric for each category was a 5-point scale for content and organization, a 4-point scale for vocabulary and grammar, and a 2-point scale for mechanics, which amounts to 20 points in total. The inter-rater reliability of each category was quite high enough for further analyses: .809 for content, .991 for organization, .908 for vocabulary, .941 for grammar, .911 for mechanics, and. 890 for total.

The scores of the participants' writing products performed in different experimental conditions were submitted to analyses using *t*-tests and a two-way ANOVA to find the answers of the two research questions. All statistical analyses were conducted using a .05 significance threshold. Effect sizes were estimated using Cohen's *d* to measure the effects of the results of *t*-tests, with the values of small = .2, medium = .5, and large = .8 (Cohen, 1988).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Effects of Planning on Initial Writing Quality

In order to investigate the effects of the two planning conditions (with-planning [WP] and without-planning [WOP]) on EFL learners' initial writing quality, a *t*-test was carried out on the score of initial writing (20 points in total). The overall mean score for the WP

and WOP conditions were 14.47 (*SD*: 2.87) and 14.29 (*SD*: 3.64), respectively. The result of the *t*-test failed to reach statistical significance ($t = .263$, $p = .793$), although the score of the WP group was higher than that of the WOP group. In addition, the scores of the five scoring categories were not different in the two planning conditions, either. That is, the two different planning conditions exerted no impact on the participants' initial writing quality (Kieft, Rijlaarsdam, Galbraith, & van den Bergh, 2007).

There have been divergent findings on the effects of planning or no planning (free writing) on text quality in L1/L2 writing. A number of studies support the facilitative role of planning in L2 writing quality (Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Johnson et al., 2012; Kellogg, 1988, 1990), whereas there are also some notable studies that put more emphasis on the alternative role of free writing (the no-planning condition) than of the planning strategy in L2 writing (Kieft et al., 2007; Ong & Zhang, 2013; Rau & Sebrechts, 1996; Torrance, Thomas, & Robinson, 2000). Interestingly, however, the outcome of the current study sheds a different light from those two empirical research finding strands on the role of planning in L2 writing in that planning might not play a significant role to explain L2 learners' writing quality, as Hayes and Gradwohl Nash (1996) argued.

One possible reason can be found in the total time allowed on the writing task or planning. In the studies that reported the positive role of planning in writing (e.g., Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Kellogg, 1988, 1990), more time was allowed to the with-planning condition group for the writing task or planning. It is quite for sure that the learners in the with-planning condition could produce better quality of writing since they had more time for planning (Grabe, 2001). Considering lack of empirical studies on the issue of planning and free writing in L2 writing, however, more research is required to provide more convincing evidence on the complicated effects of the planning condition on L2 writing in different experimental contexts.

2. Effects of Planning and Revising Conditions on Revised Writing Quality

A two-way ANOVA was conducted to examine the effects of the two planning conditions (with planning [WP] and without planning [WOP]) and the two revising conditions (initial writing accessible [IWA] and initial writing removed [IWR]) on EFL learners' revised writing quality. Descriptive statistics and the ANOVA results are presented in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively. As shown in Table 3, the main effects of planning and revising were statistically significant, but not the interaction effect. This means that the writers both in the WP condition and in the IWA condition scored significantly higher than those in the other two conditions each.

TABLE 2
Descriptive Statistics for Writing Quality in Planning and Revising Conditions

	With Planning (WP)	Without Planning (WOP)	Total
Initial Writing Accessible(IWA)	18.50 (1.22)	17.17 (1.69)	17.83 (1.60)
Initial Writing Removed (IWR)	17.43 (1.59)	15.96 (2.26)	16.68 (2.08)
Total	17.98 (1.50)	16.56 (2.06)	

TABLE 3
ANOVA Results of Planning and Revising Conditions for Revised Writing Quality

	SS	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
Intercept	28307.828	1	28307.828	365.644	.003**
Planning	46.860	1	46.860	385.451	.032*
Revising	30.681	1	30.681	252.367	.040*
Planning x Revising	.122	1	.122	.041	.841

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

To clearly show the differences in the two types of conditions, separate independent *t*-tests were carried out both on the revising conditions in the planning group and on the planning conditions in the revising group as in Table 4. The participants in the IWA condition in both WP and WOP groups and in the WP condition in both IWA and IWR groups significantly outperformed those in IWR and WOP conditions in both groups each, with relatively large Cohen's *d* effect sizes.

TABLE 3
Results of *t*-tests for Revised Writing Quality According to the Conditions in the Groups

Group	N	Conditions	*M* (*SD*)	*t*	*p*	Cohen's *d*
WP	24	IWA	18.50 (1.22)	2.586	.013*	.77
	23	IWR	17.43 (1.59)			
WOP	24	IWA	17.17 (1.69)	2.103	.041*	.62
	24	IWR	15.96 (2.26)			
IWA	24	WP	18.50 (1.22)	3.143	.003**	.92
	24	WOP	17.17 (1.69)			
IWR	23	WP	17.43 (1.59)	2.584	.013*	.77
	24	WOP	15.96 (2.26)			

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Unlike the findings obtained from the initial writing, interestingly, the WP condition turned out to be a valuable factor to enhance the learners' revised writing quality, irrespective of the two revising conditions. The outcomes provide another evidence on the beneficial effect of planning in L2 writing on the quality of the revised drafts (Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981; Johnson et al., 2012; Kellogg, 1988, 1990). No matter how fluent the writers are, they need time to plan what they are going to write before they

engage in writing (Harmer, 2004). That is, planning is highly likely to give them opportunities to organize the content of the writing text, facilitate content retrieval, and lessen cognitive demand for writing, which, in turn, triggers the enhanced quality of the revised texts (Ellis & Yuan, 2004).

The beneficial role of the planning strategy in the revised writing, which was negligible in the initial writing, could be accelerated because of accessibility of the initial draft engaged with planning. Some of the participants reported, in the post-survey, a dynamic synergy effect brought from the combination of the two conditions in that they could compare what they planned and what they wrote in the initial draft in order to reorganize their ideas systematically and coherently in the revision process, which helped them save time and cognitive capacity to produce better quality of revised texts.

When it comes to the role of the revision process, the present study provided different evidence from Ong and Zhang's (2013) results. They proved definitely that in the free writing (or without planning) condition, the initial-essay-removed group significantly outperformed the initial-essay-accessible group in the revised drafts (Galbraith & Torrance, 2004). On the contrary, in the current study, the IWA group produced better quality of revised writing than the IWR group, regardless of the planning conditions (WP and WOP). This suggests that the accessibility of their initial writing appeared to enable those in the IWA group to expand and elaborate their initial drafts in the revision task through systematic, concrete organization of the content with confidence (Ellis & Yuan, 2004). On the other hand, according to the post-survey report, those in the IWR group had a hard time recalling from their memory what they had written in the initial writing, so they were plausibly compelled to go through the writing process in the revision task from the beginning, such as generating ideas, organizing them neatly, searching for appealing expressions, relying on translation of their mother tongue, etc., which must have ended up with heavy overload of their working memory.

One thing to be mentioned is that some participants voiced complaints in the post-survey related to accessibility of their initial drafts in the revision task. They reported that having them access their initial drafts hindered creation of new ideas (Ong & Zhang, 2013), and that it took too much time to reconstruct the new ideas fusing old ones in the initial drafts together appropriately, although they acknowledged that the initial drafts provided scaffolding for them to unfold their ideas with much elaboration in the revision task.

Table 5 shows the differences of the quality of revised writing in the two conditions according to the writing categories, obtained from separate independent *t*-tests. The major categories that differentiate the corresponding conditions in each group were content and organization, and the grammar category was included in one group (IWA).

TABLE 5
Results of *t*-tests for Revised Writing Quality According to Categories in the Groups

Group	N	Category	Conditions	*M* (*SD*)	*t*	*p*	Cohen's *d*
WP	24	Content	IWA	4.67 (.482)	2.069	.044*	.62
	23		IWR	4.35 (.573)			
WOP	24	Organization	IWA	4.29(.550)	3.110	.003**	.91
	24		IWR	3.67(.816)			
IWA	24	Content	WP	4.67 (.482)	2.513	.016*	.75
	24		WOP	4.29 (.550)			
	24	Organization	WP	4.63 (.495)	2.208	.032*	.66
	24		WOP	4.29 (.550)			
	24	Grammar	WP	3.67 (.482)	2.846	.007**	.85
	24		WOP	3.25 (.532)			
IWR	23	Content	WP	4.35 (.573)	2.100	.041*	.63
	24		WOP	3.96 (.690)			
	23	Organization	WP	4.39 (.583)	3.488	.001**	1.03
	24		WOP	3.67 (.816)			

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

The WP and IWA conditions facilitate the learners' writing performance in text construction in terms of content and organization of the text. Considering a writing task involves the coordination of cognitive demands and the retrieval of the writer's linguistic and discourse knowledge (Harmer, 2004), the two conditions of WP and IWA might lower cognitive load and help operate the limited processing storage capacity of learners' working memory effectively to improve their writing performance.

Such assumptions were corroborated by what the learners in the with-planning initial-writing-accessible group (WA) reported in the post-survey. Many of them pointed out the advantages of the planning conditions such as "The overall framework planned before writing helps write systematically and coherently with concrete ideas," "Based on what I planned, meticulous construction of ideas in writing is possible," "While planning, I could come up with more appropriate and various words and expressions to convey the message I want to deliver in writing," and "I could check the content and message while writing based on what I planned." As for the merits of accessibility of their initial writing, they reported that "I could elaborate the message and add more information and examples that need for strong persuasion, reviewing my initial draft," "I could correct some of the errors I've made through self-feedback thanks to the initial draft," and "When revising the draft, I didn't need to remember what I wrote in the initial draft to make the revision process successful." Comparing with the other three groups, the WA group must have confidence in the revision stage because they were allowed to use the planning strategy and to access the initial draft, which were highly likely to play an essential role for them to perform better quality of writing.

V. CONCLUSION

The present study was conducted to address the effects of the four different writing conditions—with-planning/without-planning conditions and initial-draft-accessible/ initial-draft-removed conditions—on writing quality under the context of EFL.

As for the first research question related to the effectiveness of the planning conditions, the with-planning condition turned out to be a better strategy than the without-planning (or free writing) one when the participants were engaged in the revision process (Ellis & Yuan, 2004; Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981; Johnson et al., 2012; Kellogg, 1988, 1990), even though the two strategies failed to play a significantly different role in initial writing quality (Hayes & Gradwohl Nash, 1996). Planning holds out a fair chance of successful organization of the writing text, facilitative content retrieval, and lowered cognitive load for writing (Ellis & Yuan, 2004). Plus, the groups allowed to have planning time before the writing task are more likely to work from the vantage point in comparison with those without planning time (Ong & Zhang, 2013).

When it comes to the second research question regarding the effects of accessibility of initial writing in the revision task, this study added evidence in support of the beneficial effects of the initial-writing-accessible condition, which runs counter to Ong and Zhang's (2013) outcome that the initial-essay–removed group significantly outperform its counterpart in the revision task (Galbraith & Torrance, 2004). Providing the learners with their initial drafts in the revision process might be conducive to better quality of the revised drafts through systematic expansion and elaboration of their initial drafts to produce qualified revised ones (Ellis & Yuan, 2004).

Based on these findings, a few pedagogical implications can be suggested concerning the design and implementation of writing lessons in EFL contexts. The teacher needs to keep it in mind to allow learners to have planning time before they engage in writing tasks, which will help them effectively manage what to write how and why. Furthermore, when the teacher asks learners to revise their initial writing, which is a quintessential aspect of the process-oriented approach in writing (Hedgcock, 2005), she needs to cautiously take it account to provide them with their initial drafts in the revision process, considering its beneficial effects in terms of the reconstruction of the ideas in details along with its detrimental aspects such as restriction of creativity in revision and inefficiency to deal with the ideas.

Still, there are conflicting theoretical perspectives and empirical research findings on planning and revising conditions. The current study put much efforts into disentangling the complicated threads of the roles of the two conditions in EFL writing. Notwithstanding, we could not collect enough writing samples from different educational, regional backgrounds, and we also fail to control confounding variables such as the participants' cognitive

processing ability, learning style, and L2 writing proficiency. Further studies are expected to take these limitations of the current study into consideration to provide more convincing evidence to better understand the issues in question.

REFERENCES

Elbow, P. (1973). *Writing without teachers*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1987). Interlanguage variability in narrative discourse: Style shifting in the use of the past tense. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9*(1), 1-19.

Ellis, R., & Yuan, F. (2004). The effects of planning on fluency, complexity, and accuracy in second language narrative writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*, 59-84.

Erfanian, M. (2002). *The effect of self-correction strategy on the development of learners' linguistic competence*. Unpublished master's thesis, Allameh Tabatabaei University, Tehran, Iran.

Faigley, L., & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. *College Composition and Communication, 32*, 400-414.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1980). The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints. In L. Gregg & E. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 31-50). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication, 32*, 365-387.

Flower, L., Hayes, J., Carey, L., Schriver, K., & Stratman, J. (1986). Detection, diagnosis, and the strategies of revision. *College Composition and Communication, 37*(1), 16-55.

Galbraith, D., & Torrance, M. (2004). Revision the context of different drafting strategies. In L. Allal, L. Chanquoy, & P. Largy (Eds.), *Studies in writing: Vol. 13. Revision: Cognitive and instructional processes* (pp. 63-85). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Grabe, W. (2001). Notes on a theory of second language writing. In T. Silva & P. Matsuda (Eds.), *On second language writing* (pp. 39-57). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson.

Hayes, J. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C.

Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hayes, J. (2006). New directions in writing theory. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 28-40). New York: Guilford Press.

Hayes, J., & Flower, L. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. Gregg & E. Steinberg (Eds.), Cognitive processes in writing (pp. 3-31). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hayes, J., Flower, L., Schriver, K. A., Stratman, J. F., & Carey, L. (1987). Cognitive processes in revision. In S. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Advances in applied psycholinguistics: Vol. 2. Reading, writing, and language learning* (pp. 176-240). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hayes, J., & Gradwohl Nash, J. (1996). On the nature of planning in writing. In C. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing* (pp. 29-55). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hedgcock, J. (2005). Taking stock of research and pedagogy in L2 writing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 597-613). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. New York: Cambridge Language Education.

Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing EFL composition: A practical approach*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Johnson, M. D., Mercado, L., & Acevedo, A. (2012). The effects of planning sub-processes on L2 writing fluency, grammatical complexity, and lexical complexity. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21,* 264-282.

Kellogg, R. (1988). Attentional overload and writing performance: Effects of rough draft and outline strategies. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition, 14*, 355-365.

Kellogg, R. (1990). Effectiveness of prewriting strategies as a function of task demands. *American Journal of Psychology, 103*, 327-342.

Kieft, M., Rijlaarsdam, G., Galbraith, D., & van den Bergh, H. (2007). The effects of adapting a writing course to students' writing strategies. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*, 565-578.

Kim, H. M. (2012). *Writer, peer feedback, and revision: A comparison of L1 and L2 college freshmen with longitudinal analyses*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, TX.

Kim, S. (2015). A case study on the effect of self-error correction of Korean English learners at advanced and low level. *The International Society of Language and Literature, 31,* 149-169.

Kim, N. (2017). The effects of different planning on complexity, accuracy, and fluency in

L2 written tasks. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 33*(1), 29-60.

Kroll, B. (1990). What does time buy? ESL student performance on home versus class composition. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing* (pp. 140-154). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal, 66*, 140-449.

Lee, J.-W. (2020). Analysis of EFL learners' argumentative writing using the adapted Toulmin model. *English language & Literature Teaching, 26*(3), 63-77.

Lee, J.-W., & Yoon, K.-O. (2017). EFL learners' direct vs. translated writing in different writing genres. *English Teaching, 72*(2), 123-144,

Lowenthal, D. (1980). Mixing levels of revision. *Visible Language, 14*(4), 383-387.

Murray, D. (1978). Internal revision: A process of discovery. In C. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Research on composing: Points of departure* (pp. 85- 103). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Ong, J., & Zhang, L. J. (2010). Effects of task complexity on fluency and lexical complexity in EFL students' argumentative writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*, 218-233.

Ong, J., & Zhang, L. J. (2013). Effects of manipulation of cognitive processes on English as a foreign-language (EFL) writers' text quality. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 375-398.

Ortega, L. (1999). Planning and focus on form in L2 oral performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 108-148.

Rau, P. S., & Sebrechts, M. M. (1996). How initial plans mediate the expansion and resolution of options in writing. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 49*, 616-638.

Rahimpour, M., & Nariman-Jahan, R. (2011). The effects of planning on writing narrative task performance with low and high EFL proficiency. *English Language Teaching, 4*(1), 120-127.

Ryu, H. (2014). Revision behaviors in a peer-reviewed multi-draft writing context. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society, 12*(2), 195-215.

Scadamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1986). Research on written composition. In C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 67-95). London: Wiley.

Torrance, M., Thomas, G., & Robinson, E. J. (2000). Individual differences in undergraduate essay writing strategies: A longitudinal study. *Higher Education, 39*, 181-200.

Wallace, D. L., & Hayes, J. R. (1991). Redefining revision for freshmen. *Research in the Teaching of English, 25*, 54-66.

Wason, P. C. (1980). Specific thoughts on the writing process. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 129-137). Hillsdale, NJ:

Erlbaum.

Widodo, H. P. (2008). Process-based academic essay writing instruction in an EFL context. *IKIP Negeri Malang: Jurnal Bahasa dan Seni Tahun*, *36,* 101-115.

Yoon, K.-O., & Lee, J.-W. (2018). Features and perception of EFL students' peer feedback on their peers' writing. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 24*(3), 69-87.

Examples: English
Applicable language: English
Applicable Level: Secondary and Tertiary

Jeong-Won Lee (Professor)
Dept. of English Education
Chungnam National University
34134 Daehang-no 99, Yuseong-gu
Daejeon, Korea
Email: jeongwon@cnu.ac.kr

Kyeong-Ok Yoon (Associate Professor)
Dept. of Language and Literature (English Education)
Republic of Korea Air Force Academy
28187 Saseoham 335-1, Namil-myeon, Sangdang-gu
Cheongju, Chungbuk, Korea
Email: yko8302@mnd.go.kr

Received in April, 2022
Reviewed in May, 2022
Revised version received in June, 2022