平成１４・１５年度科学研究費補助金（基盤研究Ｃ２）

研究成果報告書

言語間におけるライティング能力の双向性についての研究：L１からL２へ

（Transferability of Composing Competence across Languages: from L1 to L2）

（課題番号　１４５８０２９２）

研究代表者：小林ひろ江（広島大学総合科学部教授）
研究分担者：リナート・キャロル（広島市立大学国際学部教授）

２００４年１０月

平成１４・１５年度科学研究費

研究成果報

言語間におけるライティング能力の双向性についての

研究：L１からL２へ

（**Transferability of Composing Competence across**

Languages: from L1 to L2）

(課題番号１４８５８０２９２)

小林ひろ江（広島大学総合科学部教授）
リナート・キャロル（広島市立大学国際学部教授）

２００４年１０月

平成１４・１５年度科学研究費補助金（基盤研究Ｃ２）

研究成果報告書

言語間におけるライティング能...

研究：Ｌ１から...

（Transferability of Composi...

Languages: from ...

(課題番号１４８５...

小林ひろ江（広島大学総合科学部教授）
リナート・キャロル（広島市立大学国際学部教授）

２００４年１０月

はしがき

研究組織

研究代表者：小林ひろ江（広島大学総合科学部教授）
研究分担者：リナート・キャロル（広島市立大学国際学部教授）

研究発表

（１）研究論文

Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (To appear). "Composing competence: How L1 and L2 writing experience interact," M. Baynham, A. Deignan, & G. White (Eds.), *Applied Linguistics at the Interface, British Studies in Applied Linguistics*, vol. *19*. British Association for Applied Linguistics (Equinox).

（２）口頭発表

Rinnert, C. & Kobayashi, H (2003). "Composing competence: How L1 and L2 writing experience interact," Paper presented at BAAL(British Association of Applied Linguistics), September, Leeds, U.K.

Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (2004). "Interaction of L1/L2 writing experience: What effects on novice writers?" Paper presented at AAAL (American Association of Applied Linguistics), May, Portland, U.S.A

Chapter 1: Introduction

The original goal of this study was to explore the possible effects of first language (L1) training and experience on second language (L2) writing. In the course of the study, it became clear that both L1 and L2 training and experience come into play and appear to influence writing in L1 and L2. In the end, a rather complex picture of interaction between L1 and L2 writing has begun to emerge.

In this introductory chapter, the impetus for the study is first explained. Then a brief review of the relevant background literature is presented. Finally, the aims for the study, including the specific research questions, are spelled out, and the overall structure of the report is outlined.

1.1 Impetus for This Study

A previous large-scale questionnaire study of Japanese *kokugo* teachers (N=180) indicated that a significant number of Japanese high schools (85 percent of 79 sample schools chosen)[1] provided special L1 (first language) training outside of regular Japanese classes to help individual students prepare to write short essays for university entrance exams (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001, 2002). This training was given on a short-term basis consisting of 1 to 4 months of intensive, individualized instruction. According to the students interviewed in the study (N=21), the common task was to write opinion-stating essays, in which they were instructed to take a clear position, for example, for or against the author's assertion or on a social issue presented in the text, and to provide supports from such sources as personal experience, observations or factual knowledge (Kobayashi

& Rinnert, 2002, p. 102). Unlike the traditional L1 composition training which focused on the expression of personal thoughts and feelings (Watanabe, 2001), the kind of writing that students were trained to produce in such special training sessions emphasized the importance of a logical argument, which echoed the typical characteristics of English academic writing (e.g., Johns, 1991; Smalley & Hank, 1982).

The results of the previous study (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001, 2002) indicated that special preparatory high school level writing training was a potentially influential factor affecting the quality of Japanese students' L1 and L2 (second language) writing after entering university. Moreover, the interviews in the pilot study carried out prior to the present study[2] revealed that similar to the L1 special training, writing training in L2 (English) geared for university entrance exams was provided for many high school students, as well. The results of these studies led to the exploration in the present study of the possible effects of such special preparatory writing training in both L1 and L2 on the English writing of university students, particularly the first year students, and also the effects of possible interaction between the kinds of writing training provided in the two languages.

1.2 Background

To help inexperienced student writers become more like 'experts', numerous studies have sought to identify strategies that experts use in their composing process (Hayes & Flower, 1983; Hayes, Flower, Schriver, Stratman & Carey, 1987; Cumming, 1989; Sasaki, 2001, 2002). These studies found that expert writers, either in a first or a second language, employ more effective planning and revising strategies than novices. The assumption

underlying these studies is that expert and novice writers exist on a single continuum (Carter, 1990; Grabe & Kaplan, 19969), and that novice writers can approximate the performance of experts by learning the strategies of those skilled writers and applying them to their own writing.   This strictly cognitive approach may lack sufficient attention to social and cultural contexts (Roca De Larios, Murphy & Martin, 2002), but many L1 and L2 writing studies conducted from such a perspective have demonstrated the complex nature of individual composing processes.

Although defining an expert writer is difficult, from a cognitive perspective, an expert can be considered to be a writer who has "the ability to employ certain universal, context-independent revision and editing practices to guide writing" (Hayland, 2003, p. 59). Attaining such ability appears to involve a number of variables, including text knowledge, in relation to which writing experience appears to play a major role.   In fact, in writing research (Cumming, 1989; Hayes et al, 1987; Sasaki, 2002), expert writers are often referred to as "professionally experienced writers", and the effect of such professional experience on their composing processes has been investigated, in comparison with the processes of novice writers.   However, in discussing "writing experience" in relation to the concept of expert/novice writers, second language writing research entails at least two issues.   One concerns the amount of writing experience student writers have in terms of either L1 or L2 or both, and the other is related to their levels of second language proficiency.

First, the effect of L1 writing experience on L2 writing appears to be positive (Bosher, 1998; Cohen & Brooks-Carson, 2001; Cumming, 1989; Raimes, 1987; Uzawa, 1996). Cumming (1989), for example, investigated 23 French-speaking university students'

English writing using a think-aloud method, and found that their L1 writing expertise affected the quality of their written texts and composing strategies. That is, students with extensive professional L1 writing experience produced essays with effective content and discourse organization, while attending to complex aspects of writing and employing problem-solving strategies. In his study, Cumming did not find any obvious effect of second language proficiency on such writing processes. Similarly, Raimes (1987) found that there was little correlation between language proficiency and composing strategies of 8 ESL students; however, those with confidence in their L1 writing ability revised and edited most frequently. The findings of Cumming and Raimes' studies suggest that writing ability and language proficiency are independent from each other, and at the same time that L1 writing ability, which is presumably at least partially constituted of L1 writing experience, is transferable to L2 writing.

Amounts and kinds of L2 writing experience have also been found to affect the quality of writing and composing strategies. For example, students with L2 paragraph writing experience in high school were found to be better L2 writers than those without such experience (Sasaki & Hirose, 1996). Similarly, students with more experience of writing short and longer L2 texts were found to better detect and correct problems at the three discourse levels of inter-sentential, paragraph and essay than less experienced students (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001). In terms of composing strategies, Sasaki (2000; 2002) compared EFL expert versus novice writers in their L2 writing processes using stimulated recall protocols, and found that the experts made more detailed overall plans for organization and refined their texts more frequently, while the novices tended to make less detailed plans and make corrections and translations at a local level. Although these

findings suggest a positive correlation between L2 writing experience and L2 writing performance, caution should be maintained because writing experience and language proficiency are often inseparable due to a high correlation between the two factors (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001).

1.3 The Study

Previous studies have investigated the effect of either L1 or L2 writing experience on second language writing. However, hardly any studies have attempted to examine the direct effects of both L1 and L2 writing experience or possible interaction between the two. Furthermore, previous studies have tended not to pay sufficient attention to social contexts (Roca De Larios, Murphy & Martin, 2002). Since writing takes place in a situated context, the writing practice writers receive in their L1 literacy setting is likely to affect their writing behaviors.

The purpose of this study is two-fold. The first aim is to investigate the possible effects of both L1 (Japanese) and L2 (English) writing experience on L2 English writing, and the other, to explore possible interaction between L1 (Japanese) and L2 (English) writing experience. As stated earlier, we are particularly focusing on the effects of special preparatory high school level training in writing short essays in both languages for university entrance examinations. The specific research questions addressed in this paper are the following.

1.3.1 Research questions regarding Japanese writing

J1. Do discourse modes (task definition) or text structure vary in the L1 essays written by the four groups (those with preparatory training in both L1 and L2

writing, those with training in only L1, those with training in only L2, and

those with no training)?

J2. Do discourse markers and development of content vary among L1 essays by

the four groups?

J3. Does writing fluency or planning time differ among L1 writers in the four

groups?

1.3.2 Research questions regarding English writing

E1. Do discourse modes (task definition) or text structure differ in the L2 essays

by the four groups?

E2. Do discourse markers and development of content vary among L2 essays in

the four groups?

E3. Are there any differences among the four groups in the process of writing L2

essays (writing fluency, planning time or pausing behavior)?

1.3.1 Questions regarding L1 (Japanese) writing versus L2 (English) writing

C1. Are there any differences between L1 and L2 essays by the four groups in

terms of text features created?

C2. Are there any differences between L1 and L2 writing within the four groups

in terms of writing fluency or planning time?

By responding to these specific questions, we would like to address the two larger

questions, which are concerned with a positive transfer of L1 writing experience on second

language writing and also with possible effects of combined L1 and L2 writing experience.

In this report, Chapter 2 explains the methodology for the study. Next,

Chapters 3 through 5 present detailed results of the analysis of the L1 and L2 writing and

interviews.   Finally, Chapter 6 discusses the results in relation to the specific and overall

research questions and attempts to draw conclusions regarding implications of the study

and directions for future research.

Notes

1. For this study, 1000 questionnaires were sent to 200 high schools selected through

    stratified random sampling, with 5 questionnaires per school.   In all, 180

    questionnaires were returned from 79 schools located in 37 prefectures.   The samples

    represented 78.7% of all the prefectures in Japan.

2. In the summer of 2002, four first year students participated in the pilot study. The

    purpose of this study was to check to see how the participants would respond to the

    given writing tasks (Traveling and Living place) and prompts, and also to elicit

    information about the special preparatory high school writing training they received in

    the past.

Chapter 2: Method

This chapter introduces the methodology employed for this study. First, the selection of the participants is explained, and the characteristics of the four groups are described. Then the procedures for data collection and data analysis are presented.

2.1 Participants

The participants were all Japanese first-year university EFL students (N=28). Because none of them had received any university-level L2 writing instruction, they could be considered novice EFL writers. Their English proficiency was held constant at an intermediate level, as shown in Table 1. The participants were selected to form four groups: (1) Group 1, those with intensive experience writing essays in both L1 and L2 (N = 9); (2) Group 2, those with experience writing in only L1 (N = 7); (3) Group 3, those with experience in only L2 (N = 7); and (4) Group 4, those with no experience in either language (N = 5).[1] Although the groups differed in terms of whether they had experienced intensive writing training in one or both languages, it should be noted that all the students had received some L1 writing instruction and experience in elementary, junior and senior high school *kokugo* classes.

Table 1: Characteristics of Participant Groups

	Number	Preparatory Training	English Mean Score* (SD)
Group 1	9	L1 & L2	470.44 (18.74)
Group 2	7	L1 only	447.71 (37.62)
Group 3	7	L2 only	462.71 (23.76)
Group 4	5	Little or none	461.20 (5.26)

*TOEFL Equivalent;[2] no significant difference among groups

The participants were recruited through a multi-stage process. First, a preliminary questionnaire (Appendix P) was administered in regular first year English classes. Based on the responses, potential candidates for each of the four groups were selected for further interviews. The main criterion for selection was the number of essays they had written during their intensive training: ideally 8-10 or more for those with training and none for those without training. During the preliminary interviews, responses were confirmed, more information about the participant's attitudes toward writing in Japanese and English were elicited, and the logistics of the research procedure were explained. Those who still fit the criteria and agreed to participate became members of the groups. In those cases where more than the target number of participants fit the criteria (mainly Group 1), the interviewees were randomly selected, and interviews were continued until the quota was filled. In a few cases it was necessary to include those who had written slightly fewer (7-9) papers among those with intensive training, or only 1 or 2 instead of no papers among those without training.

Between October, 2002 and January, 2003, a total of 19 participants (8 in Group 1, 4 in Groups 2 and 3, and 3 in Group 4) completed all the tasks in the study. The following year, between October, 2003 and January, 2004, an additional 11 students (1 in Group1, 3 in Groups 2 and 3, and 2 in Group 4) completed their participation. All participants were compensated for their time.

2.2 Data Collection

All participants composed essays and engaged in individual in-depth interviews in two separate sessions. Each student wrote one Japanese and one English essay. They all

wrote in Japanese during their first session and in English during their second one and were interviewed in Japanese about their writing in both sessions.

2.2.1 Essays

The two open-ended opinion eliciting prompts were formulated as follows:

Topic 1: Place to live

Students at universities often have a chance to choose where to live. They may choose to live in an apartment alone near their school, or they may choose to live with their family and commute to their university. What do you think of this topic? Write an essay in English, explaining your opinion about it. You written essay will be included in a compilation of class essays and your classmates will read it.

Topic 2: Travel

Many university students often have a chance to travel. They may choose to travel alone, or they may choose to travel in a group. What do you think of this topic? Write an essay in English, explaining your opinion about it. You written essay will be included in a compilation of class essays and your classmates will read it.

The topics were alternated, with half of the students in each group writing on Topic 1 in Japanese and on Topic 2 in English, and the other half doing the opposite. No time limit was given, but most participants took about 35 minutes to write each essay in either L1 or L2. They were allowed to use electronic dictionaries for their L2 writing.

2.2.2 Stimulated Recall and Interviews

Immediately after each essay was completed, the writer was asked to view a

videotape of the first 10 minutes and the last 5 minutes of the essay writing. Following the technique developed by Anzai and Uchida (1981), every time the writing stopped for 3 seconds or longer, the writer was asked to remember what they had been thinking about during the pause.

Following the pause data elicitation, students answered in-depth questions about their composing processes (for example, how much they had planned before actually writing) and about their L1 and L2 writing background. A copy of the interview protocol questions is shown in Appendix A. Each interview session lasted between 90 and 120 minutes.

2.3 Data Analysis

The data were analyzed in terms of writing product, and writing process. A brief explanation of each is presented below, and a more detailed explanation is offered in Chapters 3 through 5, as the results are explained.

2.3.1 Textual (Product) Analysis

The textual analysis included relatively well-established analyses of text structure, organization and coherence (e.g., Hirose, 2003; Kubota, 1998; Sasaki, 2000), as explained in Chapters 3 and 4. In addition, special attention was paid to the development and elaboration of the content in the written texts. Based on modified versions of PISA, Procedure for Incremental Structure Analysis (Sanders & van Wijk, 1996), and TRACE, Text-based Reconstructions of Activities by the Conceptual Executive (van Wijk, 1999), the texts were segmented into basic meaning units and coded in terms of their contribution

11

to the argument or exposition.   According to their theory (van Wijk, 1999), the basic

components of an argument essay can be represented as follows:

Argument –> *Claim* + (*Support*)

Support –> *Reason* + (*Elaboration*) [RECURSIVE]

Reason –> characteristic / motivation / cause / ...

Elaboration –> *Context* / *Specification* / *Nuancing* / ...

Context –> background / condition / evidence / ...

Specification –> characteristic / consequence / example / ...

Nuancing –> alternative / concession / contrast / ...

(taken from van Wijk, 1999, p. 48)

(See Sanders & van Wijk,1996, and van Wijk,1999, for detailed explanation and examples

of their segmentation and categorization criteria.)   We attempted to follow their basic

approach, but we added several new categories, based on patterns that emerged from our

own data.   These included the category of *meta-discourse* to identify those segments that

functioned to signal major structural components of the overall essay and the categories of

extended context and *extended specification* to distinguish the deeper elaboration of a

single, complex point from a listing of simple parallel points.

In order to make it possible for the content analysis to encompass the wide range

of essay types produced by the participants in both Japanese and English, including both

argumentation and non-argumentation essays, we refined the analysis to identify position

statements (for argument essays), thesis statements (for expository essays), meta-discourse

segments (overall or partial discourse markers, as discussed in the preceding section),

points (reasons, advantages/disadvantages or other main supports), and four kinds of

elaboration of points: context, specification, nuancing, and evaluation.   Context was

defined as giving background, conditions, or evidence that provided a context for or led up

to a point; specification consisted of examples, characteristics, or consequences used to

explain a point; nuancing[3] comprised mainly concessions (1 to 2 segments admitting

weaknesses of a point being made), and evaluation expressed a positive or negative

assessment of a point.

Appendix B shows the segmentation and categorization of a sample Japanese

essay from Group 1 and an English essay from Group 2.   The segments are numbered,

with each independent clause receiving a separate number and syntactically subordinate

segments indicated with lower case letters (*a, b, c*), and content category codes (position,

meta-discourse, point, context, specification, evaluation) are listed to the right of those

segments that belong to each category.

Following Sanders & van Wijk (1996) and van Wijk (1999), the segments are

basically syntactically identifiable meaning units, mainly single clauses or verb phrases

that represent separate actions.   For example, in the English essay in Appendix B, the

third sentence is divided into 3 segments, as follows:

3a   If graduates live with their family,

3   they don't have to do housework

4   and they can study long time.

Similarly, the seventh sentence is divided into 4 segments, as shown below:

8   They have to cook,

8a   wash,

8b   clean

8c   and study

8   by themselves.

As the numbers indicate, the first and last lines are analyzed as part of the same segment (i.e., they have to cook by themselves), and the three verbs in the middle are considered separate segments.   In contrast, verbal elements that function as subjects of objects of clauses are not separated into distinct segments.   Thus, the sixth sentence of the same essay is analyzed as a single segment:

7   First, living alone enables undergraduates to be independent from their

family.

In practice, when difficulties arose in coding particular segments, an attempt was made to formulate heuristic principles that could be applied consistently (such as the differentiation between verbal and nominal uses of verbal units, as explained above).

Japanese segmentation was carried out following as much as possible the ways English essays were segmented,.   For example, the first three sentences in the Japanese essay shown in Appendix B were divided into a total of 6 segments as follows:

1. 僕がまず思う事は、この二つの事柄はそれぞれ良い面と悪い面があると思う。

   [What I think first is that these two things each have good points and bad points.]

2. 一人で旅行する事は、

   [Traveling alone]

2a. 自分で考えた事を好きなようにして実行する事ができる、という点では、

   [in terms of the fact that you can carry out your ideas in a way you like]

2. 気楽に旅行したい人には最適だと思う。

   [would be perfect for those who want to travel leisurely I think]

14

3a. もしも急に予定を変更したとしても

   [Even if you change your schedule suddenly]

3. 誰にも迷惑がかからないし、

   [it would not bother anyone]

4. また、急に予定を変更する事も、一人旅ならではの楽しみだと思う。

   [Also I think making a sudden change in the schedule would be a pleasure of traveling alone]

   (translated into English by one researcher)

As the numbers indicate, the second and the fourth lines were considered to constitute one segment because the second line functions as a subject and the fourth line is a predicative. The third line, coming in between those two lines, was taken to be a single segment because it could be turned into a clause, with a meaning "because you can carry out your ideas..." which is syntactically subordinate to the main clause. As seen in this case, both semantic and syntactic considerations were taken when Japanese texts were segmented.

For content category coding, one point particularly related to the elaboration sub-category of specification is worth mentioning here. Whereas English speaking writers usually give a point and then state specifics, such as examples, to support it, Japanese student writers often write in a reverse order, stating specifics first and then reaching a point. When such inductive movement of ideas appeared in Japanese students' writing, segments leading up to a point were categorized as specification as long as they presented examples, characteristics, explanation or consequences.

In the course of the study, the content analysis of the English essays was carried out first, since the models being followed were written in English and it seemed easier to

begin there. Two researchers (the authors) separately coded 4 out of the 28 English

essays (12% of the data) and achieved an acceptable agreement rate of 58 out of 64

segmentation decisions (90.6%); the remaining essays were coded separately and any

disagreements were resolved through discussion. The Japanese essays were segmented

by one researcher (a Japanese research assistant) and checked by one of the authors, who

refined the segmentation. The same author then coded all the Japanese essays, consulting

with the research assistant and the other author regarding questionable cases. An inter-

coder agreement check on 15% of the data revealed a reasonably acceptable level of 85%

agreement.

2.3.2 Composing Process Analysis (Fluency, Planning and Pausing Behavior)

Comparison of participants' writing fluency was based on the length of text

produced, the amount of time needed to plan and to write, and the relation between the

length of the writing and time it took to produce the writing. Specifically, we counted the

number of Japanese characters or English words produced, measured the time spent on

planning before beginning to write and the time spent doing the actual writing, and

calculated the speed of writing in terms of the number of characters/minute or

words/minute of writing time.

The composing behavior of the participants was further analyzed on the basis of

their recollections of their mental processes, stimulated by viewing their pausing behavior

on the videotape (as introduced in section 2.2.2 above and explained in more detail in

Chapter 5). The stimulated recall responses regarding the writers' pausing behavior were

analyzed qualitatively. They were categorized in terms of the focus of the process

(planning, generating, formulating, correcting, refining,, or other), as well as the focus of

the concern on discourse organization (essay, paragraph, intersentential), content, and/or

language (intersentential connectors, sentence/clause structure, grammar, lexicon,

mechanics of punctuation or spelling).

Notes

1. Of the original six participants with no intensive writing training, one had to be dropped

   from the study because it was determined that she had acquired English writing

   instruction after entering university and before writing the essays for this study.

2. The computerized CASEC (Computerized Assessment System for English

   Communication) test, which is related to the Eiken (English STEP Test), contains four

   sections: vocabulary, idioms, listening, and dictation. Students self-administer the test

   at their own pace and their scores are reported in the form of a numerical score (out of a

   possible 1000 points, 250 for each section) and a proficiency level (like the Eiken step

   test), along with TOEIC and TOEFL equivalents.

3. Because of its low frequency, the category of *nuancing* was eliminated from the

   analysis.

Chapter 3: Discourse Mode and Text Structure

This and the following two chapters report and discuss the results of the analysis of the Japanese and English writing by the four groups of participants. In this chapter, discourse mode and text structure will be addressed. Within each sub-section, first the Japanese essays will be discussed, then the English essays, leading into a comparison of the two. (For ease of reference, Appendix C contains a complete set of the Japanese and English essays, arranged by group.)

3.1 Discourse Mode and Text Structure

As introduced in Chapter 2, analysis of textual features included a consideration of the way participants approached the writing task, based on the discourse mode they chose for their text. That is, we were concerned with how the students with different L1 and L2 writing experience chose to frame their essays when open-ended topics were given. The analysis of their L1 and L2 essays revealed that there were basically four discourse modes. One was the frame of an argument, where students stated their opinion in favor of one or other of the two choices (living at home or living alone, for Topic 1; traveling with a group or traveling alone, for Topic 2). Another was to discuss the topic in an expository framework, not taking a side, but analyzing the advantages and disadvantages of each or creating an original thesis related to the topic. The third one was that the students consciously or unconsciously chose to approach the writing as a *"sakubun"* (self-reflective writing, widely practiced in L1 classrooms from elementary school on). The fourth was a mixed approach where students chose to combine two discourse modes, for example,

combining exposition and argumentation, or self-reflection with either exposition or argumentation. By identifying which discourse modes students chose in writing Japanese and English essays, we determined how they approached the given tasks.

3.1. 1 Discourse Modes of Japanese Essays

As shown in Table 3.3, overall two discourse modes were most frequently chosen when students approached the given tasks in Japanese: Exposition (37%) and Mixed mode (37%). The other two modes, Argumentation and Self-Reflection, were less frequently chosen as a single mode (19% and 7%, respectively). Despite this overall tendency, however, there are discernible differences in the choice of mode among the four groups.

Table 3.3:   Japanese Discourse Mode Frequencies by Group

	Argumentation	Exposition	Self-reflection	Mixed	Total
Group 1 (N=9)	3	2	0	4	9
Group 2 (N=7)	2	4	1	0	7
Group 3 (N=7)	0	2	0	5	7
Group 4 (N=4)*	0	2	1	1	4
Total	5 (19%)	10 (37%)	2 (7%)	10 (37%)	27

The number in parentheses indicates frequencies in Japanese essays for comparison.
*One essay was eliminated because it was judged to be ill-defined.

Group 1 preferred Mixed mode most (4 out of 7 students), followed by Argumentation (3 students) and Exposition modes (2 students). For Group 2, the most frequently used mode was Exposition (4 out of 7 students) and the remaining modes were Argumentation (2 students) and Self-Reflection (1 student). Similar to Group 1, Group 3 chose Mixed

19

mode as the most dominant (5 out of 7 students) and Exposition mode (2 students) to some degree.   Lastly, Group 4 used a variety of modes including Exposition (2 students), Self-Reflection (1 student) and Mixed mode (1 student).

The following section illustrates representative discourse modes chosen by each group together with the structure used because these two are closely interrelated.

3.2   Structure of Japanese Essays

In this section, the most salient characteristics of the discourse created by each group will be discussed group by group.

3.2. 1 Group 1

Almost half of the Group 1 students (44%) used Mixed mode, combining Exposition and Argumentation.   In this type of essay, three students first used Exposition and then moved on to Argumentation, whereas one student used the opposite movement.   The essay excerpted below represents the mixed mode with the first type of movement, where the writer (1-7) basically explained the advantages and disadvantages of the two sides, living alone and living with family, and then stated pro-arguments and a position over the issue at the end.   The schema of the Essay 1 structure is shown below:

<div align="center">

Adv/ dis

Adv/ dis

Extended perspective

Pro

Position

</div>

The overall structure of this essay appears to be rather complex because it involves two

modes, Exposition and Argumentation. Within this frame, however, this essay made the connection between the two modes smooth, by providing an extended perspective, which appeared to be a digression, but led to a strong conclusion (the entire essay J1-2 is shown in Appendix 3). Here is an English translation of the extended perspective portion of the essay:

Essay 1:Extended perspective in Japanese essay (1-2)

Recently, I've seen news that an increasing number of senior citizens have began living together after they became alone or lost living partners , forming a new type of family. I think living alone for Hiroshima University students is closer to this type of living arrangement. When someone gets hurt or ill, we can come and take care of him or her immediately. Since we live alone, we can understand how the person would feel in such a condition. If someone feels lonely eating alone, we can join him or her too. These are easy things to do for students because most students live alone themselves.

In this part of the essay, she stated that though students live by themselves, they could get support from other students; therefore, this type of living arrangement resembles that of senior citizens living together in a group home. After this, she tied her original perspective to the construction of pro-reasons for her position, living alone. That is, university students in that type of living arrangement can appreciate the importance of friendship and also experience things, which they would never have experienced if they did not live alone. By stating these reasons, she strongly argued that living alone is better than living with family. What characterizes this essay is that it does not simply state the advantages and disadvantages of the two sides, but brings in the writer's original perspective in discussing the topic, and relates it to the argument she constructed for the position taken at the end.[1]

Another mode frequently used by Group 1 (33%) was Argumentation, where the writer states a position first and supports it by giving reasons, as shown in the following schema:

Position

Pro-reasons

Position

Following this structure, one writer (1-8), for example, first expressed her position that traveling alone is better than traveling with a group, and then gave three reasons to support it. Among these reasons, she pointed out the third reason as the most important by saying "Finally, the biggest reason why I chose traveling alone is that I want young people to break away from 'groupism', which is called a typical Japanese trait" (translated from original Japanese; see essay J1-8 in Appendix 3). Then she elaborated the reason in depth stating that it is a good virtue of Japanese to pay special attention to the development of cooperation among group members; however, it is likely to weaken individuality, allowing Japanese people to avoid developing their own opinions. Although the overall structure of this essay appears to be simple, the writer in this essay, like that of Essay 1, made a strong argument by stating her original perspective and succeeded in making her position persuasive to the reader.

Whereas the structure of an argumentative essay can be simple if the writer states only pro-arguments for the position the writer is supporting, it could become more complex if contra arguments are stated. The other two argumentative essays in Group 1 entail such arguments by devoting a chunk of the text f for the purpose. One writer (S1-9) below, for example, placed her counter arguments immediately after the statement of the

position she chose on the travel issue:

> I would like to choose the way of traveling alone. Traveling with a group is certainly attractive; when some accident happens, we can help each other, and also we can talk about what we feel during the trip. Furthermore, we can have a sense of being united because we travel together. However, I think what we need to develop as a college student is self-independence. In this respect, I would like to choose to travel alone.... (translated from original Japanese)

As seen in the above passage, counter arguments are usually the advantages of the other side that the writer opposes. The writer of the essay shows her awareness of the advantages of traveling with a group. In spite of that, she argued that traveling alone is even better for college students who need to grow into self-independent people. After restating her position at the end of the text, she explained how traveling alone helps students develop independence, and continued to discuss another advantage of traveling alone, meeting with new people, particularly those speaking different languages. The inclusion of counter-arguments in this essay worked as an effective way to strengthen the writer's argument.

In the essays discussed above, the writers adopted different discourse modes; nevertheless, they ended up by taking a position. In fact, whether Mixed or Argumentation mode, seven out of nine students (78%) in Group 1 similarly took a position for one of the two sides. This indicates that Group 1 students had a solid sense of an argumentation frame when they approached the given tasks in Japanese. At the same time, there was a tendency for them to strive to include an original perspective and also counter-arguments in their essays. The inclusion of such perspectives and arguments appeared to make the essays more interesting and persuasive to the reader. This tendency

might be related to the kind of special writing training they received as part of their college entrance essay exam preparation.

3.2.2 Group 2

The most frequently used mode by Group 2 was the Expository mode. More than half of the students (57%) used this frame as a single mode, which distinguishes Group 2 from the other three groups. In the overall structure of an essay in the Exposition mode, the writer first states a thesis, then provides explanation and finally restates the thesis. Depending on the kind of thesis stated, however, the explanation to follow in the body differs. Within this mode, two sub-structures were identified as shown below:

Exposition 1

> Thesis
> Adv/ dis
> Adv/ dis
> Thesis

Exposition 2

> Thesis
> Extended
> illustration
> Thesis

Out of the four students in Group 2 using Exposition mode, two chose Exposition 1 and the other two employed Exposition 2. In Exposition 1, the writer states the purpose of an essay, for example, " I would like to compare traveling alone with traveling in a group," and explains the advantages and disadvantages of the two sides, and ends the essay

with a summary-like statement.   This structure is the same as that of comparison and contrast, in which the writer simply analyzes the topic without taking a definite position. On the other hand, Exposition 2 contains the writer's original thesis and extended personal accounts to explain it.   Take Essay J2-7 for example.   In the introduction the writer said, "I think an act to choose a place to live is the first step leading to future life".   To explain this thesis, she first provided personal accounts of her own case, stating the process of how she decided to go to a university in the prefecture where she was living.   Under this point, she stated some advantages of living with a family; however, such statements were made not to support a position to be taken, but rather to explain the process of developing her thoughts.   Here is an English translation of her account.

Essay 2: Personal accounts in Japanese essay (2-7)

When I applied for a university, I wondered whether I should go out of my prefecture and live alone or should stay there and commute to a university from home.   I gave a lot of thoughts to this issue. For example, I asked myself whether I was capable of doing my own cooking or of leading a free life if I chose to live alone. When I considered these things, I came to the conclusion that I would be able to have more free time if I chose to commute to a university from my home. If I stayed with my family, I would not have to do cooking or laundry and so could save a lot of time for enjoying my circle activity and doing part-time jobs. After thinking about all of this, I finally decided to choose a university in the prefecture where I was living.   (translated from original Japanese)

After this, in the following paragraph, she continued to ask herself, "What would happen to someone if she did not experience making any decision on where to live," and evaluated her experience as useful because college life often requires decision-making on the part of

students.   In the conclusion, she clearly reiterated her thesis by saying "such experience served me well as the first step to my future where I would have to make lots of decisions on my own."   This essay appeared to be self-reflective writing because the writer told her story and thinking process.   However, one thing that distinguishes it from such writing is that the essay has a clear thesis in the beginning and at the end, and personal stories are used to explain the thesis.   In this sense, it is different from self-reflective writing which has no clear thesis.   In short, unlike Group 1, Group 2 students tended to approach the task not by arguing but rather by explaining.   In this latter approach, it might be considered important for the writers to include some indication of how they relate themselves personally to the given topic.

3.2.3 Group 3

Like Group 1, Group 3 used Mixed mode as the most frequent one.   Five out of seven students employed this combined mode, three consisting of Exposition and Argumentation and two being made up of Self-Reflection and Exposition.   Unlike the first two groups, Group 3 did not use any Argumentation as a single mode.

Although both Group 1 and Group 3 employed Mixed mode most frequently, there are some differences in the use of the structure used for this mode.   As opposed to 3 Group 1 students choosing the movement from Exposition to Argumentation, only one Group 3 student selected such movement, and the remaining two students used the opposite movement from Argumentation to Exposition.   In the latter movement, as the mode shifted, the writer changed position too, from taking a position on a personal level to taking no definite position on a general level.   The following schema of the structure illustrates this movement:

26

```
                    Position
                      Pro
         ---------------------------------
                    Adv / dis
                    Adv / dis
                    Thesis
```

In essay J2-2, for example, the writer first expressed her personal preference for traveling

with a group and provided several pro-reasons, such as that she can have a good time with

friends and create good memories.   In the next paragraph, however, she pointed out the

disadvantage of traveling with a group by saying "we don't have much time for ourselves

if we stay with friends all the time", and moved on to explain the advantages of the other

side, traveling alone, in detail.   She eventually concluded that traveling alone is also good

in terms of helping us to raise our level of judgment and action.   Probably because in the

process of writing, she discovered the good points of traveling alone, she decided not to

take the same position as in the beginning, but rather stated a neutral position.   She stated

in the conclusion:

> In either traveling along or traveling with a group, I think we can have a
> variety of experiences. Even though we visit the same place, we can enjoy
> the trip from different perspectives. While we have plenty of time as a
> college student, we should travel to many places in different ways and get
> experiences that we would not get from our daily life. (translated from
> original Japanese)

Another feature of the Mixed mode used by Group 3 was to use personal accounts

as a springboard to general discussion of the topic.   This tendency is seen in the combined

mode of Exposition and Argumentation, and also that of Self-reflection and Exposition.

Even in the first combined mode, writer 3-1 on Topic 1, for example, built her

argumentation based on the illustration of her personal story and the analysis of her

personal thoughts.   Similarly, the two students using the combined mode of Self-

reflection and Exposition also used extended personal accounts to give background for a thesis. In this case, however, the thesis appears in the middle of the essay just at the point when the writer moves to Exposition mode. The schema of the structure below shows this movement:

Extended personal
illustration

Thesis
Explanation
Thesis

In writing on Topic 2, writer 3-3, for example, started talking about her current condition where she had to commute to school from her home, and continued to talk about why she was living with her family; the biggest reason was that she did not want do cooking. As her thoughts moved from one to another almost in a chain-like manner, she came to the issue of self-sufficiency and tried to deal with it by asking a rhetorical question , "Does everyone living alone choose this type of living arrangement to develop self-independence?" The writer herself responded to this question with "I don't think so." In her case, the thesis took the form of question and answer, and it was explained in the second half of the essay with a conclusion "living alone would not guarantee you to become a person with self-independence." The inclusion of personal accounts such as personal events, feelings and thoughts may be related to the kind of writing training called "*Sakubun* (self-reflective writing) that the writer received in elementary and junior high school. In fact, during the interview conducted after the writing, the writer quoted above stated that she wondered how to approach the task and then decided to follow "*Sakubun*" (self-reflective writing) because she could write freely in the way she preferred.

In short, although Group 3 students employed Mixed mode as frequently as those of Group 1, their combined mode included Exposition and Self-Reflection more frequently. When the single use of these modes is added (2 students for Exposition and 1 for Self-Reflection), a total of 6 students (75%) used Exposition mode and 3 students (42%) employed Self-Reflection. That means that unlike Group 1, Group 3 students apparently preferred to approach the given task in a frame of Exposition, often including personal accounts. Perhaps due to such inclusion, the internal structure of the essays in these modes is not so obvious, while the overall structure was relatively easy to capture. Furthermore, some essays by Group 3 lacked consistency in terms of taking one position because both personal and general positions were stated in one essay.

3.2.4 Group 4

Group 4 students used a variety of modes including Exposition (2 students), Self-Reflection (1) and Mixed mode (1).[2] The structures used for these modes are similar to the ones already explained. Taking Exposition, for example, just as Group 2 students used two types of exposition (see section 3.2.2.2), the two students in Group 4 also employed these two, one simply comparing the advantages and disadvantages of the two sides, and another explaining a thesis by use of personal accounts. In the case of Mixed mode, one student used a combination of Exposition and Argumentation, where she first explained the advantages and disadvantages of the two sides without taking a position, but took a position toward the end of her essay with pro-reasons stated afterwards. The schema of her essay structure is as follows:

Thesis

Adv / dis

Adv / dis

29

Pro

This shows the reverse structure of the Group 3 student's essay illustrated earlier. Similar to that student, the writer of the essay did not take a position on a general level, saying, "I cannot decide which is better, traveling alone freely or traveling with a group, because each way has good points and bad points." Nevertheless, after stating these points of each side, she expressed her preference for traveling with a group and then gave personal reasons why she liked this way of traveling. As seen among Group 3 students, she too seemed to have difficulty in creating one position, leaving discrepancies between personal and general positions.

In short, Group 4 students appeared to share the same problem with Group 3 students, particularly in terms of stating both personal and general positions, which was not observed in the writing of either Group 1 or Group 2. Furthermore, Group 4 students shared similarities with those of Group 2 and Group 3 in terms of including extended personal accounts when they wrote essays even in a frame of Exposition, not to mention Self-reflection. These similarities can also be considered to reflect the kinds of writing training called "*Sakubun*"

3.3 Summary of Japanese modes and structures

Given the writing tasks, the four groups approached them in their Japanese essays by choosing different mode and structures. Group 1 students, with both Japanese and English special writing training, tended to frame essays in an argumentation mode, often including original perspectives and counter-arguments to make their writing more persuasive. They seemed to be concerned with how they could convince their audience.

On the other hand, Group 2 students, with only Japanese writing training, preferred to frame essays in an expository mode, in which they created their own thesis related to the given topic and explained it through personal illustration or just analyzed the advantages and disadvantages of each side of a topic. They appeared to be interested in explaining their ideas, but not arguing an issue. Lastly, Group 3 and Group 4 students who had no or little Japanese special writing training tended to share commonalities in terms of having difficulty creating one single position on an issue and also of using personal accounts to explain an idea. They showed many traits of the past writing practice the students received in *Kogugo* (Japanese) classes in elementary school and high school.

3.4 Discourse Modes of English Essays

Table 3.4 shows the breakdown of mode frequencies by the four groups. As seen in this table, overall the most frequently chosen mode was Argumentation (48%), which was used by almost half of the students, and the next most popular one was Mixed mode (37%), whereas Exposition and Self-refection were chosen rather infrequently (11% and 4%, respectively). These results indicate that there is a marked difference in the choice of mode between the two languages; students chose Exposition as a single mode most frequently when they approached the task in Japanese; however, they shifted to Argumentation when they did so in English.

Among the four groups, Group 3 showed the biggest change in the choice of mode. In writing essays in English, they employed Argumentation most often (71%), which they did not choose at all (as a single mode) for writing Japanese essays. Whereas Group 1 chose this mode consistently across the two languages, Group 2 which preferred

Exposition (44%) for Japanese essays was split across the three modes of Argumentation, Exposition and Mixed mode in their English essays. Compared with their Japanese essays, however, both Group 1 and Group 2 also increased the frequencies of Argumentation mode by 22% and 13%, respectively, for their English essays. Finally, Group 4 chose Mixed mode most frequently, which was used by three out of four students.[3]

Table 3.4: English Discourse Mode Frequencies by Group

	Argumentation	Exposition	Self-reflection	Mixed	Total
Group 1 (N=9)	5 (3)	0 (2)	0	4(4)	9
Group 2 (N=7)	3 (2)	2 (4)	0 (1)	2 (0)	7
Group 3 (N=7)	5 (0)	1 (2)	0	1(5)	7
Group 4 (N=4)*	0	0 (2)	1(1)	3 (1)	4
Total	13 (48%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)	10 (37%)	27

The number in parentheses indicates frequencies in Japanese essays for comparison.
*One essay was eliminated because it was judged to be ill-defined.

3.5 Structure of English Essays

3.5.1 Group 1

All Group 1 students used Argumentation mode as either a single mode (56%) or as part of a Mixed mode (44%), which basically consisted of Exposition and Argumentation. As already explained in the Japanese section, the overall structure of Argumentation is seemingly simple with a position statement, pro-reasons and a restatement of the position. However, if the body contains not only direct reasons but also indirect reasons, which are the negative points of the other side, it can be internally more complex, and at the same

time the inclusion of such points can strengthen the writer's position. In the following

essay sample, the writer (1-7) used indirect supports effectively in her essay:

English essay sample 1 (E1-7)

I prefer traveling with my close friend, one or two to traveling

alone or in a big group. There are some reasons.

First, in a big group, we can not visit places I want to go, because many people travel together and we have to think where to visit, considering members' opinion. On the other hand, in a small group (me and one or two close friends) we can go anywhere without planning where to visit. The places we visit depends on weather and mood of that day. In short, we can travel freely.

Secondly, there are many dangers to us in traveling alone. Especially women tend to be harmed by strangers. For example, snatch, rage, and luggage lifting. It is very difficult to avoid these cases by oneself. However in a small group, they can be avoided. If one person have his or her bag snatched away, another person can run after the snatcher or call the police. At worst, we can help together. Like this, in a small group, we expose ourselves to lesser danger.

Lastly, in the case of suffering from illness, members nurse us. So, we don't have to worry about health problem seriously.

I mentioned three reasons. That's why I prefer traveling in a small group to traveling alone or in a big group

(The underlined sentences indicate position statements.)

In this writing, the writer has three reasons to support her chosen position for traveling in a

small group, which she refers to as a group of two or three people. The first two supports

contain both indirect and direct reasons, with the indirect first and the direct next in a

sequence. For example, to explain the summary statement "we can travel alone freely" in

the second paragraph, the writer first stated a negative point of the other side, traveling in a

big group, and then turned this point into a positive one of traveling in a small group.

That is, by showing a weak point of the other side, the writer was able to make her

argument sound stronger. This same arrangement of ideas was also used in the third

paragraph where the writer explained the second reason. In this way, the internal

structure of the paragraph is paralleled for the two paragraphs. Although the third reason

was not fully developed, it is related to the second point in terms of the possibility of

obtaining help from the other group members. In short, the essay above is coherently

structured with primary focus on the body.

Whereas the argumentation essays by Group 1 presented the argument coherently, the

essays in Mixed mode tended to be somewhat weak in this respect. Such essays can have

coherency problems due to the combination of two modes. The English essay below

consisting of Exposition and Argumentation was written by the same writer whose essay

was discussed earlier in the Japanese section. Although she employed the same Mixed

mode as she did in her Japanese essay, the English counterpart has a rather abrupt

transition between the two modes due to the absence of the kind of extended perspective

that appeared in the Japanese essay.

English essay sample 2 (J1-2)

There are many chances that we travel when we are university student. Which one is more beneficial traveling alone or group travel?
First, I'd like to observe on strong point of traveling alone. First of all, it is good for us not to bother about anyone. So, we can travel freely. Besides, we can get a sense of responsibility, because we have to do everything by oneself. In addition to that, if we are in group, we are apt to satisfy without meeting something new, but if we are alone, we tend to seek meeting more positively.
In the contrary, sometimes traveling alone is danger, especially women.
Second, I'd like to observe on strong point of group travel. Above all, it is more safety than traveling alone. And, we can share pleasure or happiness of travel with someone of group.
However, group travel has some bad point. We tend to ease too much, because we can enjoy the travel without meeting something new. Besides, it is little difficult to go to somewhere we want to go freely.
I think the most attractive point of travel is meeting something new. In addition to that, travel makes us more rich psychically, especially traveling alone.
So, I come to the conclusion that traveling alone is better than group travel if we are student particularly. I'm sure that we can develop through traveling alone.1. There are many chances that we travel when we are university student.

In this essay, the writer explained the positive and negative points of each side, traveling

alone first and then traveling in a group. As an expository essay, it is well structured in

terms of comparison and contrast. Then, she shifted to Argumentation, by pulling out

"meeting something new" as the strongest reason among those stated earlier in the expository section and also introducing a new point that traveling alone enriches college students, which was not stated explicitly earlier. These reasons led her to the conclusion, a clear statement of her chosen position. In such inductive movement of ideas, a quick shift from one mode to another is likely to create a gap between the two modes unless the writer makes an effective transition, by including an extended perspective as she did in Japanese or giving sufficient explanation for the chosen reason.[4] This writer and also another Group 1 writer (1-1) who used the same Mixed mode (Mix: Exp -> Arg) failed to create a smooth transition, which resulted in a coherence problem. This is likely because they did not have as good a command of the English language as their native language, which constrained their ability to express their ideas fully. At the same time, it is possible that the combined mode of Exposition and Argumentation may not necessarily work effectively for English essays because it cannot lead to a strong argument, due to the use of two different modes in one essay. This possibility requires further investigation.

3.5.2 Group 2

Whichever mode was used by writers, all the essays of Group 2 were well-structured in terms of including a clear introduction, a body and a conclusion. Compared with those of Group 1 students, however, the bodies of the essays by Group 2 were relatively thin without much elaboration as illustrated in the essay below:

English essay sample 2 (E2-2)

I think that it's better for an undergraduate to live alone, staying away from his or her family. You may think "Why? If graduates live with their family, they don't to do housework and they can study long time. But I think it's not so important. There are two main reasons for my opinion.

First, living alone enables undergraduates to be independent from their

family.   They have to cook, wash, clean and study by themselves.   No one helps them do it.   Living alone can be an step to independence.
　　　Secondly, staying away from family have undergraduates confirm the importance of their family's being.
　　　So, I think living alone is better choice for undergraduates.

The introduction of the above essay is elaborated including a position for living alone and a counter-argument, a positive point of the other side, living with a family.   After devaluing the importance of the point, the writer announced what was to come in the body, saying "There are two main reasons for my opinion."   The body to follow is supposed to explain these reasons in detail, but is not well developed.   Although one paragraph is assigned to explain each reason, the third paragraph contains only a reason with no elaboration.   Considering the clear structure created and the inclusion of a counter-argument, the writer of this essay apparently has a clear meta-cognitive knowledge of writing that she has presumably obtained from L1 writing practice. However, she could not generate enough ideas to substantiate her position in the language she was still learning.

Regarding the use of Mixed mode, particularly the combination of Exposition and Argumentation, one essay in this mode (E2-3) has a similar coherence problem as that identified in Group 1 when the mode changed.   The problem of Group 2 was, however, slightly different; it was caused by changing the level of voice from general to personal.   In the expository part, the writer discussed both positive and negative points of each side of the traveling topic in general terms.   After this, the writer moved on to Argumentation, first by stating her personal preference for traveling with friends and then giving her own reasons to support it with a few specifics.   Again, there exists an abrupt transition between the two modes, which makes the reader wonder why the writer limits the argument to herself personally.

Lastly in relation to Group 2, the use of Exposition should be mentioned. Unlike the Japanese essays, no original thesis was created in the two expository English essays by Group 2. The writers of these essays simply showed the two sides of a topic through comparison without taking a position.

3.5.3 Group 3

Group 3 employed Argumentation as a single mode most consistently among the four groups when they approached the tasks in English. The argumentative essays by five of the seven students had an opinion stated in both initial and final positions. In spite of this tendency, unlike Group 1 students, they tended to have a weak sense of overall structure, sometimes with arbitrary paragraphing, and also to rely on personal accounts to substantiate their chosen position. The essay below illustrates such characteristics:

English essay sample 4 (J3-1)

I prefer traveling in the group to traveling alone.
When I travel somewhere, I see the sights and eat food which special of the tourist resort, whether traveling in the group or traveling alone. Because of the deeds, I get amazement, discover, and strong emotion which I can't get in usual living. I want to express and tell someone those discovery, amazement, strong emotion and various feelings. Because I am able to be happy when I tell someone who I want to tell, about my experience at the tourist resort. So, I prefer traveling in the group to traveling alone. When I travel in the group, I can tell someone my feeling and amazement sooner and more direct than traveling alone.
Also, I may be able to find things which I can't find by myself by someone's telling.
Indeed, traveling alone is good. Wherever I want to go, I can. But, by traveling with someone, I may get more happiness, enjoyment, strong emotion and various feelings. And I can share those joy or happiness with them. So, I like traveling in the group than traveling alone.

The writer stated a position for traveling in a group three times in the essay, at the beginning, in the middle and at the end position. However, the reader may find it difficult to locate where support reasons are because the body is not effectively segmented into

paragraph units, as demonstrated in the essays of Group 1 and Group 2. Also, the movement of ideas within the body is rather inductive, with a disproportionate amount of background information leading up a point. That is, the writer would appear to be searching for reasons in the process of creating text rather than to be explaining the reasons. Thus, whereas the writer's view of traveling was extensively explained before the second position statement, the two reasons stated afterwards were not well explained, and also some ideas such as *discovery, amazement,* and *strong emotion* were repeatedly used in the text. Nevertheless, the writer clearly has some meta-knowledge of English writing, which was evidenced when she intentionally added the position statement at the beginning of the essay after the whole writing was completed and also by the inclusion of a counter-argument in the conclusion. During the interview, she revealed that she had learned all this when she was receiving special English writing training in high school. Despite such awareness, it appears that she had little idea of how to structure paragraphs, nor did she know how to build up the argument in the body. The essay ended up as a collection of personal thoughts in a loosely structured framework, whereas the writer's position was reiterated more than twice.

Another member of this group also created a similar kind of overall frame by stating the writer's position at both the beginning and the end. Although the writer stated two interrelated reasons to support his position for living alone, the internal structure of the body seemed to have a problem, particularly with the third paragraph. There, the writer introduced a negative evaluation of the other side, living with a family, which was never developed any further. If this indirect support had been well-explained, the essay could have been strengthened. However, immediately after the sentence, nothing followed it up

except the restatement of the position at the end. Again such an abrupt shift to a conclusion created a coherence gap between the body and the conclusion. This essay is shown below:

English essay example 5 (E3-4)

<u>I think that students are should live by oneself</u> because they should become independent from their parent. I also live by myself, so I learned many things. For example, I learned difficulty of diet control. Though I should cook for myself, I can't do it easily. Therefore I got lean.

The others, washing, cleaning and so on, I should do many thing by myself. It's very difficult but it's necessary in the future. We children can't depend on our parents forever. Therefore we should live for ourselves to train.

On the contrary, I think that living with family is no good for children. <u>Students are should live by theirselves for independence.</u>

In short, Group 3 students have meta-cognitive knowledge of English writing, particularly about the importance of stating an opinion at the beginning of an essay. Nevertheless, they seem to have difficultly creating the internal structure of the body. This is partly because the special English writing training they received in high school mainly focused on a paragraph level, and also partly because they did not have much experience with writing this kind of opinion-statement essay in Japanese, which was specially geared for college entrance essay exams. Also, as seen in the two essays above, Group 3 students frequently included personal accounts, such as personal feelings, thoughts and events, in their writing, probably because they relied upon their past L1 writing practice "*Sakubun*," which they received in elementary and junior high school. Since the inclusion of personal accounts was observed in both their English and Japanese essays, it is likely that Group 3 students transferred such a tendency to their English writing.

3.5.4 Group 4

Group 4 used Mixed mode which consisted of Self-reflection and Argumentation most frequently. When both such partial use and the single use of Self-reflection are

39

added together, all 4 students employed this mode, making extensive use of narratives or personal stories in their essays. The essay in Mixed mode shown below illustrates Group 4's characteristics:

English essay sample 6 (J4-5)

This summer, I went to Tokyo Disney Resort with a friend of mine. This was first time that I took a trip with someone but my parents. It was very difficult for me to make an appointment. I quarreled with a friend. But the trip was a success. Because of this experience, I learned difficulty of taking a trip.

Through this trip, I was helped by a friend. If I had gone to there alone, this trip hadn't been a success. There were many accident, I forgot my cellular phone, we mistook a desk. But because of a friend, it succeeded.

Sharp person can do many things about a trip. But many people may be able to do. Taking a trip alone is very difficult. If there are some worrisomes, you must solve it by yourself. Also when you feel happy, pleasant, interested, you can't share it with someone. I think it is dull. Moving to other place is enjoyment of trips. During morning, you can talk with someone, talk about plan of a trip. I like this time the best in a trip. Taking a trip is not only for doing at a destination, but also planning, moving, talking after returning.

I like taking a trip with someone. I want to share worrisomes, pleasant on the trip. Talking with many people is more enjoyable than thinking of something alone.

The writer started her essay by telling about her personal trip to Tokyo Disneyland with a friend and described what she had experienced there; that is, owing to the friend, she had a good trip without running into serious problems. Through the description of personal experience, she implicitly referred to the positive points of traveling with someone. However, in the next paragraph, she explicitly explained the negative points of traveling alone, for example, you cannot share pleasure with a friend, and turned this indirect support into more direct support for the position she took in the conclusion. In short, although the writer stated her position at the end of the essay, the whole essay was written in a personal tone, reflecting the writer's own experience, feelings and thoughts. In spite of such strong reliance upon self-reflection, however, Group 4 students appeared to have some awareness that they are expected to state an opinion when they wrote English essays.

3.6 Summary of Japanese and English modes and structures

Given the open-ended writing tasks, in the English essays overall, Argumentation mode was most frequently chosen by the four groups. Whereas Group 1 showed consistency across the two languages in their choice of Argumentation, Group 3 showed a clear shift to this mode from Mixed mode, and Group 2, too, showed some inclination toward the mode when they framed their essays in English. Most notably, Group 3 students, having received the special English writing practice, demonstrated such training in writing English essays, particularly in terms of placing a position statement in both initial and final parts of an essay. However, apparently due to lack of L1 special writing training, they tended to have arbitrary paragraphing and also to rely upon the greater use of personal accounts to substantiate their chosen position. On the other hand, Group 2 students, having received special L1 writing practice, demonstrated a strong sense of structure, consisting of an introduction, a body and a conclusion; however, the body, in particular, was not well elaborated, most likely because of their limited English writing experience. In the case of Group 1 students with both L1 and L2 writing practice, they showed a strong concern with convincing the reader in English just as they did in Japanese. This tendency appeared to be strengthened in English essays, most of which were well-structured with substantial focus on the body. Lastly, although Group 4 student tended to state their personal opinion in writing English essay, they heavily relied upon personal accounts as if they were writing *Sakubun*.

3.7 Comparison of Discourse Mode across Languages

Table A-1 (in Appendix D) summarizes the frequencies of use of the discourse modes

by groups in the two languages, and A-2 (in Appendix D) shows the comparison of discourse mode across Japanese and English essays by individual students. According to the Table A-2, nearly half of the students in Group 1 (44%) and Group 2 (43%) similarly employed the same mode across the two languages; for Group 1, one using Mixed (Exp->Arg) and three choosing Argumentation, and for Group 2, two employing Exposition and one using Argumentation. This indicates that the students in both groups showed considerable consistency across the two languages. However, the other two groups did not demonstrate such tendency. For Group 3, only one student used Mixed mode (Self->Exp), and for Group 4, none employed the same mode across the two languages. This section attempts to show what kinds of common text features are presented by the same writers in their essays in Japanese and English and to explore how they have learned such features.

3.7.1　Common Text Features in Both Languages

Common text features found in Japanese and English essays by the same writers are listed below by group (S = student identification number, Arg = argumentation, Exp = exposition, Self = self-reflection).

Group 1, with L1 and L2 writing training

(1) use of essay structure consisting of an opinion, a counter-argument, support-arguments and a conclusion (S1-9, Arg)

(2) placement of the most important point/reason toward the end of essays (S1-8, Arg)

(3) use of concrete examples (S1-5, Arg)

(4) prolific use of discourse markers (S1-2, Mixed; S1-8, Arg)

(5) avoidance of repetition of the same expressions (S1-5, Arg; S1-2, Arg)

Group 2, with only L1 training

(1)) use of essay structure consisting of an opinion, a counter-argument, support-arguments and a conclusion (S2-2, Arg)

(2) use of personal accounts (S2-1, Arg & Self)

(3) use of concrete examples (S2-7, Exp)

(4) use of discourse markers (S2-7, Exp)

Group 3, with only L2 training

(1) an inductive movement of ideas with a conclusion at the end (S3-5, Mixed)

(2) use of concrete examples (S3-5, Mixed)

(3) avoiding a clear position statement (S3-5, Mixed)

Whereas the students in the present study generally novice writers in writing in a second language, they all had had substantial L1 writing experience, having learned how to write in Japanese in *Kokugo* classes since their elementary school days. Furthermore, Group 1 and Group 2 students, in particular, received special L1 writing training geared for college entrance essay exam preparation. Considering the amount of prior L1 writing experience these students had received, the influence of first language writing on second language writing could have been strong. This tendency is observed in the English essays of Group 1 students who received special training in both Japanese and English writing. According to the interviews with the students, (1) essay structure, (2) the placement of important ideas, and (3) the use of concrete examples were most likely transferred from special L1 writing training. One student (S1-9), for example, followed exactly the same movement of ideas in the two essays, which first stated an opinion, and then a counter-argument, followed by support arguments and a conclusion. According to her, when she started with English writing training, she did not include a counter-argument. However, after having learned the importance of stating the opinion of the other side while practicing

43

Japanese essays, she said that she applied it to her English writing. Regarding prioritizing ideas, student 1-8 reported that in order to keep the reader's interest, the writer should place the most important idea toward the end of an essay. If this idea were stated earlier, the reader might lose interest in reading the whole essay. She said that she learned the importance of prioritizing ideas in L1 writing.

Finally the use of concrete examples was observed in both Japanese and English essays by student 1-5. Although he did not explicitly refer to this point, he reported that he had learned the importance of clarity from L1 writing and so he strived to make his writing as clear to the reader as possible. It is presumed that the use of concrete examples is one possible strategy for him to achieve clarity in writing. He included examples to illustrate the point he made in both essays; his English essay, in particular, contained two cases of concrete example, one with extensive illustration (see E1-5 in Appendix 1).

According to two Group 1 students, there are two features that that they had learned from L2 writing training: the extensive use of discourse makers and the avoidance of repeated use of the same expression. Student 1-2, for example, explained that the use of discourse makers is important because it serves to make essays clear and easy for the reader to follow. She apparently believed strongly in such functions of discourse markers and employed them rather excessively in her essays in both English and Japanese.

Another feature the student above reported on having transferred from L2 to L1 was to avoid the repeated use of the same expressions. Generally this student showed great concern with language expressions, and she was careful in choosing words and phrases when she expressed ideas. One example of such a case is that in writing a Japanese essay, she used the word *"kikai* (chance)" in Chinese characters the first time in her essay, but the

second time, she chose *"channsu* (chance)" written in *katakana*, one type of Japanese syllabic representation usually used for borrowed English words. According to her, she chose this word because she learned that the repeated use of the same words in not preferred in English writing. In a similar fashion, because she did not want to use the same word repeatedly, she replaced an adjective "strong" with another one "attractive" when she described a positive point of a topic for the second time in her English essay. Whereas this particular student reportedly learned this feature from L2 training, another Group 1 student (1-5) pointed out that he learned it from L1 training. Just as the former student tried to avoid the use of the same expressions in both essays, so did he. In short, students appear to transfer some text features from one language to another regardless of the source of their knowledge about those features.

Unlike Group 1, Group 2 students received only special L1 writing training. In spite of this fact, they employed the same features in both Japanese and English essays, as Group 1 students did. However, in the case of Group 2, since they did not receive much writing practice in English, they must have transferred those features from L1 writing to L2 writing. In response to the question "Does L1 essay training affect your English writing?," the student (S2-2) who used the same essay structure in both Japanese and English essays, for example, answered with a positive "yes" without hesitation. She appeared to take it for granted that she could apply to English writing what she had learned in Japanese. Perhaps because she did not have any pre-conception of English writing from L2 training, she was able to transfer meta-knowledge of Japanese writing to L2 writing quite easily.

In relation to the use of personal accounts, one Group 2 student (2-1) did not use

45

the exactly same mode across the two languages (Self-Reflection for Japanese and Argumentation for English); however, since she used personal evidence extensively in both essays, it is worth mentioning. The use of personal accounts by this student might have resulted from another kind of L1 writing called *Sakubun* that the student had practiced in the past. In the interviews, many students expressed their view of *Sakubun* as a kind of writing in which they can freely express their ideas and feelings without much constraint. Student 2-1 reported that she liked to write very much and had written extensively in Japanese in her elementary and junior high school days. Thus, she opted to write a Japanese essay in *Sakubun* style, reflecting her personal feelings and thoughts on the topic. She transferred this style to the writing of her English essay, in which she explained her preference for traveling in a group by giving only personal accounts as support. Thus, the English essay she wrote would appear to show features of both L1 and L2 writing.

Lastly, among seven Group 3 students experiencing special L2 writing training, only one student (3-5) used the same mode (Mixed, Self->Arg) across the two languages. The remainder of the students did not demonstrate this tendency. This finding suggests that most of the students in Group 3 may not transfer L2 writing features, for example, the statement of a position at the beginning of an essay, to their L1 writing. This is probably because they might have perceived Japanese and English writing differently and they relied more on the past writing training in *Sakubun* when they approached the task in Japanese. Whereas these students wrote English essays based on their L2 training, the student (3-5) mentioned above opted to follow a Japanese style of writing for both English and Japanese essays, where she gradually led the reader to a moderate conclusion. In the interview, she revealed her perception of English writing by saying, "I know English structure has an

opinion statement first and then reasons to explain it. It seems to me too formulaic. I am not comfortable with it. I like a Japanese way of writing." In spite of the L2 training she received, she resisted against adopting what she had learned, and instead learned on what she had acquired in the *Sakubun* writing.

In summary, the findings above indicate that there is a positive transfer of L1 writing experience to second language writing and also a positive transfer of L2 writing experience on first language writing. However, the findings also suggest that whether students transfer certain text features from one language to another may depend on how they perceive writing in either language. At the same time, they indicate that many text features such as argumentation structure and the use of concrete examples are commonly shared by both Japanese and English writing.

Notes

1. During the interview, the writer said she wondered which organizational pattern to choose in writing an essay, an introduction-body-conclusion or a Japanese traditional organization pattern, *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* (introduction, continuation, change and conclusion). Since she had a good idea for *"ten"*, she decided to follow the traditional pattern. She thought it could make the writing more interesting to the reader. In discussing her L1 writing training class, she reported having learned that creating an interesting *"ten"* is one of the most important things to consider for good writing.

2. One of the 5 essays by Group 4 (J4-1) was categorized as "ill-defined," because it was not possible to identify any overall mode or structure.

3. Again, one Group 4 essay (E4-1) was categorized as "ill-defined."

4. During the interview, the writer said that for the English essay she intentionally chose a pattern consisting of an introduction, a body and a conclusion, and not a traditional organizational pattern, *ki-sho-ten-ketsu*. This is because she thought that an important feature of English writing was to state an opinion explicitly and the three-part essay structure could better serve that purpose. This writer appeared to have clear knowledge of writing and a view of English structure as different from that of Japanese writing.

Chapter 4: Discourse Markers and Development of Content

This chapter presents the results of the analysis of discourse markers and development of content in the L1 and L2 essays by the four groups. As in the preceding chapter, in each section, the Japanese essays are examined before the English essays, and comparisons are drawn.

4.1 Discourse markers

Various kinds of devices are used to organize discourse and provide logical connections among the parts. Such devices in the essays were identified and categorized in terms of the text level to which they related: overall meta-discourse (essay level) markers, such as "There are three main reasons" and "In conclusion"; partial meta-discourse markers (connecting paragraphs or multi-sentential chunks of discourse within paragraphs), such as "First," and "There are several advantages"; and inter-sentential markers (connecting two sentences), such as "In addition," and "On the other hand."

In Appendix E, discourse markers are highlighted in one Japanese and one English essay. Overall meta-discourse markers are indicated in bold font, partial meta-discourse markers in bold italics, and inter-sentential markers are underlined. As can be seen in both essays, the inter-sentential markers are relatively short, whereas the partial and overall meta-discourse markers vary in length from one word to whole clauses.

4.1.1 Japanese discourse markers

Table 4.1 displays the means and SDs of each of the categories and the total number of markers in the Japanese essays for each group. As shown in Table 3.5, Groups 1 and 2 used more meta-discourse markers than the other two groups, and Group 4 used

more inter-sentential markers than the other three groups.   According to a 4 (group) x 3

(marker type) repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance, there was a significant

overall difference among the groups (F = 3.010, p = 0.050).   Tests of effects showed

specifically that group was a significant factor differentiating partial meta-discourse

markers (F = 3.638, p = 0.027) and total meta-discourse markers (overall and partial

combined, F = 3.633, p = 0.027), and was almost significant for inter-sentential markers (F

= 2.825, p = 0.060).   Moreover, post-hoc Scheffé tests revealed only that Group 1 used

significantly more partial meta-discourse markers than Group 4 (p = .04).

Table 4.1   Japanese Discourse Markers (adjusted per 500 characters):
             Means and SDs by Group

	Meta-Discourse Markers			Intersentential	Total
	Overall	Partial	Total	Markers	Markers
Group 1	1.55	2.45	3.99	0.55	4.54
(N = 9)	(1.14)	(1.09)	(1.67)	(0.58)	(1.53)
Group 2	1.76	2.13	3.88	1.03	4.91
(N = 7)	(1.02)	(1.31)	(1.91)	(1.14)	(1.71)
Group 3	0.79	1.48	2.27	0.89	3.16
(N = 7)	(0.33)	(1.17)	(1.19)	(0.52)	(1.29)
Group 4	1.22	0.56	1.78	1.81	3.59
(N = 5)	(0.53)	(0.33)	(0.77)	(0.79)	(0.75)

These results suggest that the intensive L1 training induced students to use

explicit markers to indicate essay-level and paragraph-level discourse organization.   On

the other hand, it would appear that both L1 and L2 training may inhibit the use of inter-

sentential markers, or perhaps that such markers tend to be replaced by markers of larger

pieces of discourse.

4.1.2 English discourse markers

Table 4.2 presents the Means and SDs by group for the English essays.

Table 4.2   English Discourse Markers (adjusted per 100 words):
Means and SDs by Group

	Discourse Markers			Intersentential	Total
	Overall	Partial	Total	Markers	Markers
Group 1	0.83	2.13	2.95	1.11	4.07
(N = 9)	(0.59)	(1.04)	(1.31)	(0.86)	(1.54)
Group 2	0.69	1.97	2.66	1.11	3.77
(N = 7)	(0.97)	(0.84)	(1.31)	(0.90)	(1.98)
Group 3	0.06	1.64	1.70	0.95	2.66
(N = 7)	(0.16)	(0.28)	(0.23)	(0.45)	(0.56)
Group 4	0.00	0.10	0.10	2.64	2.74
(N = 5)	(0.00)	(0.23)	(0.23)	(1.39)	(1.53)

Although group was not found to be a significant factor overall, tests of effects

showed significant group differences for the categories of overall discourse ($F = 3.462$, p

$= .032$), partial discourse ($F = 8.728$, $p = .000$), total discourse markers ($F = 9.747$, p

$= .000$), and intersentential markers ($F = 4.221$, $p = .046$).   In addition, post-hoc Scheffé

tests showed only that Group 4 used more intersentential markers than Group 1 ($p = .046$).

Striking inter-group differences were seen in the use of meta-discourse segments

(explicit markers of overall essay structure), which appeared in 75% of both Group 1 and

Group 2 essays, but in very few of the Group 3 or 4 essays. Similarly, inter-paragraph transition markers, such as *First, On the other hand*, and *Finally*, occurred in all of the essays by Group 1 and in 75% of those by Group 2, but in only one of the essays by each of the other two groups.

Although inter-sentential connectors appeared in almost every essay, the quality and variety of connectors varied across the four groups. In the Group 4 essays, the only connectors used were *And, But* and *So*. Although these three also occurred frequently in essays by members of the other groups, a much richer variety appeared in Group 1, including *Above all, Besides, For example, In addition to that, In fact, In short*, and *However*, and to a lesser extent in Group 3, who used *Also, In fact, However*, and *Therefore*, and Group 2, who used *For example*, and *However*.

It would appear from these results that the use of meta-discourse markers was transferred from students' L1 training to their L2 writing. Nevertheless, several students reported having learned about meta-discourse markers in their L2 training. Moreover, it would seem that the L2 training and/or the combination of L1 and L2 training together contributed to greater variation in the choice of inter-sentential discourse markers.

4.1.3 Comparison of Japanese and English discourse marker use

In both languages, Groups 1 and 2 clearly used more explicit markers of discourse organization and logical connection than the other two groups. These parallel results in Japanese and English writing provide strong evidence that the L1 training, which both of the first two groups experienced and neither of the other two did, led to greater awareness of the need to organize the L1 essays coherently and guide the reader through the sections of the discourse. Furthermore, it appears that this awareness was transferred

to L2 writing and implemented in the L2 essays as well, although, as noted above, some students apparently acquired at least part of their awareness of discourse markers from their L2 training and transferred it to their L1 writing.

With respect to the greater use of inter-sentential markers in both languages by Group 4, it can be speculated that these students, who had not experienced any intensive training in either language, relied almost entirely on sentence-to-sentence connections. In contrast, the other three groups of students, all of whom had intensive training in one or both languages, appeared to focus their attention on larger chunks of discourse, going beyond simple sentence-to-sentence relations. Moreover, the use of a much richer variety of discourse markers by those students who had received both L1 and L2 training suggests that the combination of both kinds of training had a greater effect than the sum of the two separate kinds of training could be expected to have. That is, there appears to have been some kind of interaction that went beyond a simple additive effect.

It also should be noted that although the choice of argumentation, expository or mixed discourse modes did not appear to affect the quantity of discourse markers used, the choice of mode undoubtedly constrained the particular kinds of overall and partial meta-discourse markers that could be employed. For example, "There are two main reasons for my opinion" could only be used in relation to an argument, and "This is a strong/weak point" would generally be used as part of an expository comparison mode. Thus, the inter-relations between discourse mode, essay structure and discourse markers have to be kept firmly in mind.

4.2 Development of content

The development of ideas in the body of the essays was analyzed by identifying both (1) the number of points given, and (2) to what extent the points were developed or supported in the form of elaboration (based mainly on van Wijk, 1999, as explained in Chapter 2). For the following quantitative analysis of the elaboration, the focus was limited to the two main categories of elaboration that were identified in these essays: *context* (background, conditions, contextual evidence) and *specification* (examples, characteristics, consequences).

To illustrate the identification of points and elaboration, examples of two argumentation essays and two expository essays, one each in Japanese and one in English, are presented in Appendix F. In each paper, the points are indicated in bold font, and the elaboration is shown in italics, with the context elaboration in plain italics and the specification elaboration underlined.

As can been seen in Essays 1 and 2 in Appendix C, the points that were identified in argumentation essays were basically all reasons for the position taken or reasons against it (supporting the contra argument). On the other hand, in most of the expository essays, such as Essays 3 and 4 in Appendix C, the points were advantages or disadvantages of one of the alternatives being compared. As is evident in the sample essays in Appendix C, the contextual elaboration generally tended to occur prior to the point being elaborated, whereas the specification either preceded or followed the point it to which it was connected.

4.2.1 Points and elaboration in the Japanese essays

Table 4.3 displays the means and standard deviations of the number of points

per Japanese essay; the number of segments in each of the two categories of elaboration: *context* and *specification*; the total number of segments devoted to each of the two kinds of elaboration; and the ratio of total elaboration segments per point for the essays in each group.

Table 4.3: Number of Points and Amount of Elaboration (per 500 characters) in theJapanese Essays by Group

Group	Points Mean (SD)	Category of Elaboration[a] Context Mean (SD)	Specification Mean (SD)	Total Elab. Frequency Mean (SD)	Total Elab. Segs./Point Mean (SD)
1 (N = 9)	4.14 (1.63)	C:[b] 0.32 (0.52) S:[c] 0.64 (1.44)	2.82 (0.73) 10.28 (3.70)	3.13 (0.85) 10.92 (3.42)	3.27 (2.02)
2 (N = 6)[d]	3.66 (2.28)	C: 1.32 (0.50) S: 5.21 (6.24)	1.84 (1.80) 4.82 (4.42)	3.16 (1.68) 10.03 (3.42)	4.77 (4.49)
3 (N = 7)	2.39 (1.05)	C: 0.76 (0.50) S: 3.34 (5.09)	2.25 (1.45) 8.12 (3.68)	3.01 (1.34) 11.47 (3.48)	5.64 (3.04)
4 (N = 3)[d]	3.99 (1.68)	C: 1.60 (1.02) S: 6.99 (8.44)	2.69 (1.54) 5.97 (1.05)	4.29 (0.91) 12.96 (7.56)	4.64 (4.95)

[a]Context: condition/background/evidence; Specification: example/characteristic/consequence
[b]C = Adjusted number of cases per category; [c]S = Adjusted number of segments per category
[d]three papers eliminated because no identifiable points (ill-defined or entirely self-reflection)

There was no significant difference among the groups in terms of the number of points in the Japanese essays or the amount of total elaboration segments per point. However, Groups 1 and 3 generally tended to use less contextual elaboration and more specification than Groups 2 and 4. According to post-ANOVA Tests of Effects, there was

a significant group difference in the numbers of cases of context ($F = 5.67, p = .005$), and

an almost significant difference in the number of specification segments across the groups

($F = 2.87, p = .061$).

Given that Groups 1 and 2 both received L2 training, it can be inferred that it may

have been the English training that emphasized the importance of elaborating points in the

form of specification.   If so, it would also follow that this emphasis was apparently

transferred to the participants' L1 writing.

4.2.2   Points and elaboration in the English essays

Table 4.4 shows the means and SDs of the number of points and amount of

elaboration for the English essays by each group.   As shown in Table 3.8, in their English

essays, Group 4 tended to give fewer points than the other three groups.   The most salient

group differences in terms of categories of elaboration included the greater amount of

specification by Group 1 (with means of 2.04 instances and 5.48 segments per essay) as

compared to the other three groups (who ranged from 1.30 to 1.49 instances and from 2.18

to 3.74 segments), and the relatively less frequent use of *context* by Groups 1 and 2 (0.24

to 0.43 cases and 0.61 to 0.77 segments, as opposed to 0.79 to 0.82 instances and 2.08 to

3.02 segments for the other 2 groups).

Similar distinctions can be seen among the groups in terms of the amount of total

elaboration.   Groups 1 and 3 provided more total instances of elaboration than Groups 2

and 4 (means of 2.28 and 2.31 for the former, and 1.90 and 2.09, respectively, for the latter),

and Group 2 had a remarkably smaller number of segments of elaboration (3.73) as

compared to Groups 1, 3 and 4 (with 6.09, 5.82 and 5.20, respectively).   Groups 1, 3 and

4 all outscored Group 2 in terms of the mean number of elaboration segments per reason (a

range of 3.03 to 4.31 versus only 1.45 for Group 2).   However, considering that Group 4

gave relatively few points (with a mean of less than 1.5 per essay), as opposed to the other

groups, as mentioned above, this last apparent similarity between Group 4 and Groups 1

and 3 has to be treated cautiously.

Table 4.4: Number of Points and Amount of Elaboration (per 500 characters) in the English Essays by Group

Group	Points Mean (SD)	Category of Elaboration[a]		Total Elab. Frequency Mean (SD)	Total Elab. Segs./Point Mean (SD)
		Context Mean (SD)	Specification Mean (SD)		
1 (N = 9)	2.42 (1.02)	C:[b] 0.24 (0.53) S:[c] 0.61 (1.40)	2.04 (1.06) 5.48 (2.57)	2.28 (0.96) 6.09 (2.87)	3.40 (2.51)
2 (N = 7) (1.23)*	3.70 (1.69)	C: 0.43 (0.56) S: 0.77 (1.18)	1.47 (1.18) 2.96 (2.06)	1.90 (0.35) 3.73 (1.42)	1.45
3 (N = 7)	2.50 (1.16)	C: 0.82 (0.80) S: 2.08 (2.01)	1.49 (0.89) 3.74 (2.82)	2.31 (1.04) 5.82 (2.55)	3.03 (2.13)
4 (N = 4)[d]	1.47 (0.53)	C: 0.79 (0.52) S: 3.02 (1.82)	1.30 (0.67) 2.18 (1.29)	2.09 (0.50) 5.20 (1.27)	4.31 (3.15)

[a]Context: condition/background; Specification: example/characteristic/consequence
[b]C = Adjusted number of cases per category; [c]S = Adjusted number of segments per category
[d]one paper eliminated because no identifiable points (entirely self-reflection)
*$p < .05$

These findings can be interpreted to suggest that the L2 training may have

emphasized the importance of elaborating the content by providing concrete support more

than the L1 training did.   Moreover, those who received both L1 and L2 training appear to

have been induced to provide more elaboration in the form of specification (examples,

characteristics, consequences) than those with just one kind of training or no training.

We also looked at the use of personal (as opposed to general) evidence to support the points in the English essays. Whereas personal (self-centered) experience was included in 100% of the essays by members of Group 3 and 4, it was used in 75% of Group 2 and only 50% of Group 1 essays. Thus, it would appear that the L1 training may have tended to lead students toward relatively less use of personal, as opposed to general evidence, perhaps because they were encouraged to approach their essay in a logical, objective way. It should be noted that self-reflective writing tended to contribute more toward context (mainly background) than toward specification, which probably explains the higher number of contextual segments produced by Group 4 writers, as compared to the other groups.

3.4.3 Comparison of points and elaboration in the Japanese and English essays

Some of the same tendencies were found in terms of the patterns of group behavior across both languages, most notably the use of more elaboration through specification by Group 1 and that of more contextual elaboration by Group 4. On the other hand, although Groups 2 and 3 produced moderate to substantial specification in both languages, their use of contextual elaboration contrasted across languages, with Group 2 using much more than Group 3 in Japanese, and Group 3 using more than Group 2 in English. This difference undoubtedly related to the particular structural patterns that were being followed by each group in the two languages. For example, as explained in section 3.2.2.2, several Group 2 Japanese essays included extended personal illustration (coded as context) to support an original thesis or reflection on personal experience (again, context) to develop a general discussion, whereas such self-analysis was left out of the Group 2

English essays, presumably either because sophisticated explanation and expression of complex relations between personal and general content was beyond their linguistic capabilities in their L2, or because they felt that the inclusion of any kind of *"ten"* component would not be appropriate in their English essays.   On the other hand, as discussed in sections 3.2.2.3 and 3.2.4.3, although Group 3 wrote in different modes in the two language, they tended to support their English argumentation essays with personal (generally contextual) experience, which may have been influenced by their earlier L1 *"Sakubun"* writing, or perhaps could have been cultivated by their L2 training, if they were encouraged to use their own experiences to support their arguments.

Looking at the frequency data across languages, it would appear that the Japanese essays included more points and much more elaboration than the English essays. Because of the lack of correspondence between Japanese characters and English words, statistical tests of significance cannot be performed.   Nevertheless, if we consider that 500 Japanese characters is probably equivalent to many more than 100 words (probably at least 250 or 300 words), if the frequencies were adjusted in a more comparable way across the two languages, the differences would be much greater, with the numbers in the Japanese table being much higher relative to those in the English table.   This contrast is not at all surprising, considering that the participants were all novice writers, especially in their L2, and had not acquired more than an intermediate level of English proficiency.   Thus, in approximately the same time period, they were able to develop the content of their essays much further in Japanese than they could in English.   We can assume that at least part of the reason for this ability was related to the relative ease of formulating the linguistic expressions to convey their intended content in their native language.

Chapter 5: Writing Process

In this chapter, first the four groups' Japanese and English writing processes will be compared in terms of writing fluency and planning time. Second, the English writing processes reflected in the pausing behavior analysis will be compared across the four groups.

5.1 Writing Fluency

As explained in Chapter 2, writing fluency was measured in terms of the total amount of writing, along with the rate at which the writing was produced (in terms of characters or words per minute). In addition, the amount of time spent planning before beginning the actual writing was recorded and compared across the groups.

5.1.1 Japanese writing fluency

Because the participants were writing in their native language, group differences in writing fluency were not expected. Table 5.1 presents the group means and standard deviations (SDs) for the total number of Japanese characters per essay, the writing speed (the number of characters per minute), and the planning time. As this table shows, the measures appeared to be similar across the 4 groups, except that Group 3 tended to write longer essays and spend less time planning than the other 3 groups.

Table 5.1: Japanese Essay Length, Speed of Writing, Planning Time

	Character Count* Mean (SD)	Characters/Min. Mean (SD)	Planning Time (Min.) Mean (SD)
Group 1	790.11 (101.47)	26.65 (8.35)	5.16 (5.45)
Group 2	736.14 (125.09)	25.00 (8.02)	5.03 (6.32)
Group 3	1044.00 (326.40)	26.63 (12.92)	1.26 (0.53)
Group 4	737.00 (109.30)	22.52 (4.75)	4.39 (8.18)

*Group 2 < Group 3: *$p < .05$; Groups 1 & 4 < Group 3: $p < .1$

According to a 4 (groups) x 3 (characters, speed, planning time) repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) test, there was in fact a significant overall difference among the groups ($F = 3.908, p = 0.021$) for these measures. Post-hoc tests of effects showed no significant differences among the groups for the writing speed or planning time, but there was a difference in terms of the total character count ($F = 4.076, p = 0.018$). According to post-hoc Scheffé tests, Group 3 wrote significantly longer essays than Group 2 ($p = 0.047$), and there was a non-significant tendency for their essays to be longer than those of both Group 1 ($p = 0.097$) and Group 4 ($p = 0.080$), as well. This may be related to the kind of writing produced, as discussed in section 3.2.1. Another possible explanation for this tendency might be that Group 3 students, who had received L2 training, but no specific L1 training, may have overcompensated for their lack of explicit L1 essay writing knowledge by producing more. It is also possible that because they planned less before writing, they needed to produce more text in order to complete the task. Of course any such interpretations would have to be verified through further investigation.

5.1.2 English Writing Fluency

The English fluency measures (means and SDs for total words, words per minute, and planning time) are shown in Table 5.2.   As these results indicate, Group 1 tended to write more words, at a faster rate, and spend more time planning than the other 3 groups. Although group was not a significant factor overall, according to a 2 (Group 1 vs. the other three groups combined) x 3 (words, speed, planning time) repeated measures test of effects, Group 1 students (N = 9) wrote at a significantly faster rate $(F = 6.327, p = .018)^3$ than the students in the other three groups combined (N = 19).   In addition, Group 1 showed an almost significant tendency to spend more time planning (F = 4.032, p = .055) than the other three groups combined.

Table 5.2: English Essay Length, Speed of Writing, Planning Time

	Total Word Count Mean (SD)	Words/Minute Mean (SD)	Planning Time (Min.) Mean (SD)
Group 1	190.33 (46.56)	6.39** (2.15)	6.38* (4.49)
Group 2	158.43 (50.71)	4.35 (1.89)	4.02 (3.95)
Group 3	176.57 (43.98)	4.35 (1.76)	3.83 (3.71)
Group 4	180.60 (41.77)	5.07 (1.25)	1.75 (1.16)

**p < .05, *p < .1 for Group 1 versus Groups 2,3,4 combined

One interpretation of these results is that the combined L1 and L2 training led writers to plan their English essays more fully before they started writing, which in turn tended to allow them to produce more fluent L2 writing.   We will return to this issue in the discussion of the writing process (pause analysis) data in section 5.2.

5.1.3 Comparison of Japanese and English Writing Fluency

Although there was no time limit for the writing in either language, the range and means for the time the participants (N = 28) spent writing their L1 essays (range: 19.09 – 74.65 minutes, mean: 35.99 minutes, SD: 13.91) were surprisingly very similar to those for their L2 essays (range: 17.23 – 81.60 minutes, mean: 37.93 minutes, SD: 13.98). It is of course very difficult to compare the number of Japanese characters to the number of English words, as it is far from a one-to-one correspondence. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the participants wrote much longer essays in their native language, and generally wrote them at a faster rate than they did in English. (It should be noted that the writing rate was influenced by the number and length of pauses made while writing, which differed greatly among individuals; this point will be addressed further in Chapter 5.)

Regarding differences in writing fluency and writing planning across the 4 groups, the patterns differed for the two languages. In Japanese, only Group 3, which had received L2 but no L1 training, generally wrote longer L1 essays and tended to spend less time planning than the other 3 groups, and there were no differences among the groups in terms of writing rate. In English, Group 1, which had received both L1 and L2 training, tended to write their L2 essays at a faster rate and spend more time planning than the other 3 groups, while there were no significant differences in the length of the essays (though Group 1 generally tended to write longer essays and Group 2 tended to write shorter ones than the other 2 groups).

5.2 Pause Analysis

In order to shed more light on the English composing process, retrospective

recall by the participants was elicited through immediate viewing of the first 10 minutes

and the last 5 minutes of the video-taped writing sessions, as explained in Chapter 2. The

writers' reported reasons for pausing were categorized according to the functions they

served: planning (organization of ideas; essay, paragraph, intersentential structure of

discourse), generating (content), expressing (formulating language at various levels),

refining (content or language), correcting (content or language), or other (e.g., re-reading).

In addition, the largest functional category (expressing) was broken down into sub-

categories based on the language level in focus: inter-sentential, sentence and clause

structure, grammatical, lexical, mechanical, and other, as explained in greater detail below.

5.2.1 Functional categories

Frequencies for the first 10 minutes and last 5 minutes combined were adjusted

per 100 words, and the means and SDs for each group are presented in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3: Major Function Categories: Means and SDs of Adjusted Frequencies (per 100 words) by Group

Group	Planning	Generating	Expressing	Refining	Correcting	Other
1	1.17	1.87	18.89	5.27	0.96	2.99
(N = 9)	(1.17)	(3.04)	(9.29)	(5.17)	(0.90)	(1.59)
2	1.38	5.08	26.90	0.64	1.72	3.69
(N = 6)	(1.99)	(3.66)	(9.09)	(1.07)	(0.99)	(2.33)
3	0.82	3.34	30.44	2.21	1.25	3.08
(N = 7)	(1.51)	(3.40)	(7.55)	(2.45)	(0.90)	(3.71)
4	1.47	2.20	27.65	2.03	2.34	0.57
(N = 5)	(0.42)	(0.86)	(5.26)	(1.94)	(2.75)	(0.85)

As is evident from Table 5.3, all of the groups paused most frequently for the purpose of

expressing (formulating language). The most striking differences among the groups were Group 1's relatively less frequent pauses for expressing and their higher number of pauses for refining language. Although there were no significant overall group differences according to a 4 (groups) x 6 (function categories) repeated multivariate analysis of variance, a post-hoc test of effects indicated that group differences were nearly significant for the categories of expressing ($F = 2.943$, $p = .054$) and refining ($F = 2.499$, $p = .085$).

Considering the percentages of pauses in each of the categories across the groups, some differences can be observed between the pausing behavior in the first 10 minutes and that in the last 5 minutes. The frequencies of occurrence for the first 10 minutes are shown in Table 5.4, and those for the last 5 minutes are shown in Table 5.5. Perhaps the most conspicuous differences in the last 5 minutes concern the relatively greater attention paid to planning and generating a conclusion for the essay, especially by Group 2, and the greater percentage of pauses by all groups that were devoted to refining mainly language.

Table 5.4: Percentages of Total Functions Devoted to Each Category:
Means and SDs by Group (first 10 minutes)

Group	Planning	Generating	Expressing	Refining	Correcting	Other
1	4.1%	7.9%	62.5%	12.3%	3.8%	9.4%
(N = 9)	(3.5)	(10.9)	(16.4)	(13.0)	(4.1)	(5.0)
2	2.4%	12.3%	70.8%	1.2%	5.2%	8.0%
(N = 6)	(3.7)	(11.7)	(21.4)	(2.9)	(4.6)	(7.5)
3	0.8%	8.1%	80.0%	2.2%	2.9%	6.0%
(N = 7)	(2.1)	(10.1)	(6.7)	(2.8)	(4.0)	(5.7)
4	2.3%	3.8%	82.5%	3.7%	6.4%	1.3%
(N = 5)	(3.1)	(5.1)	(12.8)	(5.9)	(6.8)	(3.0)

Table 5.5:   Percentages of Total Functions Devoted to Each Category:
            Means and SDs by Group (last 5 minutes)

Group	Planning	Generating	Expressing	Refining	Correcting	Other
1	4.6%	2.4%	56.4%	21.0%	3.6%	11.9%
(N = 9)	(5.8)	(5.1)	(23.8)	(18.7)	(6.0)	(10.0)
2	7.8%	15.1%	58.6%	2.4%	2.1%	14.0%
(N = 6)	(8.9)	(17.6)	(17.9)	(5.8)	(5.1)	(15.8)
3	4.0%	8.3%	68.0%	9.1%	4.6%	6.2%
(N = 7)	(7.0)	(8.4)	(14.6)	(9.3)	(5.8)	(10.5)
4	7.6%	9.1%	68.2%	9.1%	4.0%	2.0%
(N = 5)	(4.7)	(9.7)	(22.1)	(12.3)	(5.8)	(4.5)

Given the fact that these intermediate proficiency English learners were composing in their L2, it should not be surprising that all groups would spend the largest percentage of their pausing time on formulating their ideas in English.   What seems most remarkable is that the Group 1 writers spent so much more of their time on refining their writing (21% of their pauses in the last 5 minutes were reportedly devoted to refinement). While it remains to be determined to what extent this refining is comparable to the kind of rhetorical refining found by Sasaki (2000, 2002) among her professional writers, there is no doubt that some of it was comparable.   For example, in the last sentence of her English essay ("I'm sure that we can develop through traveling alone"), Group 1 participant 1-2 had originally written the word *grow*, but changed it to *develop*.   In explaining her reason for making this change, she cited her concern for creating a strong ending for her essay. Thinking that *grow* does not imply "a great deal," she chose *develop* because it may mean "we can grow a lot through traveling alone" (quoted expressions are translated from the Japanese), demonstrating her meta-knowledge about the characteristics of effective conclusions for essays.   Similarly, Group 3 participant 3-1 original wrote "I prefer

traveling in the group ..." but later changed it to "I <u>like</u> traveling in the group ..."

because she had already used the word *prefer* earlier.   In explaining her reasoning, she

cited her awareness of English readers' expectations that good writing should not contain

the same expression repeatedly.

5.2.2   Sub-categories of Expressing

Within the functional category concerned with formulating language, 6 sub-

categories were identified, based on the language level under focus: inter-sentential

(concerned with sentence connectors), sentence and clause structure (including word order),

grammatical (below the level of clause structure, but including concern for subject-verb

agreement and tense), lexical (including both translation and choice of words and phrases),

mechanical (spelling, punctuation, capitalization), and other (mainly unclear or

undetermined focus).

Table 5.6 shows the means and SDs of the frequencies (adjusted per 100 words)

of these sub-categories for each group, and Table 5.7 shows the means and SDs of the

percentages of the same sub-categories.

Table 5.6:   Sub-categories of Expression: Adjusted Frequencies (per 100 words):
Means and SDs by Group

Group	Intersent	Sent/Clause	Grammar	Lexical	Mechanical	Other
1	1.39	4.79	2.68	8.93	0.75	0.35
(N = 9)	(1.24)	(3.49)	(3.23)	(5.13)	(0.98)	(0.70)
2	1.85	7.56	4.78	12.46	0.26	0.0
(N = 6)	(1.83)	(2.82)	(4.54)	(5.35)	(0.63)	(0.0)
3	1.24	9.20	3.45	14.70	1.01	0.59
(N = 7)	(1.74)	(4.38)	(1.98)	(7.04)	(0.96)	(1.01)
4	0.0	7.58	2.94	14.40	1.56	1.17
(N = 5)	(0.0)	(2.55)	(2.01)	(5.06)	(1.02)	(1.43)

Table 5.7: Sub-categories of Expression: Means (SDs) of Percentages by Group

Group	Intersent	Sent/Clause	Grammar	Lexical	Mechanical	Other
1	8.3%	24.4%	13.6%	48.6%	3.7%	1.4%
(N = 9)	(8.5)	(11.8)	(18.0)	(21.0)	(5.1)	(3.1)
2	6.2%	28.7%	16.4%	47.4%	1.3%	0.0%
(N = 6)	(5.6)	(10.1)	(10.2)	(17.0)	(3.3)	(0.0)
3	4.0%	38.8%	11.1%	47.4%	3.5%	2.5%
(N = 7)	(5.6)	(14.0)	(5.1)	(16.0)	(3.5)	(4.2)
4	0.0	27.0%	11.9%	51.7%	5.3%	4.1%
(N = 5)	(0.0)	(6.7)	(9.9)	(13.1)	(3.5)	(5.1)

As is evident from both tables, all of the groups attended most frequently to lexical choice, followed by the formulation of clauses or sentences. Few differences among the groups can be discerned. Perhaps the only notable one is the complete lack of attention to inter-sentential connectors during pauses by Group 4. Given the fact that this group used more than twice as many inter-sentential markers than any of the other 3 groups, it seems surprising that they never paused to reflect on their use. This would suggest that, unlike the other 3 groups, they were producing these markers rather automatically, rather than applying any kind of meta-discourse knowledge.

5.2.3 Dictionary Use

The participants were allowed to use an electronic dictionary while writing their English essays, and almost all of them availed themselves of the opportunity to do so (one or two preferred to use an ordinary printed dictionary instead). The number of times a participant paused to consult a dictionary during the first 10 minutes and the last 5 minutes of the writing was counted and adjusted per 100 words of writing.

Table 5.8 shows the means and SDs of the adjusted frequencies by group for each

time period and the total combined time. According to the results shown in Table 5.8, participants in all 4 groups tended to pause to consult a dictionary much more often during the first 10 minutes than during the last 5 minutes, which should probably not be surprising if we consider that relatively fewer new words would be needed at the end of an essay than at the beginning.

Table 5.8: Frequency of Dictionary Use by Group:
Means and SDs (per 100 words)

Group	First 10 Minutes	Last 5 Minutes	Total
1 (N = 9)	2.96 (1.57)	2.21 (1.57)	5.16 (2.72)
2 (N = 6)	6.09 (3.95)	3.60 (4.64)	9.69 (6.65)
3 (N = 7)	9.70 (6.27)	2.91 (1.90)	12.61 (5.93)
4 (N = 5)	8.94 (3.59)	4.83 (2.75)	13.77 (5.36)

With respect to cross-group differences, the most striking one was that Group 1 apparently depended upon a dictionary much less frequently than the other 3 groups, especially during the first 10 minutes. However, this finding may be misleading. If we consider that Group 1 writers tended to spend more time planning before they began the actual writing, and often this planning included consulting a dictionary, it is likely that the extra planning time taken by Group 1 could account for this discrepancy. In fact, looking at the frequency of overall dictionary use by the four groups, there was no significant difference in the number of times, overall, that writers consulted dictionaries while writing their essays.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

6.1 Overview of Salient Characteristics of Japanese and English Texts

This chapter begins with a summary of the most salient features that were found to distinguish among the Japanese and English texts of the four groups. The main features the Japanese texts are presented in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1: Salient Characteristics of Japanese Texts by Group

	Task Response/ Rhetorical Mode	Overall Essay Structure and Discourse Markers	Planning and Development of Ideas
Group 1 (N = 9)	All Arg and/or Exp (4 Arg/Exp, 3 Arg, 2 Exp)	Complexly structured essays with extended analy/persp Substantial use of meta-discourse markers (overall & partial)	Detailed pre-writing planning Elaborated support, mainly specification More general than personal evidence
Group 2 (N = 7)	Mainly Exp (4 Exp, 2 Arg, 1 Self)	Complexly structured essays with extended analy/persp Substantial use of meta-discourse markers (overall & partial)	Detailed pre-writing planning Elaborated support, both context & specification More general than personal evidence
Group 3 (N = 7)	Mainly Mixed (3 Arg/Exp, 2 Exp/Self, 2 Exp)	Movement between personal and general perspectives Moderate use of meta-discourse markers	Little pre-writing planning Elaborated support, more specification than context More personal than general evidence
Group 4 (N = 5)	Varied (2 Exp, 1 Arg/Exp, 1 Self, 1 Ill-defined)	Relatively simple essay structure Moderate use of overall meta-discourse & inter-sentential markers	General pre-writing planning Elaborated support, both context & specification More personal than general evidence

Arg = Argumentation, Exp = Exposition, Self = Self-reflection; analy/persp = analysis/perspective

A summary of the most notable features that characterized the English texts of the four groups is shown in Table 6.2.

Table 6.2: Salient Characteristics of English Texts by Group

	Task Response/ Rhetorical Mode	Overall Essay Structure and Discourse Markers	Planning and Development of Ideas
Group 1 (N = 9)	Mainly Arg (5 Arg, 3 Arg/Exp, 1 Self/Arg)	Coherently structured essays with focus on body Use of many meta-discourse markers (overall & partial)	Detailed pre-writing planning Highly elaborated support More general than personal evidence
Group 2 (N = 7)	All Arg and/or Exp (3 Arg/Exp, 2 Arg, 2 Exp)	At least 3 paragraphs, including intro, body and conclusion Use of meta-discourse markers (overall & partial)	General pre-writing planning Well-developed introductions Underdeveloped body listing many points without much elaboration Slightly more general than personal evidence
Group 3 (N = 7)	Mainly Arg (5 Arg, 1 Exp, 1 Self/Exp)	Weak sense of overall structure Sometimes arbitrary paragraphing Minimal use of overall & some use of partial meta-discourse markers	General pre-writing planning Relatively many points with elaborated support More personal than general evidence
Group 4 (N = 5)	Mixed or Self (3 Self/Arg, 1 Self, 1 Ill-defined)	Extensive use of personal narratives No use of overall & minimal use of partial meta-discourse markers; substantial use of inter-sentential markers	Minimal pre-writing planning Few points with rich elaboration Much more personal than general evidence

Arg = Argumentation, Exp = Exposition, Self = Self-reflection

In the following two sections, the specific and overall research questions will be discussed in light of the results, with implications from the findings. The final section will

discuss limitations of the study and conclude with suggestions for future research building on the work reported here.

6.2 Answers to Specific Research Questions

All the specific research questions addressed inter-group comparisons among the four groups of students selected for this study. To recapitulate the factors distinguishing the four groups, Group 1 received special intensive preparatory training in both L1 and L2 writing; Group 2 had such training in only L1 writing; Group 3 underwent such training in only L2 writing; and Group 4 received no intensive training in writing essays in either language.

6.2.1 Questions regarding Japanese writing

Questions J1 and J2: Text Features

The first two specific research questions focused on a series of text features of the Japanese essays, looking specifically at task definition, discourse mode and text structure; discourse markers; and development of content. Notable variations were found among the four groups in terms of all of these features, which were in fact inter-related.

Group 1 students, with both L1 and L2 training, wrote complexly structured essays often including extended perspective and counter-arguments (a positive point of the other side). To support their position, specification was mainly used with a variety of coherence markers, including meta-discourse and inter-paragraph makers. Similarly, Group 2 students with only special L1 training wrote complexly structured essays with substantial use of meta-discourse markers. Unlike Group 1, however, they appeared to be more concerned with explaining their original thesis by using both specification and context equally. That is, whereas they strived to

use general evidence, they also relied upon personal accounts such as personal events, feelings and thoughts, which could show an indication of the *Sakubun* training they received in regular *Kokugo* classes in elementary and junior high school. Thus, the essays of Group 2 students would appear to reflect the characteristics of both kinds of L1 writing training, one geared for college entrance essay exam preparation and *Sakubun*.

The tendency to use such personal evidence is also observed in the essays by the students in Group 3 and Group 4, who did not receive L1 special writing training. Perhaps because of lack of essay-level writing experience, their essays also tended to have a somewhat weak internal structure, often moving between personal and general perspectives in the case of Group 3 students, and to have a relatively simple structure in the case of Group 4. In essays with such structure, the use of meta-discourse by these groups was generally moderate. However, there was one difference in the kind of evidence used between the two groups; Group 3 with L2 training tended to have more specification than context to support their position or thesis, whereas Group 4 relied upon personal than general evidence. Although both groups share some characteristics, Group 3 showed an indication of having received L2 paragraph-level writing training.

In essence, it would appear from the textual analysis of the L1 essays that the L1 training led to the development of awareness of the need to create a coherent overall essay structure, signaled by overt discourse markers, and containing general evidence, rather than relying solely on personal accounts. At the same time, the L2 training may have led to greater use of specification to support the points in the writers' L1 essays, and some awareness of the need for establishing coherence through discourse markers.

Question J3: Writing Fluency

The third specific research question asked whether writing fluency would differ among L1 writers in the four groups. Surprisingly, Group 3, with L2 but no L1 training, tended to plan less and write longer essays than the other three groups. It is unclear whether this tendency resulted from the kinds of writing produced (mainly mixed modes with movement between personal and general perspectives), possible attempts to compensate for absence of L1 training by writing longer essays, relatively shorter planning time, other as yet unidentified factors, or some combination of these possibilities.

6.2.2 Questions regarding English writing

Questions E1 and E2: Text Features

Like the L1 essays, the L2 essays were found to vary in terms of text features across the 4 groups. Also similar to L1, the textual features were clearly interrelated. Regarding discourse modes and text structure, there was a tendency for all 4 groups to use more Argumentation in their L2 writing than they had in their L1 essays. Nevertheless, there were distinct differences among the 4 groups in terms of the structures, discourse markers, and development of the content of their L2 essays.

The students who had received both kinds of training (Group 1) wrote the most well-developed and coherently structured essays, with a focus on the body, including elaboration to support their position, and a rich variety of coherence markers, including meta-discourse and inter-paragraph markers such as *first, in addition, however,* and *on the other hand* (see Appendix E). In contrast, while the students with only L1 training (Group 2) also wrote relatively well-organized, coherent essays including an acknowledgement of the other side's argument, unlike

Group 1, they tended to create proportionately overly elaborated introductions and to develop relatively little detail in the body of their essays. These students appeared to follow what they had learned in their L1 essay writing training, particularly regarding overall organization and inclusion of the other side's opinion, but they were not able to develop sufficient detail, probably due to their lack of L2 writing practice. On the other hand, the students with only L2 training (Group 3) tended to include relatively elaborated support for their points, but unlike the first two groups, they showed little sense of overall essay or paragraph structure, displaying only minimal use of inter-paragraph markers and no meta-discourse markers. Although their focused paragraph-length L2 writing practice may have allowed them to develop the schema of points followed by explanation, this group of students appeared to lack meta-discourse knowledge, including awareness of overall essay structure and the need for discourse markers. Finally, those with no training (Group 4) often fell back on the kind of self-reflective writing they learned in elementary and junior high school, e.g., depending heavily on personal experience to convey their ideas.

Overall, the textual features of the L2 essays suggest that, similar to what was seen in the L1 essays, the L1 training contributed to meta-discourse knowledge regarding essay organization and the need for meta-discourse markers. Furthermore, it would appear that the L2 training, especially when it was combined with the L1 training, led to greater elaboration through specification (examples, characteristics) to support the points made in the L2 essays.

Question E3:L2 Writing Process

The fluency measures for the L2 writing indicated that Group 1 students, with both L1 and L2 training, were the most fluent English writers. This may have a direct result of their tendency to spend more time planning their essays, particularly as compared to Group 4. In

relation to this finding, we can conclude that the intensive training students received led them to an awareness of the need to plan their English essays before beginning to write, and that this effect was cumulative. That is, the more training students received, regardless of whether it was for L1 or L2 writing, the more time they tended to spend planning their L2 writing.

The results of the analysis of pausing behavior during the L2 writing provide further evidence that the students who had received the special intensive training were applying the meta-knowledge they had acquired. Although all 4 groups paused most often in order to focus on how to express their ideas in their L2, Group 1 paused less frequently than the other groups for this function and paused relatively much more frequently in order to refine their essays, including rhetorical considerations, such as effectiveness of expression and attention to audience. Particularly Group 2 spent more time at the end of the essay than the beginning, planning and generating a conclusion, reflecting their concern for essay structure. Moreover, all groups except Group 4, with no intensive training, spent time thinking about inter-sentential connections as they were writing.

6.2.3 Questions regarding comparison between Japanese and English writing

Question C1: Text features

In response to the open-ended writing tasks, the students chose more varied discourse modes, including more use of exposition, in L1, as opposed to a dominant use of argumentation, either alone or as part of mixed patterns, in L2. Only Group 1, who had received the intensive writing training in both languages, showed consistency in creating coherently structured essays with identifiable organizational patterns and inclusion of indirect support and/or counter-arguments to strengthen their arguments in both languages. Although Group 2 writers, who

had not had L2 training, generally wrote essays that had clear overall structures containing introduction, body and conclusion, the body of their essays tended not to be developed as much as the introduction or conclusion. In contrast to Group 2, Group 3, who had experienced only L2 training, appeared to have little sense of overall essay structure or paragraph breaks, but clearly tended to favor the placement of position statements at the beginning and end of their argument essays. Finally, Group 4 tended to make extensive use of self-reflection in their L1 and L2 writing, which probably related to their early "*Sakubun*" writing experience.

Question C2: Writing Fluency

Most students spent very nearly the same amount of time writing their L1 and L2 essays (an average of 36 minutes for L1 and 38 minutes for L2). Because of the enormous differences in the two writing systems, it is difficult to compare the length of the papers in terms of characters and words across the two languages. Nonetheless, the average length of 830 characters for L1 essays (slightly over two pages) is clearly much longer than the average of 177 words (generally less than one page) for the L2 essays. The writing rate was clearly faster in Japanese, the writers' L1, as they wrote more than 25 characters per minute on average for L1 as compared to 5 words per minute for L2.

Group differences in fluency varied across the two languages. In L1, the groups tended to be equally fluent writers in terms of the speed of writing, but the amount of writing produced by Group 3, with only L2 writing training, was greater, perhaps related to the kind of discourse they produced and the relatively shorter length of time they spent planning before they wrote. In contrast, in L2, Group 1, with both kinds of training, wrote more quickly than the other 3 groups, probably because they spent more time planning their essays before they began to write. They also tended to write longer L2 essays than the other groups, particularly Group

2, who had received no L1 or L2 training.

6.3 Answers to Larger Research Questions

As explained in the introduction, in addition to the specific research questions, the answers to two more general, over-arching questions were sought through this study. Each of them is discussed in turn below.

6.3.1 Positive transfer of L1 writing experience to L2 writing

One of the major purposes of the present study was to investigate the possible positive transfer of L1 writing experience, in particular, special L1 preparatory essay-level writing training, on second language writing. The features of English (L2) writing that differentiated the essays by writers who had experience intensive L1 training from those by writers who had not received such training can be assumed to have been transferred from the L1 writing. In this study, such features included (1) coherent overall essay structure (introduction-body-conclusion), (2) substantial use of both essay and partial discourse markers and also (3) a logical argument with general evidence to support their position or idea. Evidence from the pause analysis and in-depth interviews support this interpretation. The kind of special L1 training Group 1 and Group 2 students had received apparently affected their transferring all these text features to L2 writing.

In the special L1 training, students practice writing essays with 800 to 1,000 characters repeatedly, which usually consist of the three parts of introduction-body-conclusion. Although most of the students had not experienced writing a short essay in L2, they apparently transferred the essay structure with proper paragraphing to L2 writing. Also because the special L1 training aims to help students write essays to persuade college entrance examiners or to explain

ideas clearly to such readers, the students' awareness of the audience appeared to lead them to the frequent use of overall and partial meta-discourse makers, which can signal the reader what is to come and how chunks of discourse are interrelated. Such awareness probably also led some students to use concrete examples in L2 writing to illustrate the points they made, as discussed earlier in section 3.7.1. In sum, the special L1 writing training tended to heighten Group 1 and Group 2 students' great concern with the clarity of communication.

In relation to clear communication, the L1 training also helped students to become aware of the importance of building a logical argument and providing supports to substantiate a point. Supports used usually included observations or factual knowledge and personal experience. To appeal to the reader logically, both Group 1 students and Group 2 students tended to use more general evidence than personal evidence in both L1 and L2 writing.

In spite of the transfer of such text features, however, a positive transfer of L1 writing experience on second language writing may be influenced by many factors such as specific content of the special L1 training, individual students' perception of L1 writing and their past L1 writing experience (mainly "*Sakubun*"). First, although the special L1 training tends to help students write clearly, emphasis placed in the given training could be varied because this is individualized instruction and the instructor's view of writing may affect students' perception of writing. For example, in relation to overall essay structure, some students reported the instruction they received included the use of a four-part essay consisting of an opinion, a counter-argument, support-reasons and a conclusion as discussed earlier, whereas some others were reportedly taught to use a Japanese traditional rhetorical pattern, *ki-sho-ten-ketu* (introduction-continuation-change-conclusion), and for others no clear instruction on essay structure was given except in terms of making their opinion as clear to the reader as possible.

Similarly, with originality of ideas, one student said that she was repeatedly told the importance of including her own original ideas in her writing. Thus, the specific content of L1 training students received could obviously affect students' transfer of L1 training into L2 writing.

Nevertheless, it would appear to be students themselves who ultimately determine what to transfer and what not to transfer. Their perception of L1 and L2 writing, which is often interwoven with their past writing training, can significantly influence students' L1 transfer into L2 writing. Several cases illustrate this point. Two Group 1 students having received both L1 and L2 training, for example, expressed a different view of writing Japanese versus English essays. One student emphasized in the interview that for Japanese writing, *ten* ("change" in *ki-sho-ten-ketsu*) is necessary because it gives the reader a surprise and then it makes the writing more interesting; on the other hand, what is important for English writing is to write a clear statement of an opinion with logical supports. Perceiving that difference between the two languages, the student employed basically the same structure (Exposition-> Argumentation) across the two languages, but did not include a *"ten"*(change) section in her English essay. Similarly, the other student who also reported an awareness of such differences across the two languages deliberately chose the same structure (Exposition-> Argumentation) for both L1 and L2 because he preferred to explain ideas to the reader first and gradually reach a conclusion. He believed that this way (an inductive movement of ideas) would interest the reader more than an essay with an opinion stated in the beginning. Furthermore, a Group 3 student (S3-5) referred to earlier chose the traditional rhetorical *ki-sho-ten-ketsu* style because she perceived overall English essay structure as too formulaic. All these cases could constitute evidence that some students chose the way they were used to writing and transferred it to L2 writing because they valued such a structure, feeling more comfortable with it than the newly learned structures.

Next, students' past L1 writing experience, particularly with *"Sakubun"*, apparently affected students' frequent use of personal accounts in L2 essays. Japanese students have a great many chances to write *"Sakubun"* in *Kokugo* classes throughout elementary, junior and senior high schools. In the *kansoubun*, one kind of *"Sakubun"*, the writer is expected to write freely describing their feelings, thoughts and reflections. Students are often asked to do this kind of writing after they experience some school events such as a school trip or an athletic meeting, and also as a book report. Valued features emphasized in writing the *kansoubun* on a book, for example, include students reflecting on what moved them, showing how the work enriched them and a hope or desire the work has given to them (Ross, 2000). This kind of writing is closely related to students' school life and almost all students have experience with the writing. Therefore, when students have no L1 or L2 special writing training, as in the case of Group 4, they tend to rely heavily on this past writing experience when they write in both languages. Also in the case of Group 3 students, because they did not receive L1 special training, they apparently tended to transfer their past L1 writing experience into L2 writing by including personal accounts.

As seen above, a positive transfer of L1 experience to L2 writing could be influenced by many factors. At the same time, it should be remembered that the results of the present study support the arguments by Cumming (1989) and Raimes (1987), among others, that writing ability is separable from language proficiency. They also imply that not only expert writers, but also novice writers, have the possibility of transferring their composing competence from L1 to L2.

6.3.2 Possible effects of combined L1 and L2 writing experience

The results of this study indicate that students with L1 and L2 specialized writing

training succeeded in writing coherently structured, well-developed essays in both L1 and L2, whereas those with only L1 or L2 training, or without any training, were less successful either in terms of essay structure or development of content, or both, particularly in their L2 essays. This finding clearly suggests that the interaction between L1 and L2 writing experience leads to qualitatively more beneficial effects than the sum of the separate effects of L1 and L2. There are several possible reasons to explain why such positive interaction tended to occur.

First, the increased amount of writing practice the students obtained from L1 and L2 could have helped to bridge the gap between "declarative" and "procedural" knowledge (Anderson, 1983), that is, to activate the linguistic and discourse knowledge they have acquired and apply it in their L2 writing. In the special preparatory training, which was usually individualized instruction, students often wrote an essay after reading a newspaper article and revised the essay based on feedback they received from their teacher (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2002). Following this process, the students in the current study reported practicing L1 and L2 writing at least ten times or more in each language. In this repeated performance, they not only gained knowledge about writing essays, but also practiced how to apply it in actual writing.

Another reason may be that the relatively extensive experience of writing in both languages seems to encourage a strong sense of audience and the need to communicate with the reader convincingly. The kind of writing students practiced for in the intensive training had a real audience, whom they had to convince in order to be accepted into the university they hoped to enter. Under such pressure, they were strongly motivated to write essays as clearly as possible for the reader. In the interviews, all Group 1 students reported having made such efforts, namely, by consciously using discourse markers for logical connections and also including examples and specific information for explanation.

Moreover, intensive experience in both languages appears to build the confidence to write longer, more detailed texts, and perhaps experiment with a variety of more complex arguments. Such experience evidently leads to an ability to attend both to the overall structure of the essay and to the development of ideas. It also appears to provide a sense of balance in terms of essay parts; that is, the introduction and conclusion tended to be shorter than the body, rather than either the introduction or conclusion dominating the essay in terms of length, as sometimes occurred in texts by those who had experienced only L1, L2 or no training.

Last, intensive experience in both languages may raise students' awareness of the differences in writing in L1 and L2, which could lead to the cultivation of a variety of strategies to cope with the difficulties of writing in L2. Such strategies reported by Group 1 students in the interviews included eliminating possible "digressions" from the topic, writing directly in English, and converting ideas into simpler Japanese structures before translating them into English.

For all these reasons, the benefits the Group 1 students in this study received from their combined L1 and L2 writing experience apparently far exceeded those that the other two groups obtained from either L1 or L2 experience alone. Thus, once again, writing teachers may be encouraged to take advantage of the potential for transfer of writing ability across languages to help students develop their composing competence.

6.4 Limitations of this Study and Directions for Future Research

A number of limitations of the study should be noted. First is the obvious fact that all of the participants were studying at one of only two public universities in the same prefecture of Japan and thus the findings, while suggestive, cannot necessarily be generalized beyond this

population.   In particular, although some of the students came from other parts of Japan, they all took and passed relatively competitive university entrance exams for these two mid- to upper mid-level public (one national, one municipal) universities and thus have to be considered among the stronger students in Japan, without being from the highest echelon of Japanese universities.   Further research is necessary to determine whether these findings could be applicable to less academically-oriented students who have weaker motivation to acquire proficiency in academic writing.

One methodological weakness that may have negatively affected the outcome of the study was the fact that the data collection took place over a two-year period.   That is, approximately two-thirds of the research (with 19 participants) was undertaken during the first year of the study, and the remainder (with 9 more participants) was done the following year. Even though first year students were recruited at the same time of the school year (the fall semester) both times, there is a possibility that the two groups were not completely comparable.

Several other aspects of the data collection and analysis could be improved in future studies.   Most notably, because of the radical differences in the linguistic structures of the two languages, the segmentation and categorization for the content analysis (points and elaboration) was not as rigorously parallel as would be desirable.   To improve the cross-linguistic comparison, more attention needs to be devoted to devising means to insure fuller equivalency. In addition, analysis of the writers' pausing behavior in their L1 could help to clarify and provide some perspective on the L2 analysis.

Another important area for further refinement of the methodology is the interview procedures.   Even more probing questions regarding students' perceptions of their writing should be asked, and post-analysis follow-up interviews to clarify and/or confirm the analysts'

interpretations of both textual and process data could be added.

Finally, although the use of open-ended writing topics allowed us to investigate the ways the different kinds of training may have influenced the writers' task definition and choice of discourse mode, the use of a topic that required a particular discourse mode (e.g., argumentation or exposition, but not both) could prove advantageous. In particular, holding the discourse mode constant may be the only way to reliably compare writing competence through evaluation of the quality of a set of essays. Although we found it was possible to obtain reasonably reliable judgments of the quality of content and language use in a set of essays with diverse discourse modes, the reliability of different readers' judgments of the quality of organization turned out to be very low.

The future direction in which this research will take us is toward a deeper understanding of the influences of L2 writing training on L1 writing. Building on the findings to date, as well as refining the methodology and research design on the basis of the experience with this study, we intend to complete our investigation of the possibility of bi-directional transfer of composing competence. We plan to do this by looking specifically at the L1 and L2 writing by Japanese students who have undergone extensive L2 writing training and experience, with or without comparable amounts of L1 writing training. In this way, we hope to clarify the role of meta-knowledge and experience in the development of writing proficiency in both L1 and L2.

Acknowledgements

We wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity to pursue this research with

the support of this grant award. We would also particularly like to thank Masako Kawamura,

Michiko Kasuya, and Junko Seto for their valuable research assistance in carrying out this study.

Of course, we are also very grateful to all the participants, without whose sincere cooperation

the study would not have been possible.

References

Anderson, J.R.(1983). *The architecture of cognition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
Press.

Anzai, Y., & Uchida, N. (1981). *Kodomo wa ikano sakubun wo kakuka* [How children produce
writing]. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology, 29,* pp. 323-332.

Arnaudent, M., & Barrett, M. (1981). Paragraph development. Englewood   Cliffs, NJ; 2.
Prentice-Hall.

Bosher, S. (1998). The composing processes of three South East Asian writers at the post-
secondary level: An explanatory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 7, 205-241.

Carter, M. (1990). The idea of expertise: An exploration of cognitive and social dimensions of
writing. *College Composition and Communication,* 41, 265-286.

Cohen, A.D., & Brooks-Carson, A. (2001). Research on direct vs. translated writing processes:
Implications for assessment. *Modern Language Journal,* 85, 169-188.

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

Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing.* New York: Longman.

Hashiuchi, T. (1995). Paragurafu raitingu nyuumon [Introduction to paragraph writing]. Tokyo: Kenkyuusha.

Hayes, J. R. , Flower, L., Shriver, K. A., Stratman, J. F., & Carey, L. (1987). Cognitive process in revision. In S. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Advances in applied psycholinguistics*, Vol. 2 (pp. 176-240). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hinds, J. (1990). Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: Expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese and Thai. In Connor, U., & Jones., A. (Eds.), *Coherence in writing* (pp. 81-109). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Hirose, K. (2003a). Comparing L1 and L2 organizational patterns in the argumentative writing of Japanese EFL students. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12* (1), pp. 181-209.

Hirose, K. (2003b). *A preliminary study of writing strategies used by Japanese EFL students: For process-oriented English writing instruction* (Report for the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Research Grant No. 126802819). Aichi: Aichi Kenritsu University, Faculty of Foreign Languages.

Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Writing*. New York: Pearson Education.

Johns, A. (1991). Interpreting an English competency examination. *Written Communication, 8*, pp. 379-401.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2001). Factors relating to EFL writers' discourse level revision skills. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*, pp. 71-102.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2002). High school student perceptions of first language literacy instruction: Implications for second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11* (2), pp. 91-116.

Kubota, R. (1998). An investigation of Japanese and English L1 essay organization: Differences

and similarities. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 54*, pp. 475-507.

Raimes, A. (1987). Language proficiency, writing ability, and composing strategies: A study of

ESL college students writers. *Language Learning*, 37, 439-469.

Roca De Larios, J., Murphy, L., & Martin, J. (2002). A critical examination of L2 writing

process research. In S. Ransdell & M. Barbier (Eds), *New Directions for Research in L2

Writing* (pp.11-47). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Ross, P. (2000). Untangling the influence on student writing: The *kansoubun*. Paper presented at

annual meeting of JALT (Japan Association for Language Teaching), October,

Hamamatsu, Japan.

Sanders, T., & van Wijk, C. (1996). PISA – A procedure for analyzing the structure of

explanatory texts. *Text 16* (1), pp. 91 – 132.

Sasaki, M. (2000). Toward an empirical model of EFL writing processes: An exploratory study.

Journal of Second Language Writing, 9, 259-291.

Sasaki, M. (2002). Building an empirically-based model of EFL learners' writing processes. In

S. Ransdell & M. Barbier (Eds), *New Directions for Research in L2 Writing* (pp.49-80).

Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory Variables for EFL students' expository writing.

Language Learning, 46 (1), 137-174.

Smalley, R. L., & Hank, M. R. (1982). *Refining composition skills*. New York: Macmillan.

Uzawa, K. (1996). Second Language learners' processes of L1 writing, L2 writing, and

translation from L1 into L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*, 271-294.

van Wijk, C. (1999). Conceptual processes in argumentation: A developmental perspective. In

Torrance, M. & Galbraith, D. (Eds.) *Knowing what to write: Conceptual processes in*

text production. (pp. 31 – 50). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Watanabe, M. (2001). *Sakubun shidou ni miru kosei to souzouryoku no paradokkusu : Nichibei shotoukyoiku hikaku kara* [A paradox of individuality and creativity through composition lessons: A comparison of Japanese and American Elementary Schools]. *Journal of Educational Sociology. 69,* 23-42.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

インタビュー質問

日時：　　　月　　　日

Interviewer:_____

名前：_____　　ID#:_____　　課題：PJ.　TE.　TJ.　PE

大学／学部：広島大学　（総合科学　　法学　　経済　　文学）

　　　　　　広島市立大学　　（国際）

Q1　main idea について

1-1　この作文の中であなたの主な考え／意見

　　（main point）はどれですか？

1-2　その考えはあなたが一番表現したか

　　ったことですか？

Q2　プランニング（構想）について

2-1　書き出すまえにどのように書くか構想

　　を練りましたか？　　　　　　　　　　　頭の中——＞どこまで？

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　用紙の上——＞どこまで？

2-2　自分の意見はいつ決めましたか？　　　書き出す前／書き出してから

　　どうしてその意見にしましたか？

2-3　プランニングまたは構想をしているとき、　　はい／いいえ

　　作文をどのように構成するか決めましたか？

Q3　ライティングプロセスについ

3-1　文章を書き出したとき、あなたの頭の中では　　はい／いいえ

　　どう書いていくかはっきりしていましたか？

3-2 段落／パラグラフについて
　　書き出す前にどのようにまとめるか
　　わかっていましたか？

3-3 一つの文から次の文にどのように
　　つないでいきますか？

3-4 いつ訂正や推敲をしますか？　　　　　どちらかと言えば

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　1)一つの文を書き終わってから

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　2)一つの段落またはパラグラフを書き終わってか

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　3)全体の文章を書き終わってから

3-5 書いている内に、どう続けたらいいか　　　はい／いいえ
　　困ったところはありますか？　　　　　　「はい」ー＞どこですか？

Q4 書き終えた後

4-1 最初に構想したことと書き上げた作文の　　はい／いいえ
　　内容は一致しています？　　　　　　　　「いいえ」ー＞どこが違いますか？

Q5 読み手意識について

5-1 文章を書いているとき、この作文を読む　　はい／いいえ
　　人（読み手）を意識しましたか？　　　　「はい」ー＞読み手のために何か工夫を
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　しましたか？

Q6 英語で書くことについて

6-1　どんなことが一番大変でしたか？

Q7 日本語と英語で書くことの違いについて

7-1 何か違いがありましたか？　　　　　　　　　　　　　はい／いいえ

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　「はい」ー＞どんな違い？

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　「いいえ」ー＞なぜ？

_____

7-2 日本語で書くときどんな点に注意を払い

　　ながら書きますか？

_____

7-3 英語で書くときどんな点に注意を払い

　　ながら書きますか？

_____

Q8 日本語小論文と英語ライティングの訓練を受けた人へ

8-1 日本語小論文の訓練から学んだことは何ですか？

_____

8-2 日本語のレポートを書くとき、今もその影響を　　　　はい／いいえ

　　受けていると思いますか？　　　　　　　　　　　　「はい」ー＞どんな点？

_____

8-3 英語ライティングの訓練から学んだことは何ですか？

_____

8-4 英語でライティングをするとき、今もその影響を　　　はい／いいえ

　　受けていると思いますか？　　　　　　　　　　　　「はい」ー＞どんな点？

8-5 現在、英語でライティングをするとき、日本語小論文
　の影響を受けていると思いますか？　　　　　　　　　　　　　　はい／いいえ

8-6 現在、日本語で文章を書くとき、英語ライティングの
　　訓練の影響を受けていると思いますか？　　　　　　　　　　　はい／いいえ

8-7 現在、あなたにとって、日本語小論文と　　　　　　　　1) 日本語小論文
　　英語ライティングの訓練ではどちらの方が　　　　　　　　2)英語ライティング
　　影響が強いですか？　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　3)どちらとも言えない

Appendix B

Sample Analysis of Segmentation and Categorization

Japanese Essay 1-1 (Exposition)

SEGMENT		CATEGORY
1. 僕がまず思う事は、この二つの事柄はそれぞれ良い面と悪い面があると思う。		*Meta-discourse*
2. 一人で旅行する事は、		
2a 自分で考えた事を好きなようにして実行する事ができる、という点では、		*Specification*
2 気楽に旅行したい人には最適だと思う。		*Point 1*
3a もしも急に予定を変更したとしても、	*3-part Spec:**	*Specification*
3b 誰にも迷惑がかからないし、		*Specification*
3 また、急に予定を変更する事も、一人旅ならではの楽しみだと思う。		*Specification*
4a しかし、一人旅の場合は、		
4b 道に迷ったりなどしても	*5-part Spec:*	*Specification*
4c 自分一人で考え、		*Specification*
4d 決めなければならないし、		*Specification*
4e 誰かを頼るという事が非常にしにくいので、		*Specification*
4 この点では一人旅というものは常に緊張感から逃れることができないと思う。		*Point 2*
5a 旅行先が外国である場合は、	*3-part Spec:*	*Specification*
5b その国の言葉を話す事ができなければ、		*Specification*
5 途方にくれてしまうということも良くあるだろうと思う。		*Specification*
6a 一方、何人かのグループで旅行をする、という場合、	*3-part Spec:*	
6b 全ての事柄が予定通り進まなければならないし、		*Specification*
6 また、進めるように努めなければならないと思う。		*Specification*
7 自分勝手な行動をとるなどという事は、まず許されない。		*Point 3*
8a 時には自分の思い通りにならずに、		*Specification*
8b 苛立つような場面にも出くわすかもしれないが、	*6-part Spec:*	*Specification*
8c そのような時は自分の意見を押し殺してでも		*Specification*
8 周りのメンバーに合わせなければならない。		*Specification*
9a この点では、何人かのグループで旅行をするという事は、		*Specification*
9 楽しむことを目的とした旅行が、結果として不愉快なものに終わってしまうかもしれない。		*Specification*
10 しかし、何人かのグループで旅行をする事の最大の強みは、一人旅よりも心強いという事だろうと思う。		*Point 4*
11a 何か困った事に遭遇しても、		*Specification*

11b 一緒に旅行をしているメンバーと協力して	7-part Spec:	*Specification*
11c 対処する事ができるし、		*Specification*
11d 数人いれば、		*Specification*
11e それぞれの人が何かしら得意なものをもっているであろうから、		*Specification*
11f 一人の時と比べて、		*Specification*
11 確段に能率が上がると思う。		*Specification*
12a この様にして考えてみると、		
12 両者はやはり一長一短という感じがする。		
13 一概に、どちらの方が良いということは難しいと思われる。		Conclusion
14a 個人個人で自分の性格等を考慮して、		
14 最適なものを選ぶことが一番だと思う。		
15 自分に合った方法を取るという事が最も重要な事ではないだろうか。		

English Essay 2-2 (Argumentation)

SEGMENT		CATEGORY
1 I think that it's better for an undergraduate to live alone,		*Position*
1a staying away from his or her family.		
2 You may think "Why?		*Meta-discourse*
3a If graduates live with their family,		
3 they don't have to do housework	*Contra:*	*Point 1*
4 and they can study long time.		*Point 2*
5 But I think it's not so important.		*Evaluation*
6 There are two main reasons for my opinion.		*Meta-discourse*
7 First, living alone enables undergraduates to be independent from their family.		*Point 3*
8 They have to cook,	*5-part Spec:*	*Specification*
8a wash,		*Specification*
8b clean		*Specification*
8c and study		*Specification*
8 by themselves.		
9 No one helps them do it.		*Specification*
10 Living alone can be an step to independence.		*Repeat (Point 3)*
11 Secondly, staying away from family have undergraduates confirm the importance of their family's being.		*Point 4*
12 So, I think living alone is better choice for undergraduates.		*Position*

*Spec. = Specification

APPENDIX C
Japanese Essays

Group 1

Essay J1-1

　　僕がまず思う事は、この二つの事柄はそれぞれ良い面と悪い面があると思う。一人で旅行する事は、自分で考えた事を好きなようにして実行する事ができる、という点では、気楽に旅行したい人には最適だと思う。もしも急に予定を変更したとしても、誰にも迷惑がかからないし、また、急に予定を変更する事も、一人旅ならではの楽しみだと思う。しかし、一人旅の場合は、道に迷ったりなどしても自分一人で考え、決めなければならないし、誰かを頼るという事が非常にしにくいので、この点では一人旅というものは常に緊張感から逃れることができないと思う。旅行先が外国である場合は、その国の言葉を話す事ができなければ、途方にくれてしまうということも良くあるだろうと思う。

　　一方、何人かのグループで旅行をする、という場合、全ての事柄が予定通り進まなければならないし、また、進めるように努めなければならないと思う。自分勝手な行動をとるなどという事は、まず許されない。時には自分の思い通りにならずに、苛立つような場面にも出くわすかもしれないが、そのような時は自分の意見を押し殺してでも周りのメンバーに合わせなければならない。この点では、何人かのグループで旅行をするという事は、楽しむことを目的とした旅行が、結果として不愉快なものに終わってしまうかもしれない。しかし、何人かのグループで旅行をする事の最大の強みは、一人旅よりも心強いという事だろうと思う。何か困った事に遭遇しても、一緒に旅行をしているメンバーと協力して対処する事ができるし、数人いれば、それぞれの人が何かしら得意なものをもっているであろうから、一人の時と比べて、確段に能率が上がると思う。

　　この様にして考えてみると、両者はやはり一長一短という感じがする。一概に、どちらの方が良いということは難しいと思われる。個人個人で自分の性格等を考慮して、最適なものを選ぶことが一番だと思う。自分に合った方法を取るという事が最も重要な事ではないだろうか。

Essay J1-2

　　大学入学にあたって、一人暮らしを始める若者は多い。私もその一人である。今まで家族と住んでいた私にとって、家族から離れて住むということは、不安と期待が渦巻く未知なる世界だった。

　　さて、ここで一人暮らしと家族と住むことの両方について、利点と欠点をそれぞれ述べてみたい。まず一人暮らしの利点は、自分のペースで生活ができる、すべてを自分一人でやらなければならないので責任感がつく、などが挙げられる。逆に欠点は、家の中に迷惑をかける人がいないことから堕らけた生活をしがちになることや、病気やけがなど緊急を要する事態になったとき、特に一人では対処しきれない場いいには非常に困ることである。

　　一方、家族と住む場合の利点は、すべてを自分でやる必要がないので自分の時間をより多く持てる。緊急の事態に陥っても支えてくれる人がすぐそばにいて安心、などが挙げられる。逆に欠点は、一人暮らしと比べて、すべてを自分でやることを強制されてはいないので、親に頼りがちになり易い、また複数の人々と住む場合は自分勝手には生活できない、などが挙げられる。

　　ここで、広島大学について考えてみたい。広島大学の学生は９０％以上が一人暮らし、というかなり特殊な環境に置かれている。そのため、一人暮らしの少ない他大学と比べると、学生同士が

支え合って生活をする傾向が強い。私はここに新しい家族の形態を見た。

　　　　近年、一人になった高齢者同士で一緒に暮らす新しい家族の形態が増えているというニュースを見たが、広島大学の一人暮らしはこれに近いものかもしれない。誰かがけがや病気をすると、自分も一人暮らしだからこそその人の不安な気持ちもよく分かるのですぐに駆けつけてあげられる。一人で食事をすることに寂しさを覚えるのなら、皆で食事が出来る。これらは、たいていの学生が一人暮らしだからこそ出来る特権である。

　　　　離れてみて初めて家族の有り難さやぬくもりを実感した、と多くの一人暮らしの若者が言うように、一人暮らしを始めて、改めて気付かされることは多い。また、自分が困っている時にすぐに駆けつけてくれる友人の存在は何者にも代え難く、ここに友情の大切さを再度実感することだろう。大学という新しい環境での生活を、一人暮らしという方法で送ってみるのは良いことだと思う。それは一つの自己成長の機会でもあり、また、今まで気付かなかった新しい自分を発見できるチャンスでもあり、そして周囲の人達の有難さを実感できる良い機会であると、私は考える。

Essay J1-3
　　　　私は現在家族と一緒に暮らしている。大学までは家からもそう遠くはないので一人暮らしをする必要がないと思ったからだ。大学生活の中で多々、家族と暮らしていて良かったと感じることがある。これは家に帰ったら御飯があるとか洗濯をしてもらえるというようなメリットだけではない。私が一番家族と暮らしていていいなと感じることは、コミュニケーションがとれるということだ。母や父と今日何があったかなどの話をするだけで、私自身今日はこんなことをしたなと思い出すことができる。そうやってコミュニケーションをとる中で自分を振り返る時間が生まれるということだ。では一人暮らしのメリットは何だろう？簡単に言えば自立できるということである。自立したらどうなるか、それは自由を手に入れるということである。何時に起きても何時に寝てもよい。しかし自由を手に入れるということは同時に自己に責任をもつ、管理するということを忘れてはならない。一人暮らしをする中でこうしたことを実践を通して理解することができるであろう。もしも私が一人暮らしでも両親との同居でもどちらでも良いと言われたらどちらを選択するだろう。きっと両親と暮らす方を選ぶと思う。なぜなら私にとって日々のコミュニケーションはとても重要なものだからだ。大学生活を通して私はとても視野が広がった。いろんな人に出会いいろんな考え方を知った。そしてその新しい考えを単に納得するだけでは自分の成長にはつながらない。一歩成長するためには、納得してどうしたいのか、それを考えるヒントになるのが私の場合親とのコミュニケーションを通してなのだ。自分や自分の家族が当然だと思っていたことの全く逆の考えがあった時、納得するだけではなくより深い理解をしようと会話を通してコミュニケーションを日常生活の中ですることは、私自身を成長させるためにとても必要であると思う。

Essay J1-4
　　　　大学生になると、アルバイト活動なども活発になり、自分で使えるお金が増えてくる。私自身もそうであるが、その貯めたお金で旅行をしてみたいと思うようになってくる。そこでこの旅行について考えてみたい。

　　　　旅行といっても、1人旅もあればグループの旅行もある。

　　　　まずは、1人旅について考えてみたい。この最大の特徴が、自分の思うままに自由に気まま

に旅することができる点である。グループ旅行以上に冒険的であり、ある程度の積極性も求められる。ただし、危険性が高かったり、感情的な面では個独感やさびしさを感じやすいということも言えるだろう。旅行を楽しむことが一番ではあるが、この1人旅は自己判断がすべてであるので、人間的に大きく成長できる経験であると考える。

次に、グループ旅行について考えてみたい。グループ旅行では1人旅とは異なり、友達と、普段とは違う旅行先で、一緒に行動・生活し、楽しめることが最大の特徴である。集団で行動するので、何をするにも自信がつきやすい。しかし、グループ旅行であるからには、自分勝手な行動は友達への迷惑となる。ここでは協調性が必要とされる。楽しさだけをとって考えれば、1人旅以上の楽しさが得られるだろう。

このように考えてみて、旅行することは、普段の生活から離れて、その旅行を満喫することが最も大切なことであると思うが、私自身、1人旅もグループ旅行もどちらもしてみたい。どちらにもメリットがあり、大学生活を通していい経験にもなり、いい思い出にもなる。ただ、どちらにしても、その旅行を楽しむためには、それに見合った行動をとっていくことが大切なことであると考える。

Essay J1-5

私は、大学生になったら、家族と一緒に住んで大学に通うよりも、大学の近くにアパートを借りて一人暮らしをする方がいいと考える。家族から離れて一人暮らしをすることで、社会に出る際に必要な自立心を育てることができると思うからだ。

一人暮らしには様々な問題があるという人もいるだろう。確かに、家族から離れることで自由になり、生活がだらけてしまう可能性がある。それだけでなく、一人で暮らすことには様々な危険もあるのである。例えば、悪徳業者にとって、一人暮らしの大学生は一番の標的だ。しかし、逆に一人暮らしをするからこそ、自分の生活を自分で管理することの重要性を身を持って知ることができる。また、万が一、悪徳業者に引っかかっても、学生時代ならば家族の支援の下で問題を解決でき、後に同じ失敗を繰り返すことはないだろう。つまり、大学生の一人暮らしは、社会に出ていくための予行練習となるのである。家族と一緒に住んでいると、一人暮らしで起こる様々な問題が無い代わりにそれらから身を守る術も身に付けることができず、また自己管理の能力も育ちにくい。

私自身、現在一人暮らしをしており、その中で学んだ事は数多くあった。一人暮らしをしていると自由にはなるが、勉強の他に様々な家事を一人でこなす必要があり、時間の使い方を真剣に考えるようになった。また、以前よりも自分の生活を自分で管理することができるようになったと思う。家族から離れて家族の有難さを身にしみて感じることができるのも一人暮らしのいい点である。

したがって、私は大学生になったら家族と一緒に暮らすよりも、大学の近くにアパートを借りて一人暮らしをする方がいいと考える。

Essay J1-6

旅行―知らない場所へ行くということは、様々な発見を私たちにもたらしてくれる。知識欲が多かれ少なかれ備わっているヒトにとって、旅行とはその欲を満たす快感を与えてくれるものだ。

旅行には一人旅とグループでの旅がある。一人旅の長所は、自由気ままに行きたいと思う場所に行けるということだ。また知らない場で困ったことがあった折、自力で解決しなければならないので、それを経ることで精神的成長をすることができるという点も長所になるだろう。逆に短所は、

未知の場に対する不安を分担する仲間がいないことが挙げられる。グループの場合、皆で楽しみが共有できるという点が長所である。修学旅行のように枕投げをしたり、暴露大会ができるのもグループならではの楽しみだ。また、皆でいることの安心感や安全性はグループでないと得られない。短所は、自分の意見が全て反映されるわけではないということだ。行きたい場所が違えば、誰かが折れるしかない状況になる。

　　これらの点を考慮して、どちらが私に合っているかを考えてみると、一人旅の方が私向きだという結論に至る。私は冒険好きであるし、度胸も座っている。一方、他人がいるとその人に気を使い過ぎる癖もあるため、疲れてしまうことが多々ある。だから一人旅の方が自分に合っていると思ったのだ。

　　しかし、もし私自身の楽しみと完全に同じ楽しみを持っている人物がいればどうであろうか。おそらく、その人との旅は、楽しみを相乗的に高める効果があり、一人旅よりより素敵な旅となる。かと言って、そういう人物を見つけるのは至難の技である。十人十色と言うがごとく、各々の楽しみは少しではあっても、どこかずれているだろう。

　　やはり、私には一人旅が合っている。これから先、旅行する機会が増えてくると思うがまだ経験したことのない「一人旅」にも挑戦してみたいものだ。

Essay J1-7

　　いずれは社会人として一人で何でもなくてはいけない。だから私は大学生の段階から少しずつ自立した方が良いので、もし両親が許可してくれるのなら一人暮らしをした方がいいと思う。

　　もちろん生活費の管理、家事等やるべき仕事が勉強だけではなくなるため、苦しいこともあるだろう。しかし、一人暮らしをする利点の方が多いはずだ。例えば大学生にもなれば家族に干渉されず、一人になりたい時間が増える。そんな時一人暮らしなら、周りを気にする必要はない。また部活やサークルの仲間、友人との付き合いにも参加しやすくなる。実家だと他の家族の事も考えなくてはならないので、帰宅時間が制限されてしまうが、一人暮らしなら制限などないからだ。

　　一番の利点としては、大学生の本分である学業に専念できるとこだ。大学は中学、高校と異なり、暗記するだけの勉強ではなく考える勉強がほとんどだ。レポートを書くにも一人暮らしの方が周囲に邪魔されにくく、考えをまとめやすい。加えてアパートが大学の近くなら、調べ物をしていて遅くなっても帰宅が容易である。

　　このように私が一人暮らしする方が良いと考える理由はたくさんある。しかし、一人暮らしをする上で注意しなくてはいけないことがある。それは、両親に感謝の気持ちを忘れないこと、きちんと計画を立てて生活費を使い、自分の健康管理をすることだ。

　　両者の理由としては、一人暮らしの為のあらゆる資金は両親が出してくれているものであること、後者の理由としては、これを怠ると生活ができなくなることが挙げられる。一人暮らしをすることは、自分で全て管理することだ。やりたいことだけやって、気付けばお金もないし体も壊したという状態になっては一人暮らしをする意味がない。また、親に養ってもらっていることを忘れ、一人で生きている気分になってはいけない。全ては親のおかげなのだから。

　　最低限このことに注意すれば、楽しい大学生活を送れるし、将来自立するための確実なステップとなるだろう。

Essay J1-8

　　　大学生が空いた時間を利用して旅行をすることについて、何人かのグループであっても一人であってもそれは良い経験になると思う。集団にしろ個人にしろ、いつもとは違う場所で日常とは異なった体験をすることができる。

　　　しかし、私は一人で旅行をする方が、より得るものが多いと思う。まず一つ目に、計画は全て自分で立てなければならない。見知らぬ土地に行く上に他人に頼ることができないので、かなりの自立心が得られるはずだ。これは集団旅行では得にくい経験である。

　　　二つ目は、集団で旅行をしていると騒ぎ、楽しむことができるが、個人で旅行をしていると、もちろん静かな中で、いわゆる単なる観光ではない旅行がし易いと思うからである。一人で旅の途中にしみじみと回想することもできる。落ち着いて旅の途中の景色や人々を眺めることもできる。このような眺め方は、単に対象を眺めることとは、違う眺め方であると思うのだ。

　　　そして最後に、個人のみで旅行することが好ましいと思う最大の理由は、伝統的な日本人の性質である"集団性"から脱け出して欲しいと、私は若者に望むからである。日本人は協調性を重んじ、周囲を気づかうのは良い。しかし、実は個人の意見がなく、集団の雰囲気に流されて集団の意見を自分の意志であるかのように振る舞ってしまったり、個人では不安で、"失敗しないだろうか"とおそれて一人で行動できない日本人は多くないだろうか。外国人に日本人は引っ込み思案が多いと言われたり、一人では大人しくしているのに集団になると存在感を示し、街を暴走する暴走族など、そのような日本人の"個人で行動する自信のなさ"の表れている行動は他にも沢山見受けられる。

　　　計画を一人で立て一人で動ける自立性、一人で物事をじっと深く考える事ができるようになること、集団に慣れてしまわないこと、以上のことを望むゆえに、私は一人で旅行をする方が望ましいと考える。

Essay J1-9

　　　私は一人で旅行する方を選びたいと思う。何人かのグループで旅行するのも確かに魅力的である。何か事故が生じた際にはお互いに助けあえるし、旅先で感じたことなどその場で意見を言いあえる。一緒に旅行したということで、友達との一体感も生まれるだろう。しかし、私は大学生になって身につけるべきものは自主性なのではないかと思う。この点で、一人で旅行する方を選びたいのだ。問題が生じた際に頼りになるのは他の誰でもない自分自身であるし、パックツアーなどでの旅行でない限りは宿も現地の言葉で自分で予約をとらなければならない。こういった行動が自主性を少しずつ育んでいくのではないだろうか。もちろん一人で旅行することのメリットはこれだけではない。旅での一番の醍醐味は人との出会いであろう。同じ地球に住むが、違う言語を話す人々と友達になるのはとてもすばらしいことだと思う。

　　　以前私の高校の先生から聞いた話だが、彼は大学生の時に思いたってタイを一人旅したそうだ。貧乏旅行なのできれいな宿には泊まれず、その時々で自分で宿を探した。大変だったと彼は言っていたが、その旅で得たものはたくさんあったという。まず自分がいかに裕福に暮らしていたか。それに現地でたくさんの人々と友達になり、うろ覚えの言葉で話していく中で、さまざまな考えがあることを知ったという。彼の人生観が百八〇度変わったそうだ。こういった話を聞いたからというのもあるが、私は一人旅にやはり魅力を感じるのである。

　　　自主性を育むことが求められる大学生活において、仲間との友情を育むグループ旅行も確か

に価値があるし、楽しいものであるが、私はさまざまな人々と友達になる機会が多く、自分というものを一人で見つめ直す機会も作ることのできる一人旅の方をしてみたいと思うのである。

Group 2
Essay J2-1

　　　私は現在、自宅から大学に通っている、自宅生の一人です。大学受験期には漠然と一人暮らしをしたいと思っていましたが、試験結果によって、地元の大学に行くことになりました。

　　　一人暮らしにあこがれていた頃は、ただ家族と離れ、新しい場所で生活してみたいという気持ばかりでした。私の親は門限や人の家に泊まるということに厳しいのでそれから逃れたいとも思っていました。実際に大学に入ってから、部活の打ち上げや恋人の家にいたりして帰宅時間が遅くなってしまった時、すごい怒られたり、お小遣いを減らされたりします。そのことで親とケンカになったりする時、一人暮らしすれば良かったといつも後悔します。その点で帰宅時間が制限されていなくていつでも友達を家に呼べる一人暮らしの人をすごくうらやましく思っていました。

　　　しかし私の周りの一人暮らしの友達の話を聞くと、一人暮らしはいいことばかりではないということが分かりました。まず、食生活が不規則になるということ、そして生活習慣が乱れがちになったり、一人で孤独を感じたりすることがある、といったことです。私は家にいればいつでもおいしいご飯が食べれて朝はお母さんに起こしてもらって、帰りが遅くなれば心配もしてもらえます。そうして考えると自宅生というのはとても快適なものだと思えてきます。

　　　私の恋人は一人暮らしをしています。彼は、家事をこなすし、おいしい料理も作れます。そんな彼をみていると、自宅生という恵まれた環境で大学生をしていて、少し焦る気持ちがあります。彼はもう六年も一人暮らしをしていて大ベテランですが、自分のことを自分でするという姿勢を私はとても尊敬しています。自宅生だとつい親に甘えがちになります。私は自分の楽しみとかのためじゃなく、自分で自分のことができるようになるための一人暮らしができたらいいなと思っています。

Essay J2-2

　　　旅行は、多かれ少なかれ、人を成長させてくれるものだと思う。それが一人旅であれ、集団での旅行であれ、何らかの効果を人にもたらすはずだ。しかし私は、旅行は一人で行く方がより好ましいと考える。

　　　確かに、集団で旅行することにはたくさんのメリットがある。日常から慣れ親しんでいる友人と一緒に、普段行かないような場所へ旅行すれば、お互いにより親交を深めることができるだろう。また、友人同士でなくともメリットはある。例えば、JTBなどの旅行会社が主催するツアーが挙げられる。集団で行動するから、何よりまず安全である。これは大変大きなメリットであると言える。

　　　しかし私は、それらの利点が旅行に必ずしも必要だとは思わない。それには、私の考える「旅行の目的」というものが関係する。私の考えるそれは、日常を離れ、非日常の中に身を置くことによって、普段の自分を客観的に見つめる機会を持つ、ということである。

　　　友人同士にせよ他人同士にせよ、集団で旅行すると、「非日常」であるはずの旅行に「日常」が入り込んでしまう。そのことが、私の考える「旅行の目的」の達成をさまたげてしまうと思うのだ。一人旅ならば、自分以外はすっかり「非日常」の世界だ。観るもの、聞くもの、肌で感じるものすべてが日常と異なって感じられる。メディアなどを通じて、自分が日常を過ごしている場所のことを見

聞きすることもあるかもしれない。しかし、それもまた、「日常の客観視」と言えるだろう。

　　　以上のように、一人で旅行をすることが、日頃の自分についてのことを見直してみる良い機会となりうる。私は集団での旅行を否定するわけではない。そのような旅行にも良い点はたくさんある。しかし、旅行という、日常を脱する絶好の機会を存分に活用しようと思うなら、一人で行くのがより良い選択であると、私は考える。

Essay J2-3

　　　大学に自宅から通う人、一人暮らしをする人もしくは大学の寮に入り、そこから通う人など様々な人がいるが、どれが一番好ましいかは、やはりその人自信の考えによるだろう。私自身は自宅から通っているが、一人暮らしの友達をとてもうらやましく思う。なぜなら一人暮らしをした方が自宅から通うよりもメリットが多い気がするからだ。

　　　では一人暮らしのメリットとは何だろうか。まず、一番のメリットは大学に近い場所にアパートを借りれば自宅から通うよりもずっと楽だということだ。私は大学と自宅の距離がかなり遠いので、一ヶ月に三万の交通費が必要だ。それに毎朝早く起きなければならないし、朝のラッシュ時に長時間バスに乗っていなければならない。一人暮らしのもう一つのメリットは、親がいない分自由だということだ。都合のいい時間にご飯を食べられるし、好きな時間に帰宅でき、好きな時に友達を部屋に呼ぶことができる。何をしてもうるさく口出しをする親がいないということが、多くの人が一人暮らしにあこがれる一番の理由であると思う。

　　　だからといって、自宅から通うことにメリットがないわけではない。通学には不便かもしれないが、ご飯を自分で作らなくてもよいし、洗濯なども親がやってくれるだろう。それに自宅から通えば、一人暮らしよりもずっとお金がかからなくてすむ。一人暮らしをすると、まずアパート代が必要であるし、その他食費や光熱費などなにかとお金がかかる。一人暮らしのもう一つの問題には食生活が乱れるという点もある。

　　　このように自宅から大学に通うのと、一人暮らしをするのにはそれぞれメリット、デメリットがある。それでも私は一人暮らしをすることは自分にとっていい経験になると思う。親にたよることなく、家事をやったりすることで自立心が高まると考えているからだ。

Essay J2-4

　　　旅行には、色々な種類があると思いますが、大勢で行くか、それとも一人で行くのかという差は大きいと思います。

　　　もし、友人やサークルの仲間と一緒に旅行に行くのなら、それは観光を目的とするというよりむしろ親交を深めることが主な目的になるのではないでしょうか。しかし、一人旅は大勢の旅行とは違って、友人と話している間に見過ごしてしまう景色等も注意深く眺めることができます。一人旅は、他人のペースを気にしなくてよいという点で楽だとも言え、一人で旅をすることで新しい発見ができるものではないか、と思います。

　　　しかし、だからといって大勢の旅行が劣っているわけではありません。他人と意見を交換することも大切です。そこから新しい考え方や、一人では気付けなかった事実を発見できるかもしれません。また、旅行が親交を深めてくれるのは、意見交換によって相手の考え方を知ることができるからでしょう。

同じ場所へ旅行に行くとしても、一人で行くのと友人と行くのでは全く違った経験ができるということです。このことは、大勢の人が旅行に魅力を感じる一つの要因だと思います。

Essay J2-5
　　今回このトピックについて私の意見を述べるにあたり、まず一人で気ままに旅行することと、何人かのグループで旅行することを対比させながらいきたいと思う。
　　まず、一人での旅行では参加者が一人ということもあり、自分の好きな時間に好きな場所に行き好きなことができるという利点がある。この場合、急な予定変更が起きても自分一人で消化することができる。また、小回りがきき、行動範囲も広くなるため、旅行する以前には予想もしなかった人との交流、つまり旅先での交流も持ちやすくなる。一方で、一人ということが短所となり、全てのことを自分一人でやらなくてはならない、旅先で急に困ったことが起こったとしても頼れる人がいないということがある。また、一人で情報を得なくてはならない為に情報量も多勢で集めるより少なくなってしまう。
　　次に、グループで旅行する場合について述べていきたいと思う。グループで旅行すると、その中でお互のことについてよく理解できるようになる。泊りがけの旅行では特にそうである。小・中・高で行なわれる修学旅行・野外活動の目的の一つとしてこれは入っているのではないかと私は思う。朝晩を共にすることによって相手の生活パターン、協調性の度合い、性格などが端的に表われてくる。また、なにより多勢いることによって情報量も多くなり他人と共通した思い出作りもできる。会話もでき場も盛り上がり、移動中・待機中の間の時間つぶしなどにも困らなくて済む。困った時はお互いに助け合うこともできる。このような長所がある一方で、スケジュールをしっかり立てその通りに行動しなければ、うまく機能しなくなったりと急な予定変更をすぐに対処できなかったり、参加者の中の一人でも身勝手なことをし始めると全体に悪い影響を及ぼしてしまうという点がある。
　　以上のことを踏まえ、私が考えるに、一人での旅行は『自己の向上』を目指したものであり、グループでの旅行は『人との関わり』を目指したものではないかと思う。

Essay J2-6
　　大学生になると、高校の時に比べ一人暮らしをする学生が増える。その理由は様々であるが、多くの人が家が大学から遠いため一人暮らしをするという理由である。しかし一人暮らしというのは、お金がかかり責任もついてくる。簡単なことではないし家族ときちんと話し合う事も必要だと思う。
　　中には家族と一緒に住みながら自宅から大学に通う学生もいる。それは大学が自宅近辺にあったり、お金がかかったりなどの理由からである。
　　私は、一人暮らしが良いとか悪いとかではなく、やはりまず一番に自分が行きたい大学を見つけ、それから両親に一人暮らしの事も含め話し合うのがいいと思う。私も去年の春から一人暮らしをしている。広島の大学に決まった時、この大学は私が行きたかった大学でもあり、両親はとても喜んでくれた。それまで、一人暮らしはお金がかかると大変気にしており、いろいろと不安だったが、その時両親が、そういう事は気にしなくていいから自分が本当に行きたい大学を考えて弾みなさいと言われた。今ももちろん一人暮らしをしており、家賃や生活費など私にかかる費用は高校の時に比べ何倍とかかっている。この大学に行けるのも一人暮らしをできるのも両親のおかげであることは忘れてはいけないと私は思う。

大学生になると住む場所を選ぶことができる。しかしそれは両親のおかげであり、決して自分だけの問題ではない。私はできるだけ自宅から大学に通えたらと思っていたが、家の周りには大学が１つしかなく、一人暮らしは前々からほぼ決まっていた。受験をする時一人暮らしにはお金がかかるため大学はせめて国公立にしようと思っていた。

　　一人暮らしというのは、多くの学生が夢みる事であり、自由も増える。しかしその分、親の心配や負担、責任が重くなってくる。大学生になるとたしかに住む場所は選べるようになる。しかし一人暮らしにしろ、自宅から大学に通うにしろ、大事なことは自分の志望する大学や一人暮らしにかかる費用を両親としっかり話し合い、一緒に考えていくことだと思う。

Essay J2-7

　　私は大学生になり住む場所を選ぶことができる事は良い事だと考える。なぜなら、自分の進んでいく道を選択していく機会はこれからますます増えていくからである。まずは自分の生活を送る場所を選ぶという行為は、将来への過程への第一段階と私は考える。

　　私は大学受験をする時、県外の大学に行くために一人暮らしをするか、県内の大学を選んで自宅から通うか迷った。その時私は、いろいろな場合を考えた。例えば、一人暮らしをして自炊してやっていく事が自分にできるかどうか、一人暮らしで自由な生活が本当にできるかどうかなどである。そう考えた時に、自宅から通う方がむしろ自由な時間を持つ事ができるのではないかと考えた。なぜなら、ご飯を作る時間、洗濯をする時間などが省かれるため、クラブやバイトにかける時間が持てるからである。このようにして、私は県内の大学へ自宅から通う事に決めた。

　　では、自分の住む場所を選択する事なしにごく限られた場所にしか住めないとしたらどうだろう。たしかに、限られた場所なら住む場所など考えなくてもよいから楽なのかもしれない。ここに決められた場所に住めばいいのだから、一人暮らしと自宅通いの長短を考え選択する必要はない。だから余計な時間も労力も費やさずに済む。しかし、大学に入って感じた事だが、大学は高校の時と比べて自分で考え選ぶという機会がかなり増えた。私は、大学受験の時の様々な場合を考え、自分の答えを出すという経験がなかったら大学での様々な選択に対応してこられなかったと考える。

　　このように、自分の住む場所を悩み選ぶという経験は、与えられた状況をこなすだけだった高校から自分の将来へのいいつなぎ目になったと考える。ゆえに、自分のこれから進む道を考え選択するという行為の最初のステップであるこの選択は、私にとってとても良いものだったと考える。

Group 3

Essay J3-1

　　大学生というと年齢で言えば、だいたい十八歳から二十二歳となる。そろそろ自立したいという思いを持つ頃であるし、責任感なども出てくる。十八歳から二十歳までの大学生は未成年者とはいえ、親が責任を取ってくれていた高校生とは違い、自分の行う事に、それなりに自分の考えや責任などがついてくる。私は現在、十八歳の大学一年生である。入学してから、もう半年以上が過ぎた。高校生の頃までは地元の佐賀に家族四人で生活していたが、広島の大学に入学して今年の四月から一人暮らしを始めた。一人で暮らすようになってから変わったことがいくつもある。まず今まで家族と一緒にやっていたこと、詳しく言えば食事から始まる生活上の基礎的なことを一人だけでやるようになった。朝起きても家にいるのは自分一人だけで、朝食も一人でとる。大学から帰って来ても部屋に

電気がついているわけがなく、会話をする相手もいない。もちろん夕飯も一人だ。私は、一人暮らしをするまで、一人で生活することがこれほど寂しいものだとは思いもしなかった。最近よく思うのだが、TV を見ていても、食事をとっていても、それが一人で、会話をする相手がいないと、人は感情表現が下手に、また乏しくなるような気がする。

　　　次に大きく変わったことは、自分が行う全ての行動に責任というものが必要になったことだ。私は何か行動をする時は常に、これは自分が責任を持って行えることかどうか考える。高校生までは何か失敗や誤ちを犯しても親が代わりに謝ってくれたり責任をとってくれたが、親はもう側にはいない。私は高校生までは、どちらかというと親に頼ってきた方だった。悪く言えば、何か失敗や間違いをしても親が何とかしてくれるだろうという甘えがあったのだ。しかし一人暮らしを始めてまだ半年だが、自分でも実感するほど自分の行動に責任をもつことを大事にして行動するようになった。一人暮らしは、親の束縛がないという自由を手に入れられるが、その自由には常に責任が伴うということを知った。

大学生になって家族と一緒に住むこと、一人暮らしをすること、どちらにもそれぞれメリット、デメリットがあっていちがいに、どちらがいいと言うことはできないけれど、私は一人暮らしを始めてよかったと思う。家族と一緒に生活している時には、当たり前すぎて気付かなかったけれど、家族と一緒にごはんを食べられることほど幸せな事はないと思う。ごはんを食べられるということ事体幸せなことなのに、それを愛する家族と一緒にできるなんて、本当に幸せだと思う。一人暮らしをするまで親の存在がこんなにありがたいものとは思わなかったし、高校生の時以上に親を尊敬するようになった。これは大事なことだと思う。また今まで親に甘えてばかりいたが自分の行動に責任をもつようになれた。確かに一人暮らしは寂しいが、私は一人暮らしによって、親の大切さだけではなく、人が生活していく上で大事なこと、例えば本当に基礎的なことだが、食事とか睡眠とか人の優しさとかに気付くことが出来たし、自分の行動における責任という重要なものを持てるようになったので、この半年で、少しかもしれないが人間として成長できたように思える。家族と一緒に生活している人が全く私と反対とは言えないかもしれないが、私は一人で生活することは、大事なことだと思うし、大学生の一人暮らしはいい経験になると思う。

Essay J3-2

　　　どちらの旅行でも良い点はたくさんあると思いますが、私は何人かのグループで旅行したいと思います。私は色々な知らない土地に行ってみたいと思いますが、1人だと慣れない土地で迷ったり、まわりが知らない人達ばかりですごく不安になると思います。友達などと旅行すれば、みんなで相談して行き先を決めたり、地元の人々と話したり、色々な体験に参加したりなど、一人ではやりにくいようなことも出来ると思います。旅行の間中、寂しくなることもなく、ずっと楽しく過ごせると思います。友達との思い出も増え、仲も深まると思います。

　　　しかし何人かのグループでの旅行では、1人の時間が全くなくなるという点もあると思います。朝から夜寝る時までずっと誰かといて騒いだりするのもとても楽しいと思いますが、少しは1人だけの時間を持ちたいと思います。その点で一人旅というのは、自分の力だけで物事を考え、行動できるのでよいと思います。違う土地でゆっくりと物事を考えたりすることも出来るし、その土地で新しく出会った人と、じっくりと仲を深めることも出来ると思います。また一人旅では、他の人と立てた計画を気にする必要もなく、急に思いついたことが何でも出来ると思います。一人旅によって、自

分の判断力や行動力を高めることが出来るのではないかと思います。

　　　　どちらの旅行の方法でも、様々な経験が出来ると思います。同じ土地でも、一人で旅行するのとグループで旅行するのとでは、違った視点でその旅行を楽しめると思います。時間がたくさんある大学生のうちに、色々な方法で色々な所に旅行して、日常では得られないような様々な経験を得ることが大事なのではないかと思います。

Essay J3-3

　　　　私は現在実家から大学に通っている。家から大学まではあまり近いとは言えないが、通えない距離ではないからだ。しかし毎朝早起きをして電車に乗るのは辛く、時々「一人暮らしをして大学の近くに住めたらな」と思うこともある。一人暮らしをしている友人達がお互いの家を行き来しているのを見て羨しく思うこともある。そのことを友人に話すと、決まって「じゃあ一人暮らししたらいいじゃないか」と言われる。簡単に言ってくれるが、我が家の経済事情を見ると、とても親に頼むことはできない。大学に行かせてもらっているだけでありがたいのだ。経済的な面での問題もあるが、実際一番の理由は「自すいしなくて良い」ということだろう。要するに楽がしたいのである。それ思う度に、これではいつまでの自立できない、自立のためにも一人暮らしをした方が良いのではないか、と考える。しかし、一人暮らししている人間が皆自立のためにそうしているのだろうか。そうではないと思う。友人の中には親の目の届かないのを良いことに彼氏と同棲しているものもいるし、食事のほとんどを外食ですませているものもいる。こういう人々を見てしまうと、一人暮らしが良いものなのか、考えさせられてしまう。が、しかしその一方で自分で毎食食事を作り、一人暮らしを満喫している者もいる。この違いは一体どこから来るのだろう。私が思うにそれは責任感の有無ではないだろうか。実家にいれば自分の健康のこと生活のことはほとんど親がやってくれる。しかし一歩家の外に出ると自分に対する責任は全て自分にふりかかってくるのだ。それを受けとめるか放棄してしまうか、一人暮らしの成功はそこにかかってくるのではないだろうか。要するに一人暮らしをすること＝自立なのではなく、一人暮らしのために家を出る自分の面倒を自分で見ることが自立につながるのである。だから一人暮らしをすれば必ず自立できるわけではないし、家にいて親元に留まっているから自立できないというわけではないのだ。実家にいる私にでも気持ち一つで自立はできる、ということになる。

　　　　それでも「一人暮らしすれば友達とすぐ遊べるし、いいなぁ」と考えてしまう私は、まだまだ自立とはほど遠い所にいるのかもしれない。

Essay J3-4

　　　　大学生になると自由な時間が増え、旅行する機会が増えるというのは確かにあると思う。ただ、それを一人でするか、グループでするかはその時の気分次第じゃないかと僕は思う。僕は旅行するのはあまり好きな方ではないのだが、どちらかと言えばグループを好む。それは何故かと言えば、気の合う友達と旅をする方が得られる快感が多いと思うからである。一緒に色んな所を回り、一緒に騒いで一緒に笑ったりする方が楽しいし、思い出もたくさんできる。旅行というわけではないが僕はクラブで遠征に行くことがある。その時でもやはり他の仲間達と一緒に行動することがとても楽しい。その遠征が終わった後でもその旅先であった色んなことを話すことで、また楽しかった気分になれる。それはグループでの行動の大きなメリットであると思う。しかし、グループ行動での一番大きなメリットは仲間との絆が強くなることである。ずっと一緒にいることで強い仲間意識が生まれる。グルー

プで旅行をするというのもそういった仲間を大事にしたいという意識のあらわれであると思う。

　　では、一人で旅行をする人はどうかというと、何か自分なりに気持ちの整理をつけたいとか、ゆっくりと考えたいことがあるとか、そういう時にするものだと僕は思う。一人で旅をすると自分だけの時間がたくさんある。仲間との思い出などはできないが、その分周りから干渉されることはないわけだから、ゆっくりと自分だけの時間にひたれる。一人旅というのはそういった自分だけの時間をつくることで、心のやすらぎを求めるためにするものであると思う。

　　確かに僕も何かつらいことがあると一人で居たいと思うことがある。しかしそういう時に仲間といると気がまぎれるし、つらいことを忘れさせてくれるから、仲間といる方を選ぶ。僕の場合はそうであるが、グループでの旅も、一人旅も、一人でする旅も、一人一人のその時の気分、好みによって変わるものだろう。グループでの行動が好きでも、その時の気分によっては一人でいたいと思うことがあるだろう。だから、もしかしたらいつか僕も一人旅でもしたいと思うことがあるかもしれない。

Essay J3-5

　　昔、母親に言われたことがあります。

　　「大学生になったら、時間とお金に余裕ができるようになると思うんよ。だからいろいろ旅行に行ったらええわ。」

　　確かに中学・高校と比べると時間に余裕はできたし、アルバイトもしているので自由に使えるお金も増えました。いろんな所に旅行していろいろ見てみたい、そう思ったりすることもあります。

　　実際、私の友達の中にはこの夏休み中だけで３回も旅行したという子もいます。３回と友達同士（２人）で行ったそうです。

　　１人旅や、友達同士の旅行だと下手に気を使うこともなく、また共通の話題なども多いので、きっと楽しいのでしょう。その気持ちは分かります。でも楽しい反面、学生同士や１人での旅行には危険もあるのだということを知っておかなくてはいけないと思います。

　　昔、母に旅行のことについて言われたのと同じくらいの時期に、予備校の先生ともその話題について話したことがあります。その内容は、「学生たちは自分たちが危ないということを全然分かっていない。海外などで旅行者に起こる事件の中で最も多いのは女子学生２人組のパターンなのだ。やっぱり気持ちがうわついてしまうし、自分たちは大丈夫だろうという妙な安心感を持ってしまっているからだろう。だから旅行することはいい経験になるだろうし、いろいろ学ぶこともできるだろうが、行く時は１人や友達同士でなく、もっと責任の持てる人と一緒に行くようにした方がいい」というものでした。その話を聞いてすぐは、「でもやっぱり仲良しグループでの旅行とかって楽しそうなのに、、、。」と思っていましたが、今になってみると、やっぱり危険はあるだろうし、もう少し考えないといけないなあと思います。

　　最初や途中にも書いた通り、大学生はたぶん人生の中で一番時間に余裕があり、また自由にできるお金もある時だと思います。それに社会に出る前にいろいろな経験をして吸収して、人間的に成長できるとてもいい時期だとも思います。だから旅行したりして見て聞いて肌で触れてたくさんのことを学ぶことはとても大切なことだし、そしてとても楽しいことだと思います。けれどそれには同時に危険もあるのだということを忘れてはいけません。常にとは言いませんが危ないかもしれないという意識を持っていたら、浮かれた気分にはならないでしょう。せっかく旅行するのなら危ないこと

なく楽しくしたいものです。そのためにも少し気持ちをひきしめる必要があると思います。友達同士、1人での旅を楽しく思い出に残るものにするためにも。

Essay J3-6

　　　大学生は基本的には自由な時間が多い。そのため我々は退屈さから逃れるために旅行という手段を用いる。確かに社会人になってからの自分の自由にできる時間を考えると今を有効活用しないことは損とも言えるだろう。

　　　そして、旅行に出掛ける際、一人で行く人々と団体で行く人々に別れる。ちなみに自分は後者なのであるが、彼らは精神的にどのような違いがあるのだろうか。団体で旅行をする場合、必ず自分以外の仲間と共に行動することになる。仲間で行動するということは、迷った際に多くの意見を交わすことによって正確な判断を行いやすいし、何よりも気心知れた友達と楽しく会話ができるのだから当然楽しい。旅行という異地の訪問という状況下では人は開放感を持つようで、いつもの何倍も楽しく友達とはしゃぎまわれるし、夜ともなると普段は口にできないような過去の恋愛体験談などが飛び交い、大変貴重な体験ができるし、そのことで友情が深まるのは間違いないであろう。これは他人なしでは生きられない我々にとっては大変大事なことだ。このようは利点を多く持っている反面、欠点も多い。まず、行動が縛られる。これが一番大きいことだろう。友達の行動に合わせないといけないため自分の見たい場所を数秒で通りすぎないといけないこともあるだろうし、友達に気を使って自分のしたいことを断念せざる負えないこともあるだろう。このことは多少ストレスとなり、旅行の満足度を下げる要因となるであろう。次に、旅行先の人々との接点が少なくなることである。団体で行動しているとどうしても原地の人には話しかけづらい。別に原地の人々と友達にならなくてももうすでに気心知れた友達はすぐ近くにいるのだから。しかし、そのことは原地の人々との接触により得るであろう人情だとか経験を味わえないという損につながる。後に残るのはパンフレットより少々写りの悪い景色と友達の笑顔のつまった写真と少々の感動だけである。

　　　では一人旅の場合はどうであろうか。一人旅の一番の欠点は一人なので心細いということである。頼れるのは己のみ。そこには不安や寂しさが常につきまとうだろう。しかし、その一人の心細さを消すために原地の人々との接触をもつことが大きな意味をもつ。もしかしたらパンプレットには載っていない素晴らしい場所に連れてってもらえるかもしれないし、彼らと友達になることができれば、その地に再来する際の足がかりとなるはずだ。また一人で自分の思うままに行動できるという所にも魅力がある。見たいところは一時間以上かけてゆっくり見てもいいし、行きたくないところには行く必要すらない。しかも、綿密にスケジュールを組まずに行き当たりばったりで決められるのも貴重な体験をする上ではいいことである。ただ優柔不断な人は迷いすぎて一日中ホテルで睡眠なんて意味のないこともありえるのだが。さらに迷ったあげく一人で決めて訪れた所は素晴らしい所であればあるほど忘れることはない。旅を自分の一部を構成する栄養素にできるのだ。そのことは楽しさ以上に今後の人生においてプラスになるはずだ。

　　　以上のように二つの場合の違いを長々と述べてきたわけだが、結局の違いは旅行に各々が何を求めるかの違いであると僕は思う。前者は異地での体験以上に友達との絆、楽しさを求めている。一方後者は異地との心理的つながりに重点をおいているといえよう。このことは旅の仕方という小さな問題以上にその人の根底をなす思考の違いという深い領域の違いを密かに映し出しているようにも思える。人の行動には必ず心理的な源があるという心理学の基本理念を如実に示している。

旅行の楽しみ方は人それぞれであるから、ここで甲乙をつけることはしないが、かわいい子には旅をさせよということわざから察するに、旅行に何らかの成長を期待したいのであれば、予約する部屋はもう決まっているようなものである。

Essay J3-7
　　　大学生活に慣れてきて、友達も増え、長期休暇を利用して旅行に行こうという計画を、つい先日友達と話していた。一人旅もよいかもしれないが、私はグループでの旅の方が好きだ。グループとはいっても、私の場合は少人数限定のグループである。

　　　私とは反対に、友達の仲には一人旅をしたいという人もいる。私はその友達に対して、一人旅は何をするにも一人であって、ワイワイ騒ぐこともなく、決して楽しいとは思えず、なぜ一人旅を望むのか不思議に思っていた。

　　　私がなぜグループ旅行を好むかという最大の理由は、とにかく楽しいということだ。これは非常に単純なことだが、旅行に最も必要である。旅行中の小さな出来事でも、自分の中だけにとどめておくのではなく、それも一緒にいる仲間に伝えることによって、小さなことがより大きなことになり、旅行の楽しさというのはいくらでも倍増すると思う。

　　　しかし、グループ旅行は団体行動である。団体行動が苦手な人にとって、旅行までも団体行動をすることは旅行を楽しむことの妨げになるのかもしれない。一人旅をする人にとっての旅行とは、日常生活においての集団行動的なものから離れるためなのかもしれない。一人旅の楽しさとは、グループのにぎやかな楽しさとは異なり、自分だけの時間を求め、その時間の中で自分だけの特別な経験をつくっていくものだろうと思う。

　　　グループであろうと一人であろうと、旅行することそのものには変わりない。自分が望むものが、友達とただ楽しむことであったり、自分だけの自由な時間を求めることであったりなど理由は様々である。その時の自分自身の状況によって、どのような旅行が自分に最も適しているのかを知る必要がある。そして自分が経験した旅行で何を得ることができたかということが最も重要である。それぞれの目的に応じた旅行をするということが、グループ旅行をする人、一人旅をする人とに分かれることにつながっているのではないだろうか。

Group 4
Essay J4-1
　一人暮らしをするのがいいか、それとも家族と一緒に住んで大学に通うのがいいのか、それについては私はどちらでもいいと思う。大学から近いのにわざわざ一人暮らしをする必要はないだろう。一人暮らしをすることによって得るものがあるだろうが、無理してやる必要はないように感じる。広大生は一人暮らしをする人が割りと多い。その理由は、大学の近く、すなわち西条周辺に実家のある人が少ないからだろう。場所にもよるだろうが、広島市から通うのでさえ一時間近くかかってしまう。そのため私も、実家は広島市だが、西条で一人暮らしをしている。大学に通う時間を考えると、西条で一人暮らしをする方が楽なのだろう。
　だが、一人暮らしをするということは、今まで以上に責任がのしかかってくる、ということである。アパートの事でも規定は多く、近所に迷惑がかからないかどうか心配しなくてはならない。家族と暮らしていればこのようなことはそんなに感じないだろうが、一人暮らしをすれば感じざるを得なくなる。

大学に通うのは楽だと先程書いたが、それ以外の所では責任は多く、決して楽ではない。しかし一人暮らしをすれば、家族と暮らしている中では経験しないような事もいろいろ経験できると思う。そういった意味では、一人暮らしも悪くないのかもしれない。

家族と住む事、そして一人暮らしをるう事、そのどちらにも楽なところ、大変なところはある。そのどちらを選ぶのも自由だが、私は一人暮らしをするのも悪くないのでは、と思う。一人暮らしは大変だ、自分にはできないのでは、と思う人は多いだろう。私もそうだったが、一人暮らしができる、できないは本人のやる気しだいだと思う。親が許可してくれたなら、頑張ってやってみては、とこれから一人暮らしをする人に言いたい。

Essay J4-2

　　　　　私は今まであまり旅行という旅行はしたことがありません。一番大きな旅行というと修学旅行で行った台湾くらいです。けれど今世界の文化財や日本の建築、文化などに興味を持っているのでこれから先どんどんいろんなところに行ってみたいと思っています。その時、一人で自由気ままに旅行するのがいいか、何人かのグループで行くのがいいのか、私は簡単には決めることができません。どちらもいいところ悪いところがあるので。

　　　　　まず一人での旅行のいい所は何と言っても自分の好きなように行動できることです。ふとした思いつきでも誰に気を使うこともなくその日一日のプランを変更することができます。ただ女の子の一人旅行は特に危険ととなりあわせなので安全とは言いきれません。ちあんが悪い国になればなるほど危険はつきものですしねらわれやすくなるでしょう。私の友達でインドネシアに一人で旅行した人がいます。その子は女の子だったのですがやっぱり変な人に話しかけられたりしたそうです。そういう話を聞くと一人旅はちょっと怖いかな～と思ってしまいます。

　　　　　次に何人かのグループでの旅行についてですがこれはグループの人数によると思います。あんまり多勢で行きすぎると自分の行きたい所に必ずしも行けるとは限らないし。私だったら２～４人がベストかなあと思います。グループで行くとそのグループ内での思い出ができるし、やなこともあるけどそれ以上に楽しいことがあります。食事もみんなでとった方がおいしくなるはずです。そこがグループ旅行のいい所だと思います。

　　　　　どちらかというと私はグループ旅行の方が好きです。けれど最高でも４人までのグループ旅行に限ります。もともと私は団体行動が苦手なのであんまり人が多すぎると疲れが倍増してしまいます。旅行に行くのなら本当に気心知れた友達と行きたいです。来年の三月に高校の友達（浪人中の）と遅い卒業旅行に行く予定です。この友達は本当に仲が良かったので、今からすごく楽しみです。一人旅もやってみたいと思うけど今は友達との思い出をもっと作りたいので私はグループ旅行をしたいと思います。

Essay J4-4

　　　　　私は、一人で気ままに旅することも、グループで旅行することもどちらも楽しいと思います。ただし、それぞれの利点は違うものがあると思います。

　　　　　まず、一人旅では、知らない場所へ行くことや、海外であったら現地の言葉で話すことなどを、自分一人の力でやっていかなければいけません。だから、グループで旅行をするよりも、新しいことに踏み出す勇気がより必要で、その分色々得るものが大きいのではないかと思います。あと一人

なので、次はどこへ行こうなどという相談も必要なく気楽な部分もあります。

　　　グループで旅行をすることは、仲の良い友達と行ったりすれば、会話もはずんでより楽しくなるし、一人ではできなかったり行こうと思っても踏みとどまってしまったところにも行けるようになるかもしれません。また、一人旅では自分だけの観点で物事を見がちになりそうだけれど、グループなら一緒にいる人達の観点にも目がいき、一人では発見できなかった新たな発見をすることができると思います。

　　　私は学生の間に両方の旅を何回もしたいと思っています。やはり大学生のうちは、時間もあるし、学生でないとできないことがあると思います。学生のうちに、この二種類の旅を経験することによって、楽しいだけでなく、得るものもあり、将来でていく社会にも役立つこともあるだろうし、自分の人生に影響を少なからず与えると思います。

Essay J4-5

　　　私は今年の 4 月から 1 人暮らしを始めました。誰でもそうなのかもしれませんが、引っ越しのため来てくれた両親が帰ってしまった時は不安でいっぱいでした。しかし高校からの友人や多くの新しい友人、さまざまな行事のおかげで、今まで楽しく幸せにすごしてきました。

　　　これは 1 人暮らしのいつでも好きなことができる、という特長のおかげだと思っています。私は大学に入って初めて一晩中友人の家で遊んだり、話したりできました。高校の頃は、親が厳しくないとはいえ、あまり夜遅くまで外にいることは悪く感じられました。

　　　とはいえ、1 人暮らしがよいことばかりではありません。家事をすることで他のことをする時間は確実に減ります。このことで私は両親、特に父に県外の大学へ行くことを強く反対されました。確かに私はそれまで家事、特に重要な料理はまったくしていませんでした。しかし、今私は高校時代からは考えられなかった程、家事ができています。将来は必ずしなくてはならない時が来るので、いい練習期間になったと思っています。父も今は私の新しい生活をさまざまな面で支えてくれ、よく心配してメールをくれたりします。

　　　今は、生活にも慣れ、新しいことに挑戦してみたい気持ちでいっぱいです。しかし、大学に入った本来の目的を忘れてはいけません。それにあ、やはり実家で両親の元ですごす方がよいのかもしれません。今できることに集中し、確実に 1 人暮らしよりサポートが受けやすくなります。母もやはり心配してくれているようで電話をかけてきたり、さまざまな物を送ってきてくれたりします。

　　　このようなことから、私は両親が与えてくれたこのチャンスを私の人生に有効に利用しなければならないと感じます。暮らし方はどちらにしても、両親、そして家族が与えてくれていることを感謝し、今を最大限に生きることが大切です。1 人暮らしを始めた今の私には、このことがとてもよく実感できます。

Essay J4-6

　　　私は一人暮らしというのは、自分の行動に責任を持ち、行動し、生活していくことだと考えます。現在、私は家族と一緒に住んでいて自宅から大学に通っています。私は今の生活は好きです。家族と一緒にいる時間はとても楽しいし、私が悩んでいたり落ち込んでいる時には助けてくれ、支えてくれます。ですが、ふとこのままで良いのだろうかと考える時があります。私の今の生活は、ほとんどを親に頼っていて、ご飯を作ってもらい、洗濯掃除をしてもらっている状況です。私はもっと自

分で自分の事をしなければいけないと思い、一人暮らしをしたいと何度も思いました。ですが、私の場合は家から通える範囲内なのに、親に負担をかけながら毎月仕送りしてもらい、親の援助の元で一人暮らしをするのは少しおかしいとゆう気持ちがあります。なので今は可能な限り家の手伝いをして、自分の生活を自分で行える準備をしなければいけないのだと考えています。そして私は社会人になり、自分で稼ぐようになってから、一人暮らしを実現させようと考えています。ですが実際は社会人になる前に一人暮らしを経験すべきだと思います。それは社会人になってからでは、慣れない会社勤めが始まり、その上落ちこんだり悩んだりする時に支えてくれる人が側にいないのは、大変すぎると考えるからです。

　　別の面を考え、一人暮らしをすると、自由な時間や 1 人になれる時間が増えます。学生の間は、自由気ままに遊ぶこともできます。しかし、家族と住んでいるとどうしても親の目があり、干渉もされ、行動範囲が束縛されます。干渉され、制限されると自分の中の世界が広がらなくなると私は思っています。自分で行動を決めることが責任を伴い、自己責任を感じる事につながるのだと考えます。

English Essays

(Obvious spelling errors have been corrected, and paragraph indentation, standardized.)
Group 1
Essay E1-1

I think that these things have a strong point and a weak point each other.　If we live with our family, we don't have to make our meals and don't have to wash our clothes.　And if we catch a cold, our parents can nurse.　These things are a strong point.　But if we live with our family, we cannot do a thing that we feel like doing.　And we cannot drink alcohol late at night.　These things are a weak point.

On the other hand, if we live alone, we can do a thing that we want to do.　Anyone cannot complain our behavior.　This is a very strong point.

But as is often the case with living alone, living alone is apt to catch a cold.　We are apt to take less nutrition.　This is because lots of students have no time to make their meals.　Some people regard dinner as foods of convenience store.　This lead to shortage of nutrition.

But living alone have an easygoing aspect.　I expressed in advance this thing is the greatest point.

The shortage of nutrition is an important thing that should solve, but this thing loses if we have much care.　So as far as I am concerned I like living alone.

Essay E1-2

There are many chances that we travel when we are university student.　Which one is more beneficial traveling alone or group travel?

First, I'd like to observe on strong point of traveling alone.　First of all, it is good for us not to bother about anyone.　So, we can travel freely.　Besides, we can get a sense of

responsibility, because we have to do everything by oneself.   In addition to that, if we are in group, we are apt to satisfy without meeting something new, but if we are alone, we tend to seek meeting more positively.

In the contrary, sometimes traveling alone is danger, especially women.

Second, I'd like to observe on strong point of group travel.   Above all, it is more safety than traveling alone.   And, we can share pleasure or happiness of travel with someone of group.

However, group travel has some bad point.   We tend to ease too much, because we can enjoy the travel without meeting something new.   Besides, it is little difficult to go to somewhere we want to go freely.

I think the most attractive point of travel is meeting something new.   In addition to that, travel makes us more rich psychically, especially traveling alone.

So, I come to the conclusion that traveling alone is better than group travel if we are student particularly.   I'm sure that we can develop through traveling alone.

Essay E1-3

Now a days, because I started to drive a car, I had more chance to travel than before: Last month, I went to Okayama with my two friends.   Last week, I went to Sho-bara with many friends.   I love traveling very much, because for me, traveling means to touch new, unknown culture.   But, I rarely travel alone.   I almost travel with some members.   Because, I can share new discovery or good feeling with members.   Also, it is more secure than travel alone, especially when I go abroad.   When I was a high school student; I went to England with friends.   In England, I had a big culture shock and I had many small problems.   But when I felt nervous, my friends helped me, and I could spend good day in England.   This is why, I had thought that it is better to travel as group than alone.

But my feeling has changed.   At this summer, one of my sister's seniors came to Hiroshima from Tokyo alone by his bicycle.   I asked him "why did you come alone?"   And he answered "Traveling alone is freedom.   I can go wherever I like, I can sleep whenever I like.   Also, I can meet many new people, and sometimes I can make friends with them.   I think it is very important experience for me.   And I believe this travel will give me big confidence."   I was very interested in his talk.   And I'd like to challenge traveling alone.   I think it is difficult to travel alone, because, I have to have big responsibility.   But I will try.

Essay E1-4

I started to live alone last spring.   Because it takes a lot of time to go to my university from my home.   Some students go to university from their home, but some students go to there from apartment which they live alone for different reasons.   In my opinion, I think we should live alone if possible.

To live alone is very busy.   We must cook, wash, clean and so on ourselves.   Besides,

if we have trouble, we can't ask our parents to help us. But thanks to living alone, we can live our own life and grow to care ourselves more and more.

Contrastively, to live with our family is ease in the view of mental and physical phase. We can depend on our family at the point of housework and be helped by them as soon as some trouble happen.

That's why I think students should live alone if their parents permit us to live alone.

In conclusion, however, living alone makes us live our own life, and we can spend our time freely.

Essay E1-5

I'd like to travel by myself. Because if I traveled alone, I can go anywhere I want. For example, I've been Tokyo with my friends. When we planned the travel, one of my friends wanted to go Aruta and Mitsukoshi, but I didn't want to go there. I wanted to go Asakusa and Ameyoko. Each other friends had different idea, too. So we had to discuss and all the members had to give up a part of idea. Of course the travel was fun but I couldn't visit entire place where I wanted to. Travel is fun but I think, travel is the way to learn something, too. When I traveled Australia alone, I could go anywhere I want and also I could learn a lot of thing. When I got a problem, I had to solve by myself but that became good experience.

That's why I like to travel alone.

Essay E1-6

I live by myself now, because it is difficult to go to the university from my home.

Now, I'm realizing that living by oneself has a lot of troublesome problems. When I come home, don't prepare a meal and I have to do cleaning, washing, and so on. If I live with my family, I'm not must to do these. My family, especially my mother does it.

But there are not only troublesome problems. Living alone gives me free. Feel free to join clubs, have some part-times and play with my friends! It's a fascinating point of living alone.

Besides, there is another good point of living alone. It's that we can morally independent of our parents. Now, there are many single young people live with their family. They are called "Parasite single", and then, the characteristic is that depend on their parents of morally and economically too. I think, making "Parasite single" cause of that they don't have an experience of living alone.

I think it's good that we have a chance to have an experience of living alone. The chance fits we to go on to university.

Essay E 1-7

I prefer traveling with my close friend, one or two to traveling alone or in a big group

(5~10).   There are some reasons.

First, In a big group, we can not visit places I want to go, because many people travel together and we have to think where to visit, considering members' opinion.   On the other hand, In a small group, (me and one or two close friends) we can go anywhere without planning where to visit.   The places we visit depends on weather and mood of that day.   In short, we can travel freely.

Secondly, there are many dangers to us in traveling alone.   Especially women tend to be harmed by strangers.   For example, snatch, rape, and luggage lifting.   It is very difficult to avoid these cases by oneself.   However in a small group, they can be avoided.   If one person have his or her bag snatched away, another person can run after the snatcher or call the police.   At worst, we can help togather.   Like this, in a small group, we expose ourselves to lesser danger.

Lastly, in the case of suffering from illness, members nurse us.   So, we don't have to worry about health problem seriously.

I mentioned three reasons.   That's why I prefer traveling in a small group to traveling alone or in a big group.

Essay E1-8

It is necessary for University students to live with their families, because they don't have to spend their money for a house rent and they can save money.   So they can spend money for another things, for buying textbooks and so on.

Besides, they have less need to do household works; they can live without washing their clothes.   And they don't have to do part time job.

Most importantly, it help students spending their time for only studying.   They can concentrate studying only, because they don't have to earn money or do household things, like I above-mentioned.

Therefore I think collage or University students should live with their families.

Essay E1-9

I think to live by yourself is good for you.   To live with family is very convenient for you.   Because you mustn't cook, clean your room, and so son.   But I think it is important to develop your independence after you enter university.   If you live with your family, the independence doesn't develop.   To live by yourself is very difficult but there are many things that you notice.   For example, the importance of your parents.   You can notice that you are too dependent on your parents.   And the importance of money.   You must manage thanks to careful housekeeping.   If you have a part time job, you can know the difficulty of making money, too.   Above all I think it is very important to notice how you depend on your parents.

There are a lot of advantages to live by yourself and a lot of things that you must notice.   This is why I think to live by yourself is good for you.

Group 2

Essay E2-1

I prefer go to a trip with some friends to go to a trip alone. Because I have two reasons, I like go to a trip with someone.

First, I think that I make more memories of going a trip with friends than I go to a trip alone. I guess I will feel lonely if I would went to a trip alone. But friends make me happy. So I feel happy anytime to go a trip with friends. Second, I'm afraid of going strange place. I guess I will take a lost of way and lose every money so friend will help me anytime, therefore I need them. But I will get many thing in traveling alone. Because of realization I do my favorite things.

My opinion of a result, traveling alone is good, but also traveling with my friends is the true charm of trip.

Essay E2-2

I think that it's better for an undergraduate to live alone, staying away from his or her family. You may think "Why? If graduates live with their family, they don't have to do housework and they can study long time. But I think it's not so important. There are two main reasons for my opinion.

First, living alone enables undergraduates to be independent from their family. They have to cook, wash, clean and study by themselves. No one helps them do it. Living alone can be an step to independence.

Secondly, staying away from family have undergraduates confirm the importance of their family's being.

So, I think living alone is better choice for undergraduates.

Essay E2-3

I think travel alone is very good because you can go wherever you want, but if you want to go to foreign countries, you may worry about many things. For example, language. If you can't speak language that is spoken in the country, you'll be in trouble when you meet some difficulties.

Travel with some friends is more fun. There is no loneliness. You can talk with them about what you see there at any time. It is very fun, but you miss a chance to meet new people.

I want to go travel with my friends. I want to make good memories with them. Travel alone is a little lonely. I like making the plan with my friends and taking about food, historical sight, shopping, and so on.

Essay E2-4

I'd like to live alone; because it seems to be interesting. However, I'm living with my family now. Probably, if you would go to school near your house, you went to school from your house. Living with your family is very economical.

But there are many advantage of living oneself. It is the most tangible advantages to independence from your parents. I think that your parents worry about you, but if you have the enthusiasm you can try. Living alone give you precious experience, and you appreciation for your parents.

If you could afford to live by yourself, I recommended you live alone. You reach full growth with such experience.

Essay E2-5

I live with my family now. But, I think this isn't good. That's because I depend on my family for everything. But, Living with own family has good aspect. For example, They can eat a well-balanced diet by mother's cooking diet. In addition, they have more time to spend their favorite things. They can also save more money got by part-time-job. On the one hand, they can't take care of theirselves well such as cooking, cleaning and washing. They can't also do their favorite action by rules of family such as curfew and so on.

Next, there are many good aspects to live alone. They can live theirselves and invite many people without constraint. In addition they become to take care of theirselves. They also feel the importance of family. On the other hand, they may become to have a biased diet and become to be irregular life. In addition, they need much money for their life, so they must do part-time-job. By this, they feel to lessen eagerness against study.

Finally, I think living with family is good, but I hope to live alone because I feel I must take care of myself.

Essay E2-6

There' are many collerge students who likes to travel. There' are students who likes to trip alone, some students like to travel with friends or family.

I like to travel with friends because I can more enjoy than go alone, and not consume a lot of money. I'm not lonely. But there' is a fault. When many people go to trip together, they won't be concluded, you might not go to there where you want to go.

There' are some students who wants to go to travel alone because you can go to there where you want to go and you won't give some trouble to anyone. But when you're confused, or have a little money, you must think alone, can't depend on friends.

I think it's most important for you to enjoy your trip when you go to travel, and I think you should experience both traveling alone and go with friends.

Essay E2-7

I think that we decide we travel whether by ourselves or with people we know depends on when and where. Because we can suppose many cases when we travel.

For example, when we go to Hawaii for sightseeing, probably we don't go there by ourselves. And we may go there with our family or friends. In other words, when we would like to enjoy our travel, we like to make merry with someone. In addition to it, it is the travel more full of memories when we go there with someone than when by ourselves.

On the other hand, we sometimes like to travel somewhere by ourselves. For example, when we want to escape from stressful reality. It is natural that when we are under a lot of stress, we want to do so. I think that the stress often comes from a quota to complete and concern for human relations. To get rid of the stress, we sometimes travel alone. For example, I want to go to a place which has a lot of the beautiful nature. And it is good for us to travel somewhere alone without reserve.

Therefore, both to travel alone and in groups have good points. So in campus life which we have many opportunities to travel to many places, we should make the best use of them. And I think it important that we use time and circumstance properly. By doing so, I think that we can spend our lives in our college days in enjoying travels.

Group 3

Essay E3-1

I prefer traveling in the group to traveling alone.

When I travel somewhere, I see the sights and eat food which special of the tourist resort, whether traveling in the group or traveling alone. Because of the deeds, I get amazement, discover, and strong emotion which I can't get in usual living. I want to express and tell someone those discovery, amazement, strong emotion and various feelings. Because I am able to be happy when I tell someone who I want to tell, about my experience at the tourist resort. So, I prefer traveling in the group to traveling alone. When I travel in the group, I can tell someone my feeling and amazement sooner and more direct than traveling alone.

Also, I may be able to find things which I can't find by myself by someone's telling.

Indeed, traveling alone is good. Wherever I want to go, I can. But, by traveling with someone, I may get more happiness, enjoyment, strong emotion and various feelings. And I can share those joy or happiness with them. So, I like traveling in the group than traveling alone.

Essay E3-2

I want to live single at near the university. In fact, I live single now, it is very convenience when I must go to university in the early morning or I back home in the late night, because I can come and go right away by bicycle or on foot. And it is happy to invite friends with a light heart. It also happy to change the interior in all home with own way.

And we must do by oneself what we had depended on parents, so we can cook and laundry well, or to economize on, we can buy and use things wisely.   So we can study society before we graduate from a university.   We can know the importance of parents when we have a hard time with alone.

If we live with families, someone is exist when we come back home so we don't feel loneliness, and someone cook and clean and so on, so we can live comfortably.   But to study the important things to live in the society by myself, I want to live single.

Essay E3-3

I like to travel by myself.   And I like to travel with friends, too.

When I travel by myself, I can go anywhere I want to go.   I don't have to do everything without thinking of a companion.   However, if I've lost my way, I've lost my purse, I have to deal with the problem by my own efforts.

When I travel with friends, I can't act just as my likes. I have to hear other's opinion, and act as a group.   It may be annoying.   However, when we have trouble, we can cooperate to deal with the problem with the group.

I think either traveling alone or a group tour have a good part.   We can select one of them according to a kind of the travel.

Essay E3-4

I think that students are should live by oneself because they should become independent from their parent. I also live by myself, so I learned many things. For example, I learned difficulty of diet control. Though I should cook for myself, I can't do it easily. Therefore I got lean.

The others, washing, cleaning and so on, I should do many thing by myself. It's very difficult but it's necessary in the future. We children can't depend on our parents forever. Therefore we should live for ourselves to train.

On the contrary, I think that living with family is no good for children.

Students are should live by themselves for independence.

Essay E3-5

When I was a high school student, always I thought "I want to live alone".   Because living with parents was very tiresome I thought.   Watching TV, eating something, playing with my friends,,, whenever I did something I had my parents' (especially my mother's) at heart.

But now that things have come to this pass, that thought is very optimistic, I feel. From morning till night, spending time alone all the time is very lonely and hard, I notice! When I wake up at morning and when I went back home from school, a meal has been ready. This incident is very fantastic.   At night, when I'm tired, if my mother was lived together, I

could talk and laugh.

Some of my friends go to school from his (her) home everyday. In it's own way, there are some trouble, maybe. But when she went back home, she said "What is today's supper…?" I was envious of her very much.

Of course, living alone has some strong point. As I wrote first, watching TV, what is eating, playing with friends at any time any place, and so on. I can do as my likes.

In conclusion, what I want to say is "To live alone is very free, but living with family have peace of mind."

To experience living alone is very important for our life, but the space of that time, we must feel gracious of living with family.

Essay E3-6

When you become a university student, you can choice a single life or life with your family. It is natural that this choice depends on your decision, but I encourage you to live a single life.

Surely, if you lived with your family, you wouldn't need to make your dinner, wash your dirty clothes, clean your house. It is very comfortable. But, if you left a state that you depended on your family as it is, you couldn't become independent to your parents forever. For living a single life, you can get freedom. But you also get responsibility for your life. If you didn't make your dishes, you couldn't eat and live. And if you didn't clean your house, you couldn't have a place to sit down because a lot of thing take up a lot of room. After all, it is your attitude for your life whether your single life become happy life or you go to the bad. Some day, you must separate your parents, and live a single life. So to live a single life when you are university student is sure to be important to support yourself. So I think this time your university student days is the best opportunity for becoming an adult.

Essay E3-7

I wanted to live alone when I was high school student. Now, I entered university, I live with my family. I want to live alone in the future but I think that it is good of students to live with their family.

Because I am not good at cooking and cleaning rooms. It makes me feel tired.

Moreover, living alone prevent me from keeping regular hours. For example, part-time job until late at night, a haunt of friends, and so on. It makes students be irresponsible.

However, living alone have a good point. It helps become independent from your family. It is very important of us in the future. There is also another point that we can have enough free time for ourselves. I think that people who prefer to living alone make use of these things.

I often think that I want to live alone when I quarrel with my mother. But I love my home, my mothers delicious meal. More than anything else, it is important of me not to feel

lonely. That is why I prefer living with my family to living alone.

Group 4

Essay E4-1

Traveling is good, both traveling alone and group traveling. After entering University, I have never traveled. But I think so. Traveling is good. Because traveling is happy, and you can see more of life if you travel.

If I have time, I want to travel. Want to do group traveling more than traveling alone. One of my friends traveled by bicycle in this summer vacation. I admire it. But I want to do group traveling. I think group traveling is more happy than traveling alone. So I want to do it.

After entering University, free time is increased. So we can do what we can't do when we were before entering University, for example, traveling. So we should travel. We should spend a happy time, and we should see more of life in traveling. And we should make good use of this knowledge in the future.

Essay E4-2

I had hankered after a single life since I was a high school student. So, absolutely, I wanted to do a single life if I could be a university student, because I wanted my space. At first, I enjoyed cooking my own food. I worked enthusiastically, for example, cooking, cleaning, and washing, so on. But, about one month after, I got tired of doing. And I come to miss my parent's home. If I don't move, I can eat food, have a bath,…. But when I come back home, I had no thing to do. And that, I had to go back home at ten o'clock. So, when I played with my friends until late at night, My parents flew into a rage. At that moment, I thought that I wanted to go back quickly to my home which is in Saijo. So, I had stayed in Tottori only one week. I thought that though, there are much serious matter, a single life is very comfortable. I want to live in comfort.

But, now, It is very cold in Saijo. So, I sometimes think that I want to go back my home and go to see my family.

Essay E4-4

Now I'm living by myself. I think that a single life is good. Before I move in Hiroshima, I desired earnestly a single life. Because living in my parent's home was troublesome.

For two months of the first, I missed my friends in Shizuoka. In summer I wanted to meet my family. Especially my mother. It was strange that my mind changed. But I can say I understood my family as individual. So, for example, I admitted my mother's worthless action as worth.

Usually it is said that a single life teaches us how hard to cook, wash clothes, clean

one's room, etc.... But I think that a single life gives more preciousness. If you want to get out from your parent's home, a single life is best answer.

Essay E4-5

This summer, I went to Tokyo Disney Resort with a friend of mine. This was first time that I took a trip with someone but my parents. It was very difficult for me to make an appointment. I quarreled with a friend. But the trip was a success. Because of this experience, I learned difficulty of taking a trip.

Through this trip, I was helped by a friend. If I had gone to there alone, this trip hadn't been a success. There were many accident, I forgot my cellular phone, we mistook a desk. But because of a friend, it succeeded.

Sharp person can do many things about a trip. But many people may be able to do. Taking a trip alone is very difficult. If there are some worrisomes, you must solve it by yourself. Also when you feel happy, pleasant, interested, you can't share it with someone. I think it is dull. Moving to other place is enjoyment of trips. During morning, you can talk with someone, talk about plan of a trip. I like this time the best in a trip. Taking a trip is not only for doing at a destination, but also planning, moving, talking after returning.

I like taking a trip with someone. I want to share worrisomes, pleasant on the trip. Talking with many people is more enjoyable than thinking of something alone.

Essay E4-6

In students, some people travel by yourself and other people travel with their friends. I prefer travel with friends to by yourself. Because I think that we enjoy more than all by oneself.

The fact that I traveled with my best friends in this summer is very interesting and very important memory for me. Of course for friends. Because we got lost in the crowd and found good prety and stylish shops and played a amusement park. Its' travel can't succeed by myself. Because of being with my friends we enjoyed very much. If I travel by myself, I think I feel lonely. I don't like loneliness. So I have respect for traveling by oneself.

One of my friends occasionally says that he travel somewhere for a week. I'm always surprised each time. I wonder he don't feel lonely. But he says, "by oneself travel is good because it is easygoing and has many time to think something. Something is my future and my friends and so on." I thought it is truth.

I think that things is thought anyways. Admittedly I think great his thought, but I can't imitate his act. I want to travel with my friends again.

Appendix D

Discourse Modes Across Languages:

Frequencies by Group and Individual

Table A-1: Summary of Discourse Mode Frequencies by Language and Group

Mode	Language	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Total
Argument	Japanese	3	2	0	0	5
	English	5	3	5	0	13
Exposition	Japanese	2	4	2	2	10
	English	0	2	1	0	3
Mixed	Japanese	4	0	5	1	10
	English	4	2	1	3	10
Self-reflection	Japanese	0	1	0	1	2
	English	0	0	0	1	1
Total	Japanese	9	7	7	5	27*
	English	9	7	7	5	27*

*one essay eliminated as being ill-defined

Table A-2: Comparison of Individuals' Discourse Modes across Languages

	Japanese Essay	English Essay	Comparison
Group 1			
1-1	Exp	Mix (Exp -> Arg)	*
1-2	Mix (Exp->Arg)	Mix (Exp -> Arg)	=
1-3	Mix (Exp->Arg)	Mix (Self <-> Arg)	*
1-4	Exp	Mix (Arg ->Exp)	*
1-5	Arg	Arg	=
1-6	Mix (Exp->Arg)	Arg	*
1-7	Mix (Arg->Exp)	Arg	*
1-8	Arg	Arg	=
1-9	Arg	Arg	=
Group 2			
2-1	Self	Arg	x
2-2	Arg	Arg	=
2-3	Arg	Mix (Exp -> Arg)	*
2-4	Exp	Arg	x
2-5	Exp	Mix (Arg <->Exp)	*
2-6	Exp	Exp	=
2-7	Exp	Exp	=
Group 3			
3-1	Mix (Exp->Arg)	Arg	*
3-2	Mix (Arg->Exp)	Arg	*
3-3	Mix (Self->Exp)	Exp	*
3-4	Exp	Arg	x
3-5	Mix (Self->Exp)	Mix (Self ->Exp)	=
3-6	Exp	Arg	x
3-7	Mix (Arg->Exp)	Arg	*
Group 4			
4-2	Mix (Exp->Arg)	Self	x
4-4	Exp	Mix (Self -> Arg)	x
4-5	Self	Mix (Self -> Arg)	*
4-6	Exp	Mix (Arg <-> Self)	x

Arg: Argumentation; Exp: Exposition; Self: Self-reflection; Mix: Mixed;
->: direction of overall movement; <->: movement back and forth; =: same; *: partial overlap; x: different

Appendix E
Samples Essays Showing Discourse Markers*

Japanese Essay 2-2
(3 overall meta-discourse, 1 partial meta-discourse, 4 inter-sentential markers)

　旅行は、多かれ少なかれ、人を成長させてくれるものだと思う。それが一人旅であれ、集団での旅行であれ、何らかの効果を人にもたらすはずだ。<u>しかし</u>私は、旅行は一人で行く方がより好ましいと考える。

　確かに、**集団で旅行することにはたくさんのメリットがある**。日常から慣れ親しんでいる友人と一緒に、普段行かないような場所へ旅行すれば、お互いにより親交を深めることができるだろう。**また**、友人同士でなくともメリットはある。<u>例えば</u>、JTBなどの旅行会社が主催するツアーが挙げられる。集団で行動するから、何よりまず安全である。これは大変大きなメリットであると言える。

　しかし私は、それらの利点が旅行に必ずしも必要だとは思わない。それには、私の考える「旅行の目的」というものが関係する。私の考えるそれは、日常を離れ、非日常の中に身を置くことによって、普段の自分を客観的に見つめる機会を持つ、ということである。

　友人同士にせよ他人同士にせよ、集団で旅行すると、「非日常」であるはずの旅行に「日常」が入り込んでしまう。そのことが、私の考える「旅行の目的」の達成をさまたげてしまうと思うのだ。一人旅ならば、自分以外はすっかり「非日常」の世界だ。観るもの、聞くもの、肌で感じるものすべてが日常と異なって感じられる。メディアなどを通じて、自分が日常を過ごしている場所のことを見聞きすることもあるかもしれない。<u>しかし</u>、それもまた、「日常の客観視」と言えるだろう。

　以上のように、一人で旅行をすることが、日頃の自分についてのことを見直してみる良い機会となりうる。私は集団での旅行を否定するわけではない。そのような旅行にも良い点はたくさんある。<u>しかし</u>、旅行という、日常を脱する絶好の機会を存分に活用しようと思うなら、一人で行くのがより良い選択であると、私は考える。

English Essay 1-2
(2 overall meta-discourse, 7 partial meta-discourse, 5 inter-sentential markers)

There are many chances that we travel when we are university student. **Which one is more beneficial traveling alone or group travel?**

First, I'd like to observe on strong point of traveling alone. *First of all,* it is good for us not to bother about anyone. <u>So,</u> we can travel freely. <u>Besides,</u> we can get a sense of responsibility, because we have to do everything by oneself. *In addition to that,* if we are in group, we are apt to satisfy without meeting something new, but if we are alone, we tend to seek meeting more positively.

In the contrary, sometimes traveling alone is danger, especially women.

Second, I'd like to observe on strong point of group travel. Above all, it is more safety than traveling alone. <u>And,</u> we can share pleasure or happiness of travel with someone of group.

However, group travel has some bad point. We tend to ease too much, because we can enjoy the travel without meeting something new. <u>Besides,</u> it is little difficult to go to somewhere we want to go freely.

I think the most attractive point of travel is meeting something new. <u>In addition to that,</u> travel makes us more rich psychically, especially traveling alone.

So, **I come to the conclusion** that traveling alone is better than group travel if we are student particularly. I'm sure that we can develop through traveling alone.

*Key:
overall meta-discourse markers (in bold font)
partial meta-discourse markers (in bold italics)
<u>inter-sentential markers</u> (underlined)

Appendix F

Sample Essays with Points and Elaboration Identified
(Points in bold font, elaboration in italics:
context not underlined, specification underlined)

Argumentation Essays
Sample Essay 1 (Group 1, J1-8)
Points: 3
Elaboration: Context - 1 case, 1 segment; Specification – 3 cases, 19 segments

　　　大学生が空いた時間を利用して旅行をすることについて、何人かのグループであっても一人であってもそれは良い経験になると思う。集団にしろ個人にしろ、いつもとは違う場所で日常とは異なった体験をすることができる。

　　　しかし、私は一人で旅行をする方が、より得るものが多いと思う。まず一つ目に、*計画は全て自分で立てなければならない。見知らぬ土地に行く上に他人に頼ることができないので*、**かなりの自立心が得られるはずだ。**これは集団旅行では得にくい経験である。

　　　二つ目は、集団で旅行をしていると騒ぎ、楽しむことができるが、*個人で旅行をしていると、もちろん静かな中で*、**いわゆる単なる観光ではない旅行がし易いと思うからである。**一人で*旅の途中にしみじみと回想することもできる。落ち着いて旅の途中の景色や人々を眺めることもできる。このような眺め方は、単に対象を眺めることとは、違う眺め方であると思うのだ。*

　　　そして最後に、個人のみで旅行することが好ましいと思う最大の理由は、**伝統的な日本人の性質である"集団性"から脱け出して欲しいと、***私は若者に望むからである。日本人は協調性を重んじ、周囲を気づかうのは良い。しかし、実は個人の意見がなく、集団の雰囲気に流されて集団の意見を自分の意志であるかのように振る舞ってしまったり、個人では不安で、"失敗しないだろうか"とおそれて一人で行動できない日本人は多くないだろうか。外国人に日本人は引っ込み思案が多いと言われたり、一人では大人しくているのに集団になると存在感を示し、街を暴走する暴走族など、そのような日本人の"個人で行動する自信のなさ"の表れている行動は他にも沢山見受けられる。*

　　　計画を一人で立て一人で動ける自立性、一人で物事をじっと深く考える事ができるようになること、集団に慣れてしまわないこと、以上のことを望むゆえに、私は一人で旅行をする方が望ましいと考える。

Sample Essay 2 (Group 1, E1-7)
Points: 3
Elaboration: Context – 0 cases, 0 segments; Specification – 5 cases, 17 segments

I prefer traveling with my close friend, one or two to traveling alone or in a big group (5~10). There are some reasons.

First, in a big group, _we can not visit places I want to go_, _because many people travel together and we have to think where to visit, considering members' opinion_. On the other hand, in a small group, (me and one or two close friends) _we can go anywhere without planning where to visit_. _The places we visit depends on weather and mood of that day_. In short, **we can travel freely.**

Secondly, _there are many dangers to us in traveling alone_. _Especially women tend to be harmed by strangers_. _For example, snatch, rape, and luggage lifting_. _It is very difficult to avoid these cases by oneself_. _However in a small group, they can be avoided_. _If one person have his or her bag snatched away, another person can run after the snatcher or call the police_. _At worst, we can help togather_. Like this, in a small group, **we expose ourselves to lesser danger.**

Lastly, _in the case of suffering from illness, members nurse us_. So, **we don't have to worry about health problem seriously.**

I mentioned three reasons. That's why I prefer traveling in a small group to traveling alone or in a big group.

Expository Essays

Sample Essay 3 (J2-4)

Points: 5

Elaboration: Context – 2 cases, 2 segments; Specification – 2 cases, 2 segments

　　　旅行には、色々な種類があると思いますが、大勢で行くか、それとも一人で行くのかという差は大きいと思います。

　　　もし、友人やサークルの仲間と一緒に旅行に行くのなら、それは観光を目的とするというよりむしろ**親交を深めることが主**な目的になるのではないでしょうか。しかし、一人旅は大勢の旅行とは違って、友人と話している間に見過ごしてしまう**景色等も注意深く眺めることができます**。一人旅は、**他人のペースを気にしなくてよい**という点で**楽だとも言え**、一人で**旅をすることで新しい発見ができるものではないか**、と思います。

　　　しかし、だからといって大勢の旅行が劣っているわけではありません。*他人と意見を交換することも大切です*。そこから新しい考え方や、一人では**気付けなかった事実を発見できるかも**しれません。また、*旅行が親交を深めてくれるのは、意見交換によって相手の考え方を知ることができるからでしょう*。

　　　同じ場所へ旅行に行くとしても、一人で行くのと友人と行くのでは全く違った経験ができるということです。このことは、大勢の人が旅行に魅力を感じる一つの要因だと思います。

Sample Essay 4 (Group 3, E3-3)

Points: 5

Elaboration: Context – 3 cases, 3 segments; Specification – 1 case, 3 segments

I like to travel by myself.　　And I like to travel with friends, too.

When I travel by myself, **I can go anywhere I want to go.　　I don't have to do everything without thinking of a companion.**　　However, *if I've lost my way, I've lost my purse,* **I have to deal with the problem by my own efforts.**

When I travel with friends, **I can't act just as my likes.** *I have to hear other's opinion, and act as a group.　　It may be annoying.*　　However, *when we have trouble,* **we can cooperate to deal with the problem with the group.**

I think either traveling alone or a group tour have a good part.　　We can select one of them according to a kind of the travel.