

Adult Foreign Language Learners' Goals for a Writing Task

Manami Suzuki
Dokkyo University

Abstract

The present study examined the goals that 103 adult Japanese learners of English as a foreign language set for a specific writing task, asking participants to report their goals for the task before they engaged in it. The importance of goal setting has been recognized in the field of educational psychology (Zimmerman, 2008), and second language motivation and writing research (Cumming, 2006d; Cumming, Busch, & Zhou, 2002; Dornyei, 2001c). In the current study students set rhetoric and linguistic goals for a writing task most. Previous instructions and a prompt of composition influenced students' goals for a subsequent writing task.

Key words: foreign language learners, goals, second language writing

1. OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

The present study examines the goals that 103 adult learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) set for a specific writing task. Goal setting has been recognized as an important factor in learning in the field of educational psychology (Zimmerman, 2008), and second language (L2) motivation and writing research (Cumming, 2006d; Cumming, Busch, & Zhou, 2002; Dornyei, 2001c). Surprisingly, little research has been conducted on this topic in a foreign language (FL) context. Furthermore, most studies of goals in the field of L2 writing have been small-scale case studies (Cumming, 2006c; Cumming et al., 2002). Larger scale research on goals

like the research reported in the present study is needed to confirm the results of these previous small-scale studies of L2 writers' goals.

Importantly, goal setting is considered to be strongly related to motivation (Dornyei, 2001c; Zimmerman & Schunk, 2008). Moreover, the focus of L2 motivation research has shifted from learners' goals for general learning (e.g., motivation for learning English) to their motives for specific tasks such as a writing task in the current study (Dornyei, 2001b, 2003).

The present study multi-codes students' goals, using the taxonomy of goals adapted from Cumming et al. (2002). The purpose of the current study is to identify EFL learners' self-set goals for a specific writing task and examine whether or not the content of prior writing instruction has an effect on the learners' goal selection. This study compares the results to those of previous studies which were conducted in ESL contexts (Cumming, 2006d; Cumming et al., 2002), considering specific context in the present study (i.e., an EFL context). The results of the present study show that previous instructions before goal setting and writing influenced students' goals for writing. Students set rhetoric, linguistic, and content/topic goals in the present study. Students also set as their goals communication with their readers.

2. REVIEWING THE LITERATURE OF GOALS

In this section, a definition of a goal will be first provided, and next, the functions and advantageous properties of goals will be identified and explained. Theories of goals will be also presented. Finally, the relation between previous research on goals in L2 writing and the motivation for the research questions in the present study will be identified.

2.1 Definition of a Goal

The present study adopts Locke and Latham's definition of a goal because their studies of goals (Locke & Latham, 1990, 1994, 2002) have been widely recognized in the field of L2 motivation research (Cumming et al., 2002; Dornyei, 2001c). Locke and Latham have crafted their definition within the larger context of their development of goal-setting theory (Locke & Latham, 1990, 2002). They define a goal as "the object or aim of an action, for example, to attain a specific standard of proficiency, usually within a specified time limit" (Locke & Latham, 2002, p.705).

2.2 Four Functions of a Goal

Goals influence learning including language learning in four ways. First goals direct learners' "attention to goal-relevant tasks and away from goal-irrelevant task" (Zimmerman, 2008, p.268). Second, goals lead to learners making greater efforts. Students with high goals make greater effort than students with low goals (Bandura & Cervone, 1983). Third, goals enhance learners' persistence (Zimmerman, 2008). Fourth, goals enhance learners' affect (e.g., self-satisfaction or less defensiveness) and indirectly enhance their learning (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 1997).

2.3 Advantageous Properties of Goals

Zimmerman (2008) extensively reviewed research on goal setting in the field of educational psychology. According to Zimmerman (2008), there are eight advantageous properties of goals. Zimmerman summarizes the main findings:

1. Specific goals are more effective than general goals (e.g., "Do your best").
2. Proximal goals (short-term goals) are more effective than distal goals (long-term goals).
3. Distal goals can be effective when they are combined with proximal goals in a hierarchy.
4. A social context (e.g., parents' expectation, peers' perception) that enables

learners to set and pursue goals effectively is important for goal attainment.

5. Self-set goals are more effective than assigned goals. However, if learners are provided with rationale for the assigned goals, the assigned goals are as effective as self-set goals.
6. Conscious goals are more effective for task performance than unconscious motives.
7. Learning process goals are effective for learning (e.g., writing).
8. Product (performance outcome) goals are also effective for learning as well as learning process goals.

2. 4 Goals in Activity Theory

Goals have been conceptualized within a theoretical framework of activity theory (Cumming et al., 2002; Gutierrez & Stone, 2000; Leont'ev, 1979). According to activity theory, activity is an essentially “holistic conceptualization of human behavior situated in a social context” (Cumming et al., 2002, p.5). However, individual people’s goals are only one aspect of the whole system, so goals should be comprehended with reference to the whole activity structure (e.g., participants, means, norms, values, objects of activity, community) and the situation under which people act (Cumming et al., 2002).

2. 5 Motivation and L2 Learning

L2 motivation studies highlighted the importance of goal-setting, particularly short-term goal-setting (Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Ushioda, 1998). Goals are strongly related to motivation for learning, including L2 learning and writing (Cumming, 2006d; Cumming et al., 2002; Dornyei, 2001c). Recent L2 motivation research has suggested the significance of learners’ situation-specific motives (Dornyei, 2001b, 2003). For example, Dornyei (2001b) argues that L2 motivation research on task motivation is important because its findings may enable teachers to systematically

choose and employ tasks which facilitate learners' motivation. He also suggests that L2 motivation studies should "focus on specific language behaviors rather than general learning outcomes" (Dornyei, 2003, p.22).

2. 6 Research on Goals in L2 Writing

Goals are recognized to work as "a viable, effective focus for learning and instruction in second-language writing" (Cumming et al., 2002, p.2). Moreover, writing has been acknowledged as "a characteristically goal-oriented activity" (Cumming, 2006c). Second language writing is "the long, slow, painstaking process" (Silva et al., 2003, p.111). As reviewed earlier, goals enable L2 writers to sustain development of L2 writing, which requires longtime effort and perseverance. Cumming (2006b) and Cumming et al. (2002) highlighted the importance of research on goals for the design of writing instruction and curriculum. Many L2 writing studies have found that learners might vary their goals for writing task achievement greatly, depending on their perceptions of the purpose or value of each task (Leki, 1995; Spack, 1997).

Some studies provided empirical evidence that learners' self-set goals through process-oriented writing instruction and feedback led to written texts that had better quality (i.e., with respect to rhetorical, logical or grammatical features of the texts) (Cumming, 1986; Hoffmann, 1998). In Hoffman's study, learners' L2 proficiency and writing level, their efforts, and the level of self-reflection influenced the quality of their text as well. Cumming et al. (2002) conducted a case study to examine the goals of six adult learners of English as a second language (ESL) with various cultural and linguistic backgrounds. They found that L2 writers' goals for learning are "complex and diverse as well as contextually and personally situated" (p.15). This study did not focus on a specific writing task, although Cumming and his co-authors classified goals into immediate goals for writing and future goals. Their study was a small-scale case study ($N = 6$) and conducted in an ESL context. Cumming (2006b) systematically

conducted research on 60 ESL students' goals for writing improvement (see also Cumming, 2006a) and found that ESL students' goals were "closely but not exclusively related" to their instructors' goals (Cumming, 2006b, p.162). Cumming (2006b) has suggested that further studies of L2 goals are needed to investigate goals in specific contexts. Little has been examined with regard to the influence of instructors or curriculums on EFL students' goals, although such research has been conducted in the ESL context (e.g., Cumming, 2006d; Nassaji & Cumming, 2000). It would seem, therefore, that further research on learners' goals is needed in an EFL context. Polio (2003) reviewed L2 writing research and reported that little research has been carried out on what happens in the L2 writing classroom, especially in a foreign language (FL) context.

3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As reviewed earlier, little research on goal setting for a specific task (e.g., a writing task in a present study) has been conducted in EFL contexts. To my knowledge, Cumming et al. (2002) first developed the taxonomy of L2 writers' goals, which is employed in the current study, in an ESL context. Furthermore, significantly, Cumming is one of authorities in the field of L2 writing research (see Cumming, 1998, 2001). Based on the literature reviewed above, I formulated two research questions:

1. What goals do EFL learners set before they engage in a specific L2 writing task?
2. Does writing instruction influence learners' goals and a subsequent writing task?

4. METHODS

4. 1 Participants

Participants in the present study were 117 first year university students who enrolled in a half-semester (6 week) long English content-based course that I [the author] taught at university in Japan in the fall semester, 2007. A semester was 12 weeks long at the university. Students all volunteered to participate in this study. However, eight students were absent from the experimental class in the fourth week. Furthermore, I excluded from analyses the data of a Chinese student and five students who took the course again because they had failed in the course in the previous year. These absences and exclusions left the total number of participants at 103. 72 (70%) of the participants were female and 31 (30%) were male. Four class students who took the same course participated in the study. Students in two classes ($n = 52$) participated in the present study in the former half of the fall semester, 2007, and students in the other two classes ($n = 51$) participated in the study in the latter half of the semester. The students were placed in each class according to the results on the TOEFL ITP test (Test of English as a Foreign Language Institutional Testing Program) they took in April, 2007. The mean of participants' scores on the TOEFL ITP test was 602.6 and the standard deviation was 65.3. The mean of participants' ages was 18.7 ($SD = .7$). They had received little L2 writing instruction at high school. Participants in the present study had a common first language (Japanese), L2 proficiency-level, cultural and social background, and age so as to control these expected independent variables for L2 writing and motivation.

4. 2 Contexts

In this section, the content-based course and the goals of the course will be described because they might influence participants' goals for a writing task in this study directly or indirectly, as reviewed earlier. However, the present study does not focus on the influence of the overall circumstances on individual participants' goals for

a writing task in a class. The larger scope of the activity structure is beyond the present study.

In the content-based course that participants took, four teachers (two NS and two NNS) taught four different topics in a year. Thus, participants took four different content-courses (i.e., Language Learning Strategies, Introduction to Africa, Public Speaking, and Introduction to Gender Studies). The present study was conducted in the Language Learning Strategies class I taught. In the content-courses (i.e., four courses in a year) students were asked to speak mostly English and to turn in weekly written assignments and class logs. Students were assigned to read and write about each week's topic and write some self-reflection about their performance in every class. Assessment of the course was portfolio-oriented. Students made portfolios of class logs, handouts, and self-assessment at the end of the semester. Thus, at least, participating students got familiar with writing in English through the content-based courses including the class in the present study.

Self-reflection and self-assessment were important in the content-based courses. Students were expected to interact with each other. The brochure that was written by a coordinator of the courses and distributed to students at the course orientation in 2007 wrote "It is OK to make mistakes in these classes, and we all will. It is not OK to not interact." Thus, the content-based course was oriented toward oral communication. In every class, teachers gave a 5- or 10-minute short lecture, following which students engaged in oral communication tasks (e.g., to summarize the lecture in pairs or discuss the topic in pairs). Students also had opportunities for reading and writing about each week's topics, as described earlier. Holistic language learning was encouraged in the content-based courses, although each teacher decided the focus of language skills in his or her class. The present study did not investigate what happened in the other content-based courses with regard to instructions for language skills (i.e., reading, writing, listening, and speaking).

In my class (Language Learning Strategies class), participants developed learning

strategies for speaking, listening, writing, reading and vocabulary (see Appendix A) and exchanged their experiences and knowledge of the topics. I wrote the goal of my class in the syllabus:

The goal of this course is to give you an opportunity to reflect on your second language learning including English learning, learn and try out new ways of language learning through the course work. You are expected to make a good learning community through participation in this class.

4.3 Procedures

Table 1 shows the schedule for my data collection. The data were collected in the fourth week of my class. I gave a brief L2 writing lecture about brainstorming, organization of English writing, and topic sentences for 15 minutes, because L2 writing metaknowledge (e.g., planning or organization) has been recognized as an important factor for L2 writing development as well as practice (Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2001; Sasaki, 2004, in press; Sasaki & Hirose, 1996). The writing lecture was *not intentionally* designed to ascertain whether the lecture had any subsequent influence on the students' choice of writing goals. I selected important knowledge and skills for Japanese EFL writers *from the educational perspectives* of an English writing teacher and an L2 English writer. Participants wrote a narrative composition on their important experience for 30 minutes in the class. The course was an introductory required course for freshmen at the English department. Therefore, I selected narrative writing which was considered to be relatively less-demanding for writers than expository writing (Boscolo, 1990). I chose the prompt, *important experience*, because it seemed to be relevant to participants' lives. In the field of motivation research, personal relevance to task is regarded as an important factor in motivating learners' activity (Dornyei, 2001a).

Before they wrote the essay, I suggested that they should consider and answer

these nine questions:

- 1) Choose one of your important experiences in your life.
- 2) Why did you do that?
- 3) What did you expect from the experience?
- 4) Who involved in that experience?
- 5) What did you mainly do there?
- 6) What problems/difficulties did you have there?
- 7) What did you try to do to solve the problems (or get over the difficulties)?**
- 8) What did you find through the experiences? (What did you learn from the experience?)**
- 9) What did the experience bring about your life?**

Table 1: Schedule of the Data Collection Class

Lecture about brainstorming, organization, and topic sentences	15 minutes
Time to think of nine questions about an essay	10 minutes
Setting and writing goals	5 minutes
Writing an essay	30 minutes

The questions were cited from an article of Takako Kojima, who was a career counselor at St. Paul (Rikkyo) University in Japan, in the section for university students' job hunting in Asahi Newspaper (Kojima, 2006, September 26). In the article, she suggested that it was important to consider the nine issues for career plans. I translated and used the questions for preparation for writing an essay in the present study. Kojima stated the last three questions (Questions 7 to 9) were particularly significant. Therefore, I bolded these three questions in the handout I distributed to

students. I asked students to write about their important experience based on their answers to the nine questions. I also asked students to consider and write a subtitle of their writing. I intended students to focus on a specific topic (i.e., one of their important experiences), while thinking of the subtitle of their essay. I did not teach revision strategies because my 6-week classes did not focus only on writing. Writing is just one of the activities in my classes (see Appendix A). They could take writing courses and learn more about writing later. Students engaged in narrative writing within short time duration (30 minutes). I hoped that students would notice the complexity of L2 writing through performing this writing task and take writing courses at university in subsequent years.

Another reason I selected the prompt (important experience) was that I thought that the prompt could accord with the spiritual legacy of the participants' school expressed in the statement of the founder and first president of participants' university: *A university should be an institution for character building through learning*. I respected and had great empathy with the school principle.

Before they began to write, I asked them to write their goals for the writing task for 5 minutes freely.

4. 4 Data Analysis

Using the taxonomy of goals adapted from Cumming et al. (2002), I categorized students' goals for the writing task (i.e., to write an essay whose title is "My Important Experience" for 30 minutes. Cumming et al's coding scheme of goals consists of two main categories: Immediate goals for writing, and Future goals. In the present study, I only used the category of immediate goals for writing (Appendix B) because the current study examined EFL learners' goals for a specific writing task rather than long-term goals for general L2 writing. In addition to these categories developed by Cumming et al. (2002), in the present study I included one more category of "Communication with Readers" because some students reported their goals with

regard to communication with readers through writing. L2 writing research has emphasized the importance of L2 writers' consciousness of communities (e.g., audience) (Sasaki, in press).

In the content-based courses (i.e., 4 content-based classes in a year), students used a file holder for their portfolio. It was possible that in the latter half of the fall semester, the other CBI teacher who taught participants, whom I taught in the former half of the semester, could read their composition in their files, since the present study was conducted in the fall (second) semester of the academic year in Japan.

I multicode students' goals, and compared the proportions of each goal in the total number of students' goals. I analyzed the data impressionistically from my emic perspective as a teacher. In this sense, the present study is my narrative inquiry. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) argue that:

Education and educational studies are a form of experience.... Experience happens narratively. Narrative inquiry is a form of narrative experience. Therefore, educational experience should be studied narratively” (pp.18-19).

5. RESULTS

Table 2 shows the number of students' goals by the goal category and percentages of each category per the total number of goals ($N = 102$).

Table 2: Total Number and Percentage of Each Goal in Taxonomy

Type of Goals	<i>n</i>	%
Language/Spelling	9	9%
Language/Vocabulary	5	5%
Language/Grammar	8	8%

Rhetoric/Logic and Ideas	22	22%
Rhetoric/Organization	13	13%
Composing Processes/Writing Speed	8	8%
Composing Process/Planning	0	0%
Composing Process/Editing and Revising	0	0%
General Improvement	10	10%
Content or Topic	18	18%
Use of Tools	2	2%
Genre	0	0%
Understand the Culture	0	0%
Communication with Readers	7	7%
no goal	14	14%
Total Number (<i>T</i>)	102	100%

I multicode students' goals; the mean of the number of goals that students set was 1.0 and the standard deviation was .7. Therefore, almost all students (89 of 103 students, 86%) set at least one goal for the writing task in the present study. Students set rhetoric goals (Logic and Ideas; Organization) most ($n = 35$, 34%). Goals for Language (Spelling; Vocabulary; Grammar) had the second larger proportion ($n = 22$, 22%). Content or Topic Goals accounted for 18 % of students' goals. However, among the 103 students, 14 students (14%) did not write any goals for the task.

In the present study, the categories, Composing Process/Planning, Composing Process/Editing and Revising, Genre, and Understand the Culture, were not chosen by any of the participants.

6. DISCUSSION

6.1 Influence of Instruction

In the current study, EFL freshmen set rhetoric goals for a writing task the most (34%). This outcome might be attributed to the instruction just before the writing task, which focused on rhetorical knowledge (i.e., organization and topic sentences). The results are consistent with the results of previous studies of L2 writing goals (Cumming, 2006d; Cumming et al., 2002). Writing instruction can affect L2 learners' goals.

Cumming et al. (2002) reported that their participants set language (vocabulary and grammar) and strategies (planning, editing, or writing quickly) goals as immediate goals for L2 writing. Students in the present study set much fewer strategic goals than linguistic goals. One of the reasons might be attributed to the research design in the present study. In my study, immediately *after* students received the instructions for brainstorming and planning and considered answers to the nine questions, which was a preparatory activity for the writing task, I asked students to set goals (see Table 1). This may explain why no students in the present study set goals of Composing Process/ Planning.

With regard to the goals, Composing Process/Editing and Revising, the absence of instructions for editing and revising *before* the writing task might have influenced the results in the present study (i.e., no participant selection of the goals, Composing Process/ Editing and Revising).

6.2 Writing to Learn

Importantly, a relatively large number of students set as their goals the content or topic of the writing task (i.e., important experience). The result shows that some participants tried to write to enhance their command of the topic or the content of the writing tasks. Nelson (2001) argues that “writers gain command of a topic through written engagement with the topic” (p.23). Langer and Applebee (1987) conducted research on learning from writing and suggested that “writing supports more complex thinking and learning about the subjects that students are expected to learn” (p.151). In

the current study, some students tried to remember or reflect on their important experience (the topic of the essay) through writing (see examples in Appendix B). Writing instructors should carefully select prompts for writing because prompts related to certain topics may influence students' thought and cognition.

6.3 Students Without Goals

Notably, a large number of students (14%) did not write any goals for the writing task. Possible explanations include the participants not understanding what they should do (the procedures of the present study) or not having any goals for the task. As reviewed earlier, learners' goals are positively related to motivation and learning outcomes. Students without goals might have been demotivated students. Further research on students with no goals (e.g., interviews with students without goals) is needed with regard to the relation between their motivation and the outcome of their writing.

6.4 Goals for Communication with Readers

Although the proportion was small (7%), some students were conscious of their audience. For example, Yasushi (pseudonym) wrote as his goal "To show the reader the importance of peace and the danger of nuclear weapons."

Unlike Sasaki's study (in press), the present study does not examine what kind of readers were in writers' minds. Sasaki distinguished the following audiences in writers' minds: L2-related community, Imagined L2-related community, and Imagined non-L2 related community. I guess that Yasushi referred to his classmates and me (his teacher) as the reader in his goal because the content-based courses encouraged students to interact in class with regard to topics that they studied. The Language Learning Strategies class was Yasushi's last content-based course in the academic year, so no other content-based teachers had a chance to read his composition in a common portfolio file. Alternatively, Yasushi might have imagined an audience in a larger

community (e.g., out of class). Personally, I was very impressed by his essay (Appendix C) and as “a real reader” in terms of Leki, (Leki, 1990, p.59), I considered world peace while reading his composition. His writing reminded me of my grandmother and two aunts who were killed in the Tokyo Air-raid in March 1945. In this respect, he was successful in the attainment of his goal. Consciousness of audience is important for L2 development (Sasaki, in press). Further research on the orientation of L2 writers’ goals to communication should be conducted for the benefits of L2 writing instruction in both ESL and EFL contexts.

7. CONCLUSION

The present study examined 103 EFL university students’ goals for just one type of writing task. The study did not investigate the outcomes of each student’s goals (e.g., the quality of students’ written text). Furthermore, this study did not consider the influence of the other English courses including the other content-based courses which participants took. Longitudinal studies within a larger framework that Cumming (2006a) used (e.g., using activity theory) are needed in a foreign language context to examine the relation between goals and L2 learning or writing. In spite of limitations, the present study shows the importance of instructions before students engage in a writing task and the importance of selection of prompts for writing because previous instructions and prompts can influence FL writers’ goals for a writing task and their cognition of the writing topic. Writing teachers should notice that L2 writers not only set language and/or writing goals (e.g., composing process) but also topic-learning and/or communication goals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to students who volunteered to participate in this study. I would like to thank the editor and the reviewer for their valuable comments and suggestions. I am solely responsible for any shortcomings of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A., & Cervone, D. (1983). Self-evaluative and self-efficacy mechanisms governing the motivational effects of goal systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*, 1017-1028.
- Boscolo, P. (1990). The construction of expository text. *First Language*, *10*, 217-230.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cumming, A. (1986). Intentional learning as a principle for ESL writing instruction: A case study. *TESL Canada Journal, Special Issue*(1), 69-83.
- Cumming, A. (1998). Theoretical perspectives on writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *18*, 61-78.
- Cumming, A. (2001). Learning to write in a second language: Two decades of research. *International Journal of English Studies*, *1*(2), 1-24.
- Cumming, A. (2006a). Context and design of the research. In A. Cumming (Ed.), *Goals for academic writing ESL students and their instructors* (pp. 21-28). Amsterdam: The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Cumming, A. (2006b). Implications for pedagogy, policy, and research. In A. Cumming (Ed.), *Goals for Academic Writing ESL students and their instructors* (pp. 159-173). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Cumming, A. (2006c). Introduction, purpose, and conceptual foundations. In A. Cumming (Ed.), *Goals for Academic Writing ESL students and their instructors* (pp. 1-17). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Cumming, A. (Ed.). (2006d). *Goals for academic writing ESL students and their instructors*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

- Cumming, A., Busch, M., & Zhou, A. (2002). Investigating learners' goals in the context of adult second-language writing. In S. Ransdell & M. Barbier (Eds.), *New directions for research in L2* (pp. 189-208). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001a). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001b). New themes and approaches in second language motivation research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 43-59.
- Dornyei, Z. (2001c). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Essex, England: Pearson Education.
- Dornyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, orientations, and motivations in language learning: Advances in theory, research, and applications. *Language Learning*, 53(1), 3-32.
- Gutierrez, K. D., & Stone, L. D. (2000). Synchronic and diachronic dimensions of social practice: An emerging methodology for cultural historical perspectives on literacy learning. In C. D. Lee & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research* (pp. 150-164). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffmann, A. (1998). An exploratory study of goal setting and the nature of articulated goals in second language writing development. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 4, 33-48.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2001). Factors relating to EFL writers' discourse level revision skills. In R. M. Manchon (Ed.), *Writing in the L2 classroom. Issues in research and pedagogy. Special issue of International Journal of English Studies 1* (2) (pp. 71-101).
- Kojima, T. (2006, September 26). Kojima Takako's Career Start Q & A. *Asahi Shinbun*, p. 5.
- Langer, J. A., & Applebee, A. N. (1987). *How writing shapes thinking: A study of teaching and learning*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 57-68). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Leki, I. (1995). Coping strategies of ESL students in writing tasks across the curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 235-260.
- Leont'ev, A. (1979). The problem of activity in psychology. In J. Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 37-71). Armonk, NY: Sharpe.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1994). Goal setting theory. In H. F. O'Neil & M. Drillings (Eds.), *Motivation: Theory and research* (pp. 13-29). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 705-717.
- Nassaji, H., & Cumming, A. (2000). What's in a ZPD? A case study of a young ESL student and teacher interacting through dialogue journals. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 95-121.
- Nelson, N. (2001). Writing to learn: One theory, two rationales. In P. Tynjala & M. Lucia & L. Kirsti (Eds.), *Writing as a learning tool: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 23-36). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Oxford, R. L., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 12-28.
- Polio, C. (2003). Research on second language writing: An overview of what we investigate and how. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 35-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sasaki, M. (2004). A multiple-data analysis of the 3.5-year development of EFL student writers. *Language Learning*, 54(3).
- Sasaki, M. (in press). Changes in EFL students' writing over 3.5 years: A socio-cognitive account. In R. M. Manchon (Ed.), *Learning, teaching, and researching in foreign language contexts*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Sasaki, M., & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory variables for EFL students' expository writing. *Language Learning*, 46(1), 137-174.

- Silva, T., Reichelt, M., Chikuma, Y., Duval-Couetil, N., J., M. R., Velez-Rendon, G., & Wood, S. (2003). Second language writing up close and personal: Some success stories. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 93-114). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spack, R. (1997). The acquisition of academic literacy in a second language. *Writing Communication, 14*(1), 3-62.
- Ushioda, E. (1998). Effective motivational thinking: A cognitive theoretical approach to the study of language learning motivation. In E. A. Soler & V. C. Espurz (Eds.), *Current issues in English language methodology* (pp. 77-89). Castello de la Plana, Spain: Universitat Jaume I.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2008). Goal setting: A key proactive source of academic self-regulation. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 267-295). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (1997). Developmental phases in self-regulation: Shifting from process to outcome goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 29-36.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2008). Motivation: An essential dimension of self-regulated learning. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 1-30). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Appendix A

Schedule of My Class (Language Learning Strategies)

Week 1: Introduction/Setting Goals

Week 2: Speaking

Week 3: Listening

Week 4: Writing

Week 5: Reading and Vocabulary

Week 6: Summary and Self-Reflection

Final Examination

Self-assessment/Self-reflection

Portfolio Submission

Appendix B

Taxonomy of Goals adapted from Cumming et al. (2002, pp.22-24)

1. Language
 - Language/Spelling
 - Yuriko: I will not make any spelling mistakes.
 - Takako: I will reduce misspelling.
 - Language/Vocabulary
 - Yumi: And I also want to increase vocabulary through writing long story [sic].
(a long story)
 - Mamoru: I want to use appropriate vocabulary.
 - Language/Grammar
 - Akiko: I'd like to be careful about grammar.
 - Masumi: Improve my English grammer's skill [sic]. (grammar's)
2. Rhetoric
 - Rhetoric/Logic and Ideas
 - Miyuki: I want to write a passage with logical development.
 - Sayuri: I want to write paying more attention to logical development.
 - Rhetoric/Organization
 - Yasuko: I want to be conscious of organization of English writting [sic].
(writing)
 - Rie: I also want to be careful with organization of English writing and topic sentence.
3. Composing Process
 - Composing Process/Logic and Ideas
 - Hiroshi: I'd like to finish this assignment until time limit.
 - Yasuko: I want to finish writing this essay in 30 minutes.
 - Composing Process/Planning [no examples coded]
 - Composing Process/Editing and Revising [no examples coded]
4. General Improvement
 - Hiroshi: I'm not good at writing, so I want to improve my English skill.
 - Aya: proving English skill.
5. Content or Topic

Tomoko: I would like to retrace past events, know what I learned and how that experience helped me.

Naoki: I'll write to remember the most painful event.

6. Use of Tools

Miho: I'd like to write the sentences fluently, and **try not to use a dictionary as much as I can.**

Toshio: To write English without dictionary [sic]. (a dictionary)

7. Genre [no examples coded]

8. Understand the Culture [no examples coded]

9. Communication with Readers

Yasushi: To show the reader the importance of peace and the danger of nuclear weapons.

Hiroko: Through this writing, I will understand the importance of my experience again, and **want others to know what I acquired from this experience.**

[Students' names are pseudonyms. I typed spelled words and grammatical errors as they were. I made some parts bold-faced to clarify.]

Appendix C

Yasushi's Essay about Important Experience (Subtitle: How important is peace?)

[I typed misspelled words and grammatical errors as they were.]

Have you every felt the importance of peace? Probably, most people in Japan can not feel it directly. I couldn't feel how peace is important until I visited Nagasaki.

In September 2007, I traveled around Kyushu area and stopped off at Nagasaki city for just sightseeing. I visited the atomic-bomb museum at the central part of the city. There, I looked at the exhibitions. After looking at them, I met a old woman. She asked me the way to the exhibitions and I told her how to go there. While talking, she and I became very friendly and she told me many things about Nagasaki. She was born in the city and has lived for more than 70 years. Of course she knows much about the A-bomb which destroyed the city in 1945. She said her elder brother was killed by the bomb and his picture is displayed in the musium. I was very impressed by her story. I had never thought I could talk to a survivor of the bomb before I came to Nagasaki. I felt how important peace is indeed.

After returning from Nagasaki, my point of view toward the WWII changed radically. For me, the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasak which was caused by A-bombs

is not just a historical fact. The tragedy came close to me. I can feel how A-bombs are dangerous and peace is important because I could talk to the woman who experienced the tragedy directly.

However, there are some problems: how citizen people can act to remove the present nuclear weapons and how can the tragedy of war be handed down to the future generations. I feel powerless in removing nuclear weapons from the world. The woman in Nagasaki said people in Nagasaki feel that their movemets for peace might be meaningless.

So what should we do?