

EFFECTS OF PREWRITING DISCUSSION ON THE LANGUAGE QUALITY OF ARGUMENTATIVE WRITINGS

Pu Xianwei
Nanjing University

Abstract

This study investigated how prewriting discussions in different languages affect the language quality of argumentative compositions produced by first-year Chinese English majors. The 24 subjects involved were assigned into four groups, three of which were required to conduct a 15-minute long prewriting discussion in either English, or Chinese, or both English and Chinese respectively, and one of which to brainstorm individually before they wrote independently. Data analysis revealed that (1) the three discussing groups allocated just a small portion of the time discussing the use of language; (2) the participants in the discussion groups wrote more fluently than those in the brainstorming group; (3) compositions written by the English group were much better in language quality with fewer errors and higher syntactical complexity than those of the other three groups.

Key words

prewriting discussion ;L2 writing ;argumentation ;language use

1 .Introduction

Speaking activities like prewriting discussion are popular in writing classes. A majority of studies on prewriting discussion suggest that students write better after talking about a topic (Bossio 1993 ;Sweigart 1991). One major concern in the students group work is the language of discussion in the bilingual context. For many, it is a given that the more use of a second language (L2), the higher the resultant proficiency in that language (Carrol 1975). Although there are few studies on prewriting discussions conducted in different languages, the studies examining the relationship between first language (L1) and second language use in the writing process are abundant, and the results are mixed. Some studies find a positive relationship between the amount of L1 use and the quality of students writing (Friedlander 1990 ; Zamel 1983) and some studies reveal a negative relationship (Cohen & Brooks-Carson 2001 ;Swain & Lapkin 2000). Therefore, the relationship between the amount of L1 use and the quality of students writing needs to be further explored.

2 .Previous studies

In the domain of L2 writing, a consensus has been reached that one consistent and salient characteristic, which is fundamentally distinct from L1 writing processes, is that L2 writers switch back and forth between their L1 and L2 in order to work through a particular problem that they are struggling with while composing in the L2 (Wang 2003), and in the past two or three decades, numerous studies have been conducted to explore the functions of L1 use (Friedlander 1990 ;Wang & Wen 2002); the relationship between the proficiency of L2 writers and the amount of L1 use (Wang 2003 ;Wang & Wen 2002 ;Woodall 2002); the relationship between the amount of L1 use and the quality of L2 writers compositions (Cohen & Brooks-Carson 2001).

Attempts have been made to investigate the influence of talking on writing. However, the studies mainly focus on teacher-fronted talk in whole class situation, teacher-student interactions in writing conference, and peer review groups. A few studies that examined the effect of prewriting discussions have all suggested students write better after talking about a topic (Bossio 1993; Sweigart 1991). However, all these studies, which are primarily in the L1 context, fail to establish how teacher-student or student-student interactions actually assist students' writing by just comparing the students' writing scores or other quantitative measures of students' initial drafts. Recently, some researchers tried to overcome this weakness in the previous studies, intending to trace the direct influence of different modes of prewriting discussion on writing in L2 by comparing both the spoken and written texts.

The study of Shi (2003) assessed whether peer talk and teacher-led prewriting discussion affected the quality of students' compositions. Each of the forty-seven EFL students from three pre-university writing classes wrote three drafts of opinion essays under conditions of peer discussion, teacher-led discussion, and no discussion. The researcher compared not only the analytical scores of the students' writing, but also the number of mental verbs in order to trace the effects of the different modes of prewriting discussions. Nonparametric tests of rating scores showed no statistically significant differences overall in the writing under the three conditions.

Another study (Ju 2006) compared the effects of peer group discussion and brainstorming on the quality of students' compositions with task familiarity as another variable. Data analysis revealed that compositions written after student-student interaction tended to be better than those composed after self-brainstorming in overall quality. Differences were marginally significant ($P = .08$) in analytical language scores and significant in terms of content ($P = .00$) and organization ($P = .00$). The researchers also found that the differences in influence of the two prewriting activities were inclined to become greater with the increase of task difficulty level.

Although there are a wealth of studies on the use of L1 in L2 writing and some studies on L2 prewriting discussions, there are scarcely any on the use of L1 in L2 prewriting discussion, except that of Lally (2000). In order to determine which language (L1 or L2) is more preferable for prewriting activities, twelve undergraduate native speakers of English (two males and ten females) who were enrolled in a fourth semester French course were randomly assigned into two groups. Each group was given a photograph of a cultural-neutral scene and was asked to discuss the photo collectively. One group was asked to discuss the photo in English (L1) and the other in French (L2) within 30 minutes before each of the participants composed his/her own individually. Over the course of one semester, the students wrote ten compositions in their L2. Analytic average scores for each group showed that although there were no virtually differences in terms of vocabulary and expression between the compositions produced after L1 prewriting discussion and those after L2 prewriting discussion, more notable differences were found in organization and global impression scores. On the whole, the L1 prewriting discussion group performed slightly or much better than the L2 prewriting discussion group, although with no statistical significance.

Considering the limited number of studies on prewriting discussions, especially on the use of L1 in prewriting discussion, the researcher of the current study intended to further explore this area in L2 writing instruction, by following and improving the designs of the previous studies. The two specific research questions addressed (1) What are the differences in the students' discussion activities between prewriting discussion in English, prewriting discussion in Chinese and prewriting discussion in both English and Chinese? (2) How do the different modes of discussion affect the language quality of students' writing?

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The study involved 24 (12 at the first round of data collection and 12 at the second round) freshman English majors from two intact classes taught by the same writing teacher of Sichuan International Studies University. The students were assigned, according to their scores for the final writing examination at the end of the last semester before data collection, into four groups: the English group (prewriting-

discussion in L2 group), the Chinese group (prewriting discussion in L1 group), the English/Chinese group (prewriting discussion in both L1 and L2 group) and the individual brainstorming group (no-prewriting discussion group). Each group consists of six students (two subgroups with three in each). Table 1 presents the scores of the students for the final writing examination at the end of the semester before data collection. The mean scores for the four groups ranged from 81.50 to 82.50.

Table 1. Scores for the final writing examination before data collection (full score =100)

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
EG	6	81.83	6.524	73	90
CG	6	81.50	4.324	75	88
E/CG	6	82.50	6.221	73	89
BG	6	81.83	4.491	76	88

EG =English Group ,CG =Chinese Group ,E/CG =English/Chinese Group ,BG =Brainstorming Group

3.2 Writing task

The instrument used in the study was an argumentative writing task: The advantages and disadvantages of air travel. Argumentation is seen as the most demanding writing task compared with narration, description and exposition (Grabe & Kaplan 1996); therefore, the researcher inferred that significant differences might emerge in the writers' performance in both the prewriting discussions and the quality of their compositions on an argumentative task. The participants were given a writing prompt in English before writing. The writing prompts for the discussion groups varied just in the requirement of discussion language, and the writing prompt for brainstorming group was different from those of the three prewriting discussion groups in that it required the students to brainstorm individually and to write down what is in their mind instead of discussing with other group members.

3.3 Data collection

The present study involved two rounds of data collection. The first round (the pilot study) at the beginning of the second semester included 12 students from the same class, with three in each of the three prewriting discussion groups and three in the brainstorming group. The students completed the writing task in four separate classrooms under the respective supervision of the researchers and two other teachers. After reading the writing prompts individually, the students in the three discussion groups were given 15 minutes to conduct small group prewriting discussions, which were recorded by MP3s, and those in the brainstorming group were required to conduct individual thinking, and also to write down what popped up in their mind within the given time slot. Then the students were to write a composition on the topic individually within 35 minutes. At the end of task, all the compositions produced by the four groups, along with the notes taken by the students in the brainstorming group, were collected by the supervisors respectively. The same procedure was repeated in the second round of data collection at the middle of the second semester, which included 12 different students from another class.

3.4 Data analysis

The data collected from the two rounds were combined in data analysis. Altogether, there were six 15-minute long recordings of the prewriting discussions. The discussion in Chinese was translated literally into English. The recordings were analyzed with the following procedure: (1) the recordings of the prewriting discussions were transcribed according to the following transcription conventions adapted from Wang (2003) and Haneda (2004), the details of which were presented in Table 2; (2) the transcriptions were segmented into AS units (Foster, Tonkyn & Wigglesworth 2000); (3) the segmented AS units were categorized into six categories of discussion activities with the coding scheme in Table 3 adapted from Wang and Wen (2002) as well as Sweigart (1991). The examples for the discussion activities were taken from the transcriptions of the discussions. The researchers of the present study coded the data independently and reached an intercoder reliability of 80%. Problem codings were discussed until agreement was reached.

Table 2 . Transcription conventions

Conventions	Definition
?	Final rising intonation .
,	Pause shorter than 1 second or abrupt shift in the flow of an utterance .
.	A closure of an utterance with a falling intonation .
[Simultaneous speech .
—	Interrupting speech .
=	Continued speech after being interrupted .
...	Pause within 3 seconds .
(Number)	Number of seconds of the pauses longer than 3 seconds .
CAPITALS	Raised volume .
x	Unclear words or doubtful transcription . Unrecognizable speech . x = one word ;xx = phrase length ;xxx = beyond the phrase length .
{ }	Nonverbal behaviors .

Table 3 . A coding scheme of the discussion activities

Discussion activities	Examples
Task management : discussions about the writing procedures , word and time limit , etc .	Now let s discuss . First , advantage .
Task examining : analyzing the writing prompt or commenting on the task .	Everything has two sides , so it is the same ... with air travel .
Idea generating : planning the content .	The first advantage I thought was , er convenience .
Idea organizing : planning the organization .	Just write um two paragraphs or more .
Language use : discussing lexical choice , meanings of words , etc .	on the su bur b , yes on suburb .
Off task talk : talking about things not directly related to the task .	But in the Linyi airport ... , the flight to Chongqing will soon be opened .

Based on the 6 scale scoring guide for TWE (Test of Written English included in TOEFL) , a scoring system for language use was developed , according to which the students compositions were scored by the researchers independently . The final score for each composition was the mean of the two scores from the two raters . The alpha value of the language scores by the two independent raters reached .926 .

The compositions were also analyzed in terms of language fluency , accuracy and complexity , which are most frequently employed to evaluate the quality of both written and spoken language . Fluency concerns the learner s capacity to produce language in real time without undue pausing or hesitation (Skehan 1996) and also reflects the effectiveness of the planning process (Foster & Skehan 1996) . The latter two measures concern language form . Accuracy concerns the extent to which the language produced conforms to target language norms and complexity concerns the elaboration or ambition of the language that is produced and reflects learner s preparedness to take risks and to restructure their interlanguage (Skehan 1996) . In the study , fluency was operationalized as the length (total number of words) of compositions and accuracy as the number of errors per 100 words . All errors relating to syntax , morphology , lexical choice and punctuations were considered . Complexity was operationalized as the ratio of clauses (Quirk et al . 1985) to T units (Hunt 1965) .

4 . Findings and discussion

4 .1 Differences of discussion activities

In the 15 -minute discussions , the two English groups used no Chinese , but they had much more longer pauses on the average (107 seconds for the English groups , 75 .5 seconds for the Chinese groups , and 33 .5 seconds for the English /Chinese groups) . This showed that although the students were still not quite fluent at English , especially when dealing with more demanding topics , they were capable of

completing the discussion task solely in English . The two Chinese groups used only eight English words in their discussions . Although students in this group completed the discussion task as required , they commented afterwards that it was not possible or desirable to discuss solely in Chinese . This comment showed an unwillingness or “reluctance to use their shared L1 ” (Storch & Wigglesworth 2003) . The participants in the English /Chinese groups produced a total of 5300 Chinese characters and 958 English words . Therefore , there were not much difference in the language of discussion between the Chinese groups and the English /Chinese groups , and thus the English /Chinese groups and the Chinese groups in the present study could be considered as homogeneous . This might indicate that the Chinese students had a preference to use Chinese in their group work , which proved some researchers (e . g . , Brooks & Donato 1994) view that teachers are sometimes reluctant to use group work in their teaching because they feel that the students will use their native language in group situations . The discussion data of the present study reveals contradictory findings that although the Chinese students , to a certain degree , are unwilling or reluctant to use their shared L1 , they use little English while they are actually performing tasks in group situations .

Table 4 . Mean numbers and percentages of discussion activities in AS units

Discussion activities	English group		Chinese group		English /Chinese group	
	N	P	N	P	N	P
Task management	14	11.90 %	15.5	9.03 %	18.5	9.20 %
Task examining	3.5	3.02 %	24	12.85 %	6	2.75 %
Idea generating	69	60.08 %	88.5	50.31 %	114.5	56.71 %
Idea organizing	8.5	7.54 %	23	12.58 %	8	3.15 %
Language use	12	10.71 %	8	4.50 %	7.5	4.10 %
Off task talk	8.5	6.75 %	19.5	10.73 %	49.5	24.09 %
Total	115.5	100 %	178.5	100 %	204	100 %

N = Number of AS units for each category of discussion activities ; P = Percentage of AS units for each category of discussion activities

Table 4 shows the mean numbers and percentages of discussion activities in AS units for the three groups . On average , the two English groups produced 115.5 AS units , the Chinese groups 178.5 , and the English /Chinese groups 204 . The percentages of AS units for task management and idea generating of the English were higher than those of the Chinese group and the English /Chinese group . In addition , in terms of the quality of task management and idea generating , the English group also outperformed the other two groups . While discussing in English , one of the group members in either of the two English groups would voluntarily act as discussion leader to control the procedure . Therefore , the discussions of the English groups were better organized . They first discussed the advantages of air travel , then disadvantages , and finally the organization for their writing . However , the Chinese groups and the English /Chinese groups were more likely to fluctuate between discussions about advantages and disadvantages because of the lack of such a discussion leader .

All the three groups spent most of the discussion time generating ideas , while they allocated just a small portion of the time discussing language use . However , the English group had a much higher percentage of AS units (10.71 %) devoted to the discussion of language use , compared with the Chinese group (4.5 %) and the English /Chinese group (4.1 %) .

4.2 Influence on language

Table 5 reports the mean analytic language scores of the four groups and the significance levels between the mean scores . Repeated nonparametric 2 independent samples tests (Mann -Whitney tests) revealed although there were no significant differences between the scores of any two of the four groups , the mean score of the English group (4.13) was slightly higher than that of the brainstorming group (3.88) , and much higher than the English /Chinese group (3.63) and the Chinese group (3.43) . With a larger sample size , the differences might be more obvious , especially between the English group and the Chinese group . Thus the finding of the present study about the influence on language was not consonant with that of Lally (2000) , who found that although there were virtually no differences in language

between the compositions composed after L1 prewriting discussion and those composed after L2 prewriting discussion ,the L1 prewriting discussion group performed slightly better than the L2 prewriting discussion group .

Table 5 . Analytic language scores and significance levels

Descriptives					
Group	N	Mean	Std . Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
EG	6	4.13	1.08109	2.25	5.50
CG	6	3.42	.88976	1.75	4.25
E /CG	6	3.63	.91856	2.25	4.50
BG	6	3.88	.49371	3.00	4.50

4.2.1 Fluency

Table 6 presents the average length of compositions produced by each group and the significance levels among the four groups . Repeated nonparametric 2 independent samples tests (Mann -Whitney tests) showed that although the three prewriting discussion groups wrote relatively longer compositions (around 274 ,288 ,265 words on the average for the English group ,the Chinese group and the English / Chinese group respectively) than the prewriting self brainstorming group (240 .17 words on average) , there was no statistical significance between any two of the four groups . The finding of the present study contradicted that of Shi (1998) , who found that students wrote longer drafts in the condition of no discussion than those in the conditions of teacher led or peer discussion . However , the students in her study spent different amounts of time on writing :60 minutes in the no discussion sessions and only 40 minutes after 20 -minute talking sessions . “[I]t was probably the extra 20 minutes spent producing the written text that made a difference in the length of essays ”(Shi 1998) . In order to avoid the inequality in the time spent on writing ,the researcher of the current study assigned the same time slot (35 minutes)for all the students in the four groups to write their compositions after they had a 15 -minute prewriting discussion or individual self brainstorming . The finding that the discussion groups wrote longer compositions than the no discussion group proved that prewriting discussion did help the writers generate more ideas in their writing ,because they could incorporate both their own and their team mates views into their compositions .

Table 6 . Length of compositions and significance levels

Descriptives					
Group	N	Mean	Std . Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
EG	6	274 .00	67 .073	182	344
CG	6	288 .67	74 .658	195	360
E /CG	6	265 .33	70 .543	193	371
BG	6	240 .17	75 .964	148	330

4.2.2 Accuracy

Table 7 reports the mean number of errors per 100 words for each group and the significance levels between the four groups . The English group had an average number of 3 .31 errors for every 100 words , the brainstorming group 3 .95 ,the English /Chinese group 4 .38 ,and the Chinese group 4 .71 . The fewer mean errors there were in the compositions ,the better was the quality . Therefore compositions written after prewriting discussion in L2 were better in terms of errors per 100 words than those composed after prewriting discussion in L1 or in both L1 and L2 ,and those composed after individual brainstorming . The brainstorming group outperformed the Chinese group and the English /Chinese group . Repeated nonparametric 2 independent samples tests (Mann Whitney tests) showed that the differences between any two groups did not reach significance levels .

Table 7 . Mean number of errors per 100 words and significance levels

Descriptives					
Group	N	Mean	Std . Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
EG	6	3.31	2.08048	.70	6.90
CG	6	4.71	1.71564	3.20	7.95
E /CG	6	4.38	1.87047	2.70	7.50
BG	6	3.95	.94816	2.70	5.60

4.2.3 Complexity

The complexity of compositions in the current study was measured by the ratio of clauses to T units, which reflected syntactic complexity. Table 8 shows the mean ratio of clauses to T units of the compositions written by the four groups, and the significance levels among the groups. The higher the ratio of clauses to T units, the more complex the internal structures of the sentences. The English group had a mean ratio of 1.66, which was slightly higher than those of the other three groups which had mean ratios of 1.53, 1.54, and 1.58 respectively. Although repeated nonparametric 2 independent samples tests (Mann-Whitney tests) demonstrated that there were no significant differences in the ratio of clauses to T units between the four groups, compositions written by the English groups were slightly more complex than those of the other three groups.

Table 8 . Mean ratio of clauses to T units and significance levels

Descriptives					
Group	N	Mean	Std . Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
EG	6	1.66	.44513	1.31	2.50
CG	6	1.53	.13030	1.36	1.74
E /CG	6	1.54	.28630	1.07	1.86
BG	6	1.58	.14416	1.43	1.86

A re-examination of the AS units on language use produced by the three prewriting discussion groups and the notes taken by the students of the prewriting self-brainstorming group revealed the reason why there were no obvious differences in the language score, the length, the number of mean errors per 100 words and the mean ratio of clauses to T units between the compositions produced by the four groups. The AS units on language use by the three discussion groups accounted for just small percentages of the total AS units, with 10.71% for the English group, 4.5% for the Chinese group, and 4.1% for the English/Chinese group. With most of the 15-minute discussion sessions generating ideas, the students did not spend much time talking about language use. The same was true with the brainstorming group, who, according to their notes taken during the 15-minute prewriting self-brainstorming session, focused mainly on idea generation. Therefore, considering the small amount of time devoted to discussing language use by all the students, it was natural that no significant differences were found in the language use of the compositions written by the four groups of students.

Although there were no statistical significance between the compositions written by the English group and the other three groups, the average language score for the English group was much higher, and their compositions were much more accurate in terms of errors per 100 words and more syntactically complex. The outperformance of the English group might be attributed to their collective pre-task rehearsal of the topic, which led them to "optimize their resources and to perform at a more sophisticated level than they would otherwise achieve" (Bygate & Samuda 2005). In addition, in dealing with the problems in the discussion, the participants provided "scaffolded help" (Donato 1994) for each other; therefore, they also outperformed the self-brainstorming group who might also have rehearsed the topic. However, participants in the self-brainstorming group could only do so independently.

L2 learners, especially those of low L2 proficiency, are believed to have a limited pool of resources (Kellogg 1996; McCutchen 1996) while dealing with L2 tasks. When task demands exceed their resources, they have to "slow down their execution of processes or to prioritize certain processes at the expense of others" (Manchon & Roca de Larios 2007). The individual writing task in the present study

was more demanding for the students in the Chinese group and the Chinese/English group who discussed the topic in Chinese or mainly in Chinese, because they have to "translate" into English what they had talked about in Chinese. However, the collective rehearsal of the English group and the possible individual rehearsal of the self-brainstorming group gave the participants in those two groups more time to polish their language and to "upgrade" (Roca de Larios et al., 2006) their sentence structures.

5. Conclusion

This study is an investigation into the effects of three prewriting discussions on the language quality of argumentative compositions produced by first-year Chinese English majors. In the discussion, the English group not only generated higher percentages of AS units in most categories of discussion activities (e.g., in task-management, idea generating, and language use), but also outperformed the Chinese group and the English/Chinese group in terms of the quality of discussion. All the three groups spent most of the discussion time generating ideas, while they allocated just a small portion of the time discussing language use. In terms of language use, although no statistically significant differences were found between any two of the four groups, the English group did perform better than the other three groups, especially than the Chinese and Chinese/English groups. Their compositions contained fewer errors and were more syntactically complex.

The study has some limitations. For example, with a very small sample size, the results of the present study should be taken with care in terms of their generalizability. Therefore, future research should include more subjects to insure more valid comparison between the groups. The effects of prewriting discussion on different topics is another area which is worthy of exploration, since some studies reveal that writers perform differently on different topics. The use of L1 in prewriting discussions also needs further investigation. Future studies may compare the effects of several prewriting discussion groups in both L1 and L2 on the quality of compositions written after the discussions. The subjects are allowed to use both L1 and L2 at their will, and then the relationship between the amount of L1 use in the prewriting discussion and the quality of compositions produced after the discussion can be examined.

References

- Bossio, E. 1993. ESL writing under conditions of reading, group discussion and solitary composing. Unpublished Masters Research Paper, Department of Curriculum, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Brooks, F. B. & Donato, R. 1994. Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learners discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania* 77 262-274.
- Bygate, M. & Samuda, V. 2005. Integrative planning through the use of task repetition. In R. Ellis (ed.). *Planning and Task Performance in Second Language Learning*, pp. 37-76. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Carroll, J. B. 1975. *The Teaching of French as a Foreign Language in Eight Countries*. New York: John Wiley.
- Cohen, A. D. & Brooks-Carson, A. 2001. Research on direct versus translated writing: Students strategies and their results. *The Modern Language Journal* 85 169-188.
- Donato, R. 1994. Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (ed.). *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research*, pp. 33-56. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Foster, P. & Shehan, P. 1996. The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18 299-323.
- Foster, P., Tonkyn, A. & Wigglesworth, G. 2000. Measuring spoken language: A unit for all reasons. *Applied Linguistics* 21 354-375.
- Friedlander, A. 1990. Composing in English: effects of a first language on writing in English as a second language. In B. Kroll (ed.). *Second Language Writing*, pp. 109-125. Cambridge: Cambridge Applied Linguistics.
- Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R. B. 1996. *Theory and Practice of Writing*. New York: Longman.
- Haneda, M. 2004. The joint construction of meaning in writing conference. *Applied Linguistics* 25 178-219.
- Hunt, K. 1966. Recent measures in syntactic development. *Elementary English* 43 732-739.
- Ju, F. 2006. An investigation into the effects of pre-writing activities on Chinese EFL students compositions. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Nanjing University.
- Kellogg, R. T. 1996. A model of working memory on writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (ed.). *The*

- Science of Writing ,pp .57 -71 . Mahwah ,NJ Erlbaum .
- Lally ,C .G . 2000 . First language influences in second language composition :The effect of pre-writing . Foreign Language Annuals 33 428 432 .
- Roca de Larios ,J . ,Manchon ,R . M . & Murphy ,L . 2006 . Generating text in native and foreign language writing :Atemporal analysis of problem solving formulation processes . The Modern Language Journal 90 : 100 114 .
- Manchon ,R . M . &Roca de Larios ,J . 2007 . On the temporal nature of planning in L1 and L2 composing . Language Learning 57 549 593 .
- McCutchen ,D . 1996 . A capacity theory of writing :working memory in composition . Educational Psychology Review 8 299 325 .
- Quirk ,R . et al . 1985 . A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language . London :Longman .
- Shi ,L . 1998 . Effects of prewriting discussions on adult ESL students compositions . Journal of Second Language Writing 7 319 345 .
- Skehan ,P . 1996 . Second language acquisition research and task based instruction . In J . Willis & D . Willis (ed .) . Challenge and Change in Language Teaching ,pp .17 30 . Oxford :Macmillan /Heinemann .
- Storch ,N . &Wigglesworth ,G . 2003 . Isthere a role forthe use of the L1 in an L2 setting ? TESOL Quarterly 37 760 770 .
- Swain ,M . &Lapkin ,S . 2000 . Task based second language learning :The uses of the first language . Language Teaching Research 4 251 274 .
- Sweigart . W . 1991 . Classroom talk ,knowledge development ,and writing . Research in the Teaching of English 25 460 496 .
- Wang ,L . 2003 . Switching to first language among writers with differing second language proficiency . Journal of Second Language Writing 12 347 375 .
- Wang ,W . & Wen ,Q . 2002 . L1 use in the L2 composing process :An exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers . Journal of Second Language Writing 11 225 246 .
- Woodall ,B . 2002 . Language switching :Using the first language while writing in a second language . Journal of Second Language Writing 11 7 28 .
- Zamel ,V . 1983 . The composing processes of advanced ESLstudents :six case studies . TESOL Quarterly 17 : 165 187 .