Comparing Organizational Patterns of L1 and L2 Opinion Texts Written by Japanese EFL Students*

Keiko HIROSE

Abstract

This study compared second language (L2) and first language (L1) writing organizational patterns of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Japanese students. Previous research involving Japanese L1 writers' L2 writing organizational choices revealed tendencies towards inductive as well as deductive patterns. Early studies found students tended to employ inductive patterns, whereas recent studies have found students tended to employ deductive patterns. These differences can be derived from multiple factors involved in L2 writing, such as the participants' L2 proficiency levels, L1 and L2 writing abilities, L1 and L2 writing experiences, L1 and L2 writing instructional backgrounds, and the writing tasks. As a follow-up to Hirose (2003), the present study, using a within-subject design, examined L1 (Japanese) and L2 (English) organizational patterns of Japanese EFL students (N=70) who had not yet received L2 writing instruction. More specifically, the study investigated students' choices of organization patterns in relation to the organization and overall quality of L1 and L2 opinion texts.

The results found that (a) regardless of their writing levels, most students showed their preference for deductive patterns in both L1 and L2; (b) quite a few of them did not organize their texts either deductively or inductively, implying they apparently had problems in organizing their texts in both languages; and (c) there was no significant relation between students' writing abilities and their choice of organizational patterns. Finally, possible implications of the results are discussed as they pertain to L1 and L2 writing research and pedagogy. Several directions for future research are also suggested.

Background

The present study compared organizational patterns of Japanese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students' second language (L2) writing with those of their first language (L1) writing. Previous research involving Japanese students' L1 and L2 writing revealed mixed results concerning organization. The students' tendencies toward inductive patterns were identified particularly in early contrastive rhetoric studies such as Kobayashi (1984) and Oi (1984), who examined Japanese students' L1 and L2 compositions with a between-group design. Inductive patterns were used especially by Japanese students writing in L1. On the other hand, deductive patterns were also reported to be employed by some Japanese students writing in L2. For example, Kobayashi (1984) found advanced Japanese students studying in the U.S.A. tended to employ the general-to-specific (deductive) pattern, whereas many Japanese students studying in Japan used the specific-to-general (inductive) pattern in English. Similarly, Oi (1984) found that just over half of the Japanese students writing in L2 had a preference for the general-to-specific organization, whereas those writing in L1 showed preference for the specific-to-general organization. Both Kobayashi (1984) and Oi (1984) had L1 (English) American students as a control group, who showed strong tendencies to choose the general-to-specific organization. These previous studies dealing with Japanese students suggest that those with L2 writing experience tend to use the deductive style as employed by L1 English writers, whereas in L1, they use the inductive style identified as the preferred L1 Japanese pattern. Kubota (1998a), who reviewed previous contrastive rhetoric research on English and Japanese, found that "one feature commonly identified by researchers as a characteristic of Japanese writing is 'induction'" (p. 478) either in Japanese or English. Generalizability of this claim should be addressed in further empirical studies, and organizational patterns of both L1 and L2 texts employed by Japanese students require investigation.

Far from being static, organizational patterns reflect diverse factors involved in writing. The differences found in Japanese students' L2 writing

organizational analysis can be derived from multiple factors involved, not only the participants' L2 proficiency levels, writing abilities, writing experiences, and writing instructional backgrounds, but also those of L1. These multiple-faceted aspects of L2 writing call for studies that can explore relations between L1 and L2 texts within each individual student. As Kubota (1998b) pointed out, contrastive rhetoric research should investigate L1-L2 transfer in writing as a within-subject phenomenon.

Equally important factors influencing organizational patterns are the writing task variables including text type, the topic, expected readers, or writing time conditions. A review of past studies in light of text types showed that Kobayashi (1984) used narrative and expository tasks, whereas Oi (1984) used an expository task. Although the text type was the same (i.e., expository), the topics used in these two studies were somewhat different. Kobayashi's (1984) writing prompt was "one of the disadvantages of owing a car (or a TV set)", and Oi's (1984) topic was "Do you think all TV commercials should be banned?". Not only were the topics different, but the ways of topic presentation were also different. The former topic was stated in a phrase form, whereas the latter was posed in a question form starting with "Do you think." Some studies did not even report the topics. For example, Achiba and Kuromiya (1983), who analyzed expository compositions written for English as a Second Language (ESL) writing courses in several U.S. universities, revealed that linear (deductive) patterns (34%) were most frequently employed, followed by circular and inductive patterns (27%). In comparing the results of previous research, therefore, we should take the task variables into consideration. As specifically drawn attention to by Connor (1996), Swales (1990) regarded the variables of genre important in contrastive rhetoric studies. In conducting comparative studies it is essential the task variables should be controlled the same. Nitsu (2001), who compared L1 and L2 Japanese opinion texts, used the same topic "smoking," which was phrased differently for L1 and L2 groups. Comparing the results in such comparative research must be made with greater care.

The present study is concerned with argumentative writing, more specifically, opinion texts, which have not been studied until recently in

contrastive rhetoric (Connor, 1996). Although argumentative writing is sometimes regarded as a subcategory of expository writing (Oi, 1984), it is different from expository writing in that "argument attempts to prove its point reasonably by using logic or evidence" (Kane 1983, p. 468). Kamimura and Oi (1998) compared L1 and L2 English opinion texts written by American and Japanese students, respectively, and found not only differences but also similarities in their organizational patterns. One of the similarities reported in this between-group comparative study was that more than half of the two groups wrote in the general-to-specific pattern with the thesis and summary statements. Few studies to date, however, have compared L1 and L2 argumentative writing using a within-subject design. Although still small in number, such studies as of today have found EFL Japanese students employed deductive patterns not only in L2 but also in L1 (e.g., Hirose, 2003; Kubota, 1998b).

Given an impetus from Connor (2005), this study examined the relationship between L1 and L2 argumentative writing quantitatively. Connor (2005) criticized a previous study about the relationship between L1 and L2 organizational patterns (Hirose, 2003) as being flawed because the number of participants (15) was too small and they wrote on the same prompt in L1 and L2, without counterbalancing the order (see Hirose, 2006, for the justification for small-scale research). As a follow-up to Hirose (2003), the present study made within-subject comparisons of L1 (Japanese) and L2 (English) organizational patterns in relation to organization and total composition scores.

The results of the previous study revealed that (a) a majority of Japanese EFL students employed deductive patterns in both L1 and L2, though to a lesser degree in L1; (b) the inductive style was employed more in L1 by 20% of the participants; (c) despite similarities between L1 and L2 organizational patterns, L2 organization scores had no significantly positive correlations with L1 organization scores; and (d) L2 composition total scores were not correlated with L1 total scores either. These findings are contradictory to those of previous research. First and foremost, the finding that most participants resorted to deductive styles for both L1 and L2 did not concur

with findings of earlier research reviewed above such as Kobayashi (1984). On the other hand, it did concur with the findings of Kubota (1998b), who examined Japanese university students' L1 and L2 expository and persuasive writing. However, Kubota (1998b) found L1 and L2 organization scores correlated positively in both types of texts, thus contradicting my non-significant correlations in Hirose (2003). Thus, Kubota (1998b) and Hirose (2003) presented similar findings concerning similarity in the organization of Japanese EFL students' L1 and L2 argumentative texts, but they also provided conflicting findings about relations of L1 total and organization scores with L2 scores, respectively. Like Hirose (2003), Kubota (1998b) was also an empirical study with a small number of participants (22 for expository writing and 24 for persuasive writing). These issues remain unresolved for much larger scale research. While small-scale research is informative in its own light, the results of such studies should be confirmed by much larger scale quantitative research. It is also important to confirm them with different topics or with different groups of students, especially those with little background in L2 writing instruction/experiences in order to examine the influence of L1 writing instruction/experiences, namely L1 to L2 transfer.

Additionally, a follow-up small-scale study using recall protocol analysis as well as the same methods of text analysis (Hirose, 2005) controlled participants' L2 proficiency/writing levels. The study included within-subject comparisons of organizational patterns of L1 and L2 texts written by two groups of Japanese EFL students with differing L2 proficiency/writing levels. Regarding the organizational patterns, this follow-up study confirmed the findings of the previous study. Most participants employed deductive organization in L2 regardless of their L2 proficiency/writing levels. On the other hand, in L1, one-third of the "good" writers chose an inductive pattern, whereas no "weak" writers employed that pattern. Protocol analysis added that "good" writers' different organizational patterns in L1 and L2 did not necessarily derive from different planning processes, whereas the "weak" writers' similar patterns in L1 and L2 resulted from similar planning strategies in some cases, and in other cases from no attention to organization while writing in either language. The similarities found in the "weak" writers' L1/

L2 organizations and writing processes hinted at L1 writing influence on their organizational patterns in their L2 writing. These findings are comparable to those of Sasaki and Hirose (1996), who found significant differences in the "good" and "weak" writer groups' L1 and L2 writing processes based on a post-writing questionnaire survey. Unlike the "weak" writers, the "good" writers of the study were found not only to plan organization before writing, but also to pay more attention to overall organization while writing. Nevertheless, organization scores gained by the two groups were not compared in the study. Sasaki and Hirose (1996) neither investigated L1 and L2 texts from the perspective of organization nor examined organizational patterns of L1 and L2 texts. Thus, the present study examined the data to see whether differences found in organizational planning and attention on organization actually led to different organizational patterns in their writing.

The Present Study

The present study is a confirmatory study, and it thus replicates the previous study to confirm its results with a larger sample population.[1] This study addressed the following three research questions:

1. What are Japanese students' preferred organizational patterns in L1 and L2 argumentative writing?
2. Are there differences in organizational patterns between L1 and L2 argumentative writing by the same EFL Japanese students?
3. Is there any relation between students' writing abilities and their choice of organizational patterns in L1 and L2 writing, respectively?

Method

Participants

A total of 70 Japanese university freshmen (26 males and 44 females) majoring in British and American Studies participated in the present study. Their ages ranged from 18 to 21 years, with an average age of 18.3 years. They had studied English for an average of 6.5 years, mainly through junior

and senior high school education in Japan. Their English proficiency levels varied from low- to high-intermediate with the majority belonging to the intermediate level (TOEFL total mean=445.7; TOEFL total range=360–573). At N=70, the number of participants was much larger than that of the previous study (Hirose, 2003).

Furthermore, the present participants were different from those of the previous study in several significant ways. First, they were all first-year university students, whereas those of the previous study were third- and fourth-year students majoring in the same subjects. The present participants' L2 proficiency was lower than that of the previous study (CELT total mean for the former was 167.9 as opposed to 205.4 for the latter). Furthermore, the present participants had received little L2 writing instruction when they wrote L2 compositions, and were thus considered more appropriate to examine the effects of their L1 writing instruction and experiences on their L2 writing. In such cases, it can be assumed that L1 writing instruction and experiences predominantly influence how they organize their L2 texts. In contrast, the participants in the previous study had taken at least one yearlong English writing course at university, and their previous L2 writing instruction and experiences could have influenced their choice of organizational patterns; in other words, these factors could have contributed to the employment of the deductive style.

Data

(1) L1 and L2 Opinion Texts

The L1 and L2 opinion texts collected for Sasaki and Hirose (1996) were examined in light of organization. In both L1 and L2, the participants wrote an argumentative text taking one of two given positions and supporting it.[2] The task of taking one position and arguing for the position may be considered "problematic for L2 writers from more interdependently oriented cultural backgrounds" (Ramanathan & Atkinson, 1999, p. 61) such as Japanese. Although it was considered least likely that any of the participants had engaged in writing opinion letters to a newspaper editor, a letter writing task was chosen because it provided them probable context for argumentative

writing.

The following prompt was given in L1 for the L2 task:

There has been a heated discussion about the issue of "married women and their careers" in the readers' column in a newspaper. Some people think that women should continue to work even after they get married, whereas others believe they should stay at home and take care of their family after marriage. Now the editor of the newspaper is calling for the readers' opinions. Suppose you are writing for the readers' opinion column. Take one of the positions described above, and write your opinion.

The same prompt was used for both L1 and L2 writing, except for changing "a newspaper" to "an English newspaper" for L2 writing. The same topic was chosen for L1 and L2 writing, because different topics might have affected the choice of organizational patterns (Hirose, 2006) as well as writing quality (see Hamp-Lyons, 1990, for the effects of topic variables). A topic on women's roles was selected because a similar topic had been used in a number of other previous studies (e.g., Cumming, 1989; Jones & Tetroe, 1987), and also because a similar topic ("Should women stay home?") was the most popular among a similar group of Japanese university freshmen who had discussed 10 different topics in English (Hirose & Kobayashi, 1991).

The type of opinion-stating tasks employed for the present study was exactly the same as that used for the previous study (Hirose, 2003) except for the topics. The given topic "married women and their careers" was different from that employed in the previous study, i.e., "school uniforms." However, both "married women and their careers" and "school uniforms" topics are considered relatively safe in that they are easier for stating one's position than currently controversial political topics such as the Japanese Prime Minister's visits to Yasukuni Shrine, for example (Hirose, 2006).

(2) Data Collection

In order to avoid a possible order effect, L1 and L2 tasks were counterbalanced. Forty-eight participants from two classes first wrote in L2,

and then in L1, after a one-week delay, and the remaining 22 from one class wrote in the opposite order (L1→L2). For both tasks, the participants were not informed beforehand that they would be writing in class, nor were they informed beforehand about the topic. These arrangements were made in order to prevent the participants from attempting to remember what they wrote in the first time and to write similarly in the second time. They were given 30 minutes to complete each task and were not allowed to use a dictionary.[3]

Data Analysis

(1) Evaluation of L1/L2 Texts

Different rating scales were used to assess students' L1 and L2 texts because readers' expectations may be different in evaluating L1 Japanese and L2 English texts. The L2 texts were scored by two English writing specialists. Following Jacobs, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel and Hughey's (1981) ESL Composition Profile, ratings were assigned for the five differently weighted criteria: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics (see Table 1). According to Hamp-Lyons (1990), this Profile is "the best-known scoring procedure for ESL writing at the present time" (p. 78). Each participant's score was the sum of the two raters' scores, with a possible range of 68 to 200 points, and it was the same in Sasaki and Hirose (1996). On the other hand, the L1 texts were rated by three Japanese L1 education specialists, although they were rated by two in the 1996 study. Using the L1 rating scale specifically developed for this type of L1 Japanese compositions (Sasaki & Hirose, 1999), six criteria were employed, each receiving 30 points, clarity of the theme, appeal to the readers, expression, organization, knowledge of language forms, and social awareness (see Table 2).[4] Each participant's L1 composition score was the sum of the three raters' scores, with a possible range of 18 to 180 points. Thus, the participants' L1 scores were different from those of the 1996 study, and the results involving L1 scores in the present study are different from those in the previous study.

Both L1 and L2 writing scales had the organization criterion, although the full scores were different—30 points in L1 vs. 40 points in L2. The total full scores were also different—180 points in L1 vs. 200 points in L2. The total

scores were considered to reflect overall text quality, and the organization scores reflected that of organization. The L1/L2 total and organization scores were used for further analysis.

(2) Analysis of L1/L2 Organizations

In order to examine English and Japanese organizational patterns, the present study applied the three types of analysis originally employed by Kubota (1992): (a) the location of main idea(s), (b) the macro-level rhetorical pattern, and (c) presence or absence of a position/summary statement (see Kubota, 1992, for a complete list of categories).

In this study, a writer's position statement either for or against "married women and their careers" was considered as a main idea. First, the location of the position-stating sentence was identified as one of the following four: (a) *Initial* (stated in the introduction), (b) *Middle* (in the middle section), (c) *Final* (in the conclusion), or (d) *Obscure* (not clearly stated). When a writer simply expressed his/her personal wish or plans for the future by writing, "I want to have a job," or "I would like my wife to stay home," it was not regarded as a position statement nor a main idea for the given topic. For this case, *Obscure* was assigned. There were no cases of more than one position taken in the same text.

Furthermore, the macro-level rhetorical pattern was identified for each text as one of the following three major patterns: (a) *Explanation* (the writer's position statement precedes a supporting reason), (b) *Specification* (the writer's position statement and a preview statement of a supporting reason are followed by the reason), or (c) *Induction* (a supporting reason precedes the writer's position statement) (see Appendix A for subsumed patterns under the three major patterns). *Explanation* and *Specification* were considered instances of a deductive pattern, whereas *Induction* was regarded as an inductive pattern. When none of the patterns was identified for text, *Other* was assigned.

Third, the presence or absence of a position/summary statement at the end of the composition was coded as one of the following three: (a) + (the writer's position on the topic is re-presented or what was discussed in the

text is summarized), (b) − (neither position nor summary is presented), or (c) **0** (the writer's only statement of position is located at the end of the composition).

The L1 and L2 texts written by each participant were analyzed in terms of the three points mentioned above. An experienced Japanese EFL instructor who was engaged in this analysis in previous research (Hirose, 2003) and I did the coding. Besides evaluating L2 compositions, both coders also have experience evaluating Japanese university students' L1 writings such as reports and term papers. There was 89.2% agreement for the location of the opinion-statement sentence, 71.4% for the macro-level rhetorical pattern, and 90.7% for the summary statement. In the case of discrepancies, we arrived at an agreement on each of them after discussion.

(3) Comparisons of "Good" and "Weak" Writers' L1/L2 Organizations

In addition to comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns of 70 participants' texts, the "good" and "weak" writers' organizational patterns in L1 and L2 were compared, respectively, between the two groups to see whether there was any relation between their writing levels and organizational choices. As in the previous study (Sasaki & Hirose, 1996), the selection of the two writer groups was made based on their L2 composition scores. The "good" writers (n=20) had L2 composition total scores more than 0.5 standard deviations above the mean, whereas the "weak" writers (n=23) were 0.5 standard deviations or more below the means. Then, the "good" and "weak" writers' L1 and L2 organization and total scores were compared, respectively. The sample size was large enough to use statistical procedures (t-test and chi-square analysis) to test the differences between the two groups.

Results and Discussion

L1/L2 Total and Organization Scores

(1) Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

Tables 1 and 2 present descriptive statistics for the L2 and L1 composition scores, respectively. The interrater reliability for the L1 and L2 subscores and total scores was acceptable for all except L2 mechanics. This low estimate is not considered because the L2 mechanics scores were not used in further analysis. The interrater reliability for the L1 and L2 total scores was

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics and Reliability of L2 Composition Scores

Measure (total possible)	M	SD	Range	Reliability Estimates*
Content (60)	41.87	5.69	30–55	0.73
Organization (40)	26.53	4.28	18–36	0.75
Vocabulary (40)	25.71	4.07	17–35	0.75
Language use (50)	28.96	5.86	18–44	0.77
Mechanics (10)	7.83	1.17	5–10	0.49
Total (200)	130.94	19.10	91–179	0.88

* Reliability estimates for the L2 composition scores are interrater reliability estimates based on Pearson correlation coefficients.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics and Reliability of L1 Composition Scores

Measure (total possible)	M	SD	Range	Reliability Estimates*
Clarity of the theme (30)	19.26	5.06	6–27	0.79
Appeal to the readers (30)	17.20	5.37	7–26	0.84
Expression (30)	18.26	4.33	7–26	0.78
Organization (30)	16.41	5.28	7–28	0.79
Knowledge of language forms (30)	22.50	4.04	11–29	0.74
Social awareness (30)	18.70	4.82	8–26	0.77
Total (180)	112.17	24.00	52–162	0.88

* Reliability estimates for L1 composition scores are interrater reliability estimates based on Cronbach's alpha.

acceptably high, and so was the reliability for L1 and L2 organization scores. Table 3 shows descriptive statistics for L1 and L2 total and organization scores per group.

Table 3: Means and *SD*s of "Good" and "Weak" Group Scores

Measure	L1		L2	
	Good[a]	Weak[b]	Good	Weak
Organization	19.95	14.09	31.55	22.22
	(5.46)	(4.58)	(2.70)	(2.07)
Total	102.39	124.65	154.25	110.78
	(19.85)	(25.02)	(11.33)	(8.51)

[a]n=20. [b]n=23.
L1 total full score: 180. L1 organization full score: 30.
L2 total full score: 200. L2 organization full score: 40.

The t-tests were conducted to check for statistically significant differences between the two groups in terms of L1/L2 total and organization scores. The results of the t-tests revealed that the "good" writers obtained significantly better scores in both total and organization scores of L1 and L2 compositions than did the "weak" writers (L1 total: t=-3.20; L1 organization: t=-3.78; L2 total: t=-14.34; L2 organization: t=-12.57; df=41, p<.01).[5] Thus, differences found in the writing processes of the two groups were actually reflected in their end products (organizations). In other words, the "good" writers' planning organization before writing and paying attention to overall organization while writing was consistent with their significantly better organizations and texts. The two groups also wrote L1/L2 texts of significantly different lengths. The "good" writers produced significantly lengthier texts than the "weak" writers. The "good" writers' mean total number of Japanese characters was 521.50, whereas the "weak" writers' mean was 393.04 (t=-3.18, p<.01). Similarly, the former group's mean total number of English words was 166.85, whereas the latter group's mean was 84.35 (t=-7.55, p<.01).

(2) Correlations among L1/L2 Total and Organization Scores

Pearson correlations among total and subscores including organization scores were measured. The results revealed that all the subscores of L2

composition had significant positive correlations with the L2 total score. Similarly, all subscores of L1 composition had significant correlations with the L1 total score. Furthermore, L2 subscores were significantly correlated with each other, and so were L1 subscores. Table 4 shows that the L2 total scores had a highly positive significant correlation with L1 total scores, almost reaching $r=1.0$. In addition, L2 organization scores were significantly, although weakly, correlated with L1 organization scores. These findings run counter to no significant correlations between L1/L2 total and L1/L2 organization scores in the previous study (Hirose, 2003). On the other hand, the findings that there were significant correlations between L1 and L2 total and organization scores are consistent with those of previous studies such as Kubota (1998b).

Table 4: Correlation Matrix for L1/L2 Composition Total and Organization Scores

	L2 Total	L2 Organization	L1 Total	L1 Organization
L2 Total	1.00			
L2 Organization	0.92**	1.00		
L1 Total	0.997**	0.25*	1.00	
L1 Organization	0.86**	0.33*	0.86**	1.00

$df=68$. *$p<.05$. **$p<.01$.

Comparisons of L1 and L2 Organizations

(1) Location of Main Idea

Table 5 presents the results of the two coders' analysis of the organizational patterns of participants' L1 and L2 texts. Regarding the location of the main idea, the majority of the participants stated their positions about the given topic initially regardless of language. Thus, Japanese students' tendency to put their position initially in opinion texts was confirmed. Furthermore, the stronger tendency for final positioning in L1 than in L2 was, although marginally, confirmed. It has been argued that in opinion-stating essays, Japanese writers, whether student or professional, hesitate to take a position, tending instead to postpone their main points until later in their writings (see Oi, 1986, for student writings). Based on her analysis of 38 opinion columns

written by reporters and writers from the national newspaper *Asahi Shimbun*, Maynard (1996) suggests that Japanese is "bottom-heavy" in the sense of sentence, paragraph, and the whole text. Such a tendency to postpone one's main point was not found with the present participants.

It is equally worthy of attention that the second largest rated locations in both L1 and L2 were *Obscure*. *Obscure* cases constituted more than 20% both in L1 and L2, whereas the previous study (Hirose, 2003) reported no *Obscure* cases. The finding that one in five participants did not state their positions clearly deserves discussion. The *Obscure* locations consisted of the following. First, writers did not express their positions for the given topic: "Should married women stay home or not?". Instead, they made general statements such as "I think it's important for women to work" (my translation) and "This issue is a really interesting and at the same time a very difficult one" (my translation). Related to the first, some expressed their personal wish or dream regarding the topic. Such examples were "I really hope both opinions are right," and "I would want my wife to stay home" (my translation). Some refused to take their positions with such statements as "I don't agree to both opinion" and "I can't support either position" (my translation). Lastly, the positions were not stated or expressed explicitly. Only statements such as "I agree with the former opinion" (my translation) were not comprehensible without reference to the prompt text. Reading the texts alone did not help readers to understand the writers' positions. These *Obscure* cases showed such writers had problems expressing their positions clearly.

Table 5: Location of Main Ideas in L1/L2 Compositions

	L1	L2
Initial	45 (64.3%)	48 (68.6%)
Middle	3 (4.3%)	3 (4.3%)
Final	7 (10.0%)	4 (5.7%)
Obscure	15 (21.4%)	15 (21.4%)

N=70.

Further within-subject analysis was made to see whether the same writer placed the main idea similarly in L1 and L2 or not. The results showed that

(a) 47.1% of the participants (33/70) placed their main ideas initially in both L1 and L2, (b) 18.6% (13/70) placed their positions differently in L1 and L2, (c) 8.6% (6/70) did not clearly state their main ideas in both, and (d) the remaining 25.7% (18/70) did not clearly state the main idea either in L1 or in L2. Thus, more than half of the participants (55.7%) either placed their main ideas similarly or did not place them at all in both L1 and L2.

(2) Macro-Level Organizational Pattern

As Table 6 shows, the participants favored *Explanation* most regardless of language, that is, they stated a supporting reason after presenting their positions (see Appendix B for sample compositions).[6] On the other hand, the previous study (Hirose, 2003) found *Explanation (Collection)*, in which more than one supporting reason is enumerated after the position statement (see Appendix C for sample compositions), was most frequently used: 60% and 80% of them used *Explanation (Collection)* in L1 and L2, respectively. The much greater reliance on *Explanation* in the present study suggests that many participants did not enumerate and explain reasons clearly.

Next to *Explanation, Other* was the second most frequently used in L1 and most frequently used in L2. In fact, one third and about half of them did not organize their L1 and L2 texts in any given pattern, respectively (see the percentages of *Other* in Table 6). The previous study (Hirose, 2003) reported no *Other* cases. The high percentages of *Other* in both L1 and L2 in the present study manifest that participants of the present study had difficulty organizing texts. Texts rated as *Other* patterns lacked both clear position statements and supporting reasons, or either of them. The latter involved such cases as *Obscure* main ideas and positions, which, if stated at all, were not clearly supported by reasons. Although the dominant location of main ideas was *Initial*, the frequent employment of *Other* gives evidence that those who stated their positions did not necessarily provide a reason fully sufficient for readers to conceive to support the position.

It is also notable that *Induction* was employed by only a few participants in the present study, although its higher ratio in L1 (than in L2) accords with that in the previous study. Much fewer participants used *Specification* in L1

Table 6: Macro-Level Patterns in L1/L2 Compositions

	L1		L2	
Explanation	29 (41.4%)		25 (35.7%)	
Explanation (Collection)	6 (8.6%)	40 (57.1%)	5 (7.1%)	34 (48.6%)
Explanation (Comparison)	5 (7.1%)		4 (5.7%)	
Specification	1 (1.4%)	2 (2.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Specification (Comparison)	1 (1.4%)		0 (0%)	
Induction	5 (7.1%)	6 (8.6%)	2 (2.9%)	2 (2.9%)
Comparison→Induction	1 (1.4%)		0 (0%)	
Other		22 (31.4%)		34 (48.6%)

N=70.

and none chose it in L2. Similarly, no participants employed *Specification* in the previous study.

With the larger categories *Explanation* and *Specification* being regarded as deductive patterns, 60% of the participants organized their texts deductively in L1, whereas 48.6% did so in L2. The pattern was reversed in the previous study; that is, 80% organized their texts deductively in L1, and 100% did so in L2. As shown in Table 6, 48.6% of the present participants resorted to *Other* patterns in L2. The high percentages of *Other* patterns were characteristic of the present study's participants.

Within-subject comparisons were made to see whether each participant employed the same macro-level pattern in L1 and L2 or not. By incorporating the minor categories into the larger ones, the major categories, *Explanation*, *Specification*, *Induction*, and *Other*, were used for this analysis. The results showed that (a) 35.7% of the participants (25/70) used *Explanation* in L1 and L2; (b) 22.8% (16/70) used *Other* in L1 and L2; and (c) the remaining 41.4% (29/70) employed a different pattern in L1 and L2. Because the previous study reported that 53.3% used *Explanation (Collection)* for both L1 and L2, the present participants produced more varied L1 and L2 texts due to the employment of *Other*.

(3) Presence or Absence of Position/Summary Statement

Table 7 shows the results of presence/absence of position or summary

Table 7: Position/Summary Statements in L1/L2 Compositions

		L1	L2
+	writer's position re-presented or discussion summarized	35 (50.0%)	22 (31.4%)
—	neither position nor summary is presented	28 (40.0%)	45 (64.3%)
0	writer's only position statement is presented	7 (10.0%)	3 (4.3%)

N=70.

statements in the final section. It reveals there were no noticeable differences between L1 and L2 except one. More participants wrote position or summary statements in the final section in L1 than in L2. Thus, the "bottom-heavy" tendency in L1 was confirmed. These results concur with those of the previous small-scale study (Hirose, 2003).

Further within-subject comparisons showed that about half of the participants either placed or did not place the position/summary statements exactly the same in both L1 and L2. More specifically, 20% (14/70) placed them in both L1 and L2, and 31.4% (22/70) did not place them in both. The remaining 48.6% (34/70) did so differently in L1 and L2.

(4) Overall Organizational Pattern

Adopting the three-part method helped to make possible in-depth analysis of organizational patterns a single method would have missed. In summary, the combined results of the three-part analysis showed that 27.1% of them (19/70) composed their L1/L2 texts in exactly the same ways in terms of the location of main idea, rhetorical pattern, and position/summary statement. Because the previous study reported 40% did the same, the percentage of those who organized L1/L2 texts in exactly the same decreased in the present study. Nevertheless, the above within-subject analysis revealed that more than 50% organized their L1 and L2 texts similarly in terms of the location of main idea, rhetorical pattern, and position/summary statement, respectively. There was not much difference found in overall organizational patterns between L1 and L2 texts. The participants showed their preference for the initial positioning of their main idea, deductive patterns, and, to a much lesser

extent, the presence of a position/summary statement (see Appendix B for such compositions).

The similarity of organizational patterns between L1 and L2 in the present study can be explained by the transfer from L1 to L2 because the participants had received little L2 instruction, although we cannot dismiss their L2 reading experience or instruction. In cases of the participants of the previous study (Hirose, 2003), who had received some L2 writing instruction, their tendency to position the main points initially in L2 could have been partly attributed to their previous L2 writing instruction/experiences rather than L1 transfer. The differences between the present and previous studies such as occurrences of an *Obscure* main idea and *Other* patterns could be due to the two participant groups' different L1/L2 writing levels. For example, the present study's participants' L1 composition total scores ranged from 52 to 162 (M=112.17, SD=24.00: recall Table 2), whereas those of the previous study ranged from 107 to 157 (M=126.27, SD=13.54). The range of L1 total scores was much wider in the present study, and the study's participants included writers of lower levels than those of the previous study.

The similarities between L1 and L2 organizational patterns may be derived from the opinion letter task itself. The prompt used for the present study included "Take one of the positions described above, and write your opinion." The explicit task of taking a position may have pushed the participants to state their positions at the outset of their writing, which most likely additionally influenced their choice of organizational patterns. Oi (1984), who reported somewhat different results about opinion texts, used the question prompt "Do you think TV commercials should be banned totally?". Differences in the writing prompts might have partly explained differences in the results of the two studies. A more open-ended prompt such as "What do you think about married women having careers?" might have elicited more varied organizational patterns.

It is also likely that the topic of the opinion letter used in the present study may have affected the students' choice of the organization. The topic "married women and their careers" was not considered risky to state one's view. The deductive presentation of the writer's position may not work when

the topic is controversial or the audience is not expected to agree (Campbell & Huxman, 2003). According to this view, the writer is unlikely to employ a deductive pattern especially when the reader has greater power/status than the writer and the writer anticipates the reader's discontentment with his/her position (see Kirkpatrick, 1995). Furthermore, timed conditions could have facilitated their use of the deductive style because "inductive presentation takes more time or space for development" (Campbell & Huxman 2003, p. 146). In other words, much less use of the inductive pattern in the present study might have been related to the timed conditions. Kubota (1998b), whose participants wrote texts without any time constraints, found more inductive patterns.

The results suggest that it is natural that Japanese students organize their opinion texts deductively in such contexts as given in the present study in both L1 and L2. In the next section, comparisons of L1 and L2 texts are made between the "good" and "weak" writers to examine whether there were differences in L1 and L2 organizational patterns according to their writing abilities.

Comparisons of L1/L2 Organizational Patterns between the "Good" and "Weak" Writers

(1) Location of Main Idea

In order to test for the significance between the two groups, chi-square analysis was conducted for the location of the main idea, the macro-level organizational pattern and presence of a summary statement. The results showed no statistical difference between the "good" and "weak" writers in the location of the main idea. Thus, the two groups did not differ significantly in their location of the main idea in L1 and L2.

As Table 8 shows, the majority of each group placed their main ideas initially in both L1 and L2. On the other hand, there was one, although not significant, difference between the two groups. In L2, 30.4% of the "weak" writers did not explicitly state the position statement for the given topic, whereas 10% of the "good" writers did not do so. Thus, the "weak" writers were less likely to state their positions clearly in L2 than were the "good"

writers. This might have been partly derived from their limited L2 proficiency levels, which hindered them from expressing their positions understandable to the readers.

Table 8: Location of Main Ideas in L1/L2 Compositions per Group

	L1		L2	
	Good[a]	Weak[b]	Good	Weak
Initial	13 (65%)	16 (69.6%)	15 (75%)	15 (65.2%)
Middle	1 (5%)	1 (4.3%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)
Final	3 (15%)	2 (8.7%)	1 (5%)	1 (4.3%)
Obscure	3 (15%)	4 (17.3%)	2 (10%)	7 (30.4%)

[a]$n=20$. [b]$n=23$.

(2) Macro-Level Organizational Pattern

Table 9 shows macro-level patterns in L1/L2 texts of "good" and "weak" groups, respectively. The two groups differed significantly with regard to macro-level pattern in L2: $X^2=10.3$, $p<.05$. The "good" writers (55% of them in L1 and 40% of them in L2) chose the *Explanation* pattern. About half of the "weak" writers also chose the *Explanation* pattern in L1. However, in L2, the majority of the "weak" writers (69.6%) did not organize their texts either inductively or deductively, thus rated as *Other*. Some of them wrote too little to have any distinguishable pattern (see Appendix D for such examples). The higher percentage of *Other* patterns in L2 gave evidence to the "weak" writers' greater difficulty in organizing L2 texts.

There was another, although not statistically significant, difference

Table 9: Macro-Level Patterns in L1/L2 Compositions per Group

	L1		L2	
	Good[a]	Weak[b]	Good	Weak
Explanation	11 (55%)	12 (52.2%)	8 (40%)	5 (21.7%)
Explanation (Collection)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)
Explanation (Comparison)	0 (0%)	2 (8.7%)	3 (15%)	1 (4.3%)
Induction	3 (15%)	2 (8.7%)	1 (5%)	1 (4.3%)
Other	3 (15%)	7 (30.4%)	5 (25%)	16 (69.6%)

[a]$n=20$. [b]$n=23$.

between the two groups. As displayed in Table 9, *Explanation (Collection)* was only used by some "good" writers (see Appendix C for such examples). The use of *Explanation (Collection)*, despite its small number of occurrence, was associated with the "good" writers in this study. In the previous study, however, "more than half of the participants (8) used *Explanation (Collection)* for both L1 and L2" (Hirose 2003, p. 197).

(3) Presence or Absence of Position/Summary Statement

Table 10 reports the results regarding presence or absence of position/ summary statements in the final section per group. Both groups exhibited similar tendencies of restating positions or summarizing discussion in L1, and of less doing so in L2. Chi-square analysis did not find significant difference between the two groups regarding presence of position/summary statement in both L1 and L2. However, there was a non-significant difference depending on the group: i.e., the "good" writers' tendency to write position/summary statement in L2 was stronger than the "weak" writers. In L2, the majority of the "weak" writers (82.6%) did not write position/summary statements, whereas about half of the "good" writers (45%) wrote them.

Table 10: Position/Summary Statements in L1/L2 Compositions
per Group

	L1		L2	
	Good[a]	Weak[b]	Good	Weak
+	10 (50%)	12 (52.2%)	8 (40%)	3 (13%)
−	7 (35%)	9 (39.1%)	11 (55%)	19 (82.6%)
0	3 (15%)	2 (8.7%)	1 (5%)	1 (4.3%)

[a]n=20. [b]n=23.
+ : A position/summary statement is present.
− : A position/summary statement is absent.
0 : The main idea is placed at the final position.

In summary, there were no significant differences between the two groups except for macro-level pattern in L2 texts. The previous small-scale comparative study (Hirose, 2005) found differences in L1 and similarities in L2 organizations between the two groups. However, one "weak" writer in

the 2005 study in fact resorted to an *Obscure* main idea, *Other* pattern, and no summary in L2. In terms of L1 and L2 writing abilities, the "good" and "weak" writers in the present study roughly corresponded to those groups of Hirose (2005), respectively.

Deductive patterns were used by both "weak" and "good" writers in L1 and L2. Thus, there seemed to be no relation between any specific organizational patterns and writers' writing abilities. This finding is worthy of attention in light of the significant differences in L1/L2 organization and total scores between the two groups.

However, the between-group comparisons showed that there were differences in L2 texts. In L2, the "weak" writers were more likely to write an *Obscure* main idea, to employ an *Other* pattern, and to have no position/ summary statement in the end (see Appendix E for such compositions written by a "weak" writer). These three characteristics seemed to be related more to the "weak" writers' L2 organizational patterns. The texts written by those "weak" writers did not have a clear position statement nor have an organizational pattern. Further analysis to examine the combination of an *Obscure* main idea, an *Other* pattern, and no summary in the end showed that 30.4% of the "weak" writers combined these three in L2, and 8.7% of them did so in L1. The L1 and L2 texts in Appendix E written by a "weak" writer exemplify this combination. On the other hand, 10% of the "good" writers used this in L2 and 15% did so in L1. The texts with these characteristics implied the writers had problems writing the positions clearly and organizing the texts.

Conclusion

As a follow-up to the comparative study on Japanese EFL students' L1 and L2 writing (Hirose, 2003), the present study attempted to investigate the complexity of the relationship between L1 and L2 writing from the perspective of organization. The results of the present study confirmed some of the findings of the previous study but disconfirmed others. The present study found students who had had little experience in argumentative writing

showed their preference for deductive patterns in both L1 and L2 regardless of their writing levels, whereas they scarcely employed the inductive patterns. Thus, Japanese students' tendency to use deductive patterns was confirmed. Although only "good" writers chose the *Explanation (Collection)* pattern and the "weak" writers tended to write an *Obscure* main idea, choose an *Other* pattern, and not to write a summary statement, there was no significant relation between students' writing levels and their choice of organizational patterns. Thus, the texts with the same organizational patterns, such as *Initial* position of main idea + *Explanation* pattern + presence of summary statement, received different evaluations in organization and overall quality. The present study did not include analysis of argumentation, which may shed new light on factors that differentiated "good" writers' texts from those of "weak" writers. Stapleton (2001), for example, attempted to assess critical thinking ability reflected in Japanese EFL university students' L2 argumentative writing in terms of "(a) number of arguments, (b) extent of evidence, (c) recognition of opposing arguments and (d) corresponding refutations, and (e) number of fallacies" (p. 515). Future research would profit from such argument analysis in addition to organization analysis.

The present study also disconfirmed the other findings of the previous study (Hirose, 2003). L2 total composition scores were highly correlated with L1 total scores; similarly, L2 organization scores had significantly positive correlations with L1 organization scores. Such discrepancies between the two studies can be explained by differences in the participants' levels and ranges of L2 proficiency and L1 and L2 writing abilities. The previous study had a more homogeneous, higher participant group in terms of these points. The discrepancies remain unsolved for further studies. More research must be conducted to attest to the generality of these findings. Future research should address the relationship between L1 and L2 writing abilities, more specifically between L1 and L2 organizational abilities.

Finally, it was noticeable that quite a few of the participants had problems in organizing argumentative texts not only in L2 but also in L1. This derived partly from their lack of experience in such writing and also from lack of argumentative writing instruction even in L1. From pedagogical perspectives,

further research is necessary to examine the effects of L1 argumentative writing instruction on student L2 argumentative writing, and vice versa. Providing L2 argumentative writing instruction, for example, may help students to improve their L1 organizational abilities too. Such studies will be helpful to determine whether L1 and L2 argumentative writing instruction have bi-directional effects or not.

Notes

*   This is a revised version of a paper presented at the 4th Asia TEFL International Conference on August 18, 2006. I am indebted to Tanja T. Yoder, who gave editorial suggestions on earlier versions of this paper. I would also like to express my gratitude to Emiko Sugiura, who coded the data. The research reported in this paper was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (2) (No. 15500169) from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

1   Unlike the present study, the previous study (Hirose, 2003) examined student perceptions of L1 and L2 organization by incorporating their own analysis and follow-up interviews.

2   Although the term *expository* writing was used for the task (Sasaki & Hirose, 1996), *argumentative* writing was used in the present paper. The tasks required the students to take a position and support it. Kubota (1998b) called a similar task *persuasive* writing. A letter-writing task to the newspaper especially to state and support one's opinion was considered *argumentative* writing.

3   It was expected that not all students had their English-Japanese or Japanese-English dictionaries with them. Anticipating probable effects of dictionary usage on some participants' English writing, it was deemed necessary to provide all participants with the same writing conditions (i.e., no dictionary use).

4   The L1 Japanese evaluation scale used for the present study (Sasaki & Hirose, 1999) had six equally weighted criteria, whereas the scale used for the previous study (Sasaki & Hirose, 1996) had the same six criteria that were differentially weighted. The 1999 version of the writing scale was not available when the 1996 study was conducted.

5   The "good" writers obtained significantly better TOEFL total scores (M=479.20) than the "weak" writers (M=420.44) . Thus, the former group had significantly higher English proficiency than the latter group. On the other hand, the two groups were similar in age and L1/L2 instructional background (see Sasaki & Hirose, 1996, for

more details).

6   In this study, reasons were not simply counted. Unless reasons were clearly enumerated and explained, the text was rated as *Explanation*, rather than as *Explanation (Collection)*.

References

Achiba, M., & Kuromiya, Y. (1983). Rhetorical patterns extant in the English compositions of Japanese students. *JALT Journal, 5*, 1–13.

Campbell, K., & Huxman, S. (2003). *The rhetorical act: Thinking, speaking, and writing critically* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Connor, U. (2005). Dialogue: Comments by Ulla Connor. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 132–136.

Cumming, A. (1989). Writing expertise and second-language proficiency. *Language Learning, 39*, 81–141.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (1990). Second language writing: Assessment issues. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 109–125). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hirose, K. (2003). Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 181–209.

Hirose, K. (2005). *Product and process in the L1 and L2 writing of Japanese students of English*. Hiroshima: Keisuisha.

Hirose, K. (2006). Pursuing the complexity of the relationship between L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 15*, 142–146.

Hirose, K., & Kobayashi, H. (1991). Cooperative small group discussion. *JALT Journal, 13*, 57–72.

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

Jones, S., & Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), *Writing in real time: Modeling production processes* (pp. 34–57). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kamimura, T., & Oi, K. (1998). Argumentative strategies in American and Japanese English. *World Englishes, 17*, 307–323.

Kane, T. S. (1983). *The Oxford guide to writing: A rhetoric and handbook for college students*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kirkpatrick, A. (1995). Chinese rhetoric: Methods of argument. *Multilingua, 14*, 271–295.

Kobayashi, H. (1984). *Rhetorical patterns in English and Japanese*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University.

Kubota, R. (1992). *Contrastive rhetoric of Japanese and English: A critical approach*.

Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Toronto.

Kubota, R. (1998a). An investigation of Japanese and English L1 essay organization: Differences and similarities. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 54*, 475–507.

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

Maynard, S. K. (1996). Presentation of one's view in Japanese newspaper columns: Commentary strategies and sequencing. *Text, 16*, 391–421.

Nitsu, N. (2001). Akademikku raitingu no kadai: Nihonjingakusei oyobi nihongo-gakushusha no ikenbun no bunshokozo no bunseki kara [Issues of rhetorical structures in Japanese argumentative position essays] *The Journal of Hokkai-Gakuen University Gakuen Ronshu*, 110, 61–77.

Oi, K. (1984). *Cross-cultural differences in rhetorical patterning: A study of Japanese and English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Oi, K. (1986). Cross-cultural differences in rhetorical patterning: A study of Japanese and English. *JACET Bulletin*, 17, 23–48.

Ramanathan, V., & Atkinson, D. (1999). Individualism, academic writing, and ESL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*, 45–75.

Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning, 46*, 137–174.

Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1999). Development of an analytic rating scale for Japanese L1 writing. *Language Testing, 16*, 457–478.

Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing critical thinking in the writing of Japanese university students: Insights about assumptions and content familiarity. *Written Communication, 18*, 506–548.

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

Appendix A: Macro-Level Organizational Patterns*

1. *Explanation*: The writer's opinion on the topic is presented and then a supporting reason is stated.

   Explanation (Collection): The writer's opinion on the topic is presented and then supporting reasons are enumerated.

   Explanation (Comparison): The writer's opinion on the topic is presented and then a supporting reason is presented by comparing or contrasting two elements.

2. *Specification*: The writer's opinion *and* a preview statement of a supporting reason or a point of view for the subsequent argument are presented, and then it is explained in more detail.

   Specification (Comparison): The writer's opinion *and* a preview statement of supporting reasons or a point of view for the subsequent arguments are presented, and then the reasons or arguments are explained in more detail by comparing/contrasting two elements.

3. *Induction*: The main idea is placed at the end and preceding arguments constitute supporting reason(s) for it.

   Comparison→Induction: After two elements are stated in a relationship of compare/ contrast, adversative or alternative, the writer's opinion is stated at the end.

4. *Other*: None of the above.

*This is not a complete list from Kubota (1992, pp. 70–71). Only those patterns rated in this study are listed here.

Appendix B: Sample L1 and L2 Compositions Rated as *Initial* Main Idea, *Explanation* Pattern, and Present Summary Statement

L1:

　既婚女性は、仕事を持たずに家庭を守るべきではないだろうか。既婚女性には、洗濯、そうじ、子育てなど様々な仕事がある。

　しかし、一方で、既婚女性も仕事をもって、社会に進出したほうがよいという人々がいる。彼らは、前にあげたような仕事、すなわち家事を、夫婦で分担して行えばよいと考えているようだ。しかし、そこに子育てという問題が残る。女性には出産そして子育てという大きな仕事がある。生まれた時から女性にかせられている仕事である。これは夫婦で分担できる仕事ではない。女性の社会進出を唱える人々は、職場での女性の出産に対する対応に考慮するだろう。しかし、その後の子育ての問題が残る。保育所を利用することもできるが、それでは子供がかわいそうではないだろうか。

　女性の社会進出がさけばれている今日ではあるが、私としては、女性は結婚後、仕事

をもたず家庭を守るべきではないだろうかと考える。

Location of the main idea: *Initial*
Macro-level pattern: *Explanation*
Summary statement: **+**

L2:
I think that women should stay home. Women have many works, for example, bearing babies, bringing up children, cooking, washing and so on. Women should do these works after marriage. If women continue to work, they can not do all these works, I think. Some people say that women should continue to work after marriage, and husbands and wives cooperate to do many homemaking works. I can understand this idea. But bearing babies and bringing up babies are able to be done by only women. And these works are the biggest works, and these works are given to women when we women were born. I think that we women have these big works that so women don't need to work outside.

Location of the main idea: *Initial*
Macro-level pattern: *Explanation*
Summary statement: **+**

Appendix C: Sample L1 and L2 Compositions by a "Good" Writer

L1:
　女性は仕事を持って働いた方がよいのか、それとも家族を守るべきなのか。女性の社会進出が目立つ現代の日本で、この問題に悩む女性は少なくないだろう。家庭環境、経済事情、個人の能力など、人によって周囲の状況によって立場も変わっているので一慨にどちらの考えをとるべきとしてしまうのは、かなり危険なことのようにも感じられるが、あえて、片方の意見をとるなら、私は「既婚女性は仕事を持って働いたほうがよい」と考える。

　主な理由は二つある。一つ目は、社会に対する影響である。たとえ体力的に女性の力が男性に劣るとしても、知能に関して、両者に大きな違いがあるとは思われない。現に私たちは、新聞や、テレビ、雑誌等で、様々な分野で、男性顔負けいやそれ以上の活躍をしている女性の存在を知っている。その上、現在のような情報化時代において、「結婚したのだから」という理由だけで、有能な女性から仕事を取り上げてしまうのは明らかに社会にとって大きな損失となる。

　二つ目の理由として、女性自身の問題がある。家の中のことだけをしているとどうしても物事に対する視野が狭くなってしまう。確かに家にいても、マス・メディアなどを通して社

会情勢を含む様々な事柄を知ることができるかもしれない。しかし、それは、映像や活字などを通して受け取る間接的な情報にすぎない。仕事を持って社会と直接に関わることで、広い視野を持つことができるのだ。

　以上の理由から、私は既婚女性は仕事も持って働いたほうが良いと考える。それは、社会に対して、良い影響を持ち、また、女性自身にとっても良いことなのである。

Total score: 162/180 (90%)

Organization score: 28/30 (93.3%)

Location of the main idea: *Initial*

Macro-level pattern: *Explanation (Collection)*

Summary statement: **+**

L2:

　I think women had better work even after their marriage. I have two reason about this.

　Before in Japan, it was a common sense that wives should stay home. If someone wanted to work, she was regarded as a stranger person. Why? Why should women stay home without working though their husbands work? Aren't women equal to men? This is my doubt and this is why I think women had better work. To be sure, women may not be equal to men physically. But, there is little difference between them about intelligence, I think. And it is the age which computer is so popular. Some of women must have ability better than men. If women are prevented from working, it can't have good effect on our society. Women should work and help our society even after marriage.

　Second reason is that women may become very narrow-minded. If women quit their job after marriage, their surroundings will be very limited. I think we should improve all our lives and have broad-view. Working society will make us notice or know more things than only staying home. But I don't mean that home can't do good us. Home, or family is very important for us, and we need them. What I want to say is that working society gives us many

Total score: 179/200 (89.5%)

Organization score: 36/40 (90%)

Location of the main idea: *Initial*

Macro-level pattern: *Explanation (Collection)*

Summary statement: **—**

Appendix D: Sample L1 and L2 Compositions by a "Weak" Writer

L1:

ぼくの考えはどちらの意見にも賛成です。女性は家庭を守るべきだし、働くべきだと思う。そして男性も家庭を守るべきだし働くべきだと思う。「家庭か仕事のどちらか 2 つを選べ！」なんてできるわけがない。こういうことは、夫婦で相談して、その家庭にあった選択をするべきだと思う。だからぼくはどちらの立場も擁護できません。

Total score: 65/180 (36.1%)
Organization score 8/30 (26.7%)

Location of the main idea: *Obscure*
Macro-level pattern: *Other*
Summary statement: **+**

L2:

I think Mrs should have a job. Mrs want to work. And she wants to buy something she wants. I don't understand the person who don't agree with me.

Total score: 96/200 (48.0%)
Organization score: 18/40 (45%)

Location of the main idea: *Initial*
Macro-level pattern: *Other*
Summary statement: **—**

Appendix E: Sample L1 and L2 Compositions Rated as *Obscure* Main Idea, *Other* Pattern, and No Summary Statement Written by a "Weak" Writer

L1:

「女は家にいて家庭を守るべきだ」というこの言葉は昔からよく聞きますが、この言葉は現在の日本社会においてはもはや死語として扱っても良い段階にきているのではないだろうか。

何故このような言葉が生まれたかを考えてみると、それでは古い日本の習慣から来ているのである。昔は「男は仕事」「女は家庭」というこの一色が当たり前であり、例え女が働いたとしても、独立して生活できる程の賃金をもらう事はできなかった。それ故にその様な言い回しが定着したと考えられる。ところが今現在はどうだろうか。ほとんどの分野において女性も活躍し、仕事を手に立派に独立して生活している女性がたくさんいる。私

も将来そんな人達の様になりたいと思っているし、彼女たちをとても尊敬しています。そして重要な事は、彼女達が、家庭や会社に支障を持つことがないように、個人、社会、国全体が支えてやらなければいけないという事です。要するに例え

Location of the main idea: *Obscure*
Macro-level pattern: *Other*
Summary statement: ―

L2:

It seems good if women preserved and helped her family with no work, but that can be consisted because her husbnd is healthy and her family is wealthy. So, if the family is poor, there would be no hope to keep comfort in family.

And another reason women should have works "if they were married, they can lead their life actively with some hopes. Because if one could feel he/she lives by himself/ herself, he/she would have more reason to live and might be ambitious for his/her future. But if women were made not to work, they

Location of the main idea: *Obscure*
Macro-level pattern: *Other*
Summary statement: ―