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Abstract

An alternative but not often used approach to traditional writing feedback is the technique of reformulation. Reformulation moves beyond surface levels of error correction, providing a deeper level of feedback to L2 writers. In reformulation, a native speaker rewrites a learner's writing to make it sound native-like while preserving the original meaning. The present study examines reformulation's benefits and disadvantages for L2 learning and affective response. The researcher examined her own L2 Korean writing and her affective response to the reformulation process through examining six native speaker reformulations of her writing. Throughout, the researcher/learner kept a diary of noticed changes made in these reformulations and her own positive and negative emotional responses. She identified a list of 16 items that were changed in reformulated versions of her writing. Native speaker evaluation showed that when she applied these 16 changes in rewriting another letter, the result was an improvement over the original. Native speakers also judged a new letter composed with attention to these 16 items as an improvement over earlier letters. The researcher/learner’s affective responses to this process were mixed, and included feelings of frustration, discouragement, and threat to voice, but also feelings of control in the learning process and excitement at understanding native speaker variation. While aspects of reformulation were challenging, the learner was able to benefit from the process in terms of increased awareness of weaknesses in L2 writing and acquiring strategies to improve L2 writing. Reformulation needs to be further examined as a self-study or teaching tool inside or outside of classrooms.
An Introspective Study on an Intermediate Korean Learner’s Experience Using Reformulation: Noticing the Gap and Improving Writing

Written feedback in second language acquisition (SLA) is a topic that is very important to educators. It is also an area with many divergent opinions on how effective written corrective feedback is and what types of feedback represent best practices. Many studies support the idea of teacher feedback on writing being useful in helping students to learn and improve future writing, at least in certain contexts (e.g. Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener, 2012; Ferris, 1995; Polio, 2012; Sheen, 2007; Shintani, Ellis, & Suzuki, 2013). However, other researchers have posited that much of the feedback teachers provide in classrooms is limited in efficacy. According to Truscott (1996, 2007) error correction can actually have negative effects on student accuracy in later writing, and any possible benefits of error correction are small at best. Other studies hold that the written feedback teachers give is often inadequate or confusing. Zamel (1985) observed the written feedback provided by 15 ESL teachers of composition and identified that teachers tended to give feedback on surface-level problems to the exclusion of feedback on the text as a whole. The criticism of written feedback and conflict in research shows that there is a present need to continue to explore this topic and consider what approaches to written feedback might contribute to improvement of student learning.

One alternative to more typically surface-level written feedback was first proposed by Levenston (1978) and continued to be explored in practice by Cohen (1983a,b,c). In reformulation, a second language (L2) learner's writing is rewritten by a native speaker (NS) of the target language (TL) in a way that transforms the writing to sound as native-like as possible while retaining all of the original ideas. As a part this process, a step prior to reformulation called reconstruction is applied to the piece of writing. In reconstruction, a learner's writing is checked
for surface-level errors like grammar and spelling. This step consists of both *plausible reconstruction* (without the writer's feedback on intended meaning) and *authoritative reconstruction* (with the writer's feedback on intended meaning) (Corder, 1974). By making surface level corrections, a reconstructed version of the piece of writing is created. This reconstructed version should ideally be grammatically correct, but it may still contain language that would sound strange or unnatural to a native speaker. In the process, this reconstructed is then reformulated by a native speaker, meaning that the native speaker converts this error-free but awkward piece of writing into what they as a native speaker deem to be natural sounding language. Reformulation goes beyond mistakes to address issues like style and cohesion. Native speakers retain the original ideas of the writing, but may otherwise make alterations as necessary at lexical, syntactic, and discourse levels.

Support for reformulation from SLA theory can be found in the comprehensible output hypothesis (Swain, 1985) and the noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990, 2001). The comprehensible output hypothesis argues that output is a part of learning because learners identify their own limitations when they attempt to produce language that can be understood by an interlocutor. Identifying these limits then pushes the learner to expand current knowledge (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). The noticing hypothesis argues that in order for a second language form to be acquired, it first has to be noticed. According to this hypothesis, a learner cannot learn, even when corrected, if the difference between the original form and the corrected form is not noticed. In a study of Schmidt's own learning of Portuguese as an L2, this idea was emphasized by the claim that "those who notice most, learn most" (Schmidt & Frota, 1986, p. 313). The analysis process in reformulation forces learners to use both output and noticing as a part of language learning. Learners attempt to produce comprehensible output in the TL and then
analyze reformulations to notice the gap between their own output and native speaker reformulation. This process of finding differences between versions could also be described as "cognitive comparison" (Ellis, 1995). Tasks that promote cognitive comparison are highly valuable to learners as "cognitive comparisons serve as a mechanism for disconfirming or confirming hypotheses in implicit knowledge" (p. 90).

Reformulation, sometimes thought of as an extended written recast\(^1\), has several benefits. Cohen (1983a) suggests that reformulation motivates students to examine and compare writing because "the nonnatives are able to feel that the essay is still theirs" (p. 6). While the extent of teacher markings in traditional feedback can be demotivating to learners of an L2, and students can be confused and have trouble identifying what about their writing is problematic based on teacher comments (Hyland, 1998), reformulation avoids these issues because learners receive clear examples of what native-like writing could look like, and they can search for examples of what worked in their original writing and what changed from their original writing. Qi and Lapkin (2001) believe reformulation gives learners agency, in that "it provides relevant TL structures to allow the learner to appropriate from them according to his/her own needs and interests and to the context they themselves provided for a particular writing task" (p. 282). The implication of this learner-driven characteristic of reformulation is that reformulation provides learners with the information they are ready to notice at their L2 level. While much of the information in the reformulations may likely go unnoticed or noticed without understanding, the learner can selectively give attention to those changes appropriate to proficiency. Qi and Lapkin go on to explain that reformulation is also beneficial in balancing form and content material and providing second language forms within meaningful contexts for the learners.

\(^1\) "Reformulations may be thoughts of an extended written recast, in that they provide both implicit negative evidence that some form was non-targetlike as well as positive evidence of how
Beyond the theoretical justification, several studies have found empirical positive outcomes using reformulation. In one of his early studies, Cohen (1983c) first conducted a case study of his own learning of Hebrew as a second language as a pilot study and then conducted a small study of seven non-native speakers of English and six non-native speakers of Hebrew. Cohen found that reformulation provided more information to learners than reconstruction, and students had largely positive reactions to reformulations, citing that having a complete model of native writing was valuable.

Swain and Lapkin (2002) used reformulation with two seventh grade French immersion learners. After receiving a reformulation of a story they had written together, students highlighted differences between reformulations and originals, participated in a stimulated recall where they commented on the noticed changes, and were given the opportunity to make changes to their original stories. Swain and Lapkin found that the students increased their accuracy on the original stories when given a chance, benefitting from talking through the changes even when they ultimately rejected reformulations. Swain and Lapkin concluded from this that reformulation in their study was "an effective technique for stimulating noticing and reflection on language" (p. 298).

In another study, Ibarrola (2009) examined the writings of two pre-intermediate ESL students who were native speakers of Spanish and found that reformulation was more effective in helping students notice errors than self-correction. Adams (2003) similarly found reformulation to be effective in her study of 56 learners of Spanish as an L2 in university level Intermediate 1 or Intermediate Intensive classes. Adams found that students were able to successfully notice differences in reformulations of their writing.
In another study, through modifying and limiting reformulation, Fjelstad (2003) was able to successfully use this tool with lower level learners in the classroom context. Fjelstad (2003) used reformulation as a part of what she called “written recast” in the classroom with a group of pre-community college learners of ESL, first as a pilot study and then with a group of 17 students. Fjelstad used a multi-step process that included giving some early content-eliciting feedback and then combining reconstruction and reformulation into one “written recast” stage in the process. She also recast only the first half of student essays and had students apply what they had learned in the second half of their essays. She repeated this process in the classroom three times over three months. Fjelstad found that "all 17 students showed at least one positive indicator of improvement as a result of multiple exposures to written recasts" (p. 66). She also found that students that were initially overwhelmed by the process seemed to be less so with repeated exposure. Moreover, Fjelstad found that the written recast process "was an extremely motivating writing tool for students, which gave them occasion to take their initial writing as well as the process of rewriting seriously" (p. 70).

Gilbert's (1996) diary study of her own experiences using reformulation as a low-intermediate learner of German as a Second Language focused on the learning opportunities and motivational impacts a learner experiences while utilizing reformulation. Gilbert wrote and reconstructed four essays. For each essay, she then analyzed the differences between the reconstructed version and the reformulations completed by three different native speakers of German. She categorized each change between reconstructed essays and reformulated essays as vocabulary, syntax, cohesion, or discourse function and tried to hypothesize a reason for each change. During the process, Gilbert kept a diary of her feelings and responses, with attention to factors influencing her motivation as a learner. In asking what her analysis of diary entries could
"reveal about the insights or breakthroughs a low-intermediate learner experiences through studying reformulations" (p. 17), Gilbert found that she improved her understanding of native-like choices and gained "a heightened sensitivity toward different writing styles among the three German reformulators" (p. 17). She described the cognitive conflict that arose when reformulator changes differed and identified value in being able to compare separate reformulations. Having three sets of reformulations enabled her to allocate more attention to changes that appeared in more than one reformulation. She also identified what she called "poetic license", or changes that seemed to be "prompted by a reformulator's personal style or preference rather than by nonnativeness and which could be exercised more or less on a whim" (p. 44). While Gilbert found her increased awareness of native speaker variation to be a positive outcome of reformulation, it also helped her to see one possible confounding variable in her study: the Americanization of the language produced by certain reformulators. The reformulator in her study who had spent six years living in the U.S. as a student prior to the study seemed to be more tolerant of language use that was changed by other reformulators.

In analyzing factors of motivation through examining her diary entries, Gilbert noted the pronounced impact of personal factors outside of the actual process of reformulation on her motivation. In her case, personal factors were particularly prominent, as she had lost her mother shortly after beginning her study. However, she also identified various other factors influencing her motivation. While she was demotivated by the intensity and volume of work presented by the task of analyzing all twelve reformulations, and she noted that the number of changes made by reformulators became frustrating, eliciting some resistance toward the NS corrections, she also identified many positive motivational factors. She described her own desires to advance in the language as being highly motivating along with her own perception of success after being
complimented by reformulators. She found her amount of contact with native speakers, and the increase in amount of L2 in her life to be motivating. Perhaps most relevant to reformulation specifically, Gilbert reported being highly motivated by her perception of value and fascination with the process of reformulation itself and the opportunity to use what she was learning.

Despite the studies showing positive outcomes from reformulation, there are a number of studies that have found reformulation to be less effective than other forms of feedback. Cohen (1983b) compared a group of 26 advanced students in an intensive Hebrew as a Second Language class that received teacher-feedback and a similar group of 27 students that received reformulations. The students all wrote and received feedback on 3 essays over an 8-week period as a part of their language course. Cohen found that students that received teacher-feedback improved more, and students that received reformulations struggled to understand the corrections without guidance from an instructor.

In a more recent study, Sachs and Polio (2007) conducted a repeated measure experiment with 15 adult, intermediate to intermediate-high learners of English and another non-repeated measure experiment with 54 adult learners of ESL with varying language levels. Both groups included international students in the U.S. with various native languages who were largely preparing to study at the college level, and the studies took place within the classroom contexts. Sachs and Polio found that learners created more accurate revisions in the error correction conditions than in the reformulation conditions. Furthermore, even though Ibarrola (2013) found in her study of 16 native Spanish speaking learners of EFL that students who received reformulations were more successful at error detection than students who did self-correction only, neither group progressed beyond understanding sentence level errors.
In addition to the presence of studies showing both positive and negative results, a further complexity in reformulation is the fact that there is likely not a simple yes or no solution to whether or not it is a useful method of feedback; instead, the context and the level of learners need to be considered. For example, some believe reformulation is not appropriate for lower-level learners. Cohen (1983a) described reformulation as being useful for intermediate-level learners and up, adding, "it may have its greatest impact among advanced-level students who are looking to really perfect their second-language writing skills, particularly in some area of language for special purposes" (p. 5). Reformulation gives learners opportunities to receive input more authentic to actual native language, rather than "patch-up" corrections often found in teacher feedback (Cohen, 1983b, p. 2), meaning that learners receive an actual example of native speaker language communicating the idea rather than feedback on how individual items in sentences the nonnative writing could be changed to better approach nativeness. This reformulation feedback might be very useful to those learners who have mastered some of the lower-level concerns and need to explore ways to progress their writing beyond the intermediate level, where it is not uncommon for learners to become fossilized (Cohen, 1983b). Reformulation then is sometimes thought of as less effective for lower level learners because they might not understand on their own the corrections present in reformulations, and more explicit feedback could be more accessible at their level (Mantello, 1997; Qi & Lapkin, 2001). Yet, four of the studies discussed earlier used reformulation successfully with intermediate and lower learners, showing that it may be a useful tool for these learners in at least some contexts (Adams, 2003; Fjelstad, 2003; Gilbert, 1996; Ibarrola, 2009).

Additionally, an exploration of reformulation as a feedback technique has to take into account the practical challenges. Although it has been studied in the field of SLA for more than
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30 years, reformulation is seldom utilized in SL instruction. One obstacle to the use of reformulation is that creating reformulations is a time demanding endeavor on the part of the NSs involved. A teacher would struggle to reformulate an entire class of students' essays, and students may have a hard time finding NSs to help them outside of the classroom. Then, once students have the reformulations, the cognitive demand and time required to recognize and analyze the differences between their own writing and the NS reformulation of their writing is considerable. These demands deter the use of reformulation in classrooms. For example, even though Ibarolla (2009) found that reformulation produced higher rates of noticing errors, she still concluded that self-correction was better in terms of practical classroom application.

Nevertheless, there are examples of reformulation being utilized effectively in classrooms. One pattern found in literature is the modification of reformulation for classroom use. For example, Fjelstad (2003) reformulated only part of students' writing and had students apply what they noticed to the latter half of their writing. Alternatively, Allwright et al. (1988) suggested using reformulation on just one document that could be examined by the whole class.

While reformulation is a practice not commonly used in classrooms, it has been demonstrated to have high potential. As such, it needs to continue to be explored with respect to multiple perspectives including use with different TLs and learners with different educational backgrounds. Understanding the value and challenges of this technique as a learner, including the affective experiences, is essential to truly understanding the benefits and obstacles to utilizing reformulation as an instructor of a second language. Student perspectives need to continue to be explored through diary studies like that conducted by Gilbert in order to truly understand the balance of costs and benefits associated with the process and consider in which context of SLA reformulation might best fit.
While Gilbert's 1996 diary study described both the types of changes present in reformulation and the personal factors of motivation, the study stopped at analysis of reformulations and did not examine how those changes noticed in reformulations could be applied in later writing or the further affective implications of trying to use these noticed forms. Furthermore, Gilbert applied an a priori categorization system in analyzing the changes reformulators made to her writing that, while useful in providing quantifiable data on the amount and types of feedback made available to learners through reformulation, really investigates reformulation through the lens of a researcher rather than through the lens of a learner. The problem this creates is that it shifts the focus of the study from the learner perspective to the researcher perspective by investigating the data with respect to how it fits into an analysis framework rather than what aspects of the data are salient and useful to the language learner.

The current study uses a diary study design modeled in part after Gilbert's (1996) study, but with a qualitative analysis more authentic to what I found useful as a language learner instead of as a researcher. In this way, my decisions in what to investigate were directed by what I found interesting or enlightening as a language learner instead of giving equal time to all changes to find categorizations that would yield quantifiable results. In this way, I selectively gave my attention to what I believed would be useful to my language learning; a strategy that is more realistic to how a language learner outside of a research scenario would likely use reformulation. Additionally, the current study extends Gilbert's design to investigate applying noticed changes from reformulations in later writing to test if the learner is able to use noticed changes to make improvements and to follow the learning process that continues as the learner tests hypotheses formed from cognitive comparison. The diary study then also continues to explore the learner's affective experience past noticing and into the further challenge of trying to apply insights
gleaned from reformulations in future writing. Beyond methodological changes, the current study also adds to present literature by examining the perspective of a learner of Korean as a second language, a TL that, to my knowledge, has not been well explored in reformulation research. Furthermore, the current study is conducted with a learner whose experience with learning the TL has included very little formal, direct education on the TL; little is known about how such a learner might cope with reformulation as a form of feedback on L2 writing.

**Methods**

This study was originally designed as a replication of Gilbert's (1996) study. However, over the course of identifying my own specific areas of interest as an intermediate level, non-traditional learner of Korean in the process of reformulation and to further determine whether or not changes noticed in reformulations could be used to produce positive change in my later writing, the methodology of the original study was altered. The resulting methodology included Gilbert’s original reconstruction and reformulation process as accurately as they could be reproduced in a different context, but the method of analysis in the reformulation process was changed to better answer the research questions below:

1. What insights can a mid-intermediate learner of Korean with a non-traditional language learning background gain through studying reformulations of her L2 writing?
2. Does the learner use identified reformulated forms to improve later writing?
3. What is the learner’s affective experience during the process of reformulation?

**Participants**

**Learner.** The focus of the study was on my own Korean L2 writing, so it is important to understand my background as a learner. I have never been a traditional learner of Korean, in that I had never taken a formal Korean language class until I was able to audit a fourth semester

---

2 In this case, non-traditional refers to the fact that the vast majority of my Korean language learning has been outside of classrooms and without teacher instruction.
Korean class in the semester preceding the start of this study. Most of my Korean language education came instead from living in Korea as a teacher of English for a period of two years and studying on my own from Korean textbooks and cultural materials.

When I first arrived in Korea in August 2009, I would describe my Korean level as very basic. I had learned some Korean expressions through an audio lesson series, and I had learned the Korean Hangeul alphabet system and read through a few chapters of an introductory book. During my two years in Korea, I lived far enough away from Seoul and other large cities that I did not have contact with many native speakers of English, but I still had the ability to live pretty comfortably only speaking English as I had a network of Korean English teachers and several Korean friends with some English proficiency. However, I felt strongly that learning some Korean was an important part of the cultural experience of living abroad, so I committed a large part of my free time there to studying Korean from self-study textbooks, Korean songs, and Korean storybooks. I also participated in several language exchanges off and on.

That being said, I rarely had full conversations in Korean, but rather I used a combination of English and Korean in many scenarios to get by in life. I never had to actually rely on my Korean ability in daily life as I lived in a small town in which many people recognized me and gave me a lot of help in difficult situations. In looking back, I consider my living environment in South Korea to have been fairly ideal in terms of support and feeling welcomed, but perhaps less than ideal in terms of language learning.

Upon returning to the U.S., I rarely had contact with Korean speakers, and despite my intentions to continue with my Korean studies, I quickly became distracted and busy and lost some of my motivation for studying Korean. I continued to occasionally study Korean, but for two years I did not speak the language or do more than simply review some of my old Korean
books every few months. It was not until I entered graduate school at the University of Minnesota in fall 2013, a little more than two years after returning from Korea, that I resumed my Korean studies on a regular basis. While I did not have time to take any classes, I tried to improve my level through participating in a language exchange program in which I practiced conversational Korean with native speakers. I also studied the intermediate textbooks recommended by the director of the Korean program at the university. At the same time, I began using a Korean language learning application with recorded Korean dialogs to get more practice with listening comprehension. Eventually, in spring 2015 I was able to audit a 4th semester Korean class. Due to my schedule, I was only able to attend about 50% or less of the classes, but I tried to keep up with the homework and participated in all testing. At the end of the spring semester, I attained an ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview computer (OPIc) score of intermediate-mid and a Test of Proficiency in Korean (TOPIK) score in the high Level 1 range: 134/200. I do not have formal testing results prior to these, but in fall 2013 the director of the Korean language program at the University of Minnesota had evaluated my Korean level as being between advanced beginner and intermediate low. Overall, based on my past experiences, I would say that my language ability is higher in terms of communicative competence, reflected in the ACTFL score of intermediate-mid, but lower in other skills.

Korean Informants. The current research would not have been possible without the help of my Korean friends and colleagues who contributed to the reconstruction process and the reformulation process, gave feedback on my hypotheses concerning forms I noticed through the reformulation process, and evaluated the effectiveness of the Korean language insights I applied in subsequent writing. All the informants in the study were native speakers of Korean. I tried to work with female Korean speakers as much as possible to avoid any complications from gender
based language differences. However, because I had trouble finding enough women to help with every step of the process I did get feedback from a Korean man on reformulation changes I noticed, and the success of applying these items in my self-reformulation. With that exception, virtually all of the writing and correction stages of the process were completed with the help of only female informants. A summary description of my Korean informants is provided in Table A.

Table A: Korean Informants in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name*</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>English Experience</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyeri</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>A graduate student in a U.S. university</td>
<td>Reconstructor of letters 1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nari</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lived in Korea, had studied abroad in the U.S. for one year, had communicated in English in jobs</td>
<td>Reformulator of letters 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyuri</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>English teacher in Korea</td>
<td>Reformulator of letters 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeona</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>English teacher in Korea</td>
<td>Reformulator of letters 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daesung</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Undergraduate student in an American university</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dambi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Undergraduate student in an American university</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Graduate student in an American university</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* All names are pseudonyms.

**Data Collection**

In considering the possible content of the written material to be used for this study, I decided early on that informal letters written to a friend would be the most appropriate type of writing considering my educational background and proficiency level in Korean. Formal Korean
writing requires a very specific set of grammar and register rules, which I had not encountered given the very informal level of my Korean education. As most of my experience speaking and communicating through writing in Korean had been with friends, I chose to write personal letters to a Korean friend, Sora. Sora was a suitable candidate for the audience of the letter because she is a friend I am comfortable with and with whom I have shared experiences to discuss, but she was not used as an informant in this study because I do not have any method outside of physical mail to contact her. Choosing this type of writing and this audience was important because it would allow me to produce a written Korean document to communicate authentic meaning to a real audience. As part of the appeal of the reformulation process is that it ideally encourages more investment in the piece being revised because the meaning remains that of the language learner, I thought it was important to write about something that had meaning to me. It would also be fairly similar to the type of writing I already had some experience with and the type of communication that was most relevant to me, as I mostly used Korean as a form of communication with friends and not as a language for academic studies. Additionally, addressing the letter to a same-age friend was important because it allowed me to use informal language. I often struggle with some of the nuances of communication with people who are older or in higher status roles (like teachers) because Korean has many language rules requiring special attention when addressing a higher status audience. I thought this type of writing would be more comfortable for me in terms of focusing on the communication of ideas rather than polite status-conscious use of language and forms. Therefore, I communicated my own stories and experiences in the letters, trying to stay as close as possible to what I might actually communicate if I were writing in English. In the process of data collection, I wrote 4 such letters, created reconstructed versions for all 4, and collected 3 different reformulations for each of the
first 2 letters. Letters 1 and 2 were primarily used for gathering data to answer RQ1, and letters 3 and 4 were used to evaluate what I learned from letters 1 and 2 and answer RQ2.

In order to gather data on changes made in reformulations, I wrote rough drafts of letters 1, 2, and 3. For the reconstruction phase, I arranged face-to-face meetings with a Korean informant, Hyeri. In these meetings, Hyeri and I discussed her feedback on errors in the writing, and I created reconstructed versions of the letters based on the notes she and I wrote on the rough drafts during our meetings. The reconstructed versions of letters 1 and 2 were then sent to 3 native speakers of Korean for reformulation, and my initial analysis was based on those reformulations. Later, I applied what I learned from the reformulations of letters 1 and 2 to create a self-reformulation of Letter 3 to test my understanding of how the noticed insights from the reformulations could be applied in revising another piece of writing. Following this, I wrote a fourth letter utilizing what I had learned from working with reformulations of letters 1-3. Hyeri corrected surface-level errors, and I created a reconstructed version of letter 4. The process each letter went through is summarized in Table B.

Table B: Approximate Timeline of Study Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diary</th>
<th>Diary Start Date: July 12, Diary End Date: November 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rough Draft and Reconstruction of Letter 1-3</td>
<td>July 18: Letter 1 Rough Draft Completed, July 19: Letter 1 Reconstruction Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29: Letter 2 Rough Draft Completed and Reconstruction of Letter 2 Completed</td>
<td>August 7: Letter 3 Rough Draft Completed, August 8: Letter 3 Reconstruction Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformulation of Letter 1-2</td>
<td>August 7: Yeona's Reformulations of Letters 1 and 2 Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 10: Nari's Reformulations of Letters 1 and 2 Received</td>
<td>August 13: Gyuri's Reformulations of Letters 1 and 2 Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Reformulations</td>
<td>August 31 - October 20: Analysis of Reformulations of Letters 1 and 2 and Construction of Insights Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reformulation of Letter 3</td>
<td>Created Self-Reformulation of Letter 3: October 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rough drafts. The rough drafts of letters 1-3 were written over a period of about a month, from July 18th to August 7th of 2015. I did not set a time limit for my letter writing, but instead set a minimum word count of 250 words. I did not use any online translation tools to translate phrases or sentences, but I did use dictionaries and textbooks. I felt it was important to not restrict use of materials because I believed it was important that the letters I produced reflect my best effort to produce accurate language that was authentic to what I actually wanted to say in the language. A time limit would have limited the amount of content I was able to produce, and a restriction on dictionary and textbook use would have caused me to avoid discussing relevant events in my life that I simply did not have the vocabulary to describe. I set 250 words as my minimum for these letters since I thought this amount of text would give reformulators the opportunity to potentially produce a variety of changes that would not be overwhelming to either the reformulators or myself. In her 1996 study, Gilbert discussed in depth the fatigue of dealing with the reformulations of some of the longer letters she wrote (one was over 700 words), and I wanted to avoid this in my own experience with reformulation. The resulting rough draft letter lengths were: Letter 1 = 301 words, Letter 2 = 306 words, and Letter 3 = 261 words.

Reconstruction. After I wrote each rough draft of letters 1-3, I met with Hyeri to reconstruct the letters. In reconstruction, Hyeri and I worked in face-to-face meetings to go through the letters to look for mistakes in spelling, grammar, and word choice. The point of the reconstruction phase was to eliminate surface errors of spelling and grammar, but not to make the writing sound more natural. We struggled a little at first with determining how to complete this step. In the end, I asked Hyeri to suggest changes when the answer to any of the following three questions was yes: 1) Is the item grammatically wrong? 2) Does the item contain a
mistake? 3) Will the reformulators be unable to understand what is being said? Using these questions to direct the reconstruction process helped us to stay focused on surface-level accuracy. Additionally, I tried to prevent Hyeri's editing from usurping my voice by not letting her write whole new sentences without my input. Instead, if there were problems with sentence structure, Hyeri would point it out, and I would offer new sentence structures that she would either accept or reject as being incorrect. Additionally, in the case of word choice errors, Hyeri and I negotiated whenever possible on substituting another word that I knew instead of Hyeri correcting the issue independently. Negotiating these rules was important for limiting the reconstruction phase to only dealing with errors and preventing too much native speaker intervention on matters of style. I became especially cognizant of monitoring the process to make sure that there were no changes during reconstruction that were beyond my comprehension level.

It must be noted that reconstruction did happen in between each rough draft. This happened for two reasons. Firstly, reconstruction in between letter drafting was time efficient. Secondly, it spread out the time in between reconstruction sessions so that it was easier to meet with Hyeri for feedback. While this may have affected the quality of each new rough draft, I judged this acceptable as the rough draft and reconstruction phases were not the focus of the study.

After each meeting with Hyeri, I created reconstructed versions of the letters in which I made all the corrections that Hyeri had identified. The reconstructed versions of the letters were theoretically error free, though it became clear later that a few spelling errors and typos remained.

Reformulation. In this study, only letters 1 and 2 were reformulated by NSs. I first recruited three native speakers to be reformulators for the letters. I chose to only ask native
speaking women who were currently living in South Korea and had most of their educational experiences in Korea. This was done to avoid complications from either gender differences in language or Americanization of the native language that might result from spending a prolonged period of time using English in everyday life and academic contexts (see Gilbert, 1996).

All my contact with the reformulators was through email. I first sent the reformulators a sheet of instructions (Appendix A) on how to complete reformulations. I tried to emphasize to the reformulators that they should not simply correct the documents I was sending, but rather that they should look at the ideas in the letters and communicate the same ideas using more natural language. After the three reformulators (Yeona, Gyuri, and Nari) agreed to help with the process, I sent letters 1 and 2 to them separately, according to the schedule outlined in the directions in Appendix A.

Despite the directions, there was still some confusion in regards to the task. Yeona initially did both a reconstructed and a reformulated version of letter 1. In this case, I simply used the reformulated version and informed Yeona that she would not need to perform the reconstruction step in the next letter. In the case of Gyuri and Nari, both initially wrote their feedback on the same document as the reconstructed version I had sent them. In those cases, I reminded the reformulators of the instructions and asked them to re-create the reformulations in a separate document. At first I was very concerned about the quality of reformulations these misunderstandings would create, considering that reformulations could easily be limited in the amount of changes made if reformulators were simply editing the reconstructed version document. However, both reformulators made new versions in which they said they felt like they made all the changes they would want to, and the analysis revealed that the reformulations were changed substantially from the reconstructed versions.
**Identifying and using insights.** I gathered data on the insights I could from analyzing reformulations by recording what I noticed in my diary and making a log of insights. For the purposes of this paper, insights will be used to describe the patterns of change noticed when comparing native speaker reformulations of letters to my own reconstructed L2 writing.

In order to determine whether or not I could use what I noticed from the reformulations to make improvements in future writing, I attempted to apply the insights in two different ways. First I created a self-reformulated version of letter 3, which had already been reconstructed with the help of Hyeri. To create the self-reformulation I applied the insights from the log when possible to make changes to the letter. I then wrote a new letter, letter 4, using the insights and reconstructed that letter.

**Diary.** Throughout the process, I kept a diary of my experiences (See Appendix B). While I tried to record my own affective responses including motivation, cognitive fatigue, and frustration, I also recorded what I noticed in terms of changes made by native speakers and what those changes seemed to indicate about my Korean language use. The resulting diary followed my process in this study from the planning stages beginning on July 12, 2015 and followed through to my reflections on final native speaker evaluations, with the final entry recorded on November 10, 2015.

**Data Analysis**

In order to answer Research Question 1 (What insights can a mid-intermediate learner of Korean with a non-traditional language learning background gain through studying reformulations of her L2?), the first stage of analysis was conducted to determine what changes I was able to notice between my reconstructed text and the reformulations.
The original plan for the study was to conduct this data analysis using a linguistic categorization process similar to that described by Gilbert (1996), in which each change between a reconstructed letter and corresponding reformulation was marked and categorized as vocabulary, cohesion, syntax, or discourse change. While I completed analysis of the 6 reformulated versions of letters 1 and 2 using this process, it quickly became clear that the process was cumbersome and not optimal for me as a nontraditional learner in gathering information on specific insights I gained that might improve future letters, which was my goal. I did, however, find one aspect of Gilbert's analysis to be very useful. In comparing the reconstructed versions of letters 1 and 2 with their corresponding reformulations, I created side-by-side versions of the letters lined up by paragraph start points. This presentation of the letters greatly aided my ability to quickly see any dissimilarity between the versions of the letters and helped me to find common points when the letter structures were different in reformulations.

Throughout the earlier analysis process, I noted my observations about patterns of changes in my diary entries. After choosing to abandon Gilbert's categorization method of analysis, I decided to use a more qualitative approach to noting observed patterns, which relied on the observations I had noted in my diary. I created a log to list the general patterns I noticed. The log I created included a list of insights gleaned from the changes I noticed in reformulations, a description of what I noticed, my hypotheses for why the changes were made, and my plan for how to use the items in future writing (see Table C in Results section).

Throughout the process, I found it important to maintain my language learner perspective and autonomy by logging only the information I could understand and find a pattern in without

---

3 Although Gilbert's categorization method did not prove to be effective in terms of creating a bank of useful information for me as a learner, the time spent in doing the categorizations likely aided in my ability to qualitatively identify patterns, as I was very familiar with the letters after completing many hours of categorization.
outside assistance. I, therefore, avoided getting any feedback on the insights from native speakers of Korean until after I had completed recording all insights. I then eliminated any items that I could not find a justification or pattern for on my own. For example, I did notice that reformulators changed my use of prepositions several times, but I was unable to find a pattern in the changes on my own. I therefore deleted the item from my log. Of course, this log of the insights I gained through the process was not exhaustive. After all, noticing that there seems to be some problem with my use of prepositions and identifying that I need to seek out more help in this area is still an insight, even if it is not a usable observation in terms of immediate application. Many of my insights were deleted from the log because they were too limited, such as finding out a specific word I had been using did not fit the exact situation I was describing. Other insights I gained were too general to be applicable in future writing. For example, I learned that I needed to develop more complex vocabulary for specific types of situations or use more variety of vocabulary. Because I needed a way to manage the information I was discovering and narrow the information into a quantity that was manageable in moving forward to investigate the second research question, I chose to eliminate insights that were too specific or too general to immediately apply to my writing.

For each reformulation change, I included a description of the pattern behind the changes I thought I had noticed, a hypothesis about why the change may have been required or preferred in my letters, and a draft plan for how the forms might be used to improve the quality of my Korean writing in the future. Once this list was complete, I continued to examine the validity of my hypotheses and furthered my understanding of the changes by interviewing Daesung and Dambi. According to their feedback I then went through each item and altered my notes on the items and my plans for how to use them in the future to create a revised plan.
To answer Research Question 2 (Does the learner use identified forms to improve later writing?), I documented reformulation changes I noticed and used to first improve letter 3 and then to compose letter 4 and gathered evaluations from my informants as to my success.

As mentioned earlier, a reconstructed version of letter 3 had been constructed in the same time period as letters 1 and 2. I read through this reconstructed version of letter 3 and looked for places where the 16 insights in the log could be applied. Due to differences in the content and structures used in letter 3 compared with letters 1 and 2, I could not apply all of the noticed reformulation changes.

After applying the applicable reformulation insights to letter 3 to create a self-reformulation, I asked NS informants Daesung and Jessica to choose whether the reconstructed version of letter 3 or the self-reformulated version was better (less awkward and more natural). Neither letter was labeled in any way to show which letter was which, and I did not explain anything about the differences between the letters before asking for judgment on which was better.

As a final evaluation of whether I could apply the noticed reformulation changes to improve the overall quality of my Korean writing, I wrote a fourth letter trying log insights from the beginning of the writing process. I chose to emulate the content type of the first two letters by discussing past events. While I tried to write the letter in as natural a way as possible, I also made an effort to ensure that I used all of the log insights at least once in the rough draft of letter 4. I used the insights in the log according to the revised plans for use I constructed based on feedback from Dambi and Daesung. Similar to the composition of earlier letters, I did not set a time limit on my composition of letter 4, which was 301 words. I then went through the same
reconstruction process with Hyeri to find the errors in my writing. After getting Hyeri’s feedback, I created a reconstructed version of letter 4.

In order to determine if the log insights I applied to letter 4 created an overall improvement in the quality of my writing compared with earlier letters, I sent an email asking the original reformulators to read reconstructed versions of letters 1, 2, 3, and 4 and make a judgment on which letter they would choose as the best of the letters and why. I then asked for individual feedback on the use of the log insights.

To answer Research Questions 3 (What is the learner’s affective experience during the process of reformulation?), I examined my diary for entries that recorded my affective responses throughout the process of completing this study on reformulation. I re-read the full diary, marking expressions of positive feelings, like motivation or encouragement, in green and expressions of negative feelings, like frustration or worry, in red. I also wrote comments in the diary about how my ideas tied together or what patterns seemed to be present over time.

I analyzed what was happening when red (negative) or green (positive) experiences were recorded in the diary. I also analyzed how the positive and negative experiences corresponded to one another, i.e. whether the two happened together or separately and whether there was a balance or more of one than the other. I was not interested in trying to quantify these experiences, as doing so would likely not create an accurate picture of what I felt. Rather, through pulling out reoccurring themes in my affective experience, I tried to create a picture of my overall reaction and what aspects of reformulation were related to positive and negative responses.

Results

Research Question 1
What insights can a mid-intermediate learner of Korean with a non-traditional language learning background gain through studying reformulations of her L2 writing?

I was able to assemble a list of 16 insights representing the noticed changes in native speaker reformulations. After assembling the log, I conducted interviews with two Korean informants and made alterations to my log based on their feedback.

My native speaking informants, Dambi and Daesung, agreed with the majority of the log items and hypotheses. In most cases, they elucidated a justification for the reformulation changes that did not conflict with my own observations. They also made some additions in terms of voicing opinions on the relative importance of different forms and explaining when something was simply personal preference instead of a result of a rule. During the interviews, it was clear that the informants had different opinions on rules for the use of the different forms. Of the 16 noticed reformulation changes, informants gave extra information (which either added to my understanding or brought my previous understanding into question) on 11 items and simply confirmed or further explained 5 items.

After taking all feedback into consideration, I constructed revised plans for how the log items should be used to make my writing less awkward and non-native-like moving forward. Table C below summarizes the revised list of 16 insights including the description of the changes, my hypotheses for why the changes took place, my draft plans for how to apply the log items to improve future writing, and my revised plans after considering the feedback from my informants. If the comments from the informants were in agreement with what I had already noted and no revised plan was needed, this is indicated with three dashes (---). Each item is assigned a number in the table for easy reference.

Table C: Log of Sixteen Insights from Reformulation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use of &quot;I&quot; and &quot;You&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;I&quot;=나는 (naneun)/나가 (naega), &quot;You&quot;=너는(neoneun)/너가 (nega)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Change: Reformulators deleted most incidents of "I" and "You".
Hypothesis: In Korean, it is unnatural to use "I" and "You" as often as they are used in English.
Draft Plan: Omit "I" and "You" except where the identity cannot be inferred.
Revised Plan: ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Salutation: Hello, Sora.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hello&quot; (informal) = 안녕하세요(annyeong), &quot;Hello&quot; (formal) = 안녕히 계세요 (annyeong haseyo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change: &quot;Hello&quot; was changed from the formal version to the informal. The friendly particle was added to Sora's name, and the order was changed in some letters (&quot;Hello Sora&quot; - &quot;Sora hello&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis: The salutation (&quot;hello&quot;) needs to be in the same register as the rest of the letter, but other parts are flexible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Plan: Use Annyeong Sora like Yeona did in both of her letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Plan: Both informants preferred the version with the friendly ending - 요/ya but had different preferences for order of salutation and name. Therefore, I will use either Annyeong Sora-ya or Sora-ya annyeong (register consistent form, friendly particle in letter to friend, and order optional)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Double Past Tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double Past tense marker = 열여덟(-eosses)/-열아홉(-asseoss)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-I have since learned that this tense might be more accurately called the past perfect tense for Korean, but I learned it as the double past tense as 열/ is the simple past tense marker in Korean.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change: Reformulators deleted this form most of the times I used it and replaced it with simple past tense.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis: Simple past tense is more appropriate in most situations. Double past tense is only used to emphasize past and no longer pertinent information. It is awkward to use in a letter like this that talks about a series of past events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Plan: Avoid this form unless I want to add emphasis on the completeness of an action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Plan: Daesung added that using this form creates an expectation that there is some follow up information on the topic. Therefore, I altered the plan to be to use double past only when I want to talk about something that has changed and emphasize the part that is in the past.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>&quot;As you know...&quot; = 열여덟(-janh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change: There were changes in my use of this form, though not all consistent. 2 of the 3 reformulators added this when I discussed something that happened to Sora's mother. 2 of the 3 let me keep my only original use of this form when I mentioned something I had already told Sora about my parents. 1/3 added this form when talking about a shared experience between Sora and me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis: This form may be used well when talking about a shared experience because the person reading knows about that instance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Plan: I will try to use this form when talking to someone about a shared experience. I may use it when referring to information I have already told that person.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Plan: Daesung added that this form is used like that with people of the same age or younger, but it can be seen as less respectful if used with people who are older/in a more respected position. Therefore, I will use this form in situations with shared experiences when talking to someone of a similar or lower age. I will use this form less when talking to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 "First of all..." Word Choice
My word choice was 처음으로 (chaeum-euro)
Change: My use of chaeum-euro seems to be changed to other word choices often. 우선 (useon) is one of the words that seems to be put in that position.
Hypothesis: chaeum-euro means “first”, but it may be awkward to use it as a sentence starter. useon is translated as “first of all” and is therefore more natural as a sentence starter.
Draft Plan: I will try to use useon when I want “first” as a sentence starter and experiment with how to use chaeum-euro more appropriately.
Revised Plan: Daesung brought up that 먼저 (meonjeo) is another option that may be used just as frequently as useon. Therefore, I will use useon or meonjeo instead of chaeum-euro in most contexts.

6 My word choice for "Nowadays" → other options or deletion
My word choice was 요즘 (yojeum)
Change: In places, the reformulators leave yojeum as is, but in other places it is either omitted or replaced with 요새 (yosae).
Hypothesis: I think it’s possible I might simply use yojeum too much, so that it becomes repetitive. In letter 1, N and Y keep it in combination with “how are you”, but G deletes it. In letter 2, my use in front of asking Sora how she is is deleted by G, left by Y, and changed to yosae by N. Later yojeum is deleted by all three when asking how Sora’s mother is doing after a leg injury. Similar to an earlier case, when asking “do you think about the future these days?” G deletes yojeum, N changes it to yosae, and Y keeps it. Finally, when I used yojeum when talking about my sister’s relationship, it was kept by Y and N, but deleted by G. The online dictionary shows that yojeum means “Nowadays” and yosae means “these days”. I would consider those two translations to be pretty synonymous and interchangeable, so I’m unsure what would prompt one to be substituted for the other.
Draft Plan: I will try to use yojeum less in “how are you” type situations, especially when relation to a previously stated event has already been established. When I do want to use the meaning, I will consider substituting in yosae.
Revised Plan: Dambi and Daesung both gave some feedback about these forms just sounding better in certain contexts. Dambi thought there might be some difference in the designated time suggested by these two versions, but wasn't able to give a full explanation I could understand. Both did say that usually either form would be acceptable. Therefore, I probably won’t give this a lot of attention as both of these are acceptable, but I will try to add more variety by using yosae instead of yojeum sometimes.

7 Form of "because of"
"because of" = 대해서 (daehaeseo)
Change: In letter 2, I use daehaeseo pretty frequently. It is changed often to either 대해 (daehae) or 대한 (daehan).
Hypothesis: daehae may be a contraction form of daehaeseo. daehan is likely the adjective form.
Draft Plan: I think that I can leave daehaeseo without being incorrect. Y left all the occurrences except the adjective form and G left a few. This suggests that it is acceptable, at
least according to some native speakers. I think I may need to apply the adjective form in some circumstances. The reformulators seemed to pair this form with "worry," so that must be important.

Revised Plan: Daesung further explained that daehae sounds more conversational and recommended using it more commonly because the longer form can sound awkward. He also explained that daehan is less common and usually used when paired with specific words. Therefore, in informal writing, I will try to use daehae in place of daehaeseo. I will probably avoid daehan as I’m not really sure when to apply this. It seems to have some idiomatic uses.

8 Exclamation Marks

Change: In general, it seems like the reformulators used exclamations marks less than I did. There was some variation in patterns, but the reformulators generally left them in introductory or closing statements. N and G deleted them in my use of a rhetorical question structure “?!”. Y and N deleted "!" in my statement of how much time has passed. They were often deleted in combination with sentences being combined and the phrases they were in previously becoming more complex.

Hypothesis: Exclamation marks may be used less in informal Korean than they are in informal English outside of openings and closings. This may be especially true for more factual statements about time or difficulty. In addition, the rhetorical choice of combining "?!" and "!" may not be used often by Koreans and may create confusion.

Draft Plan: I will continue to use "!"s in opening and closings, but I will try to reduce my use in the body of the text, especially in relation to more factual statements. I also think I need to consider no longer using "?!" even in informal Korean writing if the meaning is not clear.

Revised Plan: Dambi and Daesung both voiced opinions about how they would use exclamation marks. While Dambi remarked that exclamation marks sounded awkward in negative statements, Daesung disagreed. Both stated that it was mostly personal preference and desired tone. Therefore, I don’t think I need to give a lot of attention to changing this. It is likely just personal tone/voice choices, so I don’t think it is problematic for me to use them where I feel I would normally place emphasis.

9 Lists

Change: I seem to have had some incorrect ideas about the grammar involved in making lists in Korean. I used lists in two places in Letter 2, and they were lists that included etc. meanings. First I used a list to explain the different nationalities of students I teach: 중국학생하고 태국학생하고 오만학생하고 사우디학생등이 있어. "There are Chinese students and Thai students and Oman students and Saudi students etc." I used “and” between each item as I thought this was more appropriate in Korean, even though I would use commas in English. I also used the ending deungi (등이) on the last item as my reconstructor suggested this as being an easy way to add the "etc." meaning without changing the form. The reformulators used different ways of connecting the list to the content, but they all used commas instead of “and” to separate the list items. They also used a variation of deungdeung (등등) to communicate "etc." but didn’t do it the same way I did. G used deungdeung, N used deungdeung의 (등등의) and Y used deung (등) by itself but as a separate word. In the second list I used a similar structure but with “or”/이나 (ina) instead of “and”. I also used “...” to communicate "etc." in this list. Again, all three reformulators replaced my conjunction use with commas. Interestingly, Y and G left the use
of “...”, and N changed “...” to a "?" mid-sentence. I also used a list one time in letter 1 that does not include "etc." Here conjunctions are again replaced with commas. Additionally, counters (grammar marking number) follow the items instead of preceding them.

Hypothesis: Lists in Korean are more similar to lists in English than I originally thought. I am better off using the regular comma list form than using conjunctions every time, contrary to what I had thought was the rule. It is unclear to me whether or not deungdeung can work with “or” lists, but it seems to be applicable as a separate word next to the last item in an “and” list to state “etc.” “...” seems to be acceptable as a means of stating “etc.” Counters should follow the item they modify.

Draft Plan: I will use commas in lists instead of conjunctions. I will use a form of deungdeung to mean “etc.” I will find out if it is acceptable in both “and” and “or” lists. I will consider “...” to still be an acceptable way of communicating “etc.” in informal writing.

Revised Plan: ---

10 Plural Markers
Plural Marker = - 들 (deul)

Change: The reformulators use the plural particle marker more often than I do in a few places. Notably, 2 out of 3 used the plural for family where it would be a noncount in English. I missed the plural in several places that the plural seems to obviously apply.

Hypothesis: I had thought of using the plural marker as somewhat optional in Korean. I know it can be skipped more than it can be in English, but maybe I’m over-generalizing.

These changes make me think that plural marker use is stricter than I initially thought. It also seems like I am experiencing some language transfer of English noncount nouns.

Draft Plan: I will apply the plural marker more consistently and apply the plural marker purposefully when dealing with an English noncount.

Revised Plan: ---

11 Sentence Combining
Change: In general, all reformulators combine sentences much more than I did.

Hypothesis: It seems obvious to me that native speakers would combine their ideas more than I did as they have much more comfort with using complex sentence combining grammar than I do. It is likely that their sentence combining leads to clearer sentences and stronger cohesion between ideas.

Draft Plan: I think I need to keep this in mind as a future goal in Korean, but the actual grammatical competence required to successfully combine sentences more than I currently do may be a beyond my reach at this stage in my learning. I will generally try to combine more sentences when I feel I can do so without losing my message due to grammar issues.

Revised Plan: ---

12 Closing
Change: Each reformulator had their own style in terms of adjusting my closing statements. The only discernable patterns were that 2 of the 3 deleted or replaced the use of “see you later” to close the letter. This seems natural to me as “see you later” could be strange to say to someone who I may not actually see for many years and someone who I am writing to and not actually seeing. All three also seemed to accept the use of a simple “-Kerry” to close the letter, as no one replaced it.

Hypothesis: There may not be a very strong specific rule for how to close an informal letter. “See you later” may be awkward in this context.

Draft Plan: I will continue to use "-Kerry" as a closing. I will use an alternative to “See you
Revised Plan: Dambi and Daesung both offered different suggestions and talked about the flexibility of using different forms. Therefore, I will use either Dambi's suggested 사랑하는 친구에게 캐리가 (Saranghaneun chingu-egye Kerry-gea="To my beloved friend, [from] Kerry") or Daesung's suggested 보고 싶은 친구 소라에게, 캐리가 (Bogo shipeun chingu Sora-egye, Kerry-gea = "Your friend who misses you, Kerry"). I will be careful to consider how close a friend is before using these closings.

13 Idiomatic Phrases

Change: There were a few examples of times when I used what I thought was idiomatic and there were changes in the reformulations. 1) As I stated earlier, I thought the formal "hello", 안녕 하세요 (annyeong haseyo) could be applied regardless of register, even though it has the formal ending. I think I just heard it so often, I thought it was universal. However, I see that the reformulators changed the register. 2) "Long time, no see"/ 오래간만 (oraeganman) was changed to a shorter form, 오랜만 (oraeman) in the reformulations. I had never thought of this phrase as having separate parts because I learned it all as a chunk in my early experiences with recorded lessons. 3) I also thought of "how are you?" / 잘 지냈어? (Jal jinaesseo?) as a set phrase to be used regardless of the fact that there is a marked tense. I’ve used it in all contexts since I learned it, but the reformulators sometimes took it out of the past tense. I’m unsure of what this changed as I just learned the phrase definition for the past tense as “How are you?” 4) I used a phrase "What are you doing?"/ 뭐 하고 있어? (Mueo hago isseo?) to ask something like “What are you doing these days?”, but it was changed to 어떻게 지내? (Eoddeohge jinae?). I’m guessing that this phrase is also similar in meaning to “How are you?”, though I’m unsure of the difference between this phrase and Jal jinaesseo?.

Hypothesis: I think that even idiomatic phrases take tense/register in Korean more than I initially thought. Even though I was able to communicate using these phrases, I may have been using them incorrectly in many contexts.

Draft Plan: Apply tense/register in my idiomatic expressions. Be more critical in understanding exactly what the idiomatic phrases I use often actually mean. I should also re-examine how I am using certain English phrases like “What are you up to these days?”, as they may transfer as being unnatural in Korean.

Altered Plan: ---

14 "After/ 후에(hu-e)"

Change: In my mind, hu-e means "after x" in a fairly universal way. So I am confused about why the reformulators replaced it with 뒤에 (dui-e) in a context when I believe the "after x" meaning was pretty clear. The replacement happened mostly for just one sentence: "This time I'll talk about my life after I left Michigan"

Hypothesis: I think it’s possible that the “after” in this context may be related to the completion of one thing before moving on to another thing. That could be the reason for the change.

Draft Plan: Learn more about the use of dui-e in these contexts and try to apply it where appropriate.

Revised Plan: Daesung and Dambi both described hu-e as being more limited to time order and dui-e as being more broadly applicable to situations. Therefore, I think I need to apply
dui-e more. I feel like I use hu-e the most because it was the first "after" preposition I learned, but I need to pay attention to what is more common and what is applied more in different contexts.

15 **Honorific Marker -_shi**

*Change:* The honorific is added in verbs related to our parents (Sora’s or mine). It was not added for talking about siblings (even my older sister).

*Hypothesis:* The honorific may not be strictly needed for small differences in age/status, but it is strange to omit it when talking about someone clearly in a higher/respected position. From these letters, it should definitely apply to parents, but I would guess it would apply to any person clearly holding a respected position (i.e. teachers or bosses).

*Draft Plan:* I will pay more attention to using the honorific when talking about older/respected people, but I will probably not worry much in informal writing when the person is only slightly higher in respect/age.

*Revised Plan:* In a discussion with Daesung, it was clarified that this honorific needs to be used even when talking about the person, not just when talking to the person. Therefore, I need to pay more attention in applying this in contexts when I am describing the actions of a person in a respectful position/age, even when the audience of the letter is a friend.

16 **Comma Use**

*Change:* The reformulators combine sentences more than I do, so they use more commas in the context of sentence combining. They also seem to use commas slightly less than I do in introductory phrases, but they still use them fairly regularly. Commas are also used with list items.

*Hypothesis:* Comma rules may be a somewhat flexible. In general, it seems like I should be using them less in setting off short introductory phrases, and I should have the goal of eventually being able to use them in sentence combination.

*Draft Plan:* I don’t know that using commas properly within longer sentence combination is really within my reach right now, so I will just try to use them when I do longer sentence combinations and I will reduce my use of them in introductory phrases.

*Revised Plan:* Daesung and Dambi both agreed that they thought commas are used less in Korean than they are in English. Therefore, I will be conscientious of applying commas less and using them mostly for between sentences.

**Research Question 2**

*Does the learner use identified reformulated forms to improve later writing?*

Regardless of the individual item issues, the overall judgment from informants was that the self-reformulation of letter 3 was an improvement over the earlier version of letter 3 and letter 4 was the best of the reconstructed versions produced in this study. As these improvements were made with the 16 log insights, I conclude that the reformulation process did lead to improvement in learner writing as demonstrated in the third and fourth letters. However, most
native speakers also indicated that the improvement in the letters from the use of the 16 log insights was small.

Not all of the log items were present in letter 3 to make changes to. The 7 forms not present in letter 3 and, therefore, not applicable for the self-reformulated version included items 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14, and 15 in Table B. I applied the insights to create the self-reformulated version of letter 3 according to the individual "Draft plans" in Table B. Both Daesung and Jessica agreed that the self-reformulated version of letter 3 was superior to the reconstructed version, showing that the letter was improved through my self-reformulation that involved making changes using the log insights.

I asked Daesung and Jessica to elucidate on what they would attribute the difference in quality to. Daesung emphasized that the reconstructed version of letter 3 contained too many sentences, making the letter overly choppy and appear to be very low level. He thought that the sentence combinations in the self-reformulation were the most important factor increasing the quality. I then showed him the log I had used and asked him to comment on my success in using these items. Daesung explained that the deletion of "I" was very important, and even commented that more occurrences of "I" could have been deleted. He also pointed to the salutation and closing in the reconstructed version of the letter as being very American in style, and the salutation and closing in the self-reformulation looked much more Korean in style. When pressed to discuss some of the other forms, he stated that while the change in word choice for "nowadays" in the self-reformulation sounded better in the context, either form would have worked and he could not really identify one form as being generally more natural than the other. He pointed to the addition of plural markers as being important in letters to add clarity. He also
identified *daehae* as being a more natural form to use in this sort of informal writing than *daehaeseo* for the meaning "because of".

Jessica noted that both versions of the letter were equally understandable and consistent in that they seemed to be written by the same person, but she supported her preference for the self-reformulated version by explaining that she found the logic to be clearer because stronger transitions were added through sentence combining, a very similar evaluation to that expressed by Daesung. The sentence combining also increased the general flow of the letter. She also explained that the reduction of the explicit subject "I" helped to change the tone a little to bring it closer to being a more natural sounding letter between friends. She did not identify any of the other forms as being particularly important to increasing the overall quality of the reformulation.

As a more rigorous evaluation of my learning, the three original reformulators evaluated the unreformulated, reconstructed versions of all 4 letters to determine which letter was the best (more natural/less awkward), and explained what made the best letter better. All three original reformulators selected letter 4 as the best of the letters. While Gyuri mentioned that she thought the letters were pretty similar in quality, she chose letter 4 because she thought the earlier letters contained more direct translation from English instead of using more natural Korean expressions. She also stated that the variety of forms used in letter 4 was helpful in terms of making the letter stand out from other letters using similar grammar. Nari explained that she found letter 4 to be smoother than the earlier letters, stating that it was "quite comfortable to read and understand". Yeona found letter 4 to be more natural because the "entire flow of the story is natural, and the use of suffix[es] are better than others." She also cited the beginning of the letter as being an improvement.
In terms of evaluating each of the insights, I was not able to get feedback on all the items from Gyuri, but I was able to get this feedback from Yeona and Nari. In addition, I met with one of my other informants, Jessica, face-to-face to go through the letters for further explanation. In order to gather information, the informants responded to a questionnaire (Appendix C) about the individual forms I used with their incidences highlighted to help them find the relevant occurrences (Appendix D). Jessica, Nari, and Yeona all agreed that the applications of items 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15, and 16 from Table B were successful.

A summary of reformulation changes used in letter 4 that at least one informant disagreed with or wanted to provide further explanation for is included in Table D below. A check mark (✔) is used when the informant stated that the form was used appropriately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form #</th>
<th>Noticed Form</th>
<th>Yeona</th>
<th>Nari</th>
<th>Jessica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use of &quot;I&quot; &amp; &quot;You&quot;</td>
<td>thought there actually were a few places where &quot;I&quot; might be helpful but not necessary in places.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;First of all&quot; vocab choice</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>would leave it out entirely instead of using meonjeo as a replacement</td>
<td>would use a longer introductory phrase to give more context instead of any one &quot;first of all&quot; word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>&quot;Nowadays&quot; vocab choice</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>would change second use back to yeojeum</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>&quot;because of&quot; form</td>
<td>✔ added that this abbreviated form shows a close relationship</td>
<td>stated that it does not matter which form is used</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lists</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>stated that grammar/form of lists are fine, but some confusing word choices</td>
<td>stated that grammar/form of lists are fine, but some confusing word choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Believed that the</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As seen in Table D, there was some variation in opinions from reformulators about how successfully different insights were used. Interestingly, the only insight all informants marked as not being used correctly was the insight on idiomatic phrases. This discrepancy in feedback is a good example of native speaker variation observed during reformulation.

**Research Question 3**

What is the learner’s affective experience during the process of reformulation?

In general, I would describe the reformulation process I experienced as a rollercoaster in terms of almost all affective aspects of the process. I went through huge changes in confidence, motivation, interest, and frustration during the months I worked on the project.

**Control in the learning process.** One thing that was notable about the positive entries was that many of them revolved around feeling like I was able to make connections and understand things that had eluded me before. I found that I had a lot of power to focus my inquiry on things that I perceived as being important, or alternatively on lower frequency items that were of interest to me because I knew that they were items that I had struggled to understand in the past. In one entry I discussed the freedom I had to look at what I found interesting. I described this as a huge factor in my initial motivation for doing this study and later identified specific points of interest in the letters and described my freedom to investigate them.
8/26/15 1:08pm I'm not an advanced learner, so a lot of this motivation is related to seeing how the grammar forms I've learned are actually used by native speakers.

9/1/15 6:30pm Two of Yeona's uses that I didn't realize were possible uses were: 싸우시다 했어 & 쌩들이 냐었어요 [being annoyed]. In both cases, I thought the words were simple verbs and I was confused by how they seem to be paired with other verbs in Yeona's use. Another thing I need to keep an eye on is the double ~었 use [double past tense]. I know that it works some of the time, and in the example above with being annoyed, Y even added this form. However, I still feel completely in the dark about when it is or is not appropriate. I'm actually sort of looking forward to seeing how Gyuri and Nari changed this letter to see how similar it is to Yeona.

9/23/15 8:50am I finished looking at the -강하 (-janha) issues. There were really very few, which makes me wonder why they stood out to me. Perhaps, because this is a form that has been challenging for me to use in a natural way in the past, I felt like any presence was worth investigating. Maybe that's the thing I like most about this technique; you can find the information you want to find.

An extension of the positive experience of having the control to look for forms that I was most interested in was the positive experience of being able to identify mistakes I realized I had been making frequently in my Korean communication. As I know my own learning history better than anyone, I was really able to see what changes were being made on items that I had been using frequently in my interactions with Koreans over the years. I also saw the value in finding out what uses I had been getting away with previously in my social interactions but were changed in the reformulations, leading me to investigate and discover that native speakers had been allowing me uses that were understandable, but clearly unnatural.

10/11/15 6:14pm I love the feeling of identifying aspects of Korean that I clearly just learned wrong because it means that I can make changes that will positively affect my ability to use Korean. For example, in reflecting, I can clearly see that I really just completely misunderstood using conjunctions in lists. I really thought that using conjunctions was more natural than using commas. I thought the use of commas to separate items in lists would be language transfer from English. I find it fascinating to think of where I might have gotten this idea after seeing all reformulators use commas in every list. I really think I must have generalized it from the very first Korean lesson I ever did (Pimsleur's recordings). I remember the recording using conjunctions after each word, and I guess I was just never corrected because my use was understandable, if not technically right.

9/10/15 9:25am One thing that is very clear to me is that I need to learn more vocabulary words so I can choose one that actually has the exact meaning I want, instead of approximating. 포기하다 [pogihada/"I give up"] is a good example of my approximate language proving to be insufficient [using it to mean "I quit" in the letter]. It's also a good example of something I'm sure I would be able to successfully use when talking to a friend, and I'm reasonably sure I would also not be corrected in person with most of my friends.
Desire to compare responses. Another factor that was motivating during this process was the presence of different responses from different reformulators. The process was made far more interesting by the anticipation of checking to see if there was overlap or differences between what the different reformulators did in their versions of the letters. This aspect of the process was interesting as it allowed me to come up with preliminary hypotheses and watch to see if the pattern held true in the other versions of the letter.

In the very early stages of the process, I was most interested in seeing if my first observations would be confirmed. My response following the long process of analysis of the reformulation of the first letter was to look forward to what I would see in the other letters.

9/1/15 6:30pm I'm actually sort of looking forward to seeing how [Gyuri] and [Nari] changed this letter to see how similar it is to [Yeona]. I really do feel like it will help me to feel more confident in the patterns I think I'm observing if I see it replicated in more than one reformulator's work.

This increased interest in the process continued to be true when I actually started comparing the different letters.

9/3/15 3:47pm I've started looking at [Gyuri]'s first letter. So far, it's actually really exciting to see where the changes are or are not lining up and where they made changes but did so differently... I'm actually surprised by how fun this is compared to what it felt like going through [Yeona's] letter on its own.

Having different reformulators participate in this process also gave me options to look for answers on how to communicate a meaning. Some of the reformulations were difficult for me to understand as the NSs utilized grammar that I did not understand, but I was able to observe different versions that were within my comprehension level in other reformulations and felt good about the fact that both were representative of language from native speakers.

10/11/15 3:11pm The multiple reformulators did reinforce for me that there are big differences in how understandable native speakers’ Korean is for me. For example, [Yeona] mostly uses forms that are familiar to me, and her constructions are fairly easy for me to read. In contrast, [Nari’s] sentence structure is really difficult for me to read and she uses several constructions that I don’t think I’ve seen at all in my textbooks.
Input overload and frustration with level. As stated previously, reformulation is a feedback style that has usually been recommended for use with advanced students. It is, therefore, perhaps not surprising that this process often resulted in making me feel overwhelmed. In the early planning stages, I actually worried that informants would only make small changes that would not be adequate for further investigation. Partially because of that, I really had a difficult time dealing with the fact that reformulators, in actuality, left hardly a sentence untouched.

8/31/15 1:37pm It feels good to be actually looking at the papers instead of just worrying about it. However, I'm also feeling a little shell-shocked at my first look at how the changes line up with my reconstructed version.

9/3/15 10:57pm Exhausted! Shockingly, [Gyuri's] reformulation was even more full of changes than [Yeona's]

This plethora of information was positive in some regards; however, it also created a really difficult situation in that it necessitated a huge amount of time and concentration to sort through the changes. It also made it difficult to take away focused information that could be used to form hypotheses about what I was doing wrong and what I could potentially change to make my writing better.

9/7/15 3:25pm Halfway through the second page on these letters, I feel like they will never end.

9/12/15 3:04pm I was able to read through everything and find differences, but I feel as though the reformulators changed everything. Not that my initial ideas weren’t retained for the most part, but I feel like there are so many stylistic and slight word form changes in virtually every sentence that I’m not quite sure where to start in terms of thinking of where I should be focusing my energies on making changes in my future writing.

10/11/15 6:14pm I feel exhausted! I’m constantly surprised by how much of a strain this process can feel like. My brain gets tired of looking for these little details throughout the letters. It’s really a draining process trying to see the patterns and make judgments about the causes of these changes.

This overabundance of information often resulted in frustration with my own language level. In several places in the diary, I made remarks about feeling limited by my language level or feeling discouraged after seeing how much the reconstructor or reformulator changed in my writing. This often caused me to have doubts about myself as a language learner.
7/29/15 9:30pm I completed the reconstructed version of the 2nd letter. I am actually feeling more frustration than I thought I would. Korean has really been a hobby for me more than anything else, so I guess it shouldn’t be a surprise that I lag far behind what I though I was capable of...Now I’m starting to realize how dependent I really am on an extremely sympathetic listener. I’m starting to feel like my limitations in learning Korean are so stark that there’s no real reason to continue to work.

Beyond just being discouraging, this issue was also a source of anxiety throughout the process as I often worried that I was not an adequate subject for this study because of my limitations as a learner.

8/24/15 7:11pm Will I be able to reach a satisfactory conclusion about what changes they made? And above everything else, is my Korean level really just too low to be applicable to this type of study? I'm sooo concerned with my language level in regard to this study.

10/25/15 2:44pm Now I find that the steps just keep getting more complicated, and I have no confidence that I’ve done anything right. I’m so frustrated with my level, with this process, and with trying to make anything of this process.

The best example of how difficult it was to separate my self as a researcher and as a participant came from a difficult meeting I had with Hyeri when she gave me feedback on letter 4. At this stage of the process, I had just come from feeling like I had really been successful in making changes to letter 3, and the shock of having to really deal with more input just overwhelmed me.

10/28/15 11:48am What a rollercoaster of a week! I felt like I was ready to give up on this whole project on Sunday after seeing how much [Hyeri] needed to change in my writing. When she told me that she thought I just needed to write more basic sentences, I didn’t just feel like I was going to cry, I actually cried... I felt like I was just too stupid to benefit from this writing process; I felt like I had lost the lottery of research participants when I decided to do an introspective study on myself. The feelings I have about this specific research specimen are definitely more judgmental than is probably acceptable in research.

Ultimately, I was able to regain perspective after talking with a friend and with my advisor about this experience. They reminded me that feeling frustrated was normal and that it was not a failure to have difficulty with a step in the process, but rather that this challenge was something interesting to discuss about the process. However, clearly my experience shows that this process can create a lot of stress.

**Threat to voice.** One of the most surprising negative reactions I found during the process was a feeling of threat to my own voice in Korean. This was a surprising emotion, not because I
did not realize that this would be a possible challenge for some learners, but because I personally did not feel like I had any attachment to my own ways of using the language that would be strong enough to cause this sort of threat reaction. In early diary entries, I wrote about my full acknowledgment of my low level and my belief that this would lead to me not having any problem with accepting all the feedback from informants without feeling discouraged.

However, in later diary entries concern over losing my voice in the process of reconstruction and reformulation became prominent. As I stated after completing initial analysis of the letters:

9/12/15 3:04pm In addition to concern about the changes being made, I’ve been surprised by the fact that I do feel a little like my voice is being usurped in some of the changes the reformulators made. Even as I feel the twinges of defensiveness, I’m surprised by my response. I really don’t think I have any illusions about my Korean level. I know that I am a low level learner, especially when it comes to grammatical accuracy. Yet, in the few places where I was trying to be humorous in my letters, I find myself feeling like the changes the reformulators made, while perhaps adding clarity to the stories, took away from the effect I was trying to create and the inflection I was trying to suggest through my phrasing and punctuation.

While this is clearly a negative reaction and perhaps a drawback of the reformulation process in general, it is also very interesting in that it provided me the opportunity to realize that I do believe I have a voice in Korean. At the same time I felt frustrated by the threat to voice, I also felt pleasantly surprised that I felt that kind of attachment to the Korean language choices I was making.

Discussion

The process of reformulation in this study yielded overall positive results for research questions 1 and 2. I was able to notice 16 insights by comparing the reconstructed versions and reformulations of letters 1 and 2, and even though I was not able to find patterns in some of those 16 items that were helpful in producing positive changes, my use of these 16 items did still help me to produce a self-reformulation of letter 3 that was judged by native speakers as being better than the original letter and a reconstructed version of the fourth letter that was judged by the
three reformulators as being an improvement over the earlier reconstructed versions of letters. Feedback from the native speakers seemed to indicate that most of the improvement in the letters was due to two of the changes: reduction of explicit "I" and "You" pronouns and combination of sentences. Some of the other forms might have had a larger impact if the context of the writing permitted their use in higher frequency. There were also some logged insights that I failed to fully understand why or why not were used in certain contexts. One possibility is that some changes were simply examples of language that sounded better to native speakers in specific situations or just showed the personal preference of the speaker. Therefore, not all of my observations were useful in terms of helping me understand how to improve my future writing.

Though the reformulators did express a preference for the fourth letter over the previous three reconstructed letters, it was not a very strong preference, with some reformulators stating that the letters seemed pretty similar. While I do not believe it is likely that it was merely chance that all three reformulators selected the same letter as the best one, I believe it does show that I have a lot of room to grow in terms of improving the quality of my Korean writing. Of course, it is also possible that what I have to learn is currently beyond my language level, so my ability to make improvements may have been at its limit with the changes I did produce. Therefore, while I am generally satisfied with the results I got for research question 2, there is still plenty of room to explore what factors limit improvement or would further add to improvement of writing.

Research question 3 is of course descriptive, and therefore, the strength of my affective response to this process is not quantifiable. While the overall experience was both positive and negative, the rollercoaster experience was honestly difficult for me to deal with as a learner. The level of the material often led me to feel discouraged and disappointed in myself. Yet, the positive experiences were very impactful. I felt like I had ownership and a voice in the learning
process. The fact that this process allowed me, an intermediate level learner with very little Korean language classroom learning experience, to experience this kind of agency goes a long way toward making me believe that there is some justification for using reformulation, even though the negative experiences were substantial.

I believe the negative experiences I had in the reformulation process could be avoided or ameliorated in several ways. Firstly, the material for the reformulations could have been more limited. A lot of what I learned could have been learned from performing the process with one letter instead of two. While having multiple reformulators was useful for confirming the presence of patterns or seeing native speaker variation, I was also sometimes frustrated with having to delve into so much information. The benefits of having multiple reformulators could have also been achieved with the only two reformulators. A second way to limit the discouraging effects of reformulation might be to have a predetermined time limit before beginning the process. A restriction on time would keep the learner from experiencing the fatigue I felt from spending hours looking at letters. While some of the changes might not be noticed with less time, the reformulation changes that were made most frequently would likely still be salient enough for the learner to notice. Those more frequent changes might theoretically also be the more important changes for the learner to notice.

Benefits of Reformulation

While this study did show that there were some demonstrable positive results of the reformulation process, a lot of what I experienced as positive in this process could not be shown in the formal results. Limiting what could be included in my list of insights to address research question 1 was essential for maintaining a focused study, but it is not my belief that those 16 logged insights really constitute a complete list of all the insights I gained in this process. It is,
rather, a list of the things I noticed that were discrete enough to be used in analysis and explainable. In reality, much of what I gained from this process was a more general awareness of my own patterns as a Korean language user and an understanding of what I am currently capable of and what I need to improve on.

For example, one of the things I was pleasantly surprised about in this process was that I was capable of using Korean to create complex meaning. To be sure, a lot of the language I constructed was very confusing and needed a lot of input from native speakers to be brought to a level of clarity that made the sentences natural, but nonetheless, I was able to communicate my intended meaning without relying on English supplementation or some of the face-to-face communication strategies I had learned in the past. This showed me that I am probably far too reliant on those strategies, and continuing to use them is likely holding me back from continuing to make progress. It was a lot of work for me to create these letters, but making the decision to communicate something that had meaning to me and staying true to the actual meaning required me to use more complex language instead of just substituting in easier content. Having pushed myself to do so, I now know that this level of language is within my ability, or at least within reach with hard work, and I should be continuing to move toward this complexity instead of letting myself rest on what works for me to the extent that I need it to. The feedback from informants on the difference combining sentences made to the overall quality of the work reinforced how important pursuing this complexity is to improving my language level.

Additionally, this process helped me to identify some general shortcomings, even when the information I received was not enough to know what exactly I should change in future writing. One thing I found is that I use a lot of approximation that is the result of having limited vocabulary. While I could not identify a specific list of words that I should learn to solve this
issue and I struggled to fully understand the vocabulary changes I did notice, I did see clearly
that I need to acquire a broader variety of vocabulary words and more accurately learn the exact
meaning of those words. Furthermore, I observed that I overgeneralize some of the early things I
learned in Korea. For example, it was clear in my writing that I sometimes used expressions in
the chunks I originally learned them as instead of applying grammar rules to make them
appropriate to specific contexts. For instance, even though I knew that the letter was an informal
register, I still used the formal 'hello". Beyond that, I need to be more aware of my use of
language transfer. I think that my access to sympathetic listeners has made it easy for me to
retain language transfer habits because listeners have often been able to determine my
approximate meaning despite the fact my Korean sounded strange. Seeing the consistent changes
reformulators made to my language in these instances made me realize that I really need to pay
attention to what I am transferring over from English and actually learn the proper Korean way
of communicating those ideas. In short, just because the meaning can be guessed, this does not
mean the language is right.

One criticism of the reformulation approach I used might be that the inclusion of a
separate reconstruction step addresses a lot of errors for the learner before reformulation ever
takes place. This means that many common errors are not included in the material the learner
analyzes. In my case, many errors were fixed in reconstruction including spelling errors, wrong
word choices, prepositions, and subject/topic/object markers. As these issues were not included
in the reconstructed version of the letters I used for comparison with the reformulations, they did
not receive much of my attention as a learner and were not a focus of my analysis. While it is
ture that these might be very important errors in my Korean writing that should be fixed to reach
higher comprehensibility, I actually think that one of the benefits of this reformulation style I
used is that it allowed me to concentrate on different ways of improving my writing instead of becoming caught up in these surface-level errors that usually receive my attention. The types of errors fixed in the reconstruction phase were largely errors that have been present in my Korean writing from the beginning and have proved to be difficult for me to resolve. However, they are errors that occur often and are very apparent to native speakers, and therefore, often become the focus of writing feedback. This can become problematic because the focus on these structures starts to be done to the exclusion of other issues that may be equally important to the quality of the paper and may be easier to understand. Such issues also come up frequently in nonnative English writing, where speaker errors in article and preposition use become somewhat fossilized. These errors then often become the focus of feedback on writing, when other areas of writing might benefit more from feedback. The writing feedback I have received in the past has almost exclusively been reconstruction style feedback, focusing on small grammar, spelling, and word choice errors. In the reformulation feedback, I was able to see other ways that my writing could be improved that are not necessarily commented on often at my language level. For example, I was able to see the extent of subject deletion and sentence combination that native speakers used and observe how different this was from my own writing. To be clear, I am not saying that reconstruction feedback is not valuable. I absolutely need to improve in those areas as a writer if I want my Korean to be understood more consistently. However, considering that the types of error correction present in reconstruction phases are already present in much of the writing feedback I receive, reformulation might be useful in that it offers a different set of language issues for a writer to focus on.

An additional benefit of reformulation for me was that it allowed me to test my own knowledge of the language. I was able to do this in my own writing by using grammar or word
choices I was not confident in to see if reformulators left or changed them in their version of the letters. I was also able to look for grammar or word choices in the reformulations that I knew were issues I often struggle with. For example, I was aware previous to writing the original letters that double past tense was a concept in Korean I struggled to understand, but I chose to use it according to what I understood so that I could see in reformulator responses how it was used naturally. Additionally, I noticed that reformulators used the "as you know" particle in the reformulations, and as this is a grammar point that has always been difficult for me to understand, I chose to focus on it as one of my logged insights despite its low incidence in the letters. My control over the learning process was thus very active. In this way, I was able to use the reformulations at the level appropriate for my own learning. Moreover, I can imagine that as my language improves, the same reformulations could open up new opportunities to explore more advanced language issues that may be out of my reach now. The learner control in the process lends some support to the idea that reformulation is adaptable to the level of the learner.

Finally, getting feedback from so many different Korean speakers gave me access to input on native speaker variation. Language learners can easily become caught up in the idea that there is a single right way to do things. The presentation of rules and the focused grammar use exercises in classrooms often reinforce this idea of prescriptive language. As a language teacher, I am well aware of the importance of making a distinction between prescriptive and descriptive grammar; yet, as a language learner, I find myself looking for a single correct way to express something and not looking further than that. Being able to see actual variation in the writing of native speakers was helpful to me in that it reminded me that I have to be cognizant of speaker variation, and by extension, how this affects the kind of feedback I get from native speakers of Korean. A glaring example of this was the repeated feedback I got from Hyeri to simplify my
language to increase clarity and the contrasting feedback I got from Daesung who identified sentence combination as one of the most important things I could do to make my language look more advanced. Additionally, the different strategies used by different reformulators was absolutely eye opening in terms of helping me to see that not all of my language was equally awkward to different speakers. For example, there were huge differences between reformulators in how often they deleted double past tense or explicit "I" subject use. Additionally, at several times, speakers gave conflicting opinions about which word was more appropriate for different contexts. This was apparent in the feedback I got from speakers on use of yojeum versus yosae for "nowadays", use of meonjeo versus useon for "first of all", and the use of dui-e versus hu-e for "after".

**Limitations and Confounding Factors**

Many of the limitations of this study are fairly straightforward given the nature of the study. The study is clearly limited in scope. The focus of study in this research was informal letters written to a close friend of the same age. This informal register of writing allowed me to avoid many of the rules that would come up in more formal levels of writing or writing that addresses a person of higher status. As a result, many of the insights I attained about Korean in this study may fail to generalize to such contexts. I would also need to gather more information to understand how these ideas may or may not apply in other types of writing. Moreover, this study was entirely focused on one learner with a nontraditional language learning background. It is impossible to say that other learners would have similar reactions to the same reformulation process. This study can only offer an explanation of my own subjective experiences working with reformulation.
The very fact that this was an introspective study also creates many limitations. As with any introspective study, there can be problems with simultaneously maintaining objectivity toward the research process and the learning progress. The value provided by exploring the learner's perspective is offset in some ways by the fact that there can be interference between the role of the learner and the role of the researcher. In my case, I often found that I experienced some confusion in making decisions about whether to move in directions that were helpful to me as a learner or helpful to creating a smoother analysis and research process. In the early stages of this research, I continued to try to apply an a priori categorical analysis strategy to the reformulated letters long after I had determined that the process was not helpful to me as a learner trying to understand the patterns of changes. I did this because I believed the information would be helpful in providing quantifiable results for the process, and it was an analysis method that I could justify using because of its presence in earlier research. In this and some other situations, I found my instincts as a researcher and my instincts as a learner to be in conflict. As I described in a diary entry during the analysis process:

10/13/15 1:41pm I’m struck again by how complicated it is to try to take the dual roles of researcher and student. I sometimes feel like my focus is very divided between what I think is methodologically more sound and what would be more useful to me as a language learner.

Having to balance the two roles was certainly a factor that influenced the process of the research, and in many ways this research was more flexible than many other types of research because of the need to explore what I found to be useful as a language learner.

Another side effect of acting as both the participant and the researcher was the amount of time spent with the data. The amount of time I spent looking at data and reflecting on the experience was highly unrealistic compared to the time that a language learner in normal contexts would likely dedicate to this type of project. While I do believe that the things I ultimately found to be patterns were all things I could have identified in a more standard learning
environment, it is absolutely true that I had already spent many hours comparing reformulations to reconstructed versions of letters 1 and 2 as part of my earlier abandoned approach to analyzing the data. It is therefore hard to definitively say that all of my insights into Korean were due to the reformulation process rather than the sheer volume of time spent with native speaker produced Korean texts.

Moreover, in terms of affective response to the reformulation process, it was exceptionally difficult to separate which of my responses were reactions to the feedback and which of my responses were reactions to how the research process seemed to be progressing. There were entire sections of the diary that described my negative experience of trying to utilize that earlier analysis method and my struggle with trying to make decisions about how to proceed with research when issues arose. While I tried to skip over the sections about the difficulty of categorization and making research process decisions when finding themes in the overall diary, the fatigue that resulted from trying to find an analysis method that worked almost certainly colored my overall response to different aspects of the reformulation process.

Furthermore, though I believe that limiting the level of analysis to things that seemed to be within my level helped to increase the authenticity of this study as truly being from a learner's perspective, it is absolutely true that this means that there may have been more valuable information in the reformulations that I missed. In an introspective learner study, analysis can only rise to the learner's understanding of the material. Informant interviews and judgments surely helped to supplement the level of analysis, but it is essential in this type of study that the focus remain on what is noticeable to the learner. This characteristic of providing the learner with the information that is available at his or her current stage is in fact one of the most important justifications for reformulation.
Considerations for Use in Practical Contexts

One thing that was apparent throughout this process was that the sheer volume of data was impractical for most real world situations. The steps I went through included many different version of each letter along with a barrage of native speaker interviews and correspondence. Additionally, I kept a diary and a separate log of insights, and, finally, the whole process was spread out over a period of almost 4 months. Clearly, this process was not meant to be directly replicated in classrooms.

However, there are many ways that the current process could be altered to make it more manageable for more traditional education contexts. One area that is misleading about this study was the time frame. Due to complications that came up and adjustments that had to be made, the study continued over a longer period of time than was strictly necessary. In other educational settings, the same study could be done in a tighter timeline with a limited time dedicated to analysis of reformulation content. Going along with the application of a stricter timeline is the fact that reformulation can be done on a much smaller scale. Past research conducted with reformulation has included classroom use of reformulation on part of a work, with students trying to apply what they learned from reformulations to the rest of the document (Fjelstad, 2003). Finally, the number of reformulators needed is flexible. While the current study included three reformulations of each letter, many of the same benefits would come from having just one reformulator. In these ways, reformulation can be adapted to meet the needs of different students and different time restraints.

While reformulation would likely be a challenge to students because of its higher cognitive load, it could also be a practice that could give teachers and students a new perspective. While teachers could act as reformulators, this type of process could also provide an opportunity
for students to access input from other native speakers by involving people outside of the classroom. Students may feel engaged by having more control over the learning process and the choice of which aspects of the language to investigate. Finally, students could benefit from seeing their own ideas communicated in the target language. One of the core justifications for reformulation is that it promotes personal investment in the process by modifying a document that is personally relevant to a student. Students may have a higher degree of interest in the process of figuring out for themselves how a native speaker's presentation of the same ideas differs from their own than they would in looking at more standard educational material.

**Future Research**

Reformulation is an old idea in education, but one that is not often used. Future research could further explore the use of reformulation in multiple contexts. As this research is my own introspective experience, there is a lot of room to expand it by gathering other perspectives. This might include other examples of introspective research or exploration of more limited use of reformulation use across larger samples in practical environments. Continuing to explore the efficacy of reformulation in multiple languages is also important. Most language research is done on ESL and the more commonly taught languages, and there is a dearth of repetition of this research in the less commonly taught languages. It is important that research not ignore the less commonly taught languages as sources for language research.

**Conclusion**

While aspects of reformulation were challenging, I was able to benefit from the process in terms of increased awareness of weaknesses in my Korean writing and acquiring strategies to improve my Korean writing. Reformulation needs to be further examined as a self-study or teaching tool inside or outside of classrooms. This experience also illustrated to me the
importance of understanding the affective impacts of different learning tools. Without completing this study, I would not have fully understood how emotional it can be to directly compare one's L2 writing to that of a native speaker, and I would not have known how important it would be to include scaffolding and support if I were to assign reformulation as a teacher. Beyond the specific feedback technique of reformulation, this illustrates how essential it is for teachers to increase their insight into student experience through putting themselves in the student role whenever possible.
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Appendix A: Reformulation Instructions

Thank you so much for your interest in helping with this project!

This study is examining a form of writing feedback called reformulation. In reformulation, a nonnative speaker is given the opportunity to see his or her own ideas reformulated in the words of a native speaker. This feedback technique is designed to go beyond simple grammar feedback to help a nonnative speaker to understand other characteristics present in the writing of native speakers. Through analysis of the similarities and differences, the nonnative speaker is intended to gain a deeper understanding of what specific language may mark language as nonnative and what language practices are characteristic of native speakers.

Information about the Reformulation Process

The process includes 5 major steps.

1) **Composing:** The nonnative speaker composes a piece of writing.
2) **Reconstruction:** The nonnative speaker is given feedback on errors in the writing (grammar, spelling, word choice) by a native speaker (reconstructor). The nonnative speaker then makes a "clean" copy of the writing, correcting all the errors identified by the reconstructor.
3) **Reformulation:** A native speaker (reformulator) then re-writes the nonnative speakers piece of writing, expressing the same ideas, but in a way that is more natural. The reformulation may include changes in the larger structure and details of the writing, including organization, wording, grammar choice, etc.
4) **Analysis:** The nonnative speaker then examines the reformulated writing for differences between it and the clean copy, analyzing what is or is not changed in the drafts.
5) **Follow up:** The nonnative speaker has the opportunity to ask questions about reformulation choices the native speaker made.

Schedule for Completing the Study

As a reformulator for this experiment, you would be agreeing to help me with step 3 (Reformulation) and step 5 (Follow up) in the process above on two letters I will be writing (about 200-300 word each).

The experiment will approximately follow the schedule below (some adjustments could be made if there are schedule issues):

7/12-7/25 Composition and Reconstruction

4 The term clean copy was not used in this paper. Instead, the term reconstructed version or reconstructed copy is used.
7/26 I will send out an email to you with an attached document containing my first letter written in Korean.

*You should reply with the reformulated version of the letter attached within about a week. If you take longer on the first letter it's okay, but I'd like to begin analyzing both letters by 8/9.

7/28-8/2 I will send out an email with an attached document containing my second letter.

*You should reply with the reformulated version of the letter attached within about a week.

8/8 All reformulated letters have been returned to me

8/9-8/30 Analysis (during this time, I may contact you if there is something I don't understand)

8/31 I will contact you to set up a time to discuss some questions about the reformulation via Skype or Kakao. (Note: contact was actually via email)

*If you think you won't be able to complete the reformulations in the time given, please contact me

Instructions for how to do reformulation

1) Read my full letter to see if you can understand my ideas.

2) You may want to make a few notes about what the ideas were.

3) Type a new letter in Korean keeping the original ideas, but communicating them in the way you would as a native speaker of Korean. (Please type a completely new letter for the formulation instead of just editing the existing Microsoft Word document. This is because I want you to make the larger structural changes that may be required to communicate the ideas naturally as a native speaker of Korean. If you just make comments on the original version, you may make fewer changes than you would if you were to rewrite the full letter in your own words.) Please do whatever is necessary to make the text sound more native-like and feel free to use your own personal writing style. However, if there are phrases or sentences that sound natural as they are, you can feel free to leave them. You don't need to change things that already seem native-like to you. It's okay if the letter is longer or shorter after you've made your changes. If there is something you don't understand in the letter, you can contact Kerry. (email: xxxx, phone(Kakao): xxxx, Skype: xxxx)

4) Attach the Korean reformulation as a new document and email it to Kerry.

Thanks again! I can't express how much I appreciate your help!
Appendix B: Diary

Journal 1
Sunday
7/12/15
8:37pm
Today is the first day I’ve really started to more actively set up the Plan B project. I already feel a little discouraged by the amount of effort this project will take. Elaine pointed out to me in my meeting with her that using male reconstructors or reformulators may add the extra variable and gender differences in language. While that is advice that will likely pay off in the long-term quality of the study, it is certainly an inconvenient factor at this time as I was hoping to work with some of the Korean men I know. Even my new language exchange partner is male (maybe he has friends). As for finding enough people to help with the experiment, I’ve contacted Hyeri, and she is the only one who has responded so far. I was hoping she would be able to do one of the reformulations. However, as she’s the only Korean woman I know well in Minnesota, I need her to help me with the reconstruction phase as that absolutely has to be done in person. She said that she is happy to help, but I’m still a little worried about the level of time commitment I’ll need. Hopefully it won’t be too much because I know she has a busy schedule. Additionally, the reconstructor is probably the most important role in terms of scheduling since I can’t go on to the next phase without. In the end, it may be good because it will force me to only use reformulators who live in Korea, therefore circumventing some issues that may come up with “Americanized” Korean. While I was writing this Gyuri responded that she can help, but she’ll be travelling for a week during the time I might need some of the reformulations. She also said she didn’t understand what I was asking her to do. I was afraid that might be a problem.

I’ve so far asked Hyeri for reconstruction help and Gyuri, Yeona, and Nari for reformulation help. I’ve also asked Daesung to ask his sister is she might be able to help if I can’t find enough others. This was a little awkward as I’ve only met her once (I actually can’t even remember her name). However, she’s a teacher, so I thought she might not mind helping with this kind of project. I’m really kind of concerned about the logistics of communicating with so many people in Korea. There’s a lot of room for miscommunications and I don’t have a reliable way to contact them in a timely way. I’ll have to rely on email and Facebook for that.

I tried to write up an explanation of the study today. I haven’t sent it out to anyone because I’m afraid it makes the study look more daunting than it actually would be for the reformulators. I don’t want it to sound like a huge commitment.

Other than that, I started writing the first letter today. I started writing the letter to Minah like I originally planned, but after a few lines I decided to write it to Sora. I’m really not sure what terms I’m on with Minah, and I feel like if the letter were to be sincere it would require me to be a little more personal than I want in a letter that I’m writing as a part of a study.

I feel more comfortable writing to Sora for this project since I likewise have a lot to tell her about what I’ve been doing the last few years, but I don’t feel like I need to navigate as many complex situations. One difference that this decision will bring up is the considerable difference in
formality. Actually, Sora is a same age friend; this is a very important thing in Korea because it means that there are relatively much fewer social rules to follow. As far as I know, that means that I can speak very comfortably to her, without worrying about using formal language. This may seem like a lost chance to get feedback on formal language, but I think this will be an equally useful challenge for me since the language books I used to study from all included formal language.

I decided to write the letter to communicate to Sora what I’ve been doing for the past several years since leaving Korea. I actually have spoken to Sora during that time. I visited Korea this last winter break and spent some time with her family, but we didn’t get a lot of time to talk. I decided that I should write the letters filling in an old friend about what’s been happening in my life over the past few years. I chose to do this for several reasons. 1) I believe it will elicit a good variety of language and tenses, which will be helpful to get feedback on. 2) It is a real topic that I can connect to and has real communicative relevance to me personally. 3) I believe it will give me an adequate amount of material to fill 3 letters. 4) My studying in Korean really hasn’t prepared me to talk about academic topics, so real life experiences are much more approachable to me from a language perspective. It suddenly occurs to me that I may need to ask Sora or Sojin to reformulate the letters for me if I can’t find enough other people. In that case, I’ll need to consider changing the audience of the letter.

I’m not quite halfway through composing the first letter, and already I recognize that this will be very challenging for me. I am trying to avoid only using very simple language due to the fact that I want to challenge myself to accurately write what my ideas really are. If I use really simple language just to make the writing easier, then I don’t think the reformulations will really be that meaningful because they won’t truly reflect what I was trying to say. This process is slow going, not only because I have to review so many of the ideas, but also because I need to type the letters. I have some experience typing in Korea, but as the keys aren’t labeled and I’m not always accurate in remembering where the different Hangeul letters are, I sometimes have to go through a frustrating series of trial and error before getting out the right syllable. Very frustrating is the fact that Korean is typed in syllables. Sometimes, if you mess up on the last letter of the syllable, you have to delete the whole syllable and start over. The worst part about working hard on Korean in the U.S. is that you don’t have Korean food to keep you motivated. If I could eat some dalk kalbi for lunch tomorrow, I’m sure I would be immediately re-inspired to jump back in the trenches of Korean letter writing.

One thing I can tell already is that I’m actually legitimately excited to complete these letters and see the feedback. I don’t think it will be too discouraging for me as I already expect my writing to pretty low level. I really haven’t spent enough time on writing to expect my phrasing to be anywhere approaching native-like. Beyond that, I also think that Korean rules for writing are often kind of mystifying. Subjects seem to disappear and reappear at whim and there are approximately 1,000 ways to end any given verb, each with it’s own socially loaded nuance. It’s not being upset by the feedback that I’m really concerned about; it’s whether or not the reconstruction and reformulation process can really be separate. I’m worried that if too much needs to be fixed in the reconstruction phase; it won’t leave much room for feedback in the
reformulation stage. I really want the reformulation to be of the ideas I communicated, not what my reconstructor changed them to.

If everything works out, I can really see this process helping me a lot. My focus in these letters is completely on communicating my ideas/experiences in the best way I can. I think this will yield the most valuable feedback because I’ll hopefully really understand how the different writing choices better communicate my meaning. I also feel like I’m really going to be proud of the final result. I really do look forward to being able to communicate so many things to Sora in my own writing (even if it had some help). I think she’ll really be surprised and happy for me when she sees how hard I’ve worked. I look forward to getting a letter back from her in Korean and putting the work into reading it.

Journal 2
Sunday
7/19/15
11:16am
I probably should have written this journal entry yesterday, or even Friday. I’m a little behind schedule now in several aspects of the process. I have managed to contact everyone I needed to and even to get responses for them. I also sent the detailed instructions about how the process works. I asked Min to read these instructions and got some feedback on how to make them more understandable. I’ve written 1 letter (I was supposed to write 2, but I completely underestimated how long these would take me to write. It’s not just the language; the typing is also slowing me down quite a bit.

However, I still have some time, and some stress is reduced because the 3rd letter is not really on a strict schedule. I have already met with Hyeri once for reconstruction. It occurs to me that this is a slight complication because my meeting with her might affect the way I write the next letters. However, with reconstruction, I doubt this is a problem. It should just help me to reduce the initial mistakes I might make. As that isn’t really the focus, I doubt it will be problematic.

The reconstruction of the first letter was difficult in some ways. The most difficult aspect was probably that Hyeri and I both expressed some doubts about the roles. I think that Hyeri’s initial impulse is to just reword things that sound a little off. However, we’re both struggling to define where the role’s limits are. I found myself asking her three questions when she was considering whether or not to correct a section: "Will they be able to understand it?" and "Is it grammatically wrong?" "Does it contain a mistake?" If the answer to 1 was yes and 2 and 3 were no, we usually decided to leave it even if Hyeri acknowledged that it was strange. Hyeri was wary of inserting too much of her own writing into my letter because she didn’t want an undo amount of native spoken language getting into the letter and reducing the amount I might get feedback on.

Even with fixing just the errors, there was hardly a sentence left unchanged by her pen. I can’t say this was completely frustrating as I was expecting to see quite a few problems. It’s more so that it was concerning in regards to the reformulation process. I think it’s really important that I maintain as much of my own voice in the writing as possible so that the reformulations will
remain meaningful to me as reflections of my own writing. Like Hyeri, I was very confused by setting limits on what she should correct. I wonder if a time limit might be appropriate for feedback. This may make it easier to keep from getting to far into reformulation colored steps. One tool we used was to stop short of her rewriting full sentences. Instead, I rewrote them in a new way and she told me if this new structure was correct.

At the same time that I felt concerned, I also feel that I am already learning a lot from just the process of sitting down with Hyeri and reformulating. I think it's really helping me to tie a few ideas to concrete examples.

1) subject/topic particles. For the first time, I'm seeing a pattern where old information with the topic particle is changed to the subject particle. I think I remember someone telling me this was how these were used, so I'm starting to form a hypothesis on that. I'm not sure yet though that this is true or that it reflects the complexity of their use.

2) counting words. counting words have always confused me in Korea. The counting words seems so unnecessary. I'm starting to understand a little about how it's used though. From Hyeri's feedback, I'm seeing that it can be either a subject (taking that particle) or it can be like adjective with the possessive particle.

3) Tense -What's remarkable to me is that I used a new past/past tense ending throughout this letter, and it seems to be almost never marked wrong. As I've really never used that ending before, I'm left wondering just how wrong my previous attempts at expressing past actions have been.

4) American expressions -I used two expressions that were shown to be not comprehensibly in Korean translation. Start a family and the Lee family.

5) Coloring by my past with sympathetic listeners. When I used the term ajossi bar and Hyeri responded that it didn't make sense, I realized that my Korean experience has been with people who were trying very hard to understand the color of my words even if they missed the actual detailed meaning. My guess is that this has made me a little lazy. When Hyeri didn't understand, I actually felt a little annoyed with her for a moment. Like, why doesn't she just get what this means. My friends in Korea would have understood. Writing a personal letter to a friend may exacerbate this mentality. This reaction makes me thing that this exercise is very important for me. Writing should help me to wean myself off the friendly, supportive experience I've had with Korean thus far, taking the responsibility somewhat off of the listener to try to understand and rightly moving it to me to communicate more clearly.

Journal 4
Wednesday
7/29/15
9:30pm
I completed the clean copy of the 2nd letter. I am actually feeling more frustration than I thought I would. Korean has really been a hobby for me more than anything else, so I guess it shouldn’t be a surprise that I lag far behind what I thought I was capable of. It’s not that I haven’t been able to express enough to fill the letters, the problem is more so that I find I can’t really express them in the way I want to. Whenever I try to insert some humor or use a longer story to insert some interest in the letter, Hyeri tells me that she can’t understand what I’m trying to say. When I write personal letters in English, I feel like I can write pretty similarly to how I talk, which means inserting anecdotes and giving humorous exaggerations. However, any writing that goes beyond simple factual representations seems to get lost in translation. I find this really difficult because I do feel somewhat successful at times when I communicate in these ways in person.

I think these feelings are compounded by the fact that I got my TOPIK scores back today and only tested at level 1. The score was close to the next level, which is slightly encouraging, but I really thought I would be able to perform better on that type of test. I’ve actually felt that I would test better on paper then I do in listen and response situations. Now I’m starting to realize how dependent I really am on an extremely sympathetic listener. I’m starting to feel like my limitations in learning Korean are so stark that there’s no real reason to continue to work. However, I have to remember that I always have these responses when faced with failing and I need to consider that there are a lot of aspects of Korean that I haven’t had the opportunity to improve. The slow pace of learning has always been difficult for me when it come to studying languages. To top it off, I really feel like I am just generally not a good language learner.

Another things that is confusing is when Hyeri says out loud some of the things that I’ve misspelled to emphasize that they sound wrong, and actually, I still don’t perceive any difference in the pronunciation. Maybe I will with time. I do feel like having to spell all these words correctly will help me to improve my pronunciation. My hold on many of the words is really pretty vague, so having to think in detail is helping to clarify. I also think that my online dictionary is sometimes giving me spellings that seem to be corrected by Hyeri when they are words adapted from English, like program and online.

I’m also noticing a few patterns. For example -지 seems to be coming up as a correction a lot for phrases in which I’ve tried to create adjective phrases. This tells me that I’m overusing -는, -를, -던 and missing out on a more appropriate grammar construction. Additionally, I have noticed that 이는 gets used at the ends of names. This isn’t a pattern I’ve seen before. 이/가 distinctions continue to terrorize me.

I got my first letter back today from Yeona. I see that she did both reconstruction and reformulation steps. I haven’t had a chance to look at the letter in detail yet, so I hope she understood the steps if not that she didn’t need to do both. I think the reformulation should still be okay, there is just an unnecessary intermediate step.
Friday
9:13pm
I continue to be frustrated by this process in some respects. I’m behind my scheduled plan by more than a bit now. I haven’t been doing any reading on the subject of reformulation and I still haven’t written my 3rd letter. I actually just wrote the salutation before remembering that I am also behind on my journal writing and should perhaps make some efforts here first. A new issue I’m dealing with is the fact that Nari and Gyuri just sent back their letters, in which they both did line-by-line rewrites. This is, of course, highly problematic because it eliminates a lot of the purpose of doing a reformulation instead of just a reconstruction. It was really awkward to write them back to ask them to make a new letter version of the corrections. However, I don’t think I had any other choice. If I let them stay as they were, there really would be very little difference between a reformulation and a reconstruction. I’m trying to get ahold of them now to talk in person. I’m afraid they might be confused or even offended that I asked them to redo it. I’m also confused by this because I thought I made that really clear in the directions I sent previously. Now, I’m not sure if the problem was in lack of clarity in the message or in the fact that maybe that didn’t read the instructions carefully. In any case, I just really hope this can be salvaged. Beyond that, I did get a message back from Gyuri saying she was surprised how well I wrote in Korean. Of course, I take this with a grain of salt because Hyeri did so much correction for me. The Level 1 score I got on the TOPIK test is also helpful in retaining my humility. Yikes!

I’m really looking forward to escaping to the wilderness to really focus on this and clear my head. This summer semester has been positive in many ways, but it has also been hugely distracting from focusing on Plan B stuff. I think it will be really good for me to have the time to work on this away from distractions.

Journal 6
8/24
Monday
7:11pm
I’m finally out at camp for my much anticipated plan b hermitage. I’ve been trying to get out here to be isolated and free of distractions since the semester ended on August 10th. It really hasn’t been easy. The weather was unbearably hot for a few days. Then, I came out but spent a couple days reading because I figured I had plenty of time. However, my sister happened to be moving at the same time as all this. I originally planned to stay out of the process so I could focus on my work, but as it turns out, she did not have enough help and needed me to throw in. Unfortunately, this meant first driving to Marquette to help them pack the car then driving all the way back to Minnesota to offer help unpacking and another driver. To top it all off, issues with their organization meant that I had to stay in a hotel in Minnesota for 2 nights. All together, I lost 6 days helping with the move.

Of course, I’m well aware that if I were truly motivated, I would have found time to work on this project while involved in all those other activities. I think I’m really dreading the analysis and it’s slowing me down quite a bit. All 3 of my reformulators had issues understanding the process at one point or another. I managed to get reformulations from everyone eventually, but I am
definitely still concerned that this may have affected the quality of the reformulations. Beyond that, I do think that a lot can really go wrong. If they simply fixed a few issues with awkward phrasing, will I have enough to analyze? Will I be able to reach a satisfactory conclusion about what changes they made? And above everything else, is my Korean level really just too low to be applicable to this type of study? I'm sooo concerned with my language level in regard to this study.

Another concern I have looking back is that I did not record nearly as many journals as I would have liked to. I got distracted and often forgot all about recording my thoughts during the process. This also means that I may not have a very strong timeline to use when discussing my project.

Today being the first day I've been back at camp, I decided to get organized. I went through my materials and got everything together. I also made a list of the different things I need to do. I'm planning to do a day-by-day plan. I do still have 2 weeks before the new semester starts on 9/8, so I need to keep in mind that it isn't exactly time to panic. I have 2 weeks in the woods with all the materials I need and nothing but a radio and a dog for distraction. I can do this! Thankfully, I also have Kakao out here, so I can ask my Korean friends for help if I really need it. Tomorrow, the real work starts!

Journal 7
8/25
Tuesday
8:10pm
I can't say I'm impressed by the progress I made today, but it was nice in a way to take the time to re-read the first study I looked that examined reformulation (Fjelstad). It was really interesting to read about her perspective as the instructor using this method on students. Though she didn't use the two-step system I did, her written recast system was similar in several ways. I kind of wish my study had more pedagogical implications, but I think I will have to satisfy myself with knowing that there is great value in understanding a concept or system as a learner. After all, in this kind of complex process, it would be easy to lose sight of what a learner might consider worth the time investment, and doing this seems really pretty efficient compared with doing a classroom study. Almost like a pilot study for my own commitment to using the strategy of feedback in the classroom.

In my reading, two ideas struck me as needing my consideration as I continue on: affect and motivation. These are two things that got me interested in this study to begin with, but I feel like I lose sight of that at times when I start to feel concerned about my language level and how smoothly the process is running. Fjelstad reported largely positive results in the students’ viewing the application of the recast steps as taking their writing seriously. This was and is very important to me. I want to know what differences I can find in my own writing compared with native speakers. I want very much to improve, and as an analytical learner, I feel like this could be a huge help to me. It is also important to consider how much Fjelstad discussed student motivation. I should perhaps give myself more of a break on my concerns about my level and
consider that I would categorize myself as a very motivated learner. That being the case, I should be able to overcome a lot of my language weaknesses by working hard to do a quality analysis.

Tomorrow I plan to re-read the work by Gilbert to make sure I understand her methodology. Fjelstad's categorization seemed very basic, but hers is not the study I'm replicating. I'm curious to see if I will be able to easily categorize the feedback on my Korean writing. Korean has always seemed to me to be much less discrete in terms of syntax than English is. I believe this may provide an interesting challenge moving forward.

Journal 8  
8/26  
Wednesday  
1:08pm  
I just started re-reading Gilbert's study and I was struck by what she is saying about her inspiration for starting to explore reformulation more in-depth. She discusses her own experience being so caught up in changing just the grammar and the communicative salience in student writing that she made corrections that sounded awkward to a native speaker. I don't have a such a specific case that inspired my interest, but rather I keep thinking back to one specific student who had a lot of issues in my composition class in Spring 2015. He was hardly the first student I had who fell behind other students in his ability to express himself in English essays, but what made him stand out to me was the fact that his language ability was so advanced in so many other respects. Over the course of the semester, I never stopped being surprised by Jared's level of vocabulary. Of course, some of that was due to extensive use of dictionaries, but he also demonstrated a wonderful commitment to learning new English vocabulary every day. Beyond this, he also excelled in discrete tests of grammar and reading skills. Yet, despite these skills, his essays continued to be difficult to follow and he made mistakes that left me confused as to what he was trying to communicate.

As a very motivated student, Jared came to me several times over the course of the semester to get extra help on his essays. I think he was as shocked as I was that, where he consistently delivered an A performance in every other context, he was struggling to even pass when it came to composition. I tried to help him as much as I could in going through specific issues in the essays, but I found myself thinking again and again that Jared's problem was larger. He seemed to not really understand the flow and strategy for expression that native English speakers used. I could see that he generally had a good reason for all of his language choices, but I was often left with no other explanation than that his language use was so awkward that it was hard to understand. The moment I heard about reformulation as a strategy for writing feedback, I immediately thought of Jared and how much he might benefit from getting an opportunity to see the complex ideas he was trying to communicate put into more graceful, native-like language. As a clearly highly analytical learner, I could imagine the breakthroughs Jared might have had in analyzing the differences between his own writing and the native writing. This is what first made me think that reformulation was a strategy that was worthy of
consideration for ESL students, particularly those who seem to have hit a wall in terms of their writing development.

In thinking about how to explore reformulation, I considered several options. At first, I wanted to explore how this process might be used as an option in writing center consultations. However, I also felt like I didn't understand well enough how valuable it would or would not be to students and what complications might come from it. I immediately thought of how interested I would be in receiving this sort of feedback in my Korean writing.

My path in learning Korean has been a complicated one. Firstly, I really don't feel like I am a classically good language learner. I get frustrated easily with instruction that overburdens me with information that isn't presented in a very logical and analytical way. I also have a hard time learning by listening and feel like I have to see everything written if I am to have any chance of committing it to memory. Despite this, I feel like I've been able to overcome a lot of my disadvantages in terms of language learning by sheer force of will and genuine interest in the language. I've mostly studied alone and greatly enjoyed the individual pursuit. However, as I've progressed more firmly into intermediate level, I've felt that I've struggled more and more with trying to find the kind of feedback that would be most helpful to me. I often find 2 extremes when it comes to feedback. Not many people study Korean. This means that many native speakers of Korean are easily impressed by my limited level of Korean and give me very little feedback when I make errors. The other option is giving feedback on every single mistake I make. This is better in some ways, but the problem is that I make so many mistakes that there is very little progress in a conversation if the listener tries to do this. Most of my experience with feedback is with spoken Korean, and the reflections above are in regard to that. However, as I've moved into written Korean, I've been surprised by how much more feedback I get on what sounds strange and how much easier it is for me to process it. It got me thinking that reformulation would be a great option for me to see in a very personal way what native Korean really looks like.

I'm not an advanced learner, so a lot of this motivation is related to seeing how the grammar forms I've learned are actually used by native speakers. I really hope I'll get enough variety to see and understand them. When I read Gilbert's introspective study, I knew immediately that I wanted to understand reformulation from the learner's perspective and consider how I personally reacted to the process. This I hope will not only be rewarding to me as a learner, but it will help me to consider how reformulation might be useful in both composition classes and in writing consultations.

Journal 8
8/26
Wed
2:44

In examining Gilbert's methodology and analysis again, I'm beginning to feel very nervous. I'm worried that the complexity of the letters I wrote as well as the length are inadequate for getting information necessary for good results. I believe I'm going to do a preliminary step of just
marking the differences without categorization so that I can get a feel for how the letters were changed and either relieve some of my anxiety or confirm that there is an issue and make a plan to address the problem.

I'm also considering adding "mechanical" to the list of possible categorizations to allow for any changes in spelling. I'm sure that a few spelling errors crept in.

Additionally, I don't think I will do the side-by-side columns of the reconstructions and reformulations like Gilbert did right away. I'll probably just use the separate sheets laid out next to each other. I imagine that will be adequate, and I don't have printer here, so any analysis on a new form type would have to be done on the computer. That is a possibility. I think I'll just see how it goes. I want to do what is easiest and keeps as much organization as possible.

I'll have to consider whether a justification like "poetic license" is necessary in my case. Gilbert used it in hers, but I would be surprised if my reformulators made that many changes.

Another thing I'm already considering is Gilbert's conclusion that she made a lot of choices to cope with her low level in the language, settling for trying to be understood rather than being natural sounding. I know that this is something I do all the time without even thinking about it. I think a lot of my Korean language is the result of messy dinner table-communication, where stringing together an idiotic expression that can be sort of understood is better than saying nothing at all. In fact, I'm so comfortable with approximate phrasing in Korean that I often just make up phrases that I'm sure don't make real sense in either English or Korean but might make a sort of poetic blurry image of what I mean. In fact, I kind of enjoy doing this in person. I kind of think of it like a strange guessing game when I'm talking to friendly listeners. I wonder if this will be an issue in my reformulations or if Hyeri already took care of any big issues with this in the reconstruction.

Journal 9
8/31
Monday
10:05am
I'm starting analysis today. I tried to put the first letter and Gyuri's reformulation side-by-side but found that the columns didn't really line up. I'm going to try to use just the printouts. I also noticed that she left a couple questions marks, so I'll have to try to figure out what to do with those. I also think I am going to stick with what I was originally planning to do and just look for differences the first time instead of trying to categorize right away. This analysis has been a long time coming, but I've really had a lot of anxiety about getting started on this. I also wanted to avoid starting any analysis before I had all the original letters and clean copies completed. It seemed like it would be a more authentic measurement if I didn't complete any later steps until I had completed the earlier steps for everything.

8/31
10:19
I'm looking at Yeona's letter 1 first to compare with my clean copy. I'm looking first for differences of any kind which I will underline and mark with a note. I'll worry about numbering and coding later. Before doing even that, I'll read through letter 1 clean copy to make sure I still understand well what I was saying.

8/31
11:21
I've only gone through the first paragraph of Yeona's letter and I can already tell that my worries about there not being enough changes were unfounded, at least in Yeona's reformulation. Instead, I'm already onto the new worry of how categorization will work here. That's a lot of changes in 3 lines of text! I can already see why people have mentioned that this process can be overwhelming!

Already, I'm noticing that there is a lot of deletion happening, as well as deletion through combination. I suspected that this might be the case as Korean seems to generally be far more accepting of the idea that there are implied subjects that don't need to be explicitly stated. I've already had a few 나는 and 소라's deleted, as well as a time clause. I'm also curious to keep exploring if Yeona continues to delete my use of the double -었- tense and replace it with simple past tense. I've been confused about this tense ever since I learned it. In the Korean textbook I've been studying over the past year it explains 3 things about this use: 1) "focusing on a past event whose effect is no longer relevant to the present moment." 2) "expresses a past situation that does not continue or is not true any more." 3) "In English, however, sometimes both single and double ~었- are translated in the same way"

As my letters to Sora focus largely on explaining many of the past things I've done over the last few years, things that I do not continue to be involved in, I use the double tense extensively as I thought it was appropriate to use that tense to describe things that I've done that no longer apply, and I then tried to use simple past for more recent things that are still relevant. In letter 1, I talked about places I used to live and jobs I used to have, so I mostly put everything in double past tense. It did feel awkward to me as it means a lot of extra sounds, but I wasn't sure if it was still correct and I was just used to hearing more simplified texts.

8/31
1:37pm
I keep finding places where Y went through and deleted pieces from my writing. She deletes my use of 나는 a lot! She is also deleting time clauses at times and objects. What is interesting is that in one line, I thought I rather succinctly wrote "5 개월 후에 나는 포기했었어" but here, Y not only added a time clause, but also added a more specific object to what I had used. In addition, she replaces 포기했었어 with 관두었어, a word I've never seen and can't seem to find in any dictionary. Several things here are interesting. First, Y is continuing to delete almost every case of the double past tense throughout the letter. Second, I have to wonder if the verb she used as a replacement is rare, slang, or if the dictionaries I'm using are insufficient. It's also possible that
the verb is some modification that doesn't show up in dictionaries because it isn't the root form. This is always something that frustrates me in studying Korean on my own. It's often really difficult to find the words you want to in the dictionaries unless you know exactly how the word was derived. Third, the time class she added 결국 is one that I used earlier in letter 1 in what I feel is a very similar circumstance, and Y replaced it with a different time clause. I'll have to think further about why it would be appropriate in one situation and not the other, or if this is perhaps just a matter of preference for different situations on Y’s part. Finally, I'm surprised Y added the object to this sentence. It seems like it should be clear what I quit, and my understanding is that Korean deletes the objects more than English. In English, I could definitely delete "my job" here, so I'm really curious about why I wouldn't do that in Korean.

I'm still feeling pretty excited about this. It feels good to be actually looking at the papers instead of just worrying about it. However, I'm also feeling a little shell shocked at my first look at how the changes line up with my clean copy. I now see just how challenging it is going to be to try to keep this analysis organized. When Y changes or combines full sentences, there are so many things going on at once that it's hard to imagine how I will be able to put them in neat categories. I can also see that this is a process I'm not going to want to do over and over again. That means, I need to make some decisions about how to go through this in an organized way. Doing this first letter like this is probably fine to get a feel for things. But, I think I might waste a lot of time if I try to do this with every letter before applying a coding process. The next step is definitely making a strong decision on how to code these letters.

8/31
5:22pm

I've decided to go forward with the coding that Gilbert used with the addition that I'll use pink to represent simple mechanical corrections like spelling mistakes. I don't know if I'll really need to use this much, but I wanted a way to mark it just in case. Those should have been picked up in the reconstruction, but I know that at least one slipped through. It doesn't seem to fit into any of the categories used by Gilbert so this way I will still need to mark it. I've also decided to hold off on using the side-by-side strategy Gilbert recommended because the changes mean that the columns don't line up very well. That being the case, I don't think I gain anything by putting them in side-by-side columns. I'm going to try to apply the numbering system and the log system though. I'll also try to use the definitions Gilbert gave in pages 12-14 to help me to stick to a designated criteria as much as possible. I think that the presence of particles may be a complication here.

9/1
Tuesday
7:21pm

I am on change number 1 on the first letter of analysis and I am already having a problem distinguishing between vocabulary and cohesion. 처음으로 and 우선 are both transitions, which is related to cohesion, but I went with vocabulary because when I looked it up, the first (which I
used) translated at "first" while the second (which Y used) translated as "first of all". I determined that it was a matter of more appropriate vocabulary instead of coherence, but the description in Gilbert’s article doesn't make it very clear to me whether or not that is the appropriate choice here. Regardless, I need to accept that I will need to make these decisions reasonably quickly and deal with possibly making changes later. I can't put this off any longer.

9/1
8:03pm

Half way through paragraph 1. Sigh! I think I'm going to have to redo these analyses later! It's so difficult to distinguish between these categories. When subjects and objects are deleted, I have no idea how to categorize that. The first subject deleted I put under syntax because I thought it made sense because of it being an unnecessary use of the pronoun "I", but the next round included the specific object of a verb, and I thought that was probably more related to cohesion because it was likely a choice about the connection already being clear between the ideas without using the specific object. Now I think it's probably both, but I should only categorize these as one or the other. Furthermore, I should be consistent! So, I better go back and re-categorize one of them. I think I'll put them both under cohesion because it seems unlikely that it's really wrong to be more specific, but maybe just awkward or confusing.

At the same time, I have to remember that what is really important is that I'm noticing that subjects and objects are being deleted rather than putting all of my concentration into categorizing the deletion. Incidentally, I did decide to do the side-by-side format and I was definitely wrong about it not having any benefit. This is definitely easier! What I'm now having doubts about is the highlighting strategy. I think my letters might end up just looking like a huge block of colors. I've already highlighted over another color when I decided that a decision Y made was probably more related to a larger discourse change rather than a simple syntax change. I think it might get messy. I really don't want to do these analyses several times!!!!

9/1
5:01pm

This is driving me crazy! I still haven't finished Y's first letter. In fact, I'm only halfway through. I've already found 35 changes and I'm noting each one as Gilbert described, but on the notes I'm really only left to guess at why the change was made. I don't really know exactly the rationale and I'm sure I'll have to have lots of conversations with people on that point. Most of my Korean friends are currently still in Korea, so hopefully when more of them come back I can get some extra help. It's really frustrating to categorize! Syntax and discourse function seem pretty similar at times, coherence causes problems too. Sentences combinations are causing me the biggest problems. They sometimes seem like simple coherence changes, but at other times they seem to really make a change to the structure/meaning or the grammatical choices. Argh! I have no idea how I'm going to get through 5.5 more of these letters. Part of me is hoping that G and N made fewer changes. Another part of me is hoping that it's only going this
slowly because this is my first shot at it. I can definitely see how this would be a problem in classes. A few paragraphs of this would probably be plenty for the students I've often dealt with.

9/1
6:30pm
I did it! One letter is finally complete. I can see that I will need to go back through the letters a few times to help myself to see the patterns better and really think about why changes were made. One thing that continues to be a little problematic for me is the difference between the topic and subject particles 이/가 & 은/는. They still seem random to me. The only hypothesis I have going that seems to sometimes work is that the topic particle is used when you need to distinguish which thing you're discussing, while the subject particle is used when it's already clear what thing you're talking about, kind of like the a/the distinction. I will continue to try to see if this works some of the time because it definitely doesn't seem to apply all of the time. One thing I've noticed is that I seem to sometimes use words as the wrong part of speech and it seems that I would need more complex grammar to use them as Y does. Two of Y's uses that I didn't realize were possible uses were: 싸우시더 했어 & 짜증이 났었어. In both cases, I thought the words were simple verbs and I was confused by how they seem to be paired with other verbs in Y's use. Another thing I need to keep an eye on is the double ~었 use. I know that it works some of the time, and in the example above with being annoyed, Y even added this form. However, I still feel completely in the dark about when it is or is not appropriate. I'm now actually sort of looking forward to seeing how G and N changed this letter to see how similar it is to Y. I really do feel like it will help me to feel more confident in the patterns I think I'm observing if I see it replicated in more than one reformulator's work.

9/3
3:47pm
I've started looking at G's first letter. So far, it's actually really exciting to see where the changes are or are not lining up and where they made changes but did so differently. This is far more interesting than the categorization, which continues to be trying, to say the least. So far, I've struggled with where to categorize changes from formal to informal language (which I've put as vocabulary changes), how to categorize paragraph separation (discourse), and how categorize a change from exclamation marks to periods (discourse). G seems to very liberally eliminate a lot of unnecessary language, so I'm interested to see what she will do as we continue. I'm actually surprised by how fun this is compared to what it felt like going through Y's letter on it's own. It seems counterintuitive considering the time/concentration demand. This change in interest level, if sustained, will be interesting in some ways as it would mean that a lot of the reformulation benefit might come from the presence of more than one perspective. This would definitely be an added challenge in terms of incorporating the technique into a class or writing center.

9/3
7:12pm
G definitely seems to delete more subjects and objects than Y did. Though, both did this more than they added things in. In both cases I'm seeing that Y and G really reduced the volume of my writing through combining sentences and omitting some information. G also seems to more freely change things related to meaning than Y did. Both deleted double -았 almost every time, telling me that I definitely am not using it in a natural way.

Also, the excitement of comparing changes does wear off after a bit.

9/3
8:33pm
G seems to delete my use of exclamation marks pretty reliably. I wonder if it's just her style or if I use more exclamation marks than Korean speakers typically would.

9/3
10:59pm
Exhausted! Shockingly, G's reformulation was even more full of changes than Y's and had even fewer opportunities to make changes. I think G did more in terms of taking out a lot of language that she perhaps found unnecessary, confusing, or awkward. This is ironic seeing as G's was the one I was most concerned with possibly being way too similar to the clean copy because it seemed like she didn't really understand what I wanted from her emails. However, she did seem to give me a lot to think about. It'll be interesting if the different reformulators hold patterns between the 2 different reformulations.

9/5
2:28pm
I talked with Daesung yesterday about a few questions I had about the letters and had a few things clarified. Firstly, I had a spelling mistake maintained in this draft that I didn't know about. 돼 is used only when it is word final, but 뒤 is used when it is not at the end of the word. This rule is completely new for me. I was always confused about why the word seemed to be spelled different ways. It always seemed kind of random to me. Actually, when I think about this, I think I've heard the difference in pronunciation matching up with these different spellings.

Daesung also told me that Nari's correction to my salutation has to do with the amount of time since you've seen a person. He explained that the salutation I used, while correct, sounds a little awkward in the context of writing a letter to a friend you haven't seen a long while.

Nari's letter is interesting to me in several ways. She seems to be making more changes in terms of bringing the letter to a more friend-to-friend tone. For example, she actually added ㅋㅋ in one place. However, she is also still deleting exclamation marks, which Daesung told me are not uncommon in Korean letters.
Interestingly, it seems like Nari allowed me to keep most of the double -었으나 uses throughout my letter. I wonder why she is more tolerant of it than Y or G were? In other places she seems to make more changes than Y or G did.

N uses 정도 quite often. I'm not sure what the word adds to the letters. Is it just softening language? Or does it add the idea of estimation? I'll have to go through the letters again.

I finally finished going through the first set of letters. I'll have to wait to go through everything again to look for patterns. I do think there's a lot to learn from this process, but I am starting to have my doubts about its practicality for any kind of implementation outside of research. If anything, I think the length would need to be highly limited. Or, perhaps if I weren't trying to categorize all of the differences but was just trying to understand the differences this would be a much faster process and wouldn't feel so overwhelming. I have noticed that the native speakers combine a lot more of the sentences than I do. That makes sense, as combining sentence is a language task that is still highly demanding for me. Moreover, a lot of the changes come from sentence combinations that the NS have done differently. Another pattern is one I predicted, the NS use far fewer pronouns than I do. Y and G also used fewer time clauses or introductory phrases. As I go through again, I will have to think carefully about the differences between the three. I am very interested in why N kept the -eoss endings in most cases while G and Y deleted almost all of them.

Halfway through the second page on these letters, I feel like they will never end. I can't imagine how frustrating it must have been for Gilbert to get through the 700 word letter she wrote. I do think I will learn a lot from this process, but the amount of time it's taking makes it difficult to distinguish whether the learning would be a result of the process or a result of just spending endless hours going through these letters. I find myself wishing that G would just leave things, even though that would be completely counter to the goals of this activity. I'm hoping things really start to become clear to me when I go through the results of this process again.

I've noticed that my communication of people's names get changed a lot. For example, 소진이 gets changed to 소진이는. I'm a bit confused because it seems like that's just the topic particle followed by the subject particle. This seems to be a special case for people's names. Is the first particle for politeness and the second particle actually serves the grammatical function? That
seems like it can't be the full explanation because then some situations would include the topic particle twice. Does it matter if the name has a badchim ending?

9/8
10:51am
I need to consider why -에 대해서 often becomes -에 대해 in the reformulations. I learned this piece of grammar as a set form. What is the difference between these two forms?

9/8
11:23
Is 인 a topic particle only for people?

9/10
9:25am
I need to look at whether or not Nari uses commas differently than Y or G. She seems to add them in after time phrases, while it seems like I was mostly deleting them before. I also need to figure out 뒤다 as I don't really understand why it is being used in so many different ways, nor do I understand why the spelling is changing so often.

One thing that is very clear to me is that I need to learn more vocabulary words, so I can choose one that actually has the exact meaning I want instead of approximating. 포기하다 is a good example of my approximate language proving to be insufficient. It's also a good example of something I'm sure I would be able to successfully use when talking to a friend, and I'm reasonably sure I would also not be corrected in person with most of my friends.

9/12
3:04pm
Having an initial analysis of all the letters leaves me a little satisfied, but also a little perplexed. I was able to read through everything and find differences, but I feel as though the reformulators changed everything. Not that my initial ideas weren't retained for the most part, but I feel like there are so many stylistic and slight word form changes in virtually every sentence that I'm not quite sure where to start in terms of thinking of where I should be focusing my energies on making changes in my future writing. One area of consternation for me is verb endings. I feel like there are an infinite amount of these verb endings that add just the smallest change in the sentence meaning that it seems like an insurmountable task to ascertain how to apply them in a logical, consistent fashion. In the few instances when I tried to use the meaning change particles I'm familiar with, my use was mostly changed in the reformulations.

Beyond the challenge of figuring out all the nuances of meanings suggested by these endings is the feeling that I am simply not equipped with the meta-language to describe the changes. I realize that I've learned Korean mostly as a new grammar point and an accompanying translation of the meaning in English and the situations in which it would apply. I have very little terminology to apply to the different aspects of Korean grammar being utilized in these letters.
In addition to concern about the changes being made, I’ve been surprised by the fact that I do feel a little like my voice is being usurped in some of the changes the reformulators made. Even as I feel the twinges of defensiveness, I’m surprised by my response. I really don’t think I have any illusions about my Korean level. I know that I am a low level learner, especially when it comes to grammatical accuracy. Yet, in the few places where I was trying to be humorous in my letters, I find myself feeling like the changes the reformulators made, while perhaps adding clarity to the stories, took away from the effect I was trying to create and the inflection I was trying to suggest through my phrasing and punctuation. Especially perplexing to me was the pattern of reformulators in deleting exclamation marks. I’m left unsure of whether Koreans use less exclamation marks in letters than Americans, or perhaps if they simply didn’t think that I communicated a situation worthy of an exclamation.

One point I want to explore further is the use of question endings in Nari’s reformulation of my second letter. For the most part, I didn’t come across a lot of grammar forms I was not at least somewhat familiar with, even if I didn’t recall their exact meaning. However, Nari’s letters seemed to consistently use endings that I didn’t know were appropriate for questions and left me unsure of what meaning they added.

9/18
11:02am
I’ve been having a really difficult time moving from the bulk of information I received from categorizing the changes in the 6 reformulations. I’ve debated about how to move forward and put the information in order. I have some definite concerns about this process, as I am absolutely overwhelmed by the amount of information I have. However, it’s important to keep in mind that this amount of information wouldn’t be characteristic of what would happen in a regular classroom situation. I also think that I’ve spent too much time looking at the papers as wholes. I feel strongly that the categorization of the whole letters was not that useful. I’m not sure if it’s just that the input becomes too much under these conditions or that the use of particles in Korean makes it so that too many different things are happening at once. I want to now look at individual aspects of the papers and try to find and verbalize the interesting aspects that I can find in the reformulations.

Salutations: In looking at the 6 different reformulations. I think I can say a few different things about the salutation in letters. Firstly, my use of 안녕하세요 was incorrect. I actually wrote all my letters in informal language because Sora is a same-age friend. However, 안녕하세요 seems so ubiquitous in Korean daily life, that I thought it would be appropriate in the salutation even though I recognized that the level of formality was not consistent with the rest of the letter. Clearly, the native speakers identified this use of formal language as awkward. Additionally, it seems that there are some optional changes in word order for the salutation. G and N changed my word order to “Sora hi”, while Y left my original “Hi Sora” order. Additionally, it seems like the friendly 야 particle is an optional addition onto the name. 3/6 reformulation added this. I wonder
if this ending might sound more natural, but in some of the letters it was left off because it's understandable without.

9/18
12:40pm
Tense: double -었
Another pattern that came up is the deletion of all or most of my uses of the double -었 grammar. My understanding of this grammar form come from my textbook. In this textbook, it explains that this form is used for past actions that are completed and no longer in effect. For example, if I say “Sora went to Japan.” using the simple past, this could mean that Sora is still in Japan. But if I use the double -었 form, it means that Sora went to Japan, but is no longer in Japan.

소라가는 일본에 갔어요 vs. 소라가는 일본에 갔었어요. In letter 1 and 2, I thought this form was appropriate to use when I was discussing my experiences in past events. For example, when I was discussing my past jobs in fields in which I no longer work, I thought this tense communicated the past complete nature of those jobs. According to my understanding of this form then, there was no reason why the reformulators should find this grammar inappropriate. Yet, the numbers show that the native speakers in this study definitely must have found something strange about these uses. In letter 1, I used this form 21 times. Gyuri changed all but one of these uses, and I suspect she only left 1 because she was unsure of the meaning of the sentence in which it was used due to a typo. Yeona also only left one. Nari seemed more accepting of this form, leaving 6, and even adding one usage. In letter 2, I used this form 10 times. G and Y deleted all occurrences of this tense, and N only left 2.

I asked a Korean instructor a general question about this form, explaining my confusion, but not showing her the actual letters, and she said this form is used more for emphasis on a past completed action, and it would be awkward to use it often in a piece of writing. Additionally, she seemed to suggest that some verbs would not work well with this form, e.g. 했어요. I’m not sure if this is completely the reason, but I’d like to look into it further.

I’d like to see more in context examples of how this form is used in normal writing by native speakers.

9/20
3:39pm
I’m finding it difficult to find how to organize my analysis. I do think that approaching this by looking at specific aspects of what I’ve noticed going through the first time is helpful. I’ve made a list of general things to look at further and am examining them one at a time. However, organizing the multiple different analyses is challenging and it takes a lot of time to go back and look through the papers again. It definitely doesn’t help that I’m coming down with a cold and
am having a really difficult time concentrating on this. Everything is cloudy and I just want to sleep.

9/22
2:30pm
-janhayo -잡아요
I’ve decided to look into a few other forms that I am familiar with, but seem to have trouble using successfully. Currently, I’m looking into -janhayo -. My textbook explains this form in the following way: “This construction is used when the speaker assumes that the listener will agree with him/her. It is used when the speaker wants to reconfirm facts already known.” (9) -book 1.
My understanding of this is that it should be used when you have shared information to acknowledge that the listener already has access to the information being discussed. Books describe this as a “You know, ….” meaning in English. However, it seems to be a form that makes my meaning confusing to listeners when I try to implement it in real life.

Is there a difference between -janh- and -janha- particles?

In letter 1, there isn’t a lot to examine overall. I used the form once, and Y and G kept it. Y and G also added the form when I discuss S’s mom’s injury. N, however, did not add it in for the injury and deleted my one occurrence where I discussed my parents being retired.

9/23
8:50am
I finished looking at the -잡아 issues. There were really very few, which makes me wonder why they stood out to me. Perhaps because this is a form that has been challenging for me to use in a natural way in the past, I felt like any presence was worth investigating. Maybe that’s the thing I like most about this feedback technique; you can find the information you want to find. In letter 1, I didn’t use this form at all in my clean copy. While N and G carried that pattern into the reformulations, Y made one addition in 없었잡아. This is interesting to me for a few reasons. Firstly, I would understand this to be an incorrect spelling, but she used the same form in letter 2, so it is probably not a typo. Is it slang? Or just an alternative spelling? Secondly, her use of this actually makes perfect sense to me because it is definitely shared information between S and me, but it also kind of changes the tone of what I was saying if I translate it directly to English. “Because of …., we weren’t able to talk much.” vs. “As you know, we weren’t able to talk much because of ….”

As for the other uses in letter 2. I can’t say they surprise me. I understand why Y and G added this form when discussing S’s mom. I think it could make the statement sound less awkward in Korean, even though I wouldn’t necessarily include “As you know” in English for this situation. Maybe that’s a disadvantage of relying too much on the idea of how it translates; you can get stuck on how it sounds in the L1 instead of how the form is actually used in the TL.
Another aspect of the letters I’ve been looking at is the deletion of “I” and “You”. In just letter 1, there are between 7 and 18 deletions of “I” in the reformulations. It’s difficult for me to make a judgment of when this happens exactly, except to say that I need to be more careful to be aware of context and omit “I” or “You” whenever it seems like the identity of the subject of the sentence should be obvious to the reader. I think this could make a big difference in making my writing seem more natural.

This is just one step in the process. After talking with Elaine, I can see that I need to make efforts to find more general patterns in my reformulations and spend less time in trying to quantify this data. This is a little frustrating because I’ve already spent so much time doing categorization according to the process described in Gilbert’s article. I wouldn’t go so far as to say this was a waste of time entirely; I do think that process gave me a better general idea of what issues were changed in reformulations. However, I do feel like I exhausted myself completing a process that I knew to have limited value early on.

It’s also difficult for me to accept that I don’t need to attribute some kind of quantified value to these patterns I think I’ve seen. How else will I know how prevalent these patterns really are? I think this is especially true because I believe I notice more the changes that came up with forms that I lacked confidence with from the beginning. For example, the “janha” form was one that jumped out at me, but when I looked back it the use, I actually only used it a couple times and it likewise only came up in reformulations a couple times. I was just interested in it because it was a form that gave me trouble in the past. I think I maybe need to find a balance between just noticing things and picking out the features I feel interested in getting feedback on.

Moving forward, I need to figure out the details of my process. 1) Complete an evaluation of the forms I noticed and make hypotheses about what I need to do differently or why my use was changed by reformulators. 2) Choose one reformulator to be my model. 3) Ask reformulator model to reformulate one more letter for me. Can I just use the old letter 3 considering that this has already be reconstructed. If I don’t reconstruct, the result will likely be worse compared to the other reconstructed letters. 4) Write new letter? Update old?. 5) Get reformulation of letter. 6) Look at changes in new letter to see if I have reduced some of the forms that have been reformulated in the past. 7) Ask for feedback from the model reformulator. 8) Evaluate the results.

I need to determine a defined process to move forward with.

One of the things I need to complete moving forward is the identification of whether or not my research questions have limitations. I’ve pretty much been using the same questions from Gilbert’s study without any modification, but I think, considering the direction I seem to be moving, I need to look at possible alterations that could make these research questions more applicable to the current study.
My questions based on Gilbert’s research questions were:

1) What can analysis of diary entries reveal about the insights a mid-intermediate learner experiences through studying reformulations?
2) To what extent do different reformulators agree on what to change and how?
3) What can analysis of diary entries reveal about factors affecting the motivation of the learner to engage in reformulation throughout the study?

I think that #1 can still work, but I need to perhaps add here a point to cover application of these concepts-uptake. I think that #2 can be eliminated as it would require the type of step-by-step categorization that I initially did but eliminated due to finding it less than useful for actually learning the different ideas. #3 can work, but I believe I would talk less about affective issues and more about what I did or did not enjoy or find useful during the process. Pretty much, what aspects of the process encouraged me and which discouraged me?

New Research Questions:

1) What insights can a mid-intermediate learner with a non-traditional language learning background experiences gain through studying reformulations?
2) Is the learner able to show uptake of the noticed issues by using the identified forms in later writing?
   a) Expert feedback on success of making the writing more native-like?
   b) evaluative statement
3) What can analysis of diary entries reveal about factors affecting the motivation of the learner to engage in reformulation throughout the study?

Process:

A. List noticed change patterns with hypothesized reasons for changes. (List should include approximately 7-10 noticed change patterns?)
B. Talk with a native speaker about these noticed patterns to see if I can support my conclusions.
C. Try to apply them in Letter 3 to see if I can identify appropriate ways to apply concepts in reformulating my own letter.
D. Ask for judgments from native speakers on if the new letter is more native-like and why.
E. Write a new letter trying to use what I’ve learned, but not looking at any of the old letters/materials.
F. Have the new letter reconstructed for errors.
G. My model, Y, will reformulate the new letter.
H. Analyze the identified forms to see if they are changed less in this reformulation than they were in the original reformulation. --Maybe just a new letter and judgment from model about success of the final letter.

9/30
9:50am
I’m happy with my strategy to move forward with my plan to look at some of the individual patterns that were changed, but I wonder if I can give credit to the complexity of the process in this manner. I think it’s really important to note which forms I feel were in my i, my i+1, and which were just completely outside what would be reasonable for me to understand. Also, I don’t know how to communicate the frustration I dealt with at times when I was trying to use rhetorical devices of language in trying to communicate humorous events or frustration and these forms were changed to more grammatically accurate forms, but forms that in my opinion seemed to eliminate those rhetorical devices and the tone I was trying to inject into my writing.

9/30
2:14pm
For next week, try to finish Noticed Forms document and apply to 3rd letter.

10/11
3:11pm
I’m working on the noticed forms sheet again after having a longer break. At this moment, I’m feeling very aware of the volume of information I’m utilizing here to try to form conclusions. I’m also very concerned about the fact that this process does not utilize analysis of the reconstruction process. I think I will need to go back and look at those documents again, but they are rather disorganized and it will be difficult for me to keep track of the changes as they go through the full process. I feel very much like this should have been done one letter at a time. While I began this process trying to follow the methodology of Gilbert’s study, I’m finding that the volume of data just doesn’t seem completely useful for a personal experience/introspective study. I kind of feel like it is difficult to take a student perspective because it is very clear that a student would not be dealing with this amount of feedback. I also think that the fact that this process is so spread out makes it seem a little less relevant than it should be. If I had this study to do over again I would operate under a strict schedule, possibly with only one reformulator on 1 letter, or 2 reformulators at the most. I would do this under a stricter schedule, and if I wanted to add more to the process, I would do so as a separate component after the first step was done. This would be pedagogically more sound and would keep the process more focused. In order to stay motivated with reformulations, I think the method would need to be applied in a very controlled, limited way. Gilbert may have found it interesting to look at reformulator differences, and it is, in a way. But as far as being useful, I think that one reformulator is enough. However, the multiple reformulators did reinforce for me that there are big differences in how understandable native speakers’ Korean is for me. For example, Yeona mostly uses forms that are familiar to me and her constructions are fairly easy for me to read. In contrast, Nari’s sentence structure is really difficult for me to read and she uses several constructions that I don’t think I’ve seen at all in my textbooks. There is a big age difference between Y and N, so that could be part of the reason, or it could be due to how much they wanted to change my voice in the writing. Regardless, I do think it would make a difference in how useful reformulations would be to me if I only had reformulations from either Y or N. I believe I would get more from Y’s reformulation because her use of Korean seems more accessible from my interlanguage, whereas N’s language seem far outside my level. While I can understand much of what N says, I don’t see myself as being able to take up the forms because
they are not at all familiar to me. Based on this, I think multiple reformulators is helpful in 2 aspects.

1) It might decrease frustration that could arise if a student was working with a reformulator who used a lot of more advanced/unfamiliar forms. I feel much more motivated when reading Y’s reformulations than I do when looking at N or G’s reformulation.

2) It could be very useful in a process of choosing a model. I would not know that Y was a better model for me than N or G unless I had seen all 3 reformulations.

These aspects should of course be taken with a grain of salt as it is highly unlikely that most language learners would ever be in the position to “audition” reformulators. Additionally, I am sure that learning could take place regardless of which reformulator I chose as a model, it would likely just be more challenging to use one N or G. One could actually argue that there would be more to learn from N or G.

In fact, my desire to choose Y as a model may be a factor that I should consider in terms of identity and voice. I feel that Y retained more of my writing style and structure. I really don’t know if that is due to her wanting to retain my structure as much as possible or if it really reflects that Y may have a more similar writing style to what I learned in books/what I’ve transferred from my own style. I find it really interesting that I value so much the fact that Y kept a lot of my style. I really didn’t think that I would have any defensiveness of voice in Korea as I feel so unsure of my abilities, but I really did have a strong reaction to larger rhetorical changes. If nothing else, I think that is a really important lesson for me to learn as a teacher and writing consultant. Even with the many errors and awkward language I use, I clearly still feel that I have a voice in it, or I would not have those strong reactions.

10/11
6:14pm

I really would like to keep looking for items in this paper, but I think I need to stop here for the day. I looked into “Nowadays”, exclamation marks, lists, closing, sentences combining, and started to look at plural particle use, and I feel exhausted! I’m constantly surprised by how much of a strain this process can feel like. My brain gets tired of looking for these little details throughout the letters. It’s really a draining process trying to see the patterns and make judgments about the causes of these changes. I do feel like I’m on the right track because I am really starting to see where there are gaps in my writing and form what I think are reasonable hypotheses about the cause of these gaps. I love the feeling of identifying aspects of Korean that I clearly just learned wrong because it means that I can make changes that will positively affect my ability to use Korean. For example, in reflecting, I can clearly see that I really just completely misunderstood using conjunctions in lists. I really thought that using conjunction was more natural than using commas. I thought the use of commas to separate items in lists would be language transfer from English. I find it fascinating to think of where I might have gotten this idea after seeing all reformulators use commas in every list. I really think I must have generalized it from the very first Korean lesson I ever did (Pimsleur’s recordings). I remember the recording using conjunctions after each word, and I guess I was just never corrected because my use was understandable, if not technically right.
I also think I need to consider how important it is to keep up this exhausting analysis of individual forms. After all, the idea is to be fairly general in terms of what I’m noticing. However, I also want to have some quantitative backup showing how prevalent what I’m noticing really is. After all, something that really surprises me might stand out to me a lot, but only occur once in the reformulations. It’s not that I don’t think this is something worth noting, but I do think it is somewhat important that I note why it was brought to my attention instead of grouping it with the high incident changes that are actually representative of patterns.

10/13
1:41pm
I’ve been trying to think about how best to continue on with the process and moving from listing hypotheses to getting to a place where I can really apply the hypotheses in meaningful ways. I made contact with Dambi to get some feedback on the process to see if she agree that my hypotheses have any merit. I do think talking to her presents some challenges as she may not have had any experience analyzing her own language, so she may not be able to give me a lot of information on whether or not the hypotheses I made are correct. There is the possibility that I should be meeting with my old Korea teacher to get feedback on this step of the process, but I don’t know for sure that she would be able to help, and I feel like I might need her feedback more later in the process. As I’m writing this, I wonder if I’m making a mistake in meeting with Dambi instead of waiting to make an appointment with Sunmi. I should probably ask Elaine about this. I also need to determine if getting help from Korean men would still be a complicating factor in this process. It seems like I should be able to use them to make judgments even though I ruled them out as reformulators/reconstructors. After all, they should still be able to strongly make judgments about nativeness/naturalness of writing. I’m struck again by how complicated it is to try to take the dual roles of researcher and student. I sometimes feel like my focus is very divided between what I think is methodologically more sound and what would be more useful to me as a language learner. At those times, I sometimes question the entire justification for this process. After all, why would I take any steps that don’t benefit me as a language learner? If a step doesn’t seem beneficial to my learning, why would I include it in a study about insights I can obtain and what I can learn? The reverse point also has merit. If I can justify taking a step for my learning, but it doesn’t seem to have a place in the methodology, how can I justify going through the process? This has become much more complicated in terms of my own thoughts on the correct steps for the study since I made the decision to deviate from Gilbert’s study. When I started the study, I followed Gilbert’s step as much as possible. Now, I’m left with those earlier steps, and I need to piece them together with how I want to move forward.

10/19
9:05am
My birthday weekend has come and gone, meaning that I’m becoming very aware of how much of the semester has passed. It’s quickly becoming impossible to pretend I have plenty of time left to complete this project. In fact, I don’t know if it’s even possible to complete this project this semester. I need to figure this out.
I met with Dambi on 10/15 to discuss my noticed forms. It was really interesting to talk to her, and I was reminded of the phenomenon that always happens when discussing grammar with a native speaker who has never given instruction on the native language before. They are surprised that they can't explain their answers. They can tell you what sounds better in a given situation, but have a difficult time thinking about the rule that makes that the case. I have gone through the same thing in English many times. I feel that the answers she gave me were generally in agreement with the hypotheses I made, but I did learn some interesting information about the nuances of different vocabulary and grammar uses. In particular, I learned that exclamation marks seem strange when used with sad information, and … would actually be used in their place in those situations to express concern. … as being seen as marking an issue of concern is not something that is not used in English, but when she described its use in Korean, it seemed like a more specific use.

10/19
10:14am

I need to establish what my process really is.

1) Write letters x3
2) Reconstruct letters with native speaker x3
3) Create clean copies x3
4) Send letters 1 and 2 for reformulation from 3 different native speakers
5) Keep letter 3 to try to apply changes found in reformulation at a later time
6) Analyze 6 reformulations to see what changes were made, what patterns in the changes can be found
   a) Tried to apply Gilbert’s categorization, wasn’t useful, changed to a more general noticed forms practice
   b) Created a noticed forms WS identifying 20 different general changes that were made
      i) explain changes, form hypotheses about changes, make a plan for what to change, ask native speaker about hypotheses, alter plan for how to apply changes if needed
7) Apply noticed forms to letter 3 to create my own reformulation
8) Ask a native speaker to judge whether L3 reformulation is more natural/native-like than the clean copy. Discuss changes and whether they were applied correctly, and whether they made a difference.
9) Write letter 4 without looking at materials
10) Reconstruct letter 4
11) With a native speaker (model), discuss the success of applying the noticed forms in Letter 4. Re-send Clean copies 1 and 2. Ask model to judge whether Letter 4 seems like an improvement over letters 1&2.
12) Examine journal for aspects of motivation in the reformulation process.

10/20
12:58pm
I made the final look through on noticed forms and eliminated the original topics I had identified that either didn’t seem to have enough occurrences in the letters to be able to really say anything about them or didn’t have any consistent patterns that could help me make a judgment about what to change. From this method I deleted prepositions and subject/topic particles because I couldn’t find patterns that would help me make decisions moving forward. I think those are definitely areas that I should continue to improve, but I don’t think noticing patterns in the reformulations will necessarily help me more than my previous experience trying to figure out those frustrating topics. I believe I would need more focused instruction to really finally understand those 2 things. I also deleted rhetorical questions because I actually only used those once or twice in my letters and changes made by reformulators were often part of larger changes in the structure of the letters and so were hard to analyze. 지 was also a form that didn’t seem to be used enough to be useful for drawing a conclusion. Finally, I added 대해서 because that was a form that was used often and changed frequently.

10/21
9:29am
I am finding that one challenge of reformulating letter 3 is that the forms I used in the other letters are not necessarily present in this letter. There is a whole list of forms that I can’t try to apply here. It might be important to plan out my next letter a little more to ensure that I am using the forms that I think were suggested as needing extra attention in the reformulations. I also need to be sure to take notes if there are other things besides the noticed forms sheet items that I am changing based on what I learned in the reformulations, even if I initially thought that those forms did not have enough of a pattern to really note as an additional form.

10/23
6:11pm
I talked with Daesung today, and it was really encouraging. He said that he could very obviously and clearly say that the letter I reformulated was the better of the two versions of letter 3. He primarily pointed out that the sentence combination was the most important aspect in being able to determine which is better. He said he thinks that sentence combination is the most important aspect that shows whether a piece of writing is higher or lower level.

10/24
2:31pm
I am currently working on Letter 4. I believe I need 1-2 more opinions on the changes I made in letter 3, but I also feel that I have enough feedback to move forward with what I know. There is a certain artificial aspect of doing things this way, but I really think it’s so important to keep moving forward. The more I think about this process, the more I think that the main limitation of this study has actually been the lack of a definitive timeline. I realize that this was due largely to things just not working out in terms of the analysis process I went through, but I really kind of wish that I had this whole thing to do over again. I would set everything up into a tight timeline, getting everything done for the analysis process in a period of about 2 weeks. I would then have a more realistic idea of what that would be like in a more acceptable learning timeline. I don’t
know if that would have been possible considering all the people that were involved in this process, but when I reflect, I also think that I wouldn’t really need as much feedback as I actually got. After all, one of the frustrations I’ve experienced during this process is an overabundance of information. The more I think about it, the more I think it would have been more beneficial as a learner to just look at one reformulation. I’m struggling with the value of this process, but at this point I really think that I just need to keep moving forward regardless of how I feel. Starting over isn’t really an option considering the amount of cooperation it’s taken to get this far. Asking all of my Korean contacts to go through the process again would just be unrealistic.

10/25
2:44pm
After getting reconstruction on letter 4-- I don’t know if I’ve ever been so frustrated with a project. I really thought this process was going to be straightforward seeing as it started as a replication of a previous study. Now I find that the steps just keep getting more complicated and I have no confidence that I’ve done anything right. I’m so frustrated with my level, with this process, and with trying to make anything of this process. Now I think I will probably have to go back and look at all the reconstructions to see what feedback happened there. I think I can learn from reformulation, but the most important things I learned from that seem irrelevant considering that I can’t apply the more basic grammar correctly. In fact, H’s exact advice to me was to make shorter sentences to be better understood. But, that’s the opposite of what I should do according to the reformulation noticed forms. Furthermore, when I applied the steps to the reconstructed letter, it was successful. However, when I wrote a new letter using what I had learned, it was almost worse than the originals. I guess I was writing beyond my ability.

10/26
8:41pm
I keep going back and forth between feeling really discouraged by the lack of success I’ve experienced and feeling like it’s really okay because it’s still an interesting finding even if it isn’t what I wanted to find. After talking to Sam, I felt better as he told me that he thinks I really need to be writing down the thoughts I’m having about these things as they are interesting things to discuss in a paper. When I stop to think about this process, I wonder if the problem is that I’ve extended this process to the point where the weaknesses have come too much to the forefront. After all, if I had just replicated the original study, I don’t think I ever would have identified there even being a problem. Even if I had just stopped at the 3rd letter, everything would have worked out. I didn’t really experience any problems with the process until I got to the 4th letter reconstruction. So, perhaps this is just identifying an issue that didn’t come up in some of the other processes I’ve looked at. Additionally, it is interesting to notice what I think my problems with letter 4 are suggesting: 1) The reformulation is allowing me to notice issues that make my letters less native-like, but the correct application of those features may be out of my i+1. 2) Analyzing the reformulation process is taking away what might be the higher priority issues identified in the reconstruction process. 3) The reformulation step may not be appropriate for someone at my level, but still might be appropriate for someone at a higher level who needs less reconstruction to just create correct sentences. It may also be more appropriate for
someone who has plateaued and needs new input to help consider writing style more than the issues with errors.

I think I’m definitely able to learn from this process, but it also seemed to take away time and attention from the higher priority issues with my writing.

10/28
11:14am
What a rollercoaster of a week! I felt like I was ready to give up on this whole project on Sunday after seeing how much Hyeri needed to change in my writing. When she told me that she thought I just needed to write more basic sentences, I didn’t just feel like I was going to cry, I actually cried...like a baby. I felt like I was just too stupid to benefit from this writing process; I felt like I had lost the lottery of research participants when I decided to do an introspective study on myself. The feelings I have about this specific research specimen are definitely more judgmental than is probably acceptable in research.

The funny thing is that, after a day to think about it and a session venting with Sam, I realized that this problem with the rough draft doesn’t actually affect the results of my research at all. None of my research questions are concerned with grammar/spelling errors in the rough draft. So, while these results were personally devastating and might raise some questions about what is left behind in the reformulation process, there was really nothing that affected the progress of the research. I was confusing the feeling of failing as a language learner with failure in conducting my research.

In my attempts for resolve the issue, I arranged to move up my appointment with Elaine to discuss the issues that came up. I wrote the email in a panic, thinking that we would have to enact some serious damage control. That night, I went to see Daesung after 11pm because I needed to know what the final verdict was on the clean copy of letter 4. I set out all 4 clean copies (without an reformulation work) and asked him if he could say any of them were better than the others. He immediately said that Letter 4 was definitely better than the others. Definitely! He didn’t even have to think about it. That means that, regardless of the obstacles that came up in reconstructions, the things that I changed definitely made a change in the quality of the resulting letter. Suddenly I realized that the results I got to my research questions went exactly as I had hoped. I must have learned something from the reformulations, because I successfully created better letters given the same amount of scaffolding. I felt much better about this process after considering that. Also, Elaine made me feel much less guilty and more confident when she pointed out that I was acting like I was expecting to be perfect after completing this process. I think she was absolutely right about the fact that I was getting discouraged way too easily by the feedback and the fact that I was still making errors. I think that’s a flaw I have as a learner. I work with international students all the time that continually make the same kinds of errors, but I have a hard time dealing with the fact that the same is true for me.

11/5
3:50pm
Well, here we go round again. Roller coaster is at the bottom of the tracks. This morning I met with Jessica and we went through the process of selecting the better of the 3rd letter drafts. She chose the reformulated version as better and identified the reasons I thought she would. We then looked at letter 4 and went through the process of identifying the changes in a more organized way. She agreed with most of the changes, but pointed out a few issues. I was feeling so great about almost being done and was looking forward to being nearly done with the process. I also got an email from Yeona in which she said that given a choice, she would select the fourth letter as being the better of the 4. She gave the reasons that the flow was more natural and the use of suffixes was better, along with some content evaluations. So I was feeling great and like I was really showing that I was learning something. If I had written this entry earlier today, I would have said that I was absolutely making progress, I was feeling motivated, and I was confident that something good was coming from my hard work. Then things started to take a bit of a downward turn. I read through most of my journal, and I think that it was really interesting for the most part to track the changes in perspective and approach I’ve gone through from the start of this study until now. I thought I had a lot of interesting insights and brought up a lot of issues that merited further attention. However, I did start to feel a little discouraged when I noticed that I wasn’t posting a lot about motivation. Instead, I shifted to talking about my plans for the study and how to continue. I started talking a lot about what I was learning/observing and what weaknesses seemed to be present in the study. This is all well and good, but my focus for the study is on motivational factors in the process of reformulation, not how to carry out the study properly. I actually felt demoralized by my own journal. I think there is a lot, but I tended to be journaling more before I was actually doing the process, not during. During the process, the journal changed to observation notes. I think I’ll have some interesting material, but I wish so badly that I’d written more. Then, I went to meet my Korean instructor today, and she chose letter 3 as the best! She actually seemed to think that the complexity of letter 4 was part of the problem in that it didn’t seem conversational, though she said it was more accurate. She also said letter 4 was similar to 1 and 2 in that it seemed to have more direct translation. It’s completely confounding as Letter 3 was really a letter that was just thrown in for the sake of having 4 letters that made sense together; it wasn’t even really a focus of analysis. Furthermore, Sunmi made a few comments about shorter sentences being better, which confused me. She did seem to think that deletion of “I” was a good thing, but she still thought letter 3 was better, even though that has lots of incidences of “I”. I feel confused all over again. She also seemed to think that a lot of the things I did didn’t really work or make a large difference in terms of meaning. I feel confounded all over again. I really value all the feedback, but it is really hard to maintain perspective sometimes. I know I’m just learning, but when everything seems contradictory, it’s hard to keep moving. Sam keeps reminding me that I need to stop thinking of these things as problems, but it’s hard when I have so much invested in this. I really want to feel like I’ve learned something, and I want evidence to back that up. In a way, I guess that this process is motivating in that I really want to improve my Korean because I see how far behind it is. I do think I’ll study harder because of it. However, I also think I feel more pessimistic about the possibility of ever making any great improvements.

11/10
I’m closing in on completing the research process. It’s strange to look back at what I’ve done over the last several months. I feel equally like there is so much and like there really isn’t much to show for my work. I guess I can say that I’m proud of the work I’ve done to improve my writing. I don’t know if it really created measurable improvements that I can point out to someone, but I do think I have a better understanding of some aspects of Korean writing. In particular, I think I’ve really improved in understanding how it’s possible that entire paragraphs could exist without the “I” subject. Furthermore, I can definitely see how my language use could be improved with more sentence combination. I may not have the ability to do that well yet, but I really do feel like I have some better understanding of how to apply it. Furthermore, I think that my ability to use language appropriate for audience is better. No small thing is the fact that I understand tense issues a little better. Honestly, I do feel like my language development largely fossilized after the beginning levels of the language. I’ve had a hard time fighting for any inch of development. I’ve been trying for a long time to reinvigorate my interest in the language. I do think this helped me with this to a certain point. I think I’ve really developed a lot of interest in understanding the portions of my language that seem to cause problems. Furthermore, I really do feel some pride in the amount of information I’ve produced. Additionally, even though one of my informants identified letter 4 as not being the best of the letters, I still feel like it was really an accomplishment for me. I worked really hard on it, and I think it is an improvement in terms of taking on more complexity than I’ve tried before. I think I’ve realized that I need to push myself to attempt more complex forms of communication. This process has shown me that my habit of sticking to simple expression, while less risky, really marks my lack of language ability. I don’t feel equipped to handle the challenges of complex ideas at this point, but with hard work, I think I could be. I also realize that, challenging though it might be, I really need to push myself to read more in Korean to get those high levels of input that will help me make progress and see varieties of sentences structures.
Appendix C: Questionnaire on Success of Applying Noticed Reformulation Changes in Letter 4

1) Are “I” and “You” subjects used appropriately? Not overused?

2) Do the salutations and closings seem natural for an informal Korean letter? (Look for pink)

3) Does the deletion of -었었 (double past) seem appropriate? (Compare with earlier letters.)

4) Is the use of -잖 (as you know…) appropriate in the context it is used? (Look for blue)

5) Are the uses of 우선 and 먼저 appropriate? Are they improvements over the use of 처음으로? (Look for green)

6) Do uses of 요즘 and 요새 seem natural? (Look for purple)

7) Do the uses of -에 대해 seem appropriate? Is this use more natural than -에 대해서 would be? (Look for yellow)

8) Does the presence or absence of exclamation marks (!) seem appropriate? (Only two exclamation marks present- one in the opening and one in the closing)

9) Are the lists used appropriate in context and form? (Look for orange)

10) Is the plural marker (들) used appropriately? Not overused? (Look for red)
11) Are sentences combined in logical ways?

Does the combination of sentences make the writing seem more natural than if the sentences were separated?

Is there anything unnatural about the combination of sentences in the letter?

Is the increased sentence combining an improvement compared to earlier letters?

12) Are there any notable errors in the use of idiomatic language that you noticed? Are there any notable correct uses of idiomatic language that you noticed?

13) Are 후에 and 뒤에 used appropriately to mean “after” in the right contexts? (Look for cornflower blue)

14) Is the use of the honorific “시” used appropriately without any noticed omissions? (Look for light green)

15) Does the use of commas seem natural? Not too many, not too few?

16) Are there any patterns you noticed in letter 4 that marked that writing as non-native or awkward?
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소라야 안녕!

지난 편지가 마지막 편지라고 했는데 여름과 가을에 대해 이야기 하고 싶어.

8월에 고향에 도착했던 때 날씨가 너무 더워서 처음에 숲에 못 갔어. 그래서 계획을 연기했어. 그런데 기온이 낮아져서 숲에 갔어. 뒤에 언니가 나에게 전화 했고 이사를 도와달라고 물었기 때문에 숲에서 일찍 출발했어. 그리고 숲에 있는 시간 동안 이상한 것이 일어났어. 먼저, 밤에 잠자는 동안 박쥐가 침실에 날아들었고 나는 겁이 났어. 담요를 머리 위에 쓰고 빵리 밖으로 달렸지만 공기가 너무 차가워서 안으로 돌아가는 것이 필요했어. 돌아가서 불을 켜고 나니 박쥐가 없어졌어. 혹시 박쥐가 나하고 밖에 나갔거나, 내 개가 박쥐를 먹었거나, 박쥐가 집에서 비밀의 장소를 가졌는지 몰라. 박쥐의 운명에 관계없이 다시 못 봤지만 그 뒤에 잘 자지 못 했어. 그리고 다음 날 운동하는 동안 벌이 무릎 뒤를 쫓고 있었어. 벌 알레르기는 없지만 무릎은 정말 아파서 운동하는 것이 불편했어. 그래서 그 캠핑 좋은 운명을 가지지 않아서 일을 많이 못 했어.

미네소타 돌아왔을 때 열심히 일해야 했지만 아직 연구가 끝나지 않았어. 그래서 아마 복학하기에 출업 안 할 것 같은데 대학에서 하는 일이 좋아서 편찮아. 요새 대학교 라이팅 센터에서 학생들의 에세이를 도와주는 일을 하고 있어. 가끔 잘 못했던 것들을 설명하는 것이 힘들어지만, 많은 다른 학생들 만나서 많이 다른 에세이를 읽으니 재미있어. 그리고 숙제를 하지 않아도 되서 주말에 즐거운 것들을 할 수 있어.
예를 들면 지난 주말에 내 생일이어서 많은 재미 있는 것을 했어. 주말동안 언니를 만났고, 동물원에도 갔고, 불링도 했어. 많은 일이 없어서 생일을 잘 축하하고, 가족과 친구들을 만날 수 있었지만 지난 학기에 자유 시간이 없어. 그래서 빌리 풀입 하는 것이 중요하지 않아. 새로운 일을 좋아 하지만 가르치는 것을 그리워하고 그래서 다음 학기에 수업을 가르치고 싶어. 가령 고등학교에서 가르치던 때 가끔 스트레스 많이 있어. 그래. 그러지만 요새 그 일을 자주 그리워해. 가끔 한국에 다시 가서 가르칠지 생각하지만 가끔 다른 나라도 생각해. 그러지만 일부 교수님들이 나는 미네소타에서 일을 찾아야한다고 하셨어. 한국에 다시 가면 너를 다시 모기를 바래.

그럼 이만 안녕!

보고 싶은 친구 소리에게, 캐리가