

A Promising Practice for Improving Writing Quality and Decreasing Writing Apprehension of Korean Students

Minjong Song
(Sungkyul University)

Song, Minjong. (2007). A promising practice for improving writing quality and decreasing writing apprehension of Korean students. *Modern English Education*, 8(2), 115- 137.

An experimental study examined the effect of process-centered writing practice on the writing quality and the writing apprehension of Korean university students who learn English as a foreign language. Students in two sections of a freshman English reading course practiced process-centered writing, involving communicative feedback focused on meaning, with no grading and no error correction. Students in two other sections of the course practiced controlled writing, involving evaluative feedback focused on formal linguistic features, with grading and error correction. Two teachers taught the four sections, each teaching one process-centered and one controlled writing section. Changes in writing quality, as measured by holistic evaluation, and in writing apprehension, as assessed by an objective measurement, were investigated by using ANOVA. Results showed that the students who practiced process-centered writing improved their writing quality more than those who practiced controlled writing, and the gain was statistically significant. Also, the former reduced their writing apprehension more than the latter, but the gain was not statistically significant. Those results were interpreted as supporting the practice of process-centered writing for Korean university students. Limitations in the study were pointed out and implications for the study were offered.

Keywords: [process-centered writing/controlled writing/writing quality/writing apprehension/과정중심작문/ 통제작문/작문의 질/작문예의 염려도]

1. Introduction

This study poses, as its basic research question, whether practicing process-centered writing significantly improves writing quality and decreases writing apprehension of Korean university students. This question was explored in a one-semester experimental study, comparing the progress of students in two experimental sections, who practiced process-centered writing, with the progress of students in two control sections, who practiced controlled writing.

In Korea, English has been taught as a foreign language at all levels in educational settings, and writing instruction begins at the university level without any nationwide curriculum for it. Many instructors have viewed that writing is producing, involving transmission of the writer's message and making it clear for others. Accordingly, their teaching has stressed a written product in which form precedes content. And they almost always used writing itself for an evaluative purpose. These viewpoints, teaching practice, and purpose of much of the current writing instruction in Korea correspond to those of ESL writing instruction in the U.S. dominant from 1945 till the 1970s. Concretely, in many Korean universities, writing instruction has been given with a controlled writing mode or an ESL version of the current-traditional rhetoric mode. Yet, as a result, many students have had some problems in their writings: Their writing quality has been not so satisfactory and their writing apprehension has been high.

So, the current researcher thought of having students practice process-centered writing in a Korean university where she taught, with an expectation that it might probably and possibly relieve those problems. The expectation was based on the premises that the practice of process-centered writing, which has been dominant for ESL writing instruction in the U.S. since the 1980s, could lead to lower the writing apprehension of ESL students (Silva, 1990), and the writing quality of low apprehensive writers must be higher than that of high apprehensive writers (Faigley, Daly & Witte, 1981).

However, before activating the practice of process-centered writing, the researcher decided to conduct an experiment in the university to see whether that expectation would be realized, with two different writing modes: controlled writing and process-centered writing.

The two research questions in this study were as follows:

(1) Do Korean university students, who practiced process-centered writing over a ten week period, improve their writing quality, as measured holistically with pretreatment and posttreatment scores on writing samples, more than do similar students who practiced controlled writing during the same period?

(2) Do Korean university students, who practiced process-centered writing over a ten week period, decrease their writing apprehension, as measured objectively with pretreatment and posttreatment scores on writing apprehension tests, more than do similar students who practiced controlled writing during the same period?

2. Theoretical Background

This section explores the developmental history of ESL writing instruction in the U.S. with three different writing modes, locating in the history the current address of EFL writing instruction in the Korean university where this study was conducted.

2.1 Controlled Writing

The year 1945 was considered by many as the beginning of the modern era in second language teaching in the U.S. From that time to 1965, the principal motto in language education was that language was speech and learning was habit formation. Therefore, during that period, writing was regarded as a secondary concern, a servant for the other language skills.

In those conditions, Silva (1990) discusses that controlled writing dominated ESL writing instruction. According to him, it is a formal accuracy-centered approach, for which the correct use of formal linguistic features such as vocabulary, sentence structure, and mechanics is emphasized. Accordingly, the teaching practice for it focuses on imitation and manipulation of model passages in a text, carefully constructed and graded for vocabulary and sentence patterns. On

manipulation, a teacher instructs substitutions, transformations, expansions, and completions. Students work on their writings on teacher-given topics extracted from the passages. They write, without any sense of audience and purpose, only by imitating and manipulating the passages. The teacher responds evaluatively to their written products and corrects them, centering on the formal linguistic mistakes.

Therefore, it can be guessed that writing quality of the students who have learned to write with this mode must not be so satisfactory. The reason for that is they have had no opportunity to be trained for their own ideas, organization, and style, which are also included in measuring the quality. Also, it can be assumed that writing apprehension of those students must be high, since their written products have been corrected and evaluated. According to Faigley, Daly, and Witte (1981), high apprehensive writers experience more than normal amounts of anxiety when they must write, consequently avoiding the situations that require writing.

In the Korean university where this study was conducted, basic writing has been taught in freshman English courses for one year, and writing itself has been considered as subsidiary to the other language skills (speaking, listening, and reading) also taught in the courses. And, the viewpoint, teaching practice, and the purpose of basic writing instruction in there were exactly the same as those of controlled writing instruction.

2.2 ESL Version of the Current-traditional Rhetoric

Thereafter, in the mid-sixties, there was an increasing awareness that ESL students needed to produce extended written discourse and controlled writing was not enough for that need. A bridge between controlled and process-centered writing was necessary.

In those conditions, Silva (1990) contends that ESL version of the current-traditional paradigm directed ESL writing instruction. According to Berlin (1997), current-traditional rhetoric takes a stance that truth is certainly established by a writer more enlightened than his or her audience, and it focuses on developing skill in arrangement and style. Then, the ESL version of it adds

Kaplan's (1966) theory of contrastive rhetoric, which assumes that second language writers would adopt a rhetoric and a series of thought which might violate the expectations of the native reader, to the current-traditional paradigm in first language composition. Silva in the same resource discusses that ESL version of the current-traditional paradigm is an organization- or a format-centered approach, for which it is tried to provide ESL students with logical construction and arrangement of discourse forms. Accordingly, the teaching practice for it focuses on paragraph and essay development of model compositions in a text. On paragraph development, a teacher instructs elements of a paragraph (topic sentence, support sentence, concluding sentence, and transitions) and its developmental patterns (compare and contrast, classification, illustration, exemplification, definition, and cause and effect). On essay development, the teacher gives lessons in larger structural entities (introduction, body, and conclusion) and organizational patterns (narration, description, exposition, and argumentation). Students work on their writings by internalizing the structure of a given model writing and then applying that structural knowledge gained from it to their own, a parallel piece with it. In this writing mode also, the teacher responds evaluatively to their written products and corrects them, centering on usage such as syntax, spelling, and punctuation.

Therefore, it can be guessed that writing quality of the students who have learned to write with this mode may not be satisfactory enough, since they have had not enough opportunity to develop their own ideas. Also, it can be assumed that writing apprehension of those students must be high, since their written products have been corrected and evaluated.

In the Korean university where this study was conducted, intermediate writing has been taught for the students who already took the basic writing in freshman English courses successfully. And, the viewpoint, teaching practice, and the purpose of intermediate writing instruction in there were almost the same as those of the ESL version of the current-traditional paradigm.

2.3 Process-centered Writing

However, during the 1970s and the 1980s, controlled writing and the traditional, product-centered paradigm were beginning to crumble, and instead, a new, process-centered paradigm was emerging. Researchers for the new paradigm (Hairston, 1982; Marshall, 1987; Raimes, 1985, 1991; Stotsky, 1983; Tierney, 1992; Tierney & Shanahan, 1991; Zamel, 1987) assert that writing is a generative and cognitive process as a means of thinking, problem-solving, and constructing activities, and also a complex and recursive process in which pre-writing, writing, and re-writing overlap and intervene. They continuously argue that writing is therefore not only a communication skill but a way of learning and developing, since most writers have only a partial notion of what they want to say when they begin to write and their ideas develop in the process of writing.

In those conditions, Silva (1990) maintains that process-centered writing governed ESL writing instruction. According to him, it is a meaning-centered approach, for which it is declared that content, ideas, and the need to communicate determine form. Accordingly, the teaching practice for it focuses on free writing, daily journal entries, self-generated topics, drafting and redrafting, attending to errors only at the final stage, and teacher-student one-to-one conference, all of which can promote discovery of meaning and ideas. Students work on their writings with self-generated topics in a free style. They write and rewrite with their teacher's helpful intervention during the process. In this paradigm, the teacher responds communicatively to their each draft, with no grade or correction, focusing on meaning.

Therefore, it can be supposed that writing apprehension of the students who have learned to write with this paradigm might be lower than that of those who have done with the two paradigms mentioned before, since their each draft has been responded communicatively, with no grade or correction. According to Faigley, Daly, and Witte (1981), low apprehensive writers are confident in their writing ability, not avoiding the situations that demand writing but frequently enjoying it. They also claim that, compared with their high apprehensive counterparts, low apprehensive writers produce essays significantly longer and syntactically more mature by developing their ideas better and putting more information into each communicative unit. Then, it may be assumed that writing quality of low apprehensive writers could be more satisfactory than that of their

high apprehensive counterparts.

In the Korean university where this study was conducted, this process-centered approach to writing has never been taught in any writing courses.

3. Methods

3.1 Design and Hypotheses

This study investigated the effect of process-centered writing practice on the writing quality and apprehension of Korean university students. For the study, the current researcher conducted an experiment in a university by using four intact reading sections in freshman English courses. Since the institutional procedures of the university did not permit true randomization, intact sections were used, randomized only by normal enrollment procedures. The researcher used reading sections, not writing sections, as the freshman English courses consisted of speaking and reading section and basic writing instruction had been customarily given in the reading section. Over a ten-week period, students in two experimental sections practiced process-centered writing, and their progress was compared with the progress of students in two control sections who practiced controlled writing. To know the effect of each practice on writing quality and apprehension, this experiment used a Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) and, as measurement instruments, two writing tasks and a writing apprehension scale.

To make the study carefully designed and controlled, the researcher managed to meet all of Hillocks' criteria for acceptable research conditions as follows (Hillocks, 1984; 1986):

- involving a treatment such as some combination of conditions, instruction, and practice over some period of time leading to a posttest;
- making use of a scale of writing quality applied to samples of writing;
- exercising minimal control for teacher biases by using two teachers, each

teaching one section for each treatment;

- controlling for differences between groups of students by statistical analysis;
- scoring pre- and posttest under conditions which help to assure validity and reliability;
- coding essays to ensure that raters cannot detect treatment and time [pre- or posttest];
- having two or more raters, their scores summed or averaged;
- achieving .70 or higher inter-rater reliabilities on holistic, analytic or primary trait scoring.

The two hypotheses of the experiment were as follows:

- The experimental group, which was exposed to practicing process-centered writing, would show significantly higher gains in writing quality, from pre- to posttest, as measured by writing tasks that would be judged by experienced English composition teachers, as compared to the gains in writing quality shown by the control group, which was exposed to practicing controlled writing, with the level of significant alpha set at $p < .05$;
- The experimental group, which was exposed to practicing process-centered writing, would show significantly greater decrease in writing apprehension, from pre- to posttest, as measured by the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Scale, as compared to the decrease in writing apprehension shown by the control group, which was exposed to practicing controlled writing, with the level of significant alpha set at $p < .05$.

3.2 Subjects and Participating Teachers

Subjects in the experiment were all female, first-year students in a Korean university who enrolled for the first semester of an academic year. In Korea, no clear picture of typical university students has been available, since there has been no nationwide standardized English proficiency test at a university level. However, participating teachers and the researcher agreed that the subjects' English proficiency level was advanced, since the university had a name-value for its competitiveness at the Scholastic Ability Test. In the university, first-year

students signed up for freshman English, a required course for them, by their choice of major field. The students who chose to major in pharmacy, law, education, and pre-medicine participated in the experiment by signing up for the four reading sections of freshman English which were involved in it. They signed up without knowing that they were to participate in the experiment. Before the first meeting, the intact sections were randomly assigned to either experimental or control groups by coin toss. Pharmacy major and law major students were assigned to experimental groups, and education major and pre-medicine major students were assigned to control groups. At the outset of the experiment, 207 students made up the initial population and each section was around 50 students in size.

Two participating teachers had similar academic backgrounds (Ph.D. or ABD in English) and teaching experiences in reading (3 years, both). For the experiment, both taught the one-semester course, each teaching one section each of the experimental and the control group. Therefore, based on those conditions, it was felt that the teacher effect would not endanger the validity of the experiment. The teachers agreed that the purpose of the experiment was to compare the effects of two different writing practices on writing quality and apprehension of their students, and both practices deserved to be tried in an identical manner. None of them were informed of the expected results of the experiment.

3.3 Procedures

During the first meeting, both groups took pretests for writing quality and apprehension. Then, each practice began. Not to endanger the reliability of the experiment, the teachers taught for their both sections with the same instructional mode, followed the same systematic sequence in the course syllabus for reading lessons, and assigned the same course requirements except writing homework. Experimental group students wrote their journal entries on six reading chapters and received communicative feedback for the practice of process-centered writing (See Appendix A for a sample.). Those students wrote their entries on self-generated topics. They wrote freely and informally, with their own ideas and

style: The entries were communicatively responded to by the researcher, who focused on the students' personal meaning and content, with no grading or error correction. Meanwhile, control group students wrote their answers to comprehension questions on the same chapters and received evaluative feedback for the practice of controlled writing (See Appendix B for a sample.). Those students wrote their answers to researcher-given questions extracted from the reading passages. They answered by transcribing a set of picked-up ideas from the reading passages and by imitating and manipulating the sentence structures in them. The answers were evaluatively responded to by the researcher, who focused on the students' formal linguistic mistakes, with grading and error correction. These procedures continued throughout one semester. At the end of the semester, both groups took posttests.

3.4 Data Collection

For each of the two writing tasks, there were two different topics for the subjects to have a topic choice. The expected rhetorical form was narrative. For each task, those subjects got their two topics one week before actual writing. They were permitted to jot down ideas or make outlines about their writing task and to use them during the actual writing. This followed the claim of some scholars (Emig, 1971; Pianko, 1977; Sanders & Littlefield, 1975) that it is important to involve students in a writing task and also the argument of Bridwell (1979) that it seems to increase students' involvement to give them time for thinking about their own before actual writing. Each task was taken during the class time, since most theorists (Cooper, 1977; Diederich, 1974) believe that a direct sample is the best way to measure writing quality. The two teachers supervised each writing session by giving the same instructions and time limit (30 minutes).

For each of the two writing apprehension tests, the Writing Apprehension Scale (WAS) developed by Daly and Miller (1975) (See Appendix C.) was used in English version. Before the experiment, the Scale had never been used for those subjects either in English or in translation into Korean. It consists of 26 statements, 13 positive ones (e.g., "I like seeing my thoughts on paper") and 13 negative ones (e.g., "I don't think I write as well as most other people") about

writing. Those statements are responded to on a five-point Likert-like scale ("strongly agree," "mildly agree," "neutral," "mildly disagree," "strongly disagree"). The Scale has been scored on a five-point one to give high apprehension a high number and low apprehension a low number. Thus, a "strongly agree" response to a negative statement is scored as 5, a "strongly agree" response to a positive statement is scored as 1. Accordingly, the scoring gives a point range from 26 to 130; arbitrarily, as Reigstad (1991) states, scores of 78 or below (78 would reflect a "neutral" response to all statements) are considered to reflect "low apprehension," scores of 79 to 99, "high apprehension," and scores above 100, "very high apprehension". Daly (1985) discusses that writing apprehension scores have been shown to correlate with a variety of other measures, from promptness in turning in assignments to choice of major based on the writing demands of the field.

The two teachers also supervised each apprehension test by giving the same instructions and time limit (15 minutes).

3.5 Data Analysis

Scoring of the writing samples and the writing apprehension tests was done only for the 166 students who participated in the whole process of the experiment.

Two writing samples per each student were collected from all of them, and all the samples were typed to avoid handwriting effect in scoring. To measure the quality of those samples, holistic scoring was used, which is a single qualitative holistic judgment based on the factors of ideas, organization, style, vocabulary, and sentence structure. As an assessment measurement, a 6-point scale was adopted, which has been used in the TWE (Test of Written English) of TOEFL. Two raters for the writing samples were carefully chosen to achieve inter-rater reliability. That was done by matching their academic background, teaching experience in ESL writing, and opinion about the nature of good writing. They were not informed of the design or the purpose of the experiment; They were just asked to read the overall impression of each writing sample (Cooper, 1977), valuing the communicative aspect of it, and also asked to "reward a student for what the student does well" (adopted from the ETS's Advanced Placement Examination XXX, 19XX). For the scoring sessions, all the samples were

appropriately coded and randomly mixed, so that none of the raters knew whether a sample came from the pretest or the posttest section or from a student in an experimental group or a control group. Each sample was read by the two raters and the two scores for each sample were added. On the 28 samples where those two raters disagreed by more than one point, the third rater arbitrated them, who had the same conditions as a rater as those of the two raters and knew nothing about the nature of the experiment. In that case, this study accepted the closest two scores from those three scores. Accordingly, every sample received the two scores to which at least two raters agreed within one point difference (See Appendix D for a writing sample.). The achieved inter-rater reliability was .83, a figure above the generally accepted minimum of .70 required to insure that ratings from holistic scoring are reliable (Hillocks, 1984, 1986).

Two tests of WAS (Daly & Miller, 1975) per each student were collected from the 166 students and scored. The scoring was mechanical and objective.

When the scoring of the data was completed, whole class data were averaged for the whole class gains, and the gains were subjected to statistical analysis for significant alpha set at $p = < .05$ through the use of SPSS and ANOVA.

4. Results

This section presents statistical analysis of each practice relating to the data items gathered in the study:

- the effect of each practice on writing quality, as gathered from holistically rated writing samples (Cooper, 1977; McAndrew, 1983);
- the effect of each practice on writing apprehension, as gathered from the Writing Apprehension Scale (Daly & Miller, 1975).

4.1 Analysis of Holistic Ratings of Writing Quality

From the scoring process, two pretest and two posttest scores came out for each of the 166 students. For the statistical procedure, the two scores for each test

were combined. This combining resulted in a possible scale of 2 to 12, low to high possible scores of each test for each writer.

The mean changes from pre- to posttest for experimental (process-centered writing) and control (controlled writing) group were +0.559 and +0.333, respectively, an improvement in both cases. Table 1 indicates the mean changes in writing quality, pre- to posttest, for the two groups.

TABLE1
Analysis of Writing Quality Mean Change Pre- to Posttest by Practice

Treatment	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Experimental G.	1.933	2.492	+0.559
Control G.	1.914	2.247	+0.333

Table 2 presents an overview of the F test of significance for writing quality based on the holistic ratings by practice. In this case, the practice effect was statistically significant, favoring the experimental group, $F(2, 166) = 5.0574$, $p = .0259$.

TABLE2
Test of Significance for Holistically Scored Writing by Practice

Source	df	F	Sig of F
between groups	1	5.0574	.0259*
within groups	164		

* $p < .05$.

4.2 Analysis of Objective Ratings of Writing Apprehension

From the scoring process, one pretest and one posttest score came out for each of the 166 students. The mean changes from pre- to posttest for experimental (process-centered writing) and control (controlled writing) group were -4.844 and -1.368, respectively, a reduction in both cases. Table 3 indicates the mean changes in writing apprehension, pre- to posttest, for the two groups.

TABLE3
Analysis of Writing Apprehension Mean Change Pre-to Posttest by Practice

Treatment	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Experimental G.	81.411	76.567	-4.844
Control G.	77.605	76.237	-1.368

Table 4 presents an overview of the F test of significance for writing apprehension based on the objective ratings by practice. In this case, while the practice effect favored the experimental group, it was not statistically significant, $F(2, 166) = 2.6597$, $p = .1048$.

TABLE4
Test of Significance for Writing Apprehension by Practice

Source	df	F	Sig. of F
between groups	1	2.6597	.1048
within groups	164		

* $p < .05$.

5. Conclusions and Implications

This section draws conclusions from the data analysis, suggests limitations in this study, and offers implications.

5.1 Conclusions

5.1.1 Process-centered Writing and Improvement in Writing Quality

The first hypothesis in the experiment was: The experimental group, which was exposed to practicing process-centered writing, would show significantly higher gains in writing quality, from pre- to posttest, as measured by writing tasks that

would be judged by experienced English composition teachers, as compared to the gains in writing quality shown by the control group, which was exposed to practicing controlled writing, with the level of significant alpha set at $p < .05$;

In this case, the analyzed data supported the hypothesis by showing that the practice effect was statistically significant, favoring the experimental group, $p = .0259$. Therefore, it was suggested that process-centered writing practice improved students' writing quality significantly more than controlled writing practice.

5.1.2 Process-centered Writing and Reduction in Writing Apprehension

The second hypothesis in the experiment was: The experimental group, which was exposed to practicing process-centered writing, would show significantly greater decrease in writing apprehension, from pre- to posttest, as measured by the Daly-Miller Writing Apprehension Scale, as compared to the decrease in writing apprehension shown by the control group, which was exposed to practicing controlled writing, with the level of significant alpha set at $p < .05$.

In this case, the analyzed data did not support the hypothesis by showing that, while the practice effect favored the experimental group, it was not statistically significant ($p = .1048$). Therefore, the greater reduction achieved by the experimental group might have happened by chance. However, it can be noted that process-centered writing practice appears to be at least as effective in decreasing students' writing apprehension as controlled writing practice.

5.2 Limitations

5.2.1 "Process" in Process-centered Writing

Practicing process-centered writing could not produce multiple drafts. Due to time constraint in the class, experimental group students wrote their journal entries for homework. For homework, they wrote only one entry on the reading content of each chapter, and got only one feedback to their each entry. Accordingly, the continuous and helpful interaction between a student and a teacher with elaboration on a topic for some time, which is customary in process-centered writing practice, could not happen in this study. Therefore, the process-centered writing practiced in this study might be called "modified

process-centered writing”.

5.2.2 Only One Respondent

Concerning the acceptable research conditions, this study did not control the respondent variable by using only one respondent, the researcher. This procedure was a necessary compromise, given the pragmatic constraints of the experimental setting. However, it may be argued that the advantages of a single respondent--consistency and continuity in responses, development of communicative relationship over time, ability to monitor changes in students' writing--might have been useful.

5.2.3 Generalizability of Population

Most of the subjects in this study could be categorized as the top students based on their academic ability in that university, which has also been recognized as one of the most competitive universities in Korea. Therefore, it is doubtful whether the same results as those in the study may come out if the subjects are changed into other students, at that university or at other universities, who have academic proficiency different from that the subjects in this study have.

5.3 Implications

5.3.1 Implications for Teachers

As supported in the study, practicing process-centered writing may be more effective than practicing controlled writing. This researcher has reason to believe that (a) process-centered writing practice was demonstrably better in improving students' writing quality, (b) process-centered writing practice was possibly better in reducing their writing apprehension, and (c) these results were congruent with the premises from Faigley, Daly, and Witte's (1981) and Silva's (1990) study. Therefore, all things being equal, process-centered writing practice would be a reasonable alternative to the traditional practice.

5.3.2 Implications for Further Research

First, there may be various kinds of EFL context where process-centered

writing can be practiced and tested as to its usefulness, besides the specific EFL context--freshman English reading course in a Korean university--where this study was conducted.

Second, there may be various controls--students' gender, students' choice of major, teachers' instructional mode, and universities with students of different academic proficiency level--which further studies can consider.

Third, more data from larger population of various majors at differential school settings are needed for making the results in this study reliable.

References

- Berlin, J. A. (1997). Contemporary composition: The major pedagogical theories. In Villanueva, V. Jr. (Ed), *Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader* (pp. 233-248). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Bridwell, L. S. (1979). Revising processes in twelfth grade students' transactional writing (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1979). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40, 5765A. (University Microfilms No. AAC8010570)
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 176-246). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Cooper, C. R. (1977). Holistic evaluation of writing. In C. R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring, judging* (pp. 3-32). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Daly, J. A. (1985). Writing apprehension. In M. Rose (Ed.), *When a writer can't write: Studies in writer's block and other composing-process problems* (pp. 43-82). New York: Guilford Press.
- Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 9, 242-249.
- Diederich, P. B. (1974). *Measuring growth in English*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Emig, J. (1971). *The composing process of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Faigley, L., Daly, J. A., & Witte, S. P. (1981). The role of writing apprehension in writing performance and competence. *Journal of Educational Research*, 75, 16-21.

- Hairston, M. (1982). The winds of change: Thomas Kuhn and the revolution in the teaching of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 76-88.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (1984). What works in teaching composition: A meta-analysis of experimental treatment studies. *American Journal of Education*, 93, 133-170.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching*. Urbana, IL: NCRE.
- Kaplan, R. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, 16(1), 1-20.
- Marshall, J. D. (1987). The effects of writing on students' understanding of literary texts. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 21, 30-63.
- McAndrew, D. A. (1983). *The effect of an unassigned rhetorical context of the holistic quality and syntax of the writing of high and low ability writers*. Unpublished manuscript. Indiana, PA: Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Pianko, S. (1977). The composing acts of college freshmen writers: A description (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1977). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 38, 3983A. (University Microfilms No. AAC7727956)
- Raines, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 229-259.
- Raines, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 407-430.
- Reigstad, T. (1991). Teaching basic writers: The personality factor. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education*, 8, 57-64.
- Sanders, S. E., & Littlefield, J. H. (1975). Perhaps test essays can reflect significant improvement in freshmen composition: Report on a successful attempt. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 9, 145-153.
- Silva, T. (1990). Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 11-23). Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on reading/writing relationships: A synthesis and suggested directions. *Language Arts*, 60, 627-642.
- Tierney, R. J., & Shanahan, T. (1991). Research on the reading-writing relationship: Interactions, transactions, and outcomes. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, Vol. II* (246-280). New York: Longman.
- Tierney, R. J. (1992). Ongoing research and new directions. In J. W. Irwin & M.A. Doyle (Eds.), *Reading/writing connections: Learning from research* (pp. 246-259). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Zamel, V. (1987). Recent research on writing pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 697-715.

Appendix A

A Sample of Experimental Group Students' Process-centered Writing Practice

Note: A student journal entry is printed flush left. Researcher's response is indented 5 spaces. Marginal comments by the researcher are inserted in the text, and bracketed.

After reading "How to Mark a Book"

After I read this writing, I thought my reading habit. I'm reluctant to make books dirty, so when I mark up a book occasionally I try to do it neatly at maximum. In other words, I belong to the second type among three kinds of book owners in this article. Now I realize that this attitude is wrong. In reading books, the main body should not be books but be myself. Important things are how should I understand author's thoughts and absorbed in it my own. <Very good!>

It is often said books contain all of mankind's wisdom. And we can experience indirectly various and fruitful lives through them. <Right. Those vicarious experiences will widen and deepen your thinking ability.> Like this, books include unlimited possibility and we can obtain it as much as we want as our reading ability. Therefore we has to read actively to get the most out of them. For the future, I won't only preserve the books tidily and I will try to read them intensively with marking up a book.

Euiyoung, you've made a good decision at last. However, if you want to keep your books clean, how about writing your thought on the paper and insert it between the pages of the books?

Appendix B

A Sample of Control Group Students' Controlled Writing Practice

Note: Comprehension questions are printed flush left. Student answers are indented 5

spaces. Researcher's grading and error correction are not marked in this print.

Comprehension Questions on "Desiree's Baby"

Department:

Name:

Please answer with full sentences in English.

1. Describe the outline of the story and characterizations of Armand and Desiree briefly which are based on the text.

Desiree was a baby who was left alone in the shadow of the big stone pillar. Monsieur Valmonde had found her and Monsieur and Madam Valmonde raised her. She grew to be beautiful and gentle, affectionate and sincere. When she was eighteen, Then oneday Armand suddenly fell in love with her and decided to marry her. Monsieur Valmonde worried about her obscure origin but Armond said that it didn't matter. Time had passed and Desiree had a baby. First everybody were happy but as time went by things changed. The baby were becoming more like black. Armand thought that Desiree was not white and his attitude got cool toward Desiree and other people. So Desiree left from him with her baby to Madam Valmonde. After she left, Armand burnt everythings connected with her. Then he found a letter which his mother had sent to his father. He finally found that he himself, not Desiree was not a white. His mother was black. Next, these are the characterization of Armand and Desiree. Armond is strick, quick-tempered and careless. He misunderstood his wife and finally lost her. Desiree is beautiful, gentle, affectionate and sincere, but she is more or less timid. First, she denied her husband's misunderstanding bravely, but at last what she could do was leaving him according to his opinion.

Appendix C

A Writing Apprehension Scale

The scale below consists of several statements about writing. For each statement, place an X through the response that best describes your feeling, using the following code:

SA: strongly agree

MA: mildly agree

N: neutral, no opinion

MD: mildly disagree

SD: strongly disagree

1. I look forward to writing down my ideas.
SA MA N MD SD
2. People seem to enjoy what I write.
SA MA N MD SD
3. I'm nervous about writing.
SA MA N MD SD
4. It's easy for me to write a good composition.
SA MA N MD SD
5. I'm no good at writing.
SA MA N MD SD
6. I like to write my ideas down.
SA MA N MD SD
7. I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas in writing.
SA MA N MD SD
8. I expect to do poorly in composition classes before I even enter them.
SA MA N MD SD
9. I avoid writing.
SA MA N MD SD
10. I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated.
SA MA N MD SD
11. I enjoy writing.
SA MA N MD SD
12. I would enjoy submitting my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.
SA MA N MD SD
13. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.
SA MA N MD SD
14. I never seem to be able to clearly write down my ideas.
SA MA N MD SD
15. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.
SA MA N MD SD
16. My mind seems to go blank when I work on a composition.
SA MA N MD SD
17. When I hand in a composition, I know I'm going to do poorly.

- SA MA N MD SD
 18. Taking a composition course is a very frightening experience.
 SA MA N MD SD
 19. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time.
 SA MA N MD SD
 20. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated.
 SA MA N MD SD
 21. Writing is a lot of fun.
 SA MA N MD SD
 22. Handing in a composition makes me feel good.
 SA MA N MD SD
 23. I don't think I write as well as most other people.
 SA MA N MD SD
 24. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.
 SA MA N MD SD
 25. I like to have my friends read what I've written.
 SA MA N MD SD
 26. I have a terrible time expressing my thoughts on paper.
 SA MA N MD SD

Appendix D

Students' Writing Samples

A Sample of Middle-Rated Writing (3 by the first rater, 2 by the second rater)

My dream in my past

Until I was fourth grade in the elementary school, I hoped to be a nurse. Because, all my friends hoped to be a nurse themselves. Perhaps, the dream to be a nurse are common to very young girls. I began learning to play the piano when I was five years old. I was interested in playing the piano very much. So, I thought I will become a great pianist.

But, I gave up my dream. Because I entered the middle school, I was very busy studying hard.

Since then, I couldn't make up my mind about future.

Except studying, I could not think others.

By being third grade in the high school, I could decide that I will become a doctor. In fact, I never wanted to be a doctor. Because I was afraid of the blood. But, I wanted to study about DNA, cancer, psychology and AIDS. Finally I had no choice but to choose the medical science college.

Now, I hope to be a doctor sincerely. Though I am afraid of the blood a little, I want study about a human-being. And I wish that my dream won't change again.

송민중 (Song, Minjong)

Department of General Education

Sungkyul University

Mt. 147-2 Anyang-8-dong

Manan-gu, Anyang-si

Gyeonggi-do, Korea

Tel: (031) 467-8920/ H.P.: 010-9871-6650

Email: mjsong43@lycos.co.kr

논문 접수일자: 2007. 6. 10

게재 확정일자: 2007. 7. 20