UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Second language writing and literary reading in university: three empirical studies

Nguyen, P.N.T.

Publication date
2012

[Link to publication]

Citation for published version (APA):
Nguyen, P. N. T. (2012). *Second language writing and literary reading in university: three empirical studies*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

EFFECTS OF TEXT ANALYSIS ON
IDEA GENERATION

Abstract

Producing a meaningful written discourse in a foreign language requires a high cognitive effort of EFL writer learners. The challenges they face are not only caused by L2 word or grammar-related difficulties, but also by L2 genre and genre conventions which are different from what they are used to in their L1. To support Vietnamese L2 writers to overcome these hindrances an intensive four-week writing intervention was designed and tested to examine whether encouraging genre awareness via a short session of sample text analysis could empower students to get rid of writerøs block and conduct effective brainstorming for argumentative writing. In a pre-test post-test control group design with switching replications, scores of 66 EFL intermediate undergraduates on four indicators of L2 argumentative writing quality including idea generation, productivity, global text quality and self-efficacy were obtained. Effect of integration of sample text analysis into the written brainstorming stage was only observed on studentsø idea generation. Students created significantly longer self-expressive free-writing texts, perceived the ideas that they generated in written brainstorming stage as more useful, and used more ideas from the brainstorming for their argumentative text composition, compared to students from the control condition. No treatment effects were found for productivity, global quality of final text, and self-efficacy. Students in both control and treatment condition generally showed a significant increase in scores on these variables.

INTRODUCTION

University undergraduate students in Vietnam have specific problems in writing an academic essay in English. First, Vietnamese writers are not used to setting up their own stance in a writing issue and newly creating and supporting their stance with their own arguments: Vietnamese students are required in their L1-writing to focus on conveying the reproductive knowledge of a literary work. Secondly, embedded within a larger context of the Asian culture, Vietnamese inherit the Asian typical characteristics of avoiding the expression of their own thoughts towards an issue; they have learnt to express the socially accepted points of view. Thirdly, in Vietnam, the writing pedagogy and assessment of English inserted in the secondary education does not focus on facilitating writers to use language as a means to create a meaningful discourse, but it is grammar-oriented instead. So, Vietnamese students in academia need to be guided adequately on what is required when writing in English and how a good writing should look like for an Anglophone or global audience. Activity from Anglophone pedagogy like free writing might be an effective way for idea generation. However, it might only be effective for second language Vietnamese students if they are more aware of what is expected from them in a new writing genre. We assume to prepare students for generating ideas for writing about topics it is

necessary to introduce students to characteristics of a writing genre via a joint analysis of the function, goal, and approach of a sample text. This activity will in turn provide Vietnamese students with an understanding about a new writing genre, and therefore trigger their self-expressive brainstorming.

1.   INTRODUCTION TO VIETNAMESE WRITING CULTURE

An argumentative writing task extracted from Mosaic, writing For or Against a Crime Punishment[7], is an extremely challenging task for Vietnamese writers with a double load: First a self-choice stance towards the issue and second a self-authority of generating arguments. The two problems could be tracked back to the three main causes: the Vietnamese unique notion of academic writing, the Vietnamese assumption of self-authority of text voice, and the reality of teaching English in secondary education (the background before students move to university undergraduate level).

1.1 Vietnamese academic writing

In secondary education in Vietnam, writing is used as a means to test writer studentsø mastery of accurate content of a literary work. Writing is not a subject per se; it is embedded in literature teaching. For example, the two writing tasks are elicited from the Vietnamese National Exam of Secondary Education Graduation in June-2011: Task 1: Analyzing character *Trang* in the short story *Vo Nhat* [The Gathered Wife] of writer Kim Lan, the extract of the story located in the *12th Grade Advanced Literature,* Book Part II, Vietnam Education Publishing House-2008; Task 2: Analysing the character *Fishing Village Woman* in the literary work *Chiec Thuyen Ngoai Xa* [The Far Boat] of writer Nguyen Minh Chau, the extract in the *12th Grade Advanced Literature,* Book Part II, Vietnam Education Publishing House-2009[8]. In the two writing tasks, a good writer is assessed through her ability in memorizing, articulating the existing knowledge of the typical character traits of the literary work and structuring that content in a traditional text form. So, with this contextually-embedded specific notion of academic writing, writers are *not* required to set up their own stance in a writing issue and to *newly create* and support their stance with their own arguments, but to focus on exposing reproductive knowledge instead.

1.2 Self-authority of text voice

Embedded within a larger context of Asian culture, Vietnamese people inherit the Asian typical traditions of avoiding the expression of their own thoughts towards an issue. Cross-cultural studies (Samovar, Porter, & McDaniel, 2009; Triandis, 1995) revealed communication issues that are typical for Asian collectivism culture which emphasize (a) the views, needs, and goals of the in-group rather than of oneself, (b)

---

[7] *Topic extracted from Mosaic 1 Writing, Silver Edition 2007, Mc GrawHill, a popular commercial book used in EFL undergraduate training in Vietnam.*
[8] *These two writing tasks are literally translated from the Vietnamese National Exam of Secondary School Graduation 2011*

social norms and duty defined by the in-group rather than pleasure, (c) beliefs shared with the in-group rather than beliefs that distinguish oneself from in-group, and (d) great readiness to cooperate with in-group members. In short, in communication writers are not expected to express directly and strongly their *I* attitude, intentions and positions, but seek conformity to what is socially shared. Therefore, in facing an L2 writing task like writing For or Against the Capital Punishment, Vietnamese writers must face an inner conflict between their culturally-embedded constraint of de-emphasizing their individual self-voice and the requirements of the L2 task emphasizing an original, strong, and individual self-thought towards the issue.

1.3 Teaching English as a Second Language in Secondary Education

Teaching writing in English as a foreign language in secondary education in Vietnam emphasizes *language knowledge mastery* rather than language knowledge transforming or language for communicative purpose. The English writing pedagogy and assessment does not focus on facilitating writers to use language as a means to create a meaningful discourse, but on grammar instead. Teaching English centers on memorizing grammar structures, identifying grammatical errors in provided sentences, using subordinators/coordinators to combine two simple sentences, and on recognizing sentences/phrases similar to each other in grammatical structures or meaning. So, learning to write meaningfully in written discourse forms like essays is not included in the English learning program in secondary education.

In summary, the specific experience with L1 literature-embedded writing class, with deemphasizing the *individual* voice in communication, and with the L2 writing background cause significant challenges in writing in English, especially in the genre that requires a personal *I* attitude and self-generation of supporting ideas.

1.4 Idea generation practice and research

In facing an L2 argumentative topic like writing For or Against Capital Punishment, the EFL writer learners definitely need instruments to trigger their self-thought towards the issue and self-generation of supporting arguments. Many writing activities closely embedded in L1 Anglo-American composition theory of process approach like free writing have been frequently suggested in L2 writing course-book for its function of activating studentsø self-thought. Searching through the whole writing course book for the undergraduate writer learners (Mosaic, Silver Edition, published 2008), we find that each chapter in the book that deals with one specific genre asks students to do free writing as a prewriting activity for content generation. For example, to prepare students for writing an essay arguing for or against an issue related to crime and punishment, a 15 minute free-writing task was suggested to writers: *Have you ever witnessed or been involved in a crime? Do you have a strong opinion on an issue related to crime or punishment? Choose one of these questions to answer and write for 15 minutes without stopping* (task extracted from Chapter 9, Mosaic). The free-writing activity in this case plays the role of an instrument to prepare students

for their personal stance taking and argument generation. However, as related to the students' specific traits embedded in their own cultural background, the prewriting activity with its specific requirements for personal involvement and self-autonomy of idea generation must be a frustrating challenge for the students. In working with the student writers we observe a reluctance towards free-writing activity. Students find it difficult to start writing and delay it. They also wonder why they have to do the free writing because the actual writing had to follow after the free writing and set other constraints. Students also show the intention to think carefully before writing, write very carefully and slowly and edit during the process of free writing although they are not encouraged by teachers to edit in the activity.

L1 writing research literature reveals some significant studies investigating the effect of an idea generation intervention on writing quality. Rogers and Graham (2008) reported in a meta-analysis of single subject design writing intervention research a few empirical research studies examining prewriting activities: using a computer prewriting outline to generate and organize information (Channon, 2004), learning to use a graphic organizer for generating ideas prior to persuasive writing (Thanhouser, 1994), and learning to use a story web for generating ideas prior to writing (Zipprich, 1995). Although these studies reported positive effects on improving writing quality, the effect sizes found were small. In another meta-analysis of experimental and quasi-experimental studies on writing instruction of Graham and Perin (2007), *study of models* was found to yield small improvements in writing quality, when compared with other conditions including free writing (Knudson, 1991), traditional language arts instruction (Thibodeau, 1964), and instruction in the process of communication in writing (Reedy, 1964). In general, the prewriting studies focused on investigating the effect of one particular prewriting strategy on the quality of text. However, these particular strategies of prewriting activities, such as encouraging planning before writing (Brodney, Reeves, & Kazelskis, 1999), group and individual planning before writing (Vinson, 1980), organizing prewriting ideas by means of a semantic web (Loader, 1989), prompting planning following a brief demonstration of how to plan (Reece & Cumming, 1986) were reported to have a positive, yet small impact on writing quality.

There is a special need for pedagogical instruments to activate L2 writers' self-generation of ideas and translation of the ideas into a final text composition. Silva (1993) reported from empirical research results that in spite of L2 writers' higher devotion to idea generation and more time spending for figuring out the topic in the prewriting stage, they still did not make progress in generating useful material and many of the generated ideas had never found their way into the written texts. An overview study that synthesized researches of learning to write in a second language from 1980s to 2001 reported not one specific research with findings on idea generation of L2 writers' composition process (Cumming, 2001). In 2008, Leki, Cumming, and Silva (2008) reported six studies on second language writing that were grouped under the category idea generation (see studies of Albrechtsen, 1997; Hirose & Sasaki, 1994; Moragne e Silva, 1989; Skibniewski & Skibniewska, 1986; Victori, 1999; Zamel, 1982, all cited in Leki et al., 2008). However, these studies were solely descriptive showing differences between skilled and less skilled L2 writers, how writers act differently when writing in their mother tongue and second languages,

and how the differences were related to idea generation quality. Yet, no report on the quality of an intervention into idea generation was published. Therefore, little is known about what intervention facilitates the idea generation process of L2 writers, especially less skilled or disadvantaged writer learners.

To facilitate students for idea generation, some brainstorming activities, such as free writing, were introduced in second language writing classrooms. However, free writing seems not to be effective. Students usually think for so long to write and the first draft tends to be the last draft (Harris, Santangelo, & Graham, 2008). The free-writing activity is neglected by students because they could not perceive it as an effective tool to generate ideas. We assumed that with a better understanding of the characteristics of a genre students will overcome the writerøs block and invest in the brainstorming activity for ideas about a writing topic. There is no research that reports effects of genre awareness on written brainstorming (free writing). However, research found a bonding tendency of text pattern knowledge and its efficacy in probing ideas and structuring text organization (Dymock, 2005; Englert & Hiebert, 1984; Reynolds & Perin, 2009).

Further, if genre awareness is assumed to assist writers with more idea generation and self-expression in the free-writing stage, then writers are believed to propel to more writing in the final text. This hypothesis corresponds with the assumption of the generative nature of writing: writing will create more writing (Klein, 1999; Rijlaarsdam et al., 2011). The assumption is explained vividly with a writing experience of Colyar (2009, p. 426) when she recalled her experience of many unproductive hours sitting in a coffee shop with delicious peppermint tea to õ*think about writing*ö, until when she stopped õ*think about writing*ö or what she should write and just started writing õ*This is not the introduction to my paper*ö and then she moved forward and generated further her text. In addition to text productivity, we assumed genre awareness possibly helped writers to construct a strategy for relating their written brainstorming to the formal later writing to enrich the quality of their persuasion. Research reported a strong impact of providing specific writing product goals on writing quality, compared to general goal setting (Graham & Perin, 2007).

Finally, we assumed with the potential effects of sample text analysis on idea generation, text productivity and quality, L2 writers must feel more comfortable, more confident in themselves about their writing ability.

Therefore, we formulated the following research question:
"Does sample-text analysis positively affect idea generation in prewriting stage, text productivity, text quality, and self-efficacy?"

2. METHOD

A pre-test post-test control group design with switching replications (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002) was used to examine the effects of text analysis on idea generation, the quantity and quality of the final text, and studentsø self-efficacy in writing (see Table 1).

Table 1. Research design

	Panel 1			Panel 2	
Group	Pre-test	Intervention	Post-test 1	Intervention	Post-test 2
EC (n = 33)	O_1	TF	O_2	IF	O_3
CE (n = 33)	O_1	IF	O_2	TF	O_3

Note: TF = Text analysis and Free writing (experimental condition) and IF = Instruction and Free writing (control condition); EC = Experimental condition in panel 1 and Control condition in panel 2; CE = Control condition in panel 1 and Experimental condition in panel 2; O = measurement of idea generation, text productivity, text quality and self-efficacy.

2.1 Participants

Participants were 66 students of EFL intermediate level, of two age groups 19-21 and 22-27. The younger age group included the students who earn a seat in the university course after passing a national university entrance exam; they are in the mainstream of study from upper secondary education to university, without interruption. The older age group included students who finished part of the undergraduate program 2-3 years ago and then they came back to the university to complete their undergraduate program. Although there might be a difference in life experience, working experience and problem solving ability of the two groups, they were ranked by the university as at the intermediate level in EFL competence.

The younger age group was randomly divided into condition EC with 14 students and condition CE with 13 students, and likewise the older age group into condition EC with 19 students and condition CE with 20 students. Both conditions were taught by one teacher. All students showed a commitment to the learning activities. They attended the course regularly and actively, finished the writing assignments and completed the questionnaires.

All participants were from Mekong Delta Vietnam, sharing similar social, cultural, demographical and economic context. The proportion of girls (69%) was significantly higher than the proportion of boys, which is common for every language class in Vietnam. Of the subjects 14 % were from Khmer, which is an ethnic minority group in Vietnam. The number of Khmer people spread equally in both age groups in group EC and CE.

2.2 Course Specifications

Idea generation prewriting activity designed in the course is created from the concept of free writing as a learning tool. First, we assume this activity could probably boost ideas embedded in each person to come out. Therefore, the writersø personal stance and belief in an issue at stake, could be hopefully revealed through an act of personal free writing. Second, this unstructured, informal prewriting is expected to

prevent as well as ameliorate possible writing difficulties caused by L2 formal language usage constraints. Further, free writing might activate writers to generate content even new to themselves (see the discussion of Elbow, 1973, on free writing).

The experiment was carried out in four weeks (three meetings of 2.30 hrs. per week) in Tra Vinh University, Mekong, Vietnam. The instructor informed the students of the experimentøs purpose and that data from the course would be used for research and treated confidentially. The instructor explained that all students would have exactly the same learning activities and writing assignments, however, in different sequence. The students were asked to participate fully in all sessions of the course.

In Table 2, the course program is summarized for both the experimental and control condition. After both groups swapped conditions, the same program was implemented.

Table 2: Course program and two conditions

Experimental conditions: Text analysis and free writing	Control condition: Teacherøs instruction and free writing

20ø	Orientation on argumentative genre: purpose of writing, audience, features/components expected
30¢	Sample text analysis Instruction on essay structure:
15¢	Free writing: Looking at some pictures of the issue at stake and write freely on the issue.
15¢	Topic involvement: Identifying the standpoint revealed in the free writing; highlighting the ideas, details that students perceived as being important, relevant in talking about the issue.
25¢	Rationale activation: students reasoned their level of agreement with pro and contra statements/arguments on the issue provided by the teacher
30¢	Rhetorical training: instructions on citing authorities in sentences, paraphrasing ideas, and exposing weaknesses in opposing arguments
60¢	Documentation: students reading information sources
25¢	Writing preparation: Adapting the free writing draft in session õFree writingö and using information from the other sessions to draw a framework for the final text composition.
70¢	Writing: Writing a full argumentative text on the issue at stake

Students of group EC started to serve as the experimental condition and examined an argumentative text sample provided. Under the teacherøs guidance, they analyzed how ideas were organized in a hierarchical structure with topic sentences and supporting sentences, how the stance of the author was stated, and how those features were related to the intention of the textøs author. They then did the free writing on the topic and built a text content structure for themselves using the ideas they highlighted as being worthwhile in their free writing. Students of group CE started to serve as the control condition with the teacherøs instructions on essay structure. Students as a whole group reviewed the common knowledge of organizational structure,

cohesion and unity of essay writing with the guiding questions provided by the teacher, and then did the free-writing activity. After the first post-test, both groups swapped: group CE served as the experimental condition and group EC as the control condition. So, instead of an untreated control group in which poorer performance might simply be attributed to the lack of the treatment, in both condition students received instructions to enhance essay writing, but the control condition with classroom recall and the experimental condition with sample text analysis.

2.3 Data Collection

Data were students' free-writing texts, final texts, and a self-efficacy questionnaire. As shown in Table 1, data were gathered at three moments: just before the start of the course (pre-test), just before the groups swapped conditions (first post-test) and at the end of the course (second post-test).

With respect to the free-writing text, students were provided with a blank paper, and a picture of the issue at stake as a writing prompt. Then they were asked to look at the picture, feel free to express what they think, write as fast as possible with no worry on structure, mechanics or organization of the language; just for words, ideas flowing out and running on the paper. All students were given 13 minutes for each time of free writing. Then from the free-writing text they highlighted the ideas, details that they perceived as valuable, important, and/or relevant in talking about the issue. Nine different students of both conditions did not submit their texts in the three moments of measurement. In total, 189 free-writing texts were collected and involved in the analysis: 62 in the pre-test session, 62 during the first post-test, and 65 in the second post-test.

With respect to the final text, all students were asked to write on an argumentative topic in 70 minutes. Six different students of both conditions did not submit their texts in the three moments of measurement. Totally, 192 texts were collected and involved in the analysis: 63 during the pre-test, 64 during the first post-test, and 65 during the second post-test. All handwritten texts were typed out to reduce the effect of handwriting quality on raters' assessment.

Finally, students completed a 19-item questionnaire on self-efficacy three times during the experiment. It took about 14 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Eighteen different students of both conditions did not submit their texts in the three moments of measurement. In total, 187 self-efficacy questionnaires were completed and involved in the analysis: 59 in the pre-test session, 64 during the first post-test and 64 during the second post-test.

2.4 Measures

Four dependent variables were measured: Idea generation, productivity, text quality and self-efficacy. *Idea generation* was measured with three indicators: (1) Length of the free writing text (2) Number of the ideas highlighted in the free-writing text, and (3) Number of the ideas that were highlighted and came back in a student's end text. All three indicators were measured by counting the number of words (with a range

from 0 to Ô). Two raters counted the ideas highlighted and the ideas coming back in the end text with an inter-rater agreement of $r = .99$ and $r = .92$, respectively.

Productivity was measured by the length of the end text produced in terms of number of words with a range from 0 to Ô.

Text quality was the quality of the end text. We adapted the scale for the measurement of text quality of Hamp-Lyons (1991). We revised the layout of the scale, deemphasized the language skills, such as grammatical structure and vocabulary, and focused on õposition/stance supportö, õcomplexity of argumentsö, and õrhetorical featuresö which were the three main components of a good argumentative text that we expected the students to get improvement in. Each text was judged according to the rating scale, using an anchor text, a better and a worse text and scored between 0 and Ô. We first organized one trial rating session to establish the clarity of the analytic description of the anchor text, the better text, and the worse text, as well as to clarify the scoring rule of judging a text in comparison to the anchor text and in reference to the rating scale. Then all 192 end texts were rated by 17 Master students in English. Each text was judged by three different raters. We used the mean score per text as the score for text quality although the inter-rater reliability between the 3 raters per text was high ($r = .80$).

Self-efficacy was measured with a 19-item questionnaire, using a 10 point Likert type scale with *0* = no confidence and *10* = high confidence. Some sample items: õI think I could write an introduction in which I introduce the issue and my main pointsö, õI think I could support my main points with strong supporting ideasö, õI think I know the characteristics of a good writing pieceö, õI think I have developed the topic wellö, õI think I know the strategy for keeping the writing goingö, õI think I know the strategy for organizing the content of a written textö. The questionnaire reached an appropriate level of reliability through three times of measurement (Cronbachøs > .94).

2.5 Analyses

The scores on three indicators of idea generation were highly correlated, especially the number of marked ideas in free writing and the number of marked ideas coming back in the final text (from r = .66 for pre-test scores to r = .82 for scores on post-test 2). The other correlations were from r = .14 to r = .36). To examine the effect of text analysis on idea generation, we therefore used multivariate analyses of covariance in both panels with condition (control vs. experimental) as independent variables, the three indicators of idea generation in post-test 1 as dependent variables, and the pre-test scores of the three indicators as covariates. In panel 2, this analysis was repeated with post-test 2 scores as dependent variables. Subsequently, we used paired samples t-tests to examine the differences between measurement times within conditions.

To examine effects on the other three variables (text productivity, text quality, and self-efficacy) we used univariate analysis of covariance and paired-samples t-test similar to the multivariate analyses described above.

3. RESULTS

In this experiment, we tested the effect of a four-week intervention of sample text analysis on the generation of ideas in free writing, on text productivity, global text quality and self-efficacy. The intervention was tested twice with a switching replication between post-test 1 and 2. Table 3 provides means and standard deviations of all variables and indicators in the two panels, separately for the control and the experimental condition.

Table 3. Means and (standard deviations between brackets) for three measurement occasions (T1-T3): Group EC: Experimental condition, then Control condition; Group CE: Control condition, then Experimental condition

Variable	Indicator	Group	Pre-test	Post-test 1	Post-test 2
Idea generation	*Length free-writing texts*	EC	140.52 (48.10)	176.28 (61.43)	175.37 (61.19)
		CE	156.55 (56.19)	165.1 (41.20)	232.73 (59.88)
	Nr. of ideas marked in free-writing texts	EC	3.16 (2.27)	5.62 (3.22)	3.53 (2.66)
		CE	3.97 (1.96)	3.23 (2.08)	3.82 (2.99)
	Nr. of marked ideas used in final texts	EC	1.68 (1.40)	3.62 (2.71)	2.29 (2.10)
		CE	2.39 (1.36)	1.27 (1.29)	2.39 (2.19)
Text productivity		EC	245.44 (77.46)	392.32 (98.58)	403.75 (103.16)
		CE	288.84 (71.40)	393.03 (96.99)	459.27 (154.13)
Text quality		EC	75.94 (42.55)	126.51 (50.50)	31.64 (62.31)
		CE	106.99 (63.56)	156.26 (102.94)	142.47 (75.17)
Self-efficacy		EC	5.31 (1.52)	5.50 (1.51)	5.94 (1.41)
		CE	5.47 (1.28)	5.56 (1.36)	6.28 (1.12)

3.1 Text analysis and generation of ideas

In panel 1, the multivariate covariance analyses with the three dependent variables showed a significant effect ($\lambda(3.48) = 8.58$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .35$). Subsequently, the univariate results showed positive effects of text analysis on all the three variables. The experimental condition, in comparison to the control condition, wrote longer free-writing texts ($F(1,54) = 5.08$, $p = .029$, $\eta^2 = .09$), highlighted more ideas that they perceived as useful from the free-writing texts ($F(1,54) = 23.21$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .32$), used more ideas from the free-writing texts for their composition ($F(1, 54) = 19.52$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .28$)

Because at the end of panel 2, both groups participated in both the control and experimental condition, we did not expect differences between control and experimental condition. However, in panel 2 the multivariate covariance analyses with the three dependent variables also show a significant effect of condition on dependent variables ($(3, 53) = 6.18$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .259$). Subsequently, the univariate results

showed positive effects of text analysis on one variable *Length of free-writing text* ($F(1,59) = 12.01$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .179$).

In order to test the development pattern of the three variables in panel 2 for the two conditions we did paired-samples t-test between post-test 1 and post-test 2. Students in EC condition reported a decrease in *Number of ideas marked in free-writing texts* ($t(30) = .19$, $p = .003$). The CE group showed a significant increase in two out of the three variables: *Number of marked ideas in free-writing texts used again in final texts* ($t(29) = 2.94$, $p = .006$) and *Number of words of free-writing texts* ($t(29) = 11.01$, $p < .001$). In sum, this means that we found an effect of sample-text analysis on *Number of marked ideas in free-writing texts used again in final texts* and *Number of words of free-writing texts*. These effects were maintained with the students of the EC group when they returned to the regular course. For *Number of ideas marked in free-writing texts* we found a sequence effect that showed that students who attended first the control condition and then the experimental condition, generally marked more ideas than the other students; these students (first experimental and then control condition) showed a decrease in number of marked ideas when they participated in the control condition.

3.2 Text analysis and productivity, quality of final text, students' self-efficacy

Univariate covariance analyses with text productivity at post-test 1 (panel 1) and post-test 2 (panel 2) did not show an effect of text analysis on productivity. In order to test for an effect in panel 2, paired-samples t-tests were performed on scores of post-test 1 and 2, for each condition. A significant increase in productivity was found for students in the experimental condition ($t(32) = 3.44$, $p = .002$), whereas student in the control condition did not change.

In panel 1 and 2, no effects of sample-text analyses were found on the quality of the final text. Paired-samples t-test between post-test 1 and post-test 2 to test the development pattern of text quality in panel 2 for each condition separately, did not show a statistical difference.

In panel 1 and 2, no effects of sample-text analyses were found on students' self-efficacy in text writing. Paired-samples t-test between post-test 1 and post-test 2 to test the development pattern of self-efficacy in panel 2 for each condition separately did show a statistical difference for both conditions: Control condition (group EC: $t(25) = 4.52$, $p < .001$) and experimental condition (group CE: $t(30) = 5.047$, $p < .001$).

4.   DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results confirm the hypothesis that genre awareness via a sample text analysis affects the generation of idea in the prewriting stage. We found improvement of students in idea generation in the three indicators: (i) length of free-writing text, (ii) the perceived usefulness of ideas in the free-writing text and (iii) the actual use of these ideas in the writer's final text. The maintenance effect was also reported in students' productivity of free-writing text and the usage of ideas they generated in free writing

for text composition. This finding consolidates the two functional benefits of genre awareness: a framework to help students to boost the self-expressive free writing, and to manipulate and capture strategically the free writing as a valuable source material for composing a more formal final text. We read from this finding an educational meaning of the intervention in facilitating the students to create a rich expression of their own positions and intentions towards an issue at stake. Sample-text analysis to introduce the writer learners explicitly of what is required of a particular genre could be a meaningful pedagogical tool to be included in the writing programs for EFL students. If students have practiced free writing, the additional introduction of function, goal, and approach of a genre via a joint analysis of a sample text could result in more productive free writing.

No effects of sample-text analysis were found on text productivity, text quality, and self-efficacy. That means integrating sample text analysis does not seem to contribute directly to the final text productivity, final text quality and self-efficacy. We would like to pose two explanations for this finding. The first explanation could be that the difference between the experimental and control condition might be irrelevant for producing large differences in quality and quantity of text, as well as in self-efficacy for writing. Both the experimental and the control condition received instructions on good quality writing and the experimental received further one short sample text for analysis which was quite effective for idea generation. The second explanation is that between the written brainstorming stage and text composition we introduced students in both conditions to other writing techniques such as rationale activation, rhetorical training, and documentation. These additional elements might have leveled out studentsø differences in text composition. The last issue we open up now for further consideration. For EFL writers, a formal final text composition is far more constraining than an expressive free-writing text in terms of language usage and rhetorical requirements like essay structure, balance between parts of an essay, word choice, and grammar appropriation. These constraints might limit the EFL writers in elaborating their final text. Therefore, students in the experimental condition, although found to be more effective in free writing, did not differ from their peers in the control condition in the length and the quality of the final texts, and self-efficacy. While many researches reply to the question of effects of prewriting on text performance, this research first focused on activating genre awareness in the prewriting stage and then examine the latter effects of that activation on text length, text quality and self-efficacy. The finding of positive effects of sample-text analysis on studentsø idea generation might enrich the understanding of L2 writing process and foster an appropriate pedagogy for L2 writing teaching.