

The Effects of Writing Prompt Types on L2 Learners’ Writing Strategy Use and Performance*

Young Ah Cho
(Gwangju University)

Cho, Young Ah. “The Effects of Writing Prompt Types on L2 Learners’ Writing Strategy Use and Performance.” *Studies in English Language & Literature* 45.3 (2019): 295-314. The present study aims to explore the effects of writing prompt conditions on learners’ writing strategy use and writing performance. Forty-seven university students were assigned to either a framed prompt group or a reading-based prompt group. For the study, a background questionnaire, a writing strategy questionnaire, pre-, post-, and delayed writing tests were employed. The results reveal that learners in the reading-based prompt group increased their writing strategy use in terms of pre-writing and revising strategies. This study also indicates that the reading-based writing prompt significantly influenced learners’ writing performance in the immediate and long term. Overall, writing prompts made different impacts on L2 learners’ perceptions towards strategy use and writing products. Based on these results, several implications for writing instruction are suggested. (Gwangju University)

Key Words: writing prompts, writing performance, strategy use, L2 learners, English writing instruction

I. Introduction

Writing could be generally considered as an intricate cognitive activity with various skills being integrated simultaneously that requires a number of processes

* This Study was conducted by research funds from Gwangju University in 2019.

and strategies for both first language (L1) and second language (L2) acquisition (McCutcheon, 2006; Syarifah & Emiliyasi, 2019). Lindemann (2001) states that writing is "a process of communication that use a conventional graphic system to convey a message to a reader" (p. 10). Along with an increasing importance of communicative competence in L2 learning, it is assumed that writing skills can serve learners' communication needs and also enhance successful language learning (Asmari, 2013; Weigle, 2002).

In an effort to find out the most efficient ways of increasing writing competence, substantial attention has been paid to prompt variations. They are generally categorized into three distinct areas: discourse modes, rhetorical specification, and the wording and structure of writing prompts (Huot, 1990; Plakans, 2010; Wu, 2013). In particular, research related to L2 writing assessment has reported that a writing prompt is one of the most essential factors that affects learners' writing production, and the effects of writing prompts could vary depending on the task types (Crusan, 2010; Liu & Stapleton, 2018; Weigle, 2002). In terms of various characteristics of writing prompts, the influence of topic familiarity, task complexity, text sources, prompt formats, and visual and aural prompts has been largely investigated in relation to writing achievement, and there are a lot of diverse results based on the literature.

Of the various strands of L2 writing research, writing strategies are classified by cognitive factors which substantially influence learners' writing products. In this respect, a number of researchers have explored the features between more and less skilled writers and found that learners significantly differed in the use of their own writing strategies when completing composition tasks (Chien, 2012; Hu & Chen, 2007; Kim, 2016). More specifically, good L2 writers were inclined to employ different skills and procedures from poor ones to good ones at each stage of the writing process, meaning that there was a positive relation between writing strategy use and writing performance (Asmari, 2013; Lee, Hong, & Lim, 2014).

L2 writing studies have explored different variables, such as the learners' L1 and

L2 proficiency, writing performance, prompt types, text sources and genres, motivation, attitudes, strategy use, and anxiety (Chien, 2008; Hu & Chen, 2007; Liu & Stapleton, 2018). However, little research has examined how writing instruction with different prompt conditions may differently affect learners' writing strategy use and writing performance, specifically focusing on Korean EFL college students. Accordingly, this research can yield important implications for L2 writing classrooms to investigate the effects of different writing prompts on learners' writing strategy usage, patterns, and outcomes. Based on that, the research questions were:

1. How do different types of writing prompts affect L2 learners' writing strategy use?
2. How do different types of writing prompts affect L2 learners' writing performance in terms of immediate and long-term perspectives?

II. Literature review

2.1 Prompt types in writing processes

Kroll and Ried (1994) defined writing prompts, "in testing situations, [as] the stimulus for the students to respond to" (p. 231). They further mentioned several variables which are carefully considered in preparing writing prompts for L2 writing instruction. The variables belong to context, content, language, tasks, rhetorical specification, and evaluation. Weigle (2002) suggested the components of writing prompts as purpose, topic, and audience.

As for the types of writing prompts, Kroll and Ried (1994) proposed three different prompt formats: bare, framed, and text-based or reading-based prompts. The bare prompt consists of a direct and simple statement about the entire task while the framed prompt is presented with a situation which is related to a given task. The text-based or reading-based prompt contains reading materials and task direction.

Way, Joiner, and Seaman (2000) introduced three kinds of writing prompts: bare, vocabulary, and prose-model prompts. The bare prompts involves a brief explanation of the writing tasks, and the vocabulary prompt includes a list of words and expressions. The prose-model prompt contains a simple explanation along with a composite for a writing task.

Previous studies have been conducted to find out the effects of different writing prompts on L2 learners' writing performance and writing task types. Way et al. (2000) explored the effects of different writing tasks and prompts on novice learners' writings by assessing learners' performance in terms of quality, fluency, accuracy, and syntactic complexity. The results showed that learners got better grades on descriptive rather than narrative and expository writing tasks, and they produced more outcomes in the prose-model prompt than the bare and vocabulary prompt conditions. Farshi and Tavakoli (2014) explored the effects of aural and written prompts on EFL learners' writing production. The participants were assigned to pre-task planning and no planning conditions. The pre-task planning group was further divided into aural and written prompt conditions. Learners in the pre-task planning group learned concept mapping strategies. The results indicated that those given a written prompt showed better fluency on writing tests than those who only received an aural prompt. The condition, giving learners a written prompt with no planning time, significantly influenced the learners' writing production in terms of complexity.

Huh and Lee (2018) examined whether task complexity affected Korean high school students' narrative writing abilities by using two types of writing prompts, bare and framed ones as well. The findings indicated that learners in the framed prompt group used more sophisticated vocabulary while doing writing tasks than those who were in the bare prompt group. Lee (2018) investigated what effects of the prompt types had on Korean middle school students' task motivation and writing performance. The researcher stated that the bare writing prompt was correlated to learners' task motivation and writing outcomes in a significant way.

2.2 Writing strategies in writing processes

Writing in a second language involves complex and demanding cognitive processes, and skillful writing needs to use writing strategies (Asmari, 2013). Research on L2 writing reveals that writing strategies are closely associated with the writer's quality of writing (Harrison & Beres, 2007).

Given that there is a correlation between learners' writing abilities and use of writing strategies, Petrić and CzárI (2003) devised a clever and, indeed, valid writing strategy questionnaire. This instrument is made up of three writing phases: pre-writing strategies, while-writing strategies, and revising strategies. Tsai (2004, pp. 239-240) divided writing strategies into two categories: metacognitive strategies and cognitive strategies. The factor, metacognitive strategies, includes planning, considering the audience, monitoring, and evaluating the product. The factor, cognitive strategies, consists of comprehending processes and memory retrieval processes. More specifically, the comprehending process contains translating, inferencing, and clarifying/verifying while the memory and retrieval process is made up by the learners' invoking prior knowledge, organizing information, composing, and revising.

Previous researchers have investigated the interrelationship between writing strategy use and other variables, such as writing performance, proficiency levels, gender, writing genre, and writing anxiety. Kim (2012) investigated the difference in writing strategy use between Korean college students based on their writing proficiency levels. The findings showed a correlation between writing strategy use and writing abilities, adding that successful writers employed more cognitive strategies than less successful ones. Lee et al. (2014) explored the relations among writing strategies, writing anxiety, and writing performance for Korean high school students. The results indicated that writing strategy use proved to be positively related to writing performance, whereas writing anxiety was negatively associated with use of writing strategies and writing competence. Similarly, Asmari (2013)

commented that learners who employed more writing strategies outperformed their peers. Kim's (2016) study demonstrated that EFL learners with high proficiency levels showed a use of writing strategies more often than less proficient learners in terms of planning, while-writing, and revising strategies.

Taking into account the findings of the previous research, although many variables were certainly associated with writing processes, there is insufficient research on the relationship between writing prompts, writing strategies, and writing performance in L2 contexts.

III. Methods

3.1 Participants

A total of 47 college students, 3 males and 44 females, participated in the current study. They were all freshmen who were attending a compulsory English course. The participants' ages ranged from 19 to 22 ($M=19.85$, $SD=.416$), and their majors were nursing science and early childhood education. In terms of the participants' self-evaluated English proficiency levels, 25 students assessed themselves as low proficiency (53.2%), 21 students as intermediate proficiency (44.7%), and 1 student rated him/herself as a high proficiency learner (2.1%). As for the participants' English writing competence, 33 students reported themselves as low proficiency (53.2%) and 14 students rated as intermediate proficiency learners (29.8%). In addition, 16 students (34.1%) had no experience with English writing and 35 students (74.4%) said that they had never used writing strategies when composing. In sum, considering those assessments, the learners in the study seemed to be ranged from low-intermediate to novice.

To verify the homogeneity of the participants, a pre-writing test and pre-writing strategy use assessment were conducted, and the outcomes indicated that the two

groups were comparable in terms of initial writing competence and strategy usage (see IV. Results and discussion for details). This study adopted the writing prompt conditions presented by Kroll and Reid (1994), thus the two classes were randomly assigned to two different writing prompt conditions: framed prompt group (FG) and reading-based prompt group (RG).

3.2 Instruments

Three instruments were used in the current study: a background questionnaire, the Writing Strategies Questionnaire (WSQ) (Petrić & Czár 2003), and pre-, post-, and delayed writing tests.

The background questionnaire consisted of 10 closed-ended question-items that asked about the learners' gender, age, major, self-evaluated general English proficiency levels and writing abilities, experience with writing tasks, and their opinions towards English writing.

The pre- and post-Writing Strategies Questionnaire (WSQ), originally developed by Petrić and Czár (2003), was adapted and modified to measure learners' strategy usage patterns before and after the treatment sessions. The original version of the WSQ consisted of three domains with a total of 38 items. Considering the purpose of the present study and the Korean EFL context, a total of 34 items from the WSQ were used: pre-writing strategies with 8 items, while-writing strategies with 12 items, and revising writing strategies with 14 items. All items in the WSQ were translated into Korean, the learners' L1, and were marked on a 5-point Likert-type scale. As for the reliability coefficients, the WSQ used in the study was .794.

The pre-, post-, and delayed writing tests were developed to rate learners' writing performance by using three types of writing prompts: bare, framed, and reading-based prompt formats. The pre-test was designed to assess learners' initial writing competence while the delayed test was intended to measure the effects of different writing prompt conditions on their writing outcomes. The pre- and delayed

tests consisted of the same writing topic and were accompanied by a bare prompt type, which means the entire task was simply and directly stated. The topic of the writing task was about successful college life. The four post-writing tests were manipulated with two different prompt types, that is, the framed and the reading-based prompt conditions. The topics of the writing assignments asked about the participants' future job, favorite places, new classmates, and special holidays. Specifically, learners in the framed prompt condition were told to reflect on a situation and write their ideas in reference to this while learners in the reading-based prompt group were asked to read the reading materials and then write their ideas. All the topics and experimental input materials were selected from *Longman Academic Writing Series 1* and *Longman Academic Writing Series 2* (Pearson Education, 2017a, 2017b). The wording in the tests was written in Korean while the reading materials were presented in English.

3.3 Procedures and data analysis

First, learners in the two groups were instructed to fill out the background questionnaire and the pre-WSQ. Then they completed the pre-writing test. The genre for the writing task was a descriptive task partly because it was suitable for novice writers (Way et al., 2000). As for the writing task intervention, four post-tests were modified to fit the two writing prompts. One week later, the two groups undertook two different writing tasks once a week for four successive weeks: the framed (FG) and the reading-based (RG) writing prompt groups. Before getting involved in the tasks, the instructor presented the framed and reading-based prompt writing samples to each group, respectively, using PPT files, and the instructor gave a brief introduction and demonstration of each writing task by using model writing. After that, the FG learners received the post-test which contained a situation or event which was related to a given task while the RG learners received the post-test which included task direction and reading materials related to the writing topic.

After the experimental periods, all groups took a delayed test and post-WSQ two weeks later. The assigned time for completing all tests was approximately 20 minutes.

To measure the quality of the participants' writing, Jeon and Min's (2009) analytical scoring criteria was used. The scoring rubric was intended to rate writing products into five aspects with each subscale graded from 3 to 30 points (Max=100 points): content (15-30 points), organization (5-20 points), vocabulary (5-20 points), language use (5-20 points), and mechanics (3-10 points). For scoring all the writings, two experienced, trained ESL researchers reviewed the scoring criteria, and then assessed the entire writing independently. Afterwards, the two raters' evaluation of learners' writing products was averaged to make the final judgement of the learners' writing performance. The inter-rater reliability for writing performance quality was .919, showing a high reliability.

As for the data analysis, the background questionnaire was computed by frequency analysis. The WSQ was calculated by Cronbach alpha coefficients, descriptive statistics, and a MANOVA. The pre- and delayed writing tests were analyzed by an independent-samples *t*-tests and pair-wise *t*-tests whereas the post-tests were examined by repeated-measures ANOVAs. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons were administered to investigate if there were any significant differences between the two groups' outcomes. Data were analyzed by SPSS 20.0.

IV. Results and discussion

4.1 The effects of writing prompt types on learners' writing strategy use

The first research question is about whether different types of writing prompts affected L2 learners' writing strategy use. First of all, outcomes from the pre-WSQ were run by descriptive statistics and a MANOVA. As can be seen in Table 1,

learners in the study used the factor, while-writing strategies ($M=3.418$), the most, followed by revising strategies ($M=2.883$), and then pre-writing strategies ($M=2.715$). The results also indicated that learners employed overall writing strategies at a medium level ($M=3.033$) when composing tasks (Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995).

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of pre-WSQ

Categories	Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Rank
pre-writing strategies	FG	21	2.720	.447	1
	RG	26	2.716	.560	2
	sub-total	47	2.715	.507	3
while-writing strategies	FG	21	3.433	.359	1
	RG	26	3.407	.333	2
	sub-total	47	3.418	.341	1
revising strategies	FG	21	2.810	.317	2
	RG	26	2.942	.333	1
	sub-total	47	2.883	.329	2
Total	FG	21	3.008	.323	2
	RG	26	3.052	.291	1
	total	47	3.033	.303	

In order to more precisely identify whether there were any significant differences between groups, a MANOVA was administered on the pre-WSQ. The results proved that there existed no difference between the two groups ($F=1.327$, $Sig.=.273$). Therefore, learners in the study had a similar writing strategy use frequency before the treatment.

Table 2 illustrates the results on the post-WSQ. As with the results on the pre-WSQ, while-writing strategies ($M=3.404$) were the most frequently used, followed by revising strategies ($M=3.175$), and then pre-writing strategies ($M=3.159$). However, the overall mean scores of the post-WSQ ($M=3.252$) were greater than those of the pre-WSQ ($M=3.033$) (refer to Table 1) after the treatment. The findings also proved that learners in the RG used more pre-writing strategies and revising strategies than those in the FG whereas learners in the FG were more

adopted while-writing strategies than those in the RG.

Table 2 Descriptive statistics of post-WSQ

Categories	Group	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Rank
pre-writing strategies	FG	21	2.988	.501	2
	RG	26	3.298	.459	1
	sub-total	47	3.159	.498	3
while-writing strategies	FG	21	3.417	.336	1
	RG	26	3.394	.357	2
	sub-total	47	3.404	.344	1
revising strategies	FG	21	3.010	.310	2
	RG	26	3.308	.421	1
	sub-total	47	3.175	.400	2
Total	FG	21	3.149	.293	2
	RG	26	3.336	.291	1
	total	47	3.252	.304	

In order to assess whether there existed any significant differences between groups, a MANOVA was employed on the post-WSQ, and those results are presented in Table 3. Significant differences were found within groups ($Sig=.003$) with a larger effect size ($ES=.281$).

Table 3 MANOVA results of post-WSQ

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis	<i>df</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>ES</i>
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.008	1850.904	3	43	.000	.992
Group	Wilks' Lambda	.719	5.589	3	43	.003	.281

$p<.05$, ES =Effect Size

To specifically identify differences, post-hoc pairwise comparisons were calculated, and the findings are showed in Table 4. Learners in the RG used pre-writing ($Sig=.032$, $ES=.098$) and revising ($Sig=.010$, $ES=.139$) strategies significantly more, with a moderate effect size, compared to learners in the FG during the descriptive task. On the other hand, no significant difference was found between groups in relation to the while-writing strategy factor.

Table 4 Group comparison results of post-WSQ

Categories	Source	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	ES
pre-writing strategies	Between Groups	1.116	1	1.116	4.871	.032	.098
	Within Groups	10.312	45	.229			
	Total	11.428	46				
while-writing strategies	Between Groups	.006	1	.006	.048	.827	.001
	Within Groups	5.452	45	.121			
	Total	5.458	46				
revising strategies	Between Groups	1.028	1	1.028	7.289	.010	.139
	Within Groups	6.347	45	.141			
	Total	7.375	46				

$p < .05$, ES= Effect Size

According to Petrić and Czár (2003), the factor of pre-writing strategies contains strategies such as adjusting time for writing processes, revising requirements, looking at a writing sample, making notes about a topic, and outlining. The factor of while-writing strategies includes strategies such as rereading what learners write, changing outlines, using dictionaries, checking grammar and vocabulary, finding similar words, and asking for help. The factor of revising strategies consists of strategies such as revising what learners write, changing vocabulary, sentence structure, content or ideas, checking requirement, comparing with others' writing, and checking mistakes from others' feedback.

As for the significant difference between two groups' writing strategy use, one possible explanation is that different types of writing prompts may make learners exhibit different writing behaviors and perceptions towards the writing processes. In other words, as learners in the reading-based prompt group received a simple statement about the topic along with model writing examples, learners may pay attention to the overall writing structure, content, and organization, and then they can try to plan and revise their writing using a writing sample.

Literature on L2 writing proved that skilled and unskilled writers differ in use of writing strategies, which means skilled writers more frequently use writing strategies such as organizing ideas, formulating, and revising than unsuccessful ones (Chien,

2008; Kim, 2016; Sasaki, 2000). Here, based on the results of the current study, it is quite meaningful that the findings showed that different writing prompt formats significantly affected learners' writing strategy use partly because of a lack of studies on the relationships between writing prompt types and writing strategy use. More importantly, given the fact that learners in the study were novice L2 writers, and they had few opportunities for training with writing strategies in English sessions, writing instruction with reading-based prompt condition seemed more suitable and helpful in facilitating writing strategy use.

4.2 The effects of writing prompt types on learners' writing performance

The second research question is concerned with whether different writing prompts affected L2 learners' writing performance in the immediate and long term. First of all, in order to identify the homogeneity of the two groups before the treatment, the outcomes of the pre-test were computed by an independent-samples *t*-test (see Table 5). The mean scores for the FG were 65.71, and the RG were 66.81, showing that there was no difference between the two groups' writing abilities, initially (*Sig.*=.757).

Table 5 Group comparison results of pre-test

Group	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>ES</i>
FG	21	65.71	11.336	.080	-.311	.757	.001
RG	26	66.81	12.448				

p<.05, *ES*= Effect Size

Next, to clarify the effects of writing prompt conditions on learners' descriptive writing tasks, the performance of the four post-tests was measured by descriptive statistics and repeated-measures ANOVAs. The results indicated that mean scores of the RG were numerically higher than those of the FG across of all the tests.

Table 6 Descriptive statistics of post-tests

Groups	Test 1			Test 2		Test 3		Test 4	
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
FG	21	71.71	11.78	71.67	10.21	76.81	12.69	71.52	10.55
RG	26	79.19	12.26	76.27	9.90	79.04	9.55	72.38	10.67
Total	47	75.85	12.50	74.21	10.20	78.04	10.99	72.00	10.51

The findings also suggested that there existed significant main effects for the tests ($F=2.903$, $Sig=.046$, $ES=.168$) and groups ($F=5.844$, $Sig=.020$, $ES=.115$). To closely explore difference, post-hoc pairwise comparisons were employed on the groups' performance, and the results are illustrated in Table 7. The learners in the RG exhibited significantly higher gains than those in the FG in the immediate effect.

Table 7 Group comparison results of post-tests

Group	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>ES</i>
FG	21	72.929	1.167	5.844	.020	.115
RG	26	76.721	1.049			

$p<.05$, ES = Effect Size

Along with results from previous research (Huh & Lee, 2018; Way et al., 2000), this study indicates that writing prompt formats could suggest somewhat inconsistent results. In the present study, the reading-based writing prompt seemed to an aid for eliciting better writing products in the short term. In a similar vein, Way et al. (2000) stressed that the prose-model prompt produced greater writing performance than the bare or vocabulary prompt conditions. In their study, the prose-model prompt consisted of composit model writing. Considering that the reading-based prompt yielded better writing abilities in the study, actual writing materials or model writing may be effective for novice L2 learners to practice and train for writing assignments.

Next, Table 8 displays the outcomes on the delayed test. The mean scores in the RG were numerically higher than those in the FG, whereas there was no difference

between two groups ($Sig.=.207$). Therefore, this study may assume that two different prompt types significantly did not differ with regards to the learners' writing achievement on the delayed test.

Table 8 Group comparison results of delayed test

Group	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>ES</i>
FG	21	71.571	9.4674	.516	-1.279	.207	.036
RG	26	75.385	10.6849				

$p<.05$, *ES*= Effect Size

In order to identify if time intervention affects learners' writing performance dependant on the types of prompts, pair-wise *t*-tests were performed for each groups' pre- and delayed tests, and the findings are suggested in Table 9. The results revealed that learners in the RG showed a significant difference between pre- and delayed tests ($Sig.=.021$) while no significant difference was found in the FG learners' performance ($Sig.=.079$).

Table 9 Group comparison results between pre- and delayed tests

Group	pre-test		delayed test		<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>ES</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
FG	65.71	11.336	71.571	9.4674	-1.848	.079	.067
RG	66.81	12.448	75.385	10.6849	-2.455	.021	.121

$p<.05$, *ES*= Effect Size

Thus, it can be said that reading-based prompt tasks make learners, particularly those at the beginner level of writing, increase their potential in the writing processes over time. These results were partially supported by Farshi and Tavakoli's (2014) findings, meaning that written prompts can serve as a base from which learners can express their ideas.

Notably, even though learners in the RG were trained through the reading-based prompt type, they improved their writing skills in the bare prompt condition,

provided as pre- and delayed test formats. As for the task complexity, the bare prompt is regarded as more difficult and demanding than the other prompts (Huh & Lee, 2018). In this regard, it is necessary to widen the scope of writing prompts in L2 writing instruction which could trigger learners' creativity and enhance their thinking processes. In sum, writing prompts are a useful form for motivating learners to write more effectively. In terms of task features of writing prompts, suitable prompts should be presented to learners depending on task types.

V. Conclusions

This study attempts to explore the effects of different types of writing prompts on L2 learners' strategy use and writing performance. The results reveal that learners in the reading-based prompt group used strategies more frequently than those in the framed prompt groups in terms of the pre-writing and revising strategies after the treatment. This study also proves that learners in the reading-based prompt condition showed higher mean scores than the framed prompt groups' learners on the post-writing tests. In addition, learners in the reading-based prompt writing group significantly enhanced their writing skills in the long term. Overall, writing prompts made different impacts on L2 learners' behavior and perceptions towards strategy use and writing products.

Writing can be regarded as one of the most challenging skills to master for L2 learners. As previous researchers mentioned, as writing is a productive and active skill, most language learners face multiple challenges and appear to be less confident in writing at all levels (Erkan & Saban, 2011; Latif, 2007; Syarifah & Emiliyasi, 2019; Walker & Riu, 2008). In particular, unskilled language learners may have difficulty in composing assigned tasks because they seem to lack an understanding of the topic and purpose of writing. They also have little knowledge and experience in terms of organizing ideas or putting ideas into writing.

Based on the findings of the study, it is suggested that language teachers apply writing prompts into instruction, which can help learners improve their writing competence as well as facilitate positive attitudes towards employing writing strategies. Consequently, writing tasks, combined with modeling with appropriate prompts, can be an alternative method. Plus, these skills should be trained — strategy use, planning, managing, and revising writing (Harrison & Beres, 2004; Harris, Graham & Mason, 2006). Strategy-centered writing sessions could be implemented by practicing prompt based writing tasks. Additionally, since strategy use can vary depending on tasks, skill-based writing tasks should be considered in designing a writing curriculum. To optimize learners' writing abilities, teachers should analyze their students' writing behaviors and characteristics on writing tasks and then provide them with catered writing activities. Through these types of writing instruction, learners can become more aware of the importance of strategy use, and this may be effective for building learners' confidence and potential in language learning contexts.

In future research on writing prompts, it is recommended that learners' proficiency levels and in-depth interviews can be useful variables to obtain rich data. Additionally, writing training sessions should be integrated with more diverse prompt formats, such as visual and aural input to better investigate these processes.

Works Cited

- Asmari, AbdulRahman A. Investigation of Writing Strategies, Writing Apprehension, and Writing Achievement among Saudi EFL-major Students. *International Education Studies* 6.11 (2013): 130-143. Print.
- Chien, Shih-Chieh. *A Cognitive Analysis of the Relationships between Chinese EFL Writers' Strategy Use and Writing Achievement Performance*. Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics (COPiL), 2008. Print.
- _____. Students' Use of Writing Strategies and Their English Writing Achievements in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 32.1 (2012): 93-112. Print.

- Crusan, Deborah. *Assessment in the Second Language Writing Classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2010. Print.
- Erkan, Dilek Y., and Ayten İ. Saban. Writing Performance Relative to Writing Apprehension, Self-efficacy in Writing, and Attitudes towards Writing: A Correlational Study in Turkish Tertiary-level EFL. *Asian EFL Journal* 13.1 (2011): 164-192. Print.
- Farshi, Najmeh., and Manssor. Tavakoli. The Effects of Concept Mapping Strategy and Aural vs. Written Prompts on Writing Test Performance under Different Planning Conditions. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills* 6.2 (2014): 1-25. Print.
- Harris, Karen R., Steve. Graham, and Linda H. Mason. Improving the Writing, Knowledge, and Motivation of Struggling Young Writers: Effects of Self-Regulated Strategy Development With and Without Peer Support. *American Educational Research Journal* 43.2 (2006): 295-340. Print.
- Harrison, Gina L., and Deborah. Beres. The Writing Strategies of Post-secondary Students with Writing Difficulties. *Exceptionality Education Canada* 17.2 (2007): 221-242. Print.
- Hu, Guangwei., and Bo. Chen. A Protocol-based Study of University-level Chinese EFL Learners' Writing Strategies. *English Australia* 23.3 (2007): 37-56. Print.
- Huh, Myung-Hye., and Jongbong Lee. Task Complexity and Writing Prompts and Performance in EFL High School Students' Narrative Writing. *English Teaching* 73.4 (2018): 55-72. Print.
- Huot, Brian. The Literature of Direct Writing Assessment: Major Concerns and Prevailing Trends. *Review of Educational Research*, 60.2 (1990): 237 - 263. Print.
- Jeon, Eun-Gyeong., and Chan Kyoo Min. The Effects of the Teachers' Feedback Types on Students' Writing Ability in English Journal Writing. *English Language Teaching* 21.4 (2009): 293-313. Print.
[전은경, 민찬규. 「영어 저널쓰기에서 교사의 피드백 유형이 학습자의 쓰기능력 신장에 미치는 영향」. 『영어교육연구』 21.4 (2009): 293-313.]
- Kim, Ji Yeon. English Writing Strategies of Korean University Students by English Proficiency Levels. *The Journal of Studies in Language* 32.1 (2016): 47-74. Print.
[김지연. 「영어 능숙도 수준에 따른 대학생들의 영어쓰기 전략」. 『언어연구』 32.1 (2016): 47-74.]
- Kim, Young Ja. Exploring English Writing Strategies Employed by Korean College Students. *The Journal of Mirae English Language and Literature* 17.1 (2012): 69-98. Print.
[김영자. 「한국 대학생의 수준별 영어쓰기 전략 연구」. 『영어영문학』 17.1 (2012): 69-98.]
- Kroll, Barbara., and Joy. Reid. Guidelines for Designing Writing Prompts: Clarifications, Caveats, and Cautions. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 3.3 (1994): 231-255. Print.
- Latif, Muhammad M. M. The Factors Accounting for the Egyptian EFL University Students'

- Negative Writing Affect. *Essex Graduate Student Papers in Language & Linguistics* 9 (2007): 57-82. Print.
- Lee, Da Hye. *Effects of Writing Prompt Formats on EFL Learners' Task Motivation and Writing Performance*. Unpublished MA thesis, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, 2018. Print.
- Lee, Youn-Hee., Ji-Yoon Hong, and Hyun-Woo Lim. Interrelations among Writing Anxiety, Writing Strategy Use, and Writing Performance in Korean English Learners. *English Language & Literature Teaching* 20.4 (2014): 85-106. Print.
- Lindemann, Erika. *Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001. Print.
- Liu, Fulan., and Paul. Stapleton. Connecting Writing Assessment with Critical Thinking: An Exploratory Study of Alternative Rhetorical Functions and Objects of Enquiry in Writing Prompts. *Assessing Writing* 38 (2018): 10-20. Print.
- McCutcheon, Deborah. Cognitive Factors in the Development of Children's Writing. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Gzrahm, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of Writing Research* (pp. 115-130). New York, NY: The Guilford Press, 2006. Print.
- Oxford, Rebecca L., and Judith A. Burry-Stock. Assessing the Use of Language Learning Strategies Worldwide with the ESL/EFL Version of the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). *System* 23 (1995): 1-23. Print.
- Pearson Education. *Longman Academic Writing Series 1*. USA: Pearson Education, 2017a. Print.
- Pearson Education. *Longman Academic Writing Series 2*. USA: Pearson Education, 2017b. Print.
- Petrić, Bojana., and Bernadett. Czár. Validating a Writing Strategy Questionnaire. *System* 31 (2003): 187-215. Print.
- Plakans, Lia. Independent vs. Integrated Writing Tasks: A Comparison of Task Representation. *TESOL Quarterly* 44.1 (2010): 185-194. Print.
- Sasaki, Miyuki. Toward an Empirical Model of EFL Writing Processes: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 9.3 (2000): 259-291. Print.
- Syarifah, Eva F., and Raynesa N. Emiliyasi. Project-based Learning to Develop Students' Ability and Creativity in Writing Narrative Story. *Indonesian EFL Journal* 5.1 (2019): 85-94. Print.
- Tsai, Constance H. L. *Investigating the relationship between ESL Writer's Strategy use and Their Second Language Writing Ability*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Columbia University, 2004. Print.
- Walker, Robin., and Carmen P. Riu. Coherence in the Assessment of Writing Skills. *ELT Journal* 62.1 (2008): 18-28. Print.

- Way, Denise P., Elizabeth G. Joiner, and Michael A. Seaman. Writing in the Second Foreign Language Classroom: The Effects of Prompts and Task on Novice Learners of French. *The Modern Language Journal* 8.2 (2000): 171-184. Print.
- Weigle, Sara C. *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Print.
- Wu, Ruey-Jiuan R. Native and Non-native Students' Interaction with a Text-based Prompt. *Assessing Writing* 18 (2013): 202-217. Print.

Young Ah Cho (Gwangju University/Assistant Professor)
Address: College of Basic Liberal Arts Gwangju University
277 Hyodeok-ro, Nam-gu, Gwangju 61743, Korea
E-mail: blanche05@hanmail.net

Received: July 10, 2019 / Revised: August 10, 2019 / Accepted: August 19, 2019