

Infelicity of Expression and L1-L3 Interferences on EFL Writing*

Youngroung Kim · Haeryen Seo
(Woosuk University)

Kim, Youngroung & Seo, Haeryen. 2009. Infelicity of Expression and L1-L3 Interferences on EFL Writing. *The Linguistic Association of Korea Journal*. 17(1). 135-152. This paper leads off with the argument that, when students equate Korean phrases with the target language L2 English, the interferences which are fueled by the meaning confusion between L1 Korean and L3 Chinese characters have had a great effect upon their writing. Claiming that L1/L3 interferences on L2 English take a heavy toll on writing, we factor in and weigh a number of language variants among Korean, English, and Chinese characters. This paper purposes to provide EFL students with a way to hone their writing by examining their infelicity of expressions. The lack of understanding of the meaning differences generate garble-like translations, to the extent that their intended writings are difficult to decipher. This is attributable to the interferences of L1 Korean and L3 Chinese characters, constituting the bulk of infelicity expressions in English writing. By lumping together the stylistic infelicity of expression, we see that many students concern themselves solely with literal translation of Korean phrases, not with the discernment of meaning differences. Students are highly likely to get confusion arising from homophonic utterance of a word in Korean and in Chinese characters. This paper seeks to find out a solution, helping them hone their writing skills, while putting a great deal of thought into crafting their drafts.

Key Words: Interferences, EFL writing errors, meaning differences, literal translation, infelicity of expression, homophonic

* This paper was supported by Woosuk University grant.

The improvement of this paper is thanks to anonymous readers. Their helpful comments and advice are appreciated. All remaining errors are mine.

1. Introduction: Writing & Infelicity of Expression

A general shift has taken place in the teaching of EFL writing in Korea. For instance, the National Examination for Secondary English Teacher (NESET), the previous “focus on form” has been changed to a “focus on the writing” since 2008. Given that using a language is involved culturally and socially, writing is influenced by various factors which differ from one culture to another. A learner’s cultural and social background has a potential influence upon the way that he/she writes. To be English teachers at secondary school in Korea, candidates are required to be equipped with ability to write English well, and they have to take an exam on writing skills in terms of essays for 4 hours in the NESET. Since a great change took place in the framework of the NESET in 2008, sharpening and building up writing skills have been viewed as a time-consuming and complex procedure, but a must work, i.e., a required capability imperative for students to build up to pass the NESET.

As noted by Kroll (2001), the ability to achieve even a modicum of success in writing in a second language is no doubt even more difficult to achieve than the ability to read, speak, or understand the language. When we factor in a number of language variants and in considerations of the ways suitable for a particular purpose, leading EFL students to become successful writers, who are able to make up a good composition, is a complex task. Believing that the lack of understanding of the meaning differences, which are caused by confusion between Korean and Chinese characters, constitute the bulk of their errors in writing, we focus on the errors shown in the articles, which student reporters contributed to a school English magazine, spanning 3 years.

When reading students’ articles, we often have difficulty deciphering their drafts, as their writing is quite different from their intended messages, and in uncovering potential meanings the student might have tried to express in their writings. With a view to eliminating stylistic infelicity of expressions concerning word use, irrespective of grammatical problems, this paper presents some of the general issues involved in writing, including the importance of a clear understanding of how to foster the skills for using appropriate words when translating Korean sentences into English. With a focus on pedagogical implications, we touch on a number of phenomena as to significant cultural and

social interferences of Chinese characters on EFL writing.

Sensing that when translating Korean sentences into L2 English, the misunderstanding of the meanings of a phrasal use between L1, Korean, and L3, Chinese characters, takes a heavy toll on writing, we should take into considerations various grounds for writing errors, arising from the interferences on vocabulary of the two languages, Korean and Chinese characters. This surely leads learners to minimize unnecessary loopholes in writing. Then, where does the fallacy and confusion of vocabulary and meaning between L1 Korean and L3 Chinese characters? Looking into students' understanding of the basic lexicon knowledge, which they have acquired since, spanning several years, their high school days, we can help them make up proper English constructions. As for L2 English, the improper equation and replacement of words, as a result of meaning confusion between L1 Korean and L3 Chinese characters, are not a few-and-far-between error. They are rather, as provided below, a phenomenal one that most students have in common in English writing. The most compelling arguments for vocabulary-related critical data I have collected for up to 3 years are shown as a piece of evidence for improperly equating Korean phrases with English expressions.

We need to take a hard look at learners' inadequate understanding of the target language. As noted in Choe (1997), EFL learners almost habitually equate the meaning and usage of mother tongue with those of the target language. However, the items, which seem to be identical at a glance, prove to be discrepant in their meanings from each other. In this regard, Choe (1997) claims that "Out of sheer ignorance, one puts a target item in the way he may use it in his native language."

2. Previous Research on Interferences & EFL Writing

Fruition in writing can be borne only through sustained efforts and a time-consuming process. There are no rules to be learned which generate fully conceived and problem-free essays. Under the circumstances in which a variety of cultural settings and ambiances is coming out, teaching writing to EFL students is a hard work. We can definitely say that, to build up the capability of

writing skill, students must write for themselves, with appropriate feedback from their teachers¹⁾, as, without feedback opportunities in a writing course, there is little reason for students to be there. Students are not expected to produce and submit complete and polished responses to their writing assignments without going through the stages of drafting and receiving feedback on their drafts.

Regarding the interferences of the first language in principles of second language acquisition, H.D. Brown (2007) says that psychological variables like learning, cognition, strategies, and emotions form a foundation stone for building a comprehensive understanding of the acquisition of the linguistic system. When it comes to the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH), he also noted that “Deeply rooted in the behavioristic and structuralist approaches of the day, the principal barrier to second language acquisition is the interference of the first language system with the second language system, and that a scientific, structural analysis of the two languages in question would yield a taxonomy of linguistic contrasts between them which in turn would enable linguists and language teachers to predict the difficulties a learner would encounter.” Further describing the CAH, Brown (2007) says that “behaviorism contributed to the notion that human behavior is the sum of its smallest parts and components, and therefore that language learning could be described as the acquisition of all of those discrete units. Moreover, human learning theories highlighted interfering elements of learning, concluding that where no interference could be predicted, no difficulty would be experienced since one could transfer positively all other items in a language. The logical conclusion from these various psychological and linguistic assumptions was that second language learning basically involved the overcoming of the differences between the two linguistic systems--the native and target language. Intuitively the CAH

1) It is true there are many students in one class for a teacher, hard to provide feedback to all students, with a very limited amount of time. However, teachers should find a way to sharpen students' skills in writing and to increase their ability to improve their writing drafts. As claimed by Brown (2007), feedback should be implemented in such a way that “we may as well refrain from too much of a misemphasis of second language learners and an underemphasis on adults,” not “nitpicking at minor points or nonintrusive grammatical errors.”

has appeal in that we commonly observe in second language learners a plethora of errors attributable to the negative transfer of the native language to the target language.”

In acquisition of different culture as a way for improving EFL writing skill, in the preface to *Linguistic Across Cultures*, Robert Lado (1957) claims that “The plan of the book rests on the assumption that we can predict and describe the patterns that will cause difficulty in learning, and those that will not cause difficulty, by comparing systematically the language and the culture to be learned with the native language and culture of the student.” Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin (1965) constructed a hierarchy of difficulty for grammatical structures of two languages in contrast.²⁾ Clifford Prator (1967) and Stockwell et al (1965) have the opinion that their hierarchy could be applied to virtually any two languages and make it possible to predict second language learner difficulties in any language with a fair degree of certainty and objectivity³⁾. As a role that a writing teacher has to play, the facilitative role has been emphasized as a responder to students’ writing. The teacher, as a facilitator, should offer guidance in helping students to engage in the thinking process of composing. In a spirit of respect for student opinion, they must not impose his or her own thoughts on student writing. Citing the argument by Reid (1994), we should not take on hands-off approaches when we comment on student writing. Brown (2007) argues that “as students are encouraged to bring their own schemata to bear on understanding texts, and in writing to develop their own ideas, offer their own critical analysis, and find their own voice, the role of teachers must be one of facilitator and coach, not an authoritative director and arbiter.”

In the meantime, Truscott (1996) points out that most students lack the language competence of L1 language. The issue concerning whether students’

2) Their grammatical hierarchy included 16 levels of difficulty, based on the same notions used to construct phonological criteria, with the added dimensions of “structural correspondence” and “functional/semantic correspondence.”

3) Clifford Prator (1967) captured the essence of this grammatical hierarchy in six categories of difficulty as follows: Level 0 (Transfer), Level 1 (Coalescence), Level 2 (Underdifferentiation), Level 3 (Representation), Level 4 (Overdifferentiation), Level 5 (Split). Prator’s representation was based on principles of human learning. The first, or “zero,” degree of difficulty represented complete one-to-one correspondence and transfer, while the fifth degree of difficulty was the height of interference.

errors should be corrected at all and the role of overgrammar instruction as a way to help them avoid or lessen the presence of errors in writing are a hot issue under discussion. We have to decide which errors to correct, and how to correct errors. The decision on whether to address all or selected errors is a complex one, and probably depends a great deal on the level of writing the student is capable of producing. However, correcting all of a student's errors is probably rarely called for. Teachers are instead required concentrate on calling the student's attention to those errors which are considered more serious and/or represent a pattern of errors in that particular student's writing.⁴⁾ Kroll (2001) claims that the teacher not be swayed by the presence of language problems of turning a writing course into a grammar course; that errors must be dealt with at an appropriate stage of the composing process; and that proofreading students' writing is a sort of essential work to eliminate grammatical problems and stylistic infelicity. Writing activities that involve a variety of grammatical manipulations and practice in self-expression for its own sake certainly serve a function in laying the groundwork for more complex writing tasks.

3. Writing Errors Under L3 Environment

We analyzed the errors in the articles that student writers contributed to a school English magazine. Examining their writing, we only focus on the side of

4) Regarding error treatment, Brown (2007), citing James Hendrickson (1980), advises differentiating global and local errors, adding that local errors usually need not be corrected since the message is clear and correction might interrupt a learner in the flow of productive communication. Global errors need to be treated in some way since the message may otherwise remain garbled. Noting that many student errors in writing performance is grammatical, Brown claims that "The treatment of grammatical errors in writing is a different matter. In process of writing approaches, overt attention to local grammatical and rhetorical errors is normally delayed until learners have completed one or two drafts of a paper. Global errors that impede meaning must of course be attended to earlier in the process." In fact, it is claimed in Kroll (2001) that teachers' correction of grammatical errors can be a counterproductive activity, which might exacerbate whatever insecurities students might have about their writing and drawing their attention away from the other kinds of revision that must be attended to.

the use of proper phrases intended to convey exact meanings between the two languages, English and Korean, regardless of lots of errors, including linearity, part of speech, tense, spelling, etc. Our analysis is instead focused on finding out whether students are conscious of the meanings of words correctly equating between the two languages. The analysis purposes to bring to light what have led students not to equate the meanings of the two languages. In the wake of analyzing the articles written by students reporters spanning 3 years, we find that lots of errors in equating the L1 words and expressions with L2 ones are due to interferences of L3, i.e., Chinese characters. Their errors may result from word-to-word or expression-to-expression simple replacement into a target language on a homophonic basis, not taking into account the meanings or connotations involved at all. Their errors might be attributable to a heavy dependence upon a sort of automatic translation device. Instead, they should be immersed in developing their writing skills in a bid to craft their drafts. The following table below, showing how ridiculous the errors are, involve some of dramatic examples taken out of students' writing.

Some of the conspicuous problems, coming out of students' lack of understanding of both languages, Korean and English, can be described as follows: In translating the Korean sentence, "*sureun noe jungchu singyeonggeul machwisikinda (Drinking wine paralyzes central nerve),*" they put *jungchu*' into 'midautumn' instead of 'central nerve,' thinking that what is meant by '*jungchu*' is 'in the middle of autumn' in Chinese characters. In the Korean sentence, "*gamgiyagi naeseongeul kiunda (Taking drugs develops resistance),*" they employ the word, 'introspect' for *naeseong*, instead of 'resistance.' As for the sentence, "*gagyeogeun oebuui sikdanggwa biseutada (Prices are similar to those of restaurants out of school ground),*" they are confused by the word *oebuui*, thus using irrelevant 'external restaurants,' not the proper 'the restaurants out of school (ground).' In "*3 segimada jungheunggiga pyeolcheojinda (The period of restoration takes places every 3 centuries),*" they use the word *flag* for *gi*, thinking of *gi* as implying 'flag' homophonically in Chinese character. In translating the Korean sentence, "*seongoe daehan gwansimi jureodeulgo itda (People's interests in elections are on the decrease),*" they employ the word 'dock' for *seongoe*, instead of 'elections,' thinking dock, which means 'a place in a port where ships are loaded, unloaded, or repaired,' and elections are the same words, on the ground that

they have the homophonic utterance in Chinese characters. As for the sentence, “12wool 19il daeseone chulmahanda (They will run for the presidential elections slated for 19 December),” instead of ‘run for’ for *chulmahanda*, they use the expression, ‘go out on horseback,’ as it has the same phonetic sound in Chinese characters.

As regards the sentence, “huboneun minjokjungsimeul jujanghanda (The candidate upholds the nation-minded campaigns),” to express *minjokjungsim*, the following phrase ‘nation center of gravity’ is used, not the appropriate expression ‘the nation-minded campaigns.’ As for the sentence, “bunbaereul tonghae naesilganhwareul jujanghanda (The candidate stresses growth through distribution),” the learner employs ‘division’ for *bunbae* instead of ‘distribution,’ and ‘main room’ for *naesil* instead of ‘growth,’ respectively. He should have employed ‘distribution’ and ‘growth,’ not ‘division’ and ‘main room,’ for the proper replacement equating with *bunbae* and *naesil*. In translating the sentence, “gaeseonggongdan gateun teukbyeolgongdan mani joseonghanda (We have to build special industrial complex like Kaeseong Industrial Complex),” the proper noun, *gaeseong*, which is an area in North Korea, is replaced by the English phrase ‘personality industrial complex,’ as the learner might not discern the proper meanings of the two phrases. He regards the two expressions as the same for the ground that they have the homophonic utterance in Korean. For the translation of the expression, “banmi jaju oegyoo (Anti-American independent diplomacy),” the learner expresses the Korean *banmi* as ‘cooking rice’ in English, as he is completely ignorant of the meanings of the two expressions, granted that the two expressions are same in the phonetic utterance. As the phrase, “jayumuyeok bandaereul jujang (They are opposed to Free Trade Agreement),” the Korean word *bandae* is changed into ‘reverse,’ not the correct expression opposition. As the two words for *bandae*, ‘reverse’ and ‘opposition,’ are phonetically same in Korean and in Chinese characters, the student writer does not try to discern the meanings of the two words. Likewise, regarding the expression “bijeonggyuyjikbeop chanseong (in favor of part-time job law),” *bijeonggyujik* is changed into ‘rain full-time job,’ not ‘part-time job,’ as word *bi* is homophonic with the word meaning ‘rain,’ in Korean. In expressing “gangjero segeumeul geotda (levy tax by force),” the word *gangjero* is translated into ‘steel material tax’ instead of the proper expression ‘by force,’ as *gangjero* phonetically implies ‘steel material’ in Chinese characters. Such change might be thought of being

ridiculous, hard to believe. The translation of these expressions cannot but be construed otherwise than as shutting their eyes to the meaning differences which arise from the sentences even though they have the same pronunciation only on a homophonic footing. The learners are revealed to be only interested in the literal translation of the Korean phrases into English, coming from lack of discernment of the meaning differences even though the phrases have the homophonic utterance in common. They should make efforts not to fall into a loophole in infelicity of expression through misunderstanding of a given phrase. They do not read between the lines to find out both difference and connotation. The infelicity largely results from a lack of perception among the L1-L2-L3 interferences, that is, Korean, English, and Chinese characters. It is clearly revealed that interferences of L1-L2-L3, Korean, English, Chinese, and misunderstanding of meanings arising therefrom heavily weigh student writers' mind. Given the circumstances in which almost all Korean students have learned and have been vulnerable to Chinese characters since they were elementary school students or much earlier, it is highly likely that they are confused by the meanings implied by Korean and Chinese characters when a given word has the same phonetic expressions in particular.

Putting the phrase "*jeongi memallaganeun hyeondae sahoe* (We are not considerate towards others in modern society)," *jeong* is translated into 'pill' as if to be 'a pill of drugs' as the word is completely same just in terms of pronunciation in Korean. As for the sentence, "*pongnyeogui gongpoga dosarida* (There are lots of fears of violences)," *dosarida* is put into 'sit cross-legged.' The student writer is not aware of the fact that expression *dosarida* have variable meanings according to in what context it is used. In the phrase, "*hakgyo cheugeubuteo* (from the school side)," the underlined phrase, *hakgyo cheug*, is translated not into 'school side' but 'into school lateral.' The infelicity arises not only from the same phonetic expressions in Korean, but also from the student writer's ignorance and lack of interests in the meaning which the sentence should convey exactly. With regard to the Korean phrase, "*jangmyeonni uriege sisahaneun* (what the scene implies us is...)," for the underlined word *sisahaneun*.... the word 'test fire' is employed, instead of 'imply.' In the following Korean sentence, "*gyosunimi simsareul bonda*...(professors examines...)," for the phrase *simsareul bonda*, an improper equation, 'see a mind,' is employed, not the correct English word, 'examine' for

it. For the phrase, “*ilje gangjeomgi (the occupation period by the Japanese imperialists)*,” the learner uses ‘strong point’ for *gangjeomgi*, not employing ‘occupation period,’ not being able to discern the meaning differences coming from Korean and Chinese character. For the expression, “*urinarae michineun yeonghyang... (...have influence on our country)*,” *michineun yeonghyang* is expressed as ‘goes mad,’ literally, not conscious of the meaning the phrase should describe. Regarding “*tongsang machareul wanhwa (ease trade friction)*,” *tongsang machareul* is changed into ‘normal rubbing,’ not for the correct expression ‘trade friction.’ In sentence, “*yangguk ganui muyeongnoga siwonhage ttullida (The route for trade is clearly opened up between the two countries)*,” *siwonhage ttullida* is translated into ‘is coolly pierced,’ instead of the proper expression for it ‘clearly open up.’ The student writer never thinks of the meaning that the expression has in the context. For the expression, “*pyeonggyun 2eok won naeoe... (the production costs are around 200 million won on average)*,” *naeoe* is changed into ‘interior and exterior,’ not the correct expression ‘around or about.’

For the phrase, “*deuramae daehan geu jungdokseong (addicted to dramas)*,” *jungdokseong* is put into ‘toxicity,’ not ‘addicted,’ which results from a complete ignorance of the differences of the meanings between the two words. For the phrase, “*gongsikjeogeuro gaechoehada... (...officially held)*,” *gongsikjeogeuro* is put into ‘with a formula,’ not the proper one, ‘officially,’ not discerning the sheer differences between the two words, ‘formula’ and ‘officially’ even though they have the same phonetic expressions in Korean. To translate the phrase, “*jaedanjeonipgeum hwakchung (increase the donations from the school foundation)*,” *geum* is expressed as ‘price,’ not ‘donations’ or ‘money.’ In the phrase, “*sichukgwa sibeomgyeonggi (kickoff and games)*,” *sichuk* is translated into ‘verse scroll,’ not ‘kickoff.’ The mistranslation is entirely based on from the same literally phonetic utterance in Korean. Referring to “*yuksang jeonyong teuraek (running track)*,” *yuksang jeonyong* is translated into ‘land diversion,’ instead of the correct expression ‘running track,’ with no knowledge of the difference of the meaning of ‘diversion,’ resulting from a sheer ignorance and indifference to the words. To put the following Korean phrase into English, “*chon gjangu dwireulieo je 9dae chongjang... (the 9th president following the former president...)*,” the phrase *dwireulieo* is translated into ‘on the back of,’ instead of ‘following.’ For the expression of *cheongpyeong daem geonseol (Cheongpyeong Dam constrution)*,

pyeong is changed into ‘criticism,’ not into ‘dam,’ only by literal translation based on the meaning of a Chinese character, despite the fact that *Cheongpyeong* is a proper noun. Referring to the phrase “*seomui jungangbue (in the center of the island),*” *jungangbu* is expressed as ‘center department,’ not ‘in the center,’ as the word *bu* is literally translated. In translating the phrase, “*sonamuga yeopseocheoreom areumdaun (beautiful pinetrees like postcards),*” *yeopseocheoreom* is changed into ‘phyllotaxis’ which means ‘the arrangement of leaves on an axis or stem,’ not properly translated into ‘postcard.’ Referring to the phrase, “*nau gisa (my article),*” *gisa* is translated into ‘engineer,’ not ‘article.’ As the two words, ‘engineer’ and ‘article,’ have homophonic utterance in common, the student writer does not mind discerning the differences of meanings between the two words. In the sentence, “*dokjaga yanggugeul ihaehago (readers understand both countries),*” the phrase *poisonous person* is employed to express *dokja*, not ‘readers,’ as the student writer thinks of a Chinese meaning to refer to it. Referring to the phrase in English, “*geurui moche (main sources of articles in the magazine),*” *moche* is changed into ‘mother body,’ instead of ‘main sources.’ Thinking of the ideographic meaning of *moche* based on Chinese characters, the student writer does not distinguish what is meant by *moche* in this context. Putting the Korean phrase “*chimeul jaju bareuda (put saliva on the lips)*” into English, the student writer translates *chim* into quite a different word ‘needle,’ not into proper word ‘saliva.’ The student writer does not have a sense of distinguishing the two words, just regarding *chim* as the word ‘needle’ which has the same phonetic expression as ‘saliva.’ As for the expression, “*jeungsangi simhaejida (the symptom becomes serious),*” the learner employs the expression ‘deep-see’ for *simhaejida*, not the correct phrase ‘become serious,’ just judging from the same phonetic utterance arising from the interferences on Chinese characters, without a bit of interest in the meaning in the phrase. To translate the expression, “*bal gwanri keurim (cream to treat feet),*” the phrase ‘civil officials’ are employed for *gwanri*, instead of correct word *treat*, judging from the fact that the two expressions, ‘civil officials’ and ‘treat,’ have the same phonetic utterance both in Korean and in Chinese characters. However, the student writer has no interest in the meaning difference caused by his ignorance and indifference. To put the phrase “*sosui gachireul injeong (value a minority)*” into English, *sosu* is changed into ‘decimal’ which means ‘a fraction, that is, a number less than 1,’

not into proper word ‘minority.’ The student writer thinks that, because the two words, ‘decimal’ and ‘minority,’ are homophonic in Korean arising from Chinese characters, any words may work in the given context. Consequently, the use of wrong words, which do not agree to the meaning of a given context, causes the sentences to crash. To translate the following phrase, “*jiteun hwajangcheoreom (like a thick makeup),*” instead of proper word ‘makeup,’ the word ‘toilet’ is employed, which has the same pronunciation as makeup in Korean. The sentence does not make sense at all accordingly. For the phrase, “*euneunhan hyanggi (graceful or lovely fragrance),*” *euneunhan* is translated into ‘silver,’ not ‘graceful’ or ‘lovely,’ only judging from the same pronunciation of the two words, regardless of the meaning differences.

Table 1. Student Writers’ Translation Errors

Korean phrases in question	Wrong translations	Revised	Interferences ⁵⁾
<i>sureun noe jungchu⁶⁾ singyeongeul machwi</i>	midautumn	central nerve	L1-L3
<i>gamgiyagi naeseongeul kiunda</i>	introspection	resistance to	L1-L3
<i>gagyeogeun oebuui sikdanggwa biseut</i>	external	restaurants out of school	L1-L3
<i>jungheunggiga pyeolcheojida</i>	restoration flag	period	L1-L3
<i>seongeoe daehan gwansim</i>	dock	elections	L1-L3
<i>12wol 19il daeseone chulmahanda.</i>	go out on horseback	run for	L1-L3
<i>huboneun minjokjungsimeul jujangghanda.</i>	nation center of gravity	nation-mindedness	L1-L2
<i>bunbaereul tonghae naesil</i>	main room	growth	L1-L3
<i>bunbaereul tonghae naesil</i>	division.	distribution	L1-L2

<i>gaeseonggongdan</i>	personality	Kaesong	Lack of interest
<i>banmi jajuoegyoo</i>	cooking rice	anti-American	L1-L3
<i>jayumuyeokyeopjeongeul bandae</i>	reverse	opposition	L1-L3
<i>bijeonggyuyjikbeop</i>	rain full-time job	part-time working people	Lack of interest
<i>gangjero segeumeul geotda.</i>	steel materials tax	levy tax by force	L1-L3
<i>jeongi memada</i>	pill is very dry	considerate toward	L1-L3
<i>pongnyeogui gongpoga dosarida.</i>	sit cross-legged	There are lots of...	L1-L3
<i>hakgyo cheugeurobuteo</i>	from a school lateral	school side	L1-L3
<i>jangmyeoni sisahada</i>	testfire to us	imply, mean	L1-L3
<i>gyosunimi simsareul boda</i>	professor sees a mind with	examine, screen	L1-L3
<i>ilje gangjeomgi</i>	strong point	occupation period	L1-L3
<i>urinarae michineun yeonghyang...</i>	goes mad to our country	have influence on	L1-L3
<i>tongsangmachareul</i>	normal rubbing	trade friction	L1-L3
<i>muyeongnoga siwonhage ttullida.</i>	is pierced coolly	opened up	L1-L3
<i>pyeonggyun 2eok won naeoe</i>	interior and exterior,	around, about	L1-L3
<i>deuramaui pyeondang jejakbi</i>	faction	per drama	L1-L3
<i>deurama jungdokseong</i>	toxicity	addicted	L1-L3
<i>gongsikjeogeuro gaechoehada.</i>	with a formula	officially	L1-L3

<u>jaedanjeonipgeum</u> <i>hwakchung</i>	the foundation transference price	money (donated by)	L1-L3
<u>sichukgwa</u> <i>sibeomgyeonggi</i>	a verse scroll	kickoff	L1-L3
<u>yuksangjeonyong</u> <i>track</i>	land diversion track	track for...	L1-L3
<u>dwireulieo je 9dae</u> <i>chongjang</i>	on the back of	following	L1-L3
<u>cheongpyeongdaem</u> <i>geonseoldaem</i>	Chung criticism dam onstruction	Chongpyong Dam	lack of interest
<i>seomui</i> <u>jungangbue</u>	center department of the island	central part	L1-L3
<i>man 7,000</i> <u>pyeongeul</u> <i>gaeganhayeo</i>	criticism	a plottage of more than 47,000 square meters	L1-L3
<i>sonamuga</i> <u>yeopseocheoreom</u> <i>areumdaun</i>	phyllotaxis	postcard	L1-L3
<i>nau</i> <u>gisa</u>	engineer	article	L1-L3
<u>dokjaga yanggugeul</u> <i>ihachada</i>	poisonous person	readers	L1-L3
<i>geurui</i> <u>moche</u>	mother-body	main sources	L1-L3
<u>chimeul</u> <i>bareuda.</i>	needle	saliva	L1-L3
<i>jeungsangi</i> <u>simhaejida</u>	deep-sea position.	serious	L1-L3
<i>bal</i> <u>gwanri keurim</u>	civil official	treat	L1-L3
<i>sosuui</i> <u>gachireul injeong</u>	decimal	minority	L1-L3
<i>jiteun</i> <u>hwajangcheoreom</u>	toilet	makeup	L1-L3
<u>euneunhan</u> <i>hyanggi</i>	silver	graceful	L1-L3

5) L1 stands for Korean, L2 for English, and L3 for Chinese characters.

6) The underlined words or phrases imply Korean expressions that have been in question in the process of being put into English.

4. Conclusion

We have seen that the infelicity of expression is largely attributable to student writers' lack of interests in discerning the meaning differences of a word even though it has the same phonetic utterance both L1, Korean, and L3, Chinese character. The misunderstanding of the meanings between L1 Korean and L2 English also constitutes the bulk of their errors in writing, resulting from a sheer ignorance and indifference to words. Thus, the tripartite relations of interferences among L1, L2, and L3, i.e., Korean, English, and Chinese characters, mainly lead student writers to be confused about a meaning of a phrase, fueling mistranslation between Korean and English. Student writers are bent on being interested in literal translation, not making efforts to avoid falling into a loophole in infelicity. Such translation behaviors cannot but be construed otherwise than as shutting their eyes to the meaning differences.

Given the circumstances in which Korean students have learned Chinese characters since early childhood, it is highly likely that they are vulnerable to confusion about the meanings of a given word between Korean and Chinese characters when a given word has homophonic utterance in particular. This paper seeks to find out a way which promotes students' improvement in writing proficiency, by looking into the errors arising from L1/L3 interferences and from lack of understanding of the meanings of words, with the same pronunciation both in Korean and in Chinese characters. The articles that students contributed to an English magazine involve lots of errors, showing loopholes that student writers easily fall into when translating Korean into English. As a result, their intended writings are often difficult to decipher. Their errors, in part, come from not understanding how to translate L1 sentences into an L2 environment. Thus, this topic is worth investigating, as we can see what has made student writers fall into errors in English writing. The evidence, amply provided in the table above, implies that, as Korean students are vulnerable to the L1/L3 interferences resulting from Korean cultures wherein lots of Chinese characters are included, teachers, as facilitators, should factor in and weigh the interferences on writing to pilot EFL students to become successful writers.

As teaching English writing must be a complex and time-consuming procedure, it has been said that as with many other aspects of teaching writing,

there remains no easy answer to the question about what type of teaching will facilitate students' mastery of writing. We should find a method or a tool, with which to empower students to make more efforts to sharpen English writing. To this end, it is imperative for teachers to have a good grasp of their writing errors. To bear an efficient fruit in teaching EFL students writing, teachers should get students work on as many given assignments in writing class as possible. On the other hand, reading is an essential part to sharpen writing skills. As claimed by Hale et al. (1996) writing tasks require students to do a great deal of reading in order to synthesize and analyze academic material. Writing class can incorporate lessons which assist students in preparing academic writing assignments to practice such skills as summarizing, paraphrasing, interpreting, and synthesizing concepts. Many EFL students are not skilled readers, having had limited opportunities to read extensively in English. It is unlikely that anyone who is a nonproficient reader can develop into a good proficient writer. Students learn how to write through reading. EFL students are advised to read as many articles and texts as possible to understand what the writing structures are like. They should be immersed in developing their writing skills, while putting a great deal of thought into crafting their drafts.

References

- Brown, H.D. (2007). *Teaching by Principle* (3rd ed). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Choe (1997), Mother culture interferences on EFL writing. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 3, 1-12.
- Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33(1), 76-88.
- Hale et al. (1996). A study of writing tasks assigned in academic degree programs. *TOEFL Research Report No. 54*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Hendrickson, J. (1980). *Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent*

- Theory, Research, and Practice. Croft, Kenneth (Ed.), *Readings on English as a Second Language*. Cambridge: Winthrop.
- Kroll, B. (2001). Considerations for Teaching and ESL/EFL Writing Course. M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. (3rd ed). (pp. 219-247). MA: Heinle & Heinle
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures*. Ann arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Prator, C. (1967). In Brown, H.D. *Teaching by Principle 2007* (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Reid, J. (1994). *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Stockwell, R., Bowen, J., & Martin, J. (1965). *The grammatical structures of English and Spanish*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46: 327-369.
- Youngroong, Kim and Haeryen, Seo. (2008a). College Students' Writing Errors Based on High School English Curriculum. *The Linguistic Association of Korea*, 16 (1), 175-192.
- Youngroong, Kim and Haeryen, Seo. (2008b). An Evaluation of Curricular Designing and Teaching Efficiency. *Studies in Modern Grammar*, 52, 61-82.
- Youngroong, Kim and Haeryen, Seo. (2008c). An Evaluative Approach to Accuracy and Communicative Skills in English Teaching. *The New Studies of English Language & Literature*, 40, 217-236.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing process of advanced ESL students. Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17. 165-187.

Youngroong Kim

Dept. of English Education, Woosuk University
Wanju-Gun, Chonbuk, 565-701
T: +82-63-290-1336
E-mail: youngkim@woosuk.ac.kr

Haeryen Seo

Dept. of English Education, Woosuk University
Wanju-Gun, Chonbuk, 565-701
T: +82-63-290-1335
E-mail: hrseo@hanmail.net

Received: 31 January, 2009

Accepted: 16 March, 2009

Revised: 20 March, 2009