

A Dialogue Journal Study with Korean College Freshmen

Min-Jong Song

Sungkyul University

Song, Min-Jong. (2008). A dialogue journal study with Korean college freshmen. *Modern English Education*, 9(1), 168-187.

The effect of dialogue journal writing on heightening writing ability has been empirically substantiated from both first language and second language studies. This experimental study examined the effect of dialogue journal writing on the writing ability of EFL college freshmen in Korea. Subjects were 207 students in four intact sections of a freshman English reading course. For a 10-week period, students in two experimental groups wrote dialogue journals, and their progress was compared with the progress of the students in two control groups who answered comprehension questions for the same period. Writing ability was assessed holistically with two essays in a pretest/posttest format. Results indicated that the journal-writing groups progressed better in the area, and that was statistically significant. Supplementarily, a participating teacher, subjects' major fields of study, and the interaction between a teacher and a treatment, respectively, had a noticeable effect on improving writing ability, and those were all statistically significant. Some limitation was also noted.

[dialogue journal writing/writing ability/대화식 저널 쓰기/쓰기 능력]

I. INTRODUCTION

This study poses whether writing dialogue journals significantly improves the writing ability of Korean college freshmen who learn English as a foreign language. Dialogue journals, as one type of unassigned writing, are regularly written between a student and a teacher for a semester or a school year. In their journal entries, students write about self-chosen topics on academic and/or personal concerns, typically in an informal language, and each entry is responded

communicatively. Therefore, unlike in an assigned classroom writing, students tend to command various language functions or speech acts. Each entry is focused on meaning and neither evaluated nor corrected in grammatical points and mechanics. Also, dialogue journals can create an individual tutorial relationship between a teacher and each student in that the teachers make their responses comprehensible and, at the same time, stretch their students' thinking and language skills.

For the study, the current state of English writing instruction in Korean colleges needs to be mentioned. In many universities and colleges, the instruction has been given by customarily following a controlled writing mode or an ESL version of the current-traditional rhetoric mode, which focuses on the correct use of formal linguistic features or the logical construction and arrangement of discourse forms. Accordingly, it can be assumed that students have not had enough opportunities to develop their own meaning in their written products. As a result, many instructors have said that writing ability of many students has not been satisfactory enough.

For the students' writing problem, it was thought to administer dialogue journal writing in a college where the researcher has been teaching, with an expectation that this might probably and possibly relieve the problem. The expectation was based on the facts that (1) dialogue journal writing can be used as a development of the process-centered approach to writing, the teaching practices of which led to better results in students' writing ability (Faigley, Daly, & Witte, 1981; Min-Jong Song, 2007a) and (2) the effect of dialogue journal writing on heightening writing ability was already empirically substantiated from both L1 and ESL studies, and also in some EFL studies (Min-Jong Song, 2003, 2004). This research is a developed one from Min-Jong Song's (2003, 2004) in that it focuses more on the aspects of dialogue journals and reports some more results.

The research question was established as follows:

Do Korean college freshmen, who write dialogue journals over a ten week period, improve their writing ability more than do similar students who answer comprehension questions during the same period?

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

1. Theoretical Background

1) The Development of Dialogue Journal Research

It is quite probable that the use of dialogue journals as a means of communication between students and teachers may well have been practiced as a teacher-developed classroom practice for many years prior to becoming subject to explicit analysis and theories of researchers. For example, Leslee Reed, a sixth-grade teacher of native students in Los Angeles, initiated it in 1964 to get to know her students better, to get feedback on lessons, to improve the classroom discipline, and to involve each student in meaningful reading and writing (Staton, Shuy, Peyton, & Reed, 1988). Staton (1988c) briefly reviews the history of a dialogue journal in the preface of a book on dialogue journal communication from multiple perspectives.

The first comprehensive study of dialogue journals in classroom settings began in Mrs. Reed's classroom with the team-work of Shuy, Kreeft, Staton, and Reed in 1979, with the texts of 26 dialogue journals from the 1979-80 class, focusing on the context and characteristics of the students' writing from a variety of perspectives. This teaching procedure assumes that literacy must be used to liberate and empower, not to control and degrade either teacher or student. Staton continuously claims that this view was strongly influenced by the earlier works of people such as Bruner, Vygotsky, Ashton-Warner's *Teacher*, Holbrook's *English for the Rejected*, Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, and *Letters to a Teacher by the Schoolboys of Barbiana*, all of which spoke about the importance of personal literacy for the illiterate, the oppressed, and the child. This study was also influenced by the emerging research methods from discourse analysis and pragmatics in analyzing these texts, to view the acquisition and use of language as a means of thinking and getting things done in the world. In the spring of 1982, the final report of this study, titled "Analysis of Dialogue Journal Writing as a Communicative Event," was completed and disseminated; it encouraged the spread of dialogue journal use and research, often with students very different in age, background and language.

A second study of dialogue journals used the diaries of Mrs. Reed's sixth-grade

ESL students and the interaction in the classroom during 1980-81 year as its data base, after she was transferred to another school, one where many immigrant children were learning English as a second language. Eventually, this data base formed the corpus for the study directed by J. K. Peyton (1984), resulting in a collaborative research project, titled "Dialogue Writing: Analysis of Student-Teacher Interactive Writing in the Learning of English as a Second Language" (Kreeft, Shuy, Staton, Reed, & Morroy, 1984). With the results of that study, the use of dialogue journals in the ESL community got increased interest, so that journals are now becoming a part of the many major ESL programs across the United States and abroad. Also, a newsletter called *Dialogue* was started in 1982 to trace and share the applications of dialogue journals to many different kinds of interpersonal settings in which communication, reading/writing development or both are central needs and a solid network of researchers and practitioners has formed and is growing.

A third study examined the effect of sustained written interaction for deaf students and their teachers. It found out that dialogue journals can serve as an effective entry into literacy for very young deaf students who may have only minimal competence in sign language or written language use, when they are given the opportunity for daily written dialogues with their teacher (Bailes, Searls, Slobodzian, & Staton, 1986; Staton, 1985).

2. Dialogue Journal Studies

1) First Language Studies

Staton et al. (1988) analyzed the text of 26 student-teacher dialogue journals collected from a sixth-grade classroom. They described the interactional structure of those cumulative dialogues and the strategies for jointly initiating, developing, and maintaining them. From the studies, Shuy (1988b) found that students could use their communicative competence already mastered in oral conversation in performing written communication. Peyton (1988a) found that dialogue journal writing served as a bridge between natural spoken conversation and the traditional classroom task of essay writing, leading the students to develop the ability to

construct written discourse.

Practitioners also reported that, across the year, students became to use a wider range of specific language functions. For example, Shuy (1988a, 1988c) found that students could complain more and more suitably over the year. Peyton (1988b) found that the teacher used questions to encourage and develop students' awareness and reflective thinking. Staton (1988a) found that students could discuss and solve the problems with the support of the interactional scaffolding provided by the teacher's responses.

Staton and Peyton (1988) found that students and teacher wrote about a wide variety of topics in their dialogue journals. Staton (1988b) also found that students learned to be more elaborative and to introduce new, interesting information in order to continue a topic discussion.

Battle (1986) asked 24 first semester freshmen enrolled in a standard freshman English course to keep journals characterized as dialogical communication, in conjunction with other reading and writing activities. She gathered various instruments over one semester – "cloze reading samples, the Goodman miscue analysis, Buxton-scored writing samples, student interviews and instructor journal, and a questionnaire on instructional activities" (abstract, p. 2060A). She concluded that the set of activities was helpful in improving verbal and written communication, but her abstract gives no indication that the data gathered were (1) accompanied by similar data from a control group; (2) gathered over time within a pre-/posttest design; or (3) analyzed for statistical significance.

Most of these series of studies, based on data from actual classrooms, strongly support central claims about the value of dialogue journals for writing development in L1 settings. However, they raise two questions to be explored in this research;

- (1) Can the positive results found mostly informally in these studies be verified in a more structured experimental/ control testing situation?
- (2) Can these positive results be extended to ESL settings?

2) Second Language Studies

Several studies report positive results from using dialogue journals with ESL learners. For the most part, these studies are based on text analysis; they rely on case studies or small samples.

Peyton (1984, 1990) investigated the students' use of selected English grammatical morphemes, and reported that the use of dialogue journal writing could promote acquisition of the written forms of a second language. Staton (1984) analyzed features of the language input (comprehensible input) received from the teacher's writing in the journals, and reported that the dialogue journal interaction provided the conditions for the development of written language competence. Blanton (1987) reported that using journals with college ESL students increased students' writing proficiency and reduced their writing apprehension. Vanett and Jurich (1990) argued that journal writing with adult ESL students could be a tool to teach the writing skills needed in various contexts, including school and business contexts. Lucas (1990) examined the conventions of personal journal writing in an adult ESL writing course and concluded informally that students increased confidence in English writing and they improved writing ability. Peyton, Richardson, Staton, and Wolfram (1990) analyzed the quantity and maturity of the writing of 12 sixth-grade ESL students in three assigned writing tasks and in unassigned entries in dialogue journals. They reported that the quantity and maturity of the dialogue journal writing was at least equivalent to that of the assigned writing, and in many cases showed more complex linguistic expression. Reyes (1991) examined the responses of ten sixth grade Hispanic bilingual students in dialogue journals and literature logs in their first and second language. She concluded that dialogue journals were more effective than literature logs for the students to construct meaning.

Conclusively, those studies broadly report positive results in writing improvement from using dialogue journals with native speakers and with English as a second language classes. Now, this study investigates the effectiveness of dialogue journal use with EFL students.

III. METHOD

1. Design and Hypothesis

This research conducted an experiment on the effectiveness of dialogue journal writing with Korean college freshmen in the reading sections of freshman English course. Over a ten week period, students in two experimental sections wrote dialogue journals about their reading content, and their progress on writing ability was compared with the progress on the same variable of students in two control sections, who answered comprehension questions about the same content. To know the effect of each treatment, this study used a Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) and, as a measurement instrument, two different writing tasks.

The hypothesis was that the experimental group would show significantly higher gains in writing ability as compared to the gains in writing ability shown by the control group with the level of significant alpha set at $p < .05$.

2. Participants

The subjects were all female, first-year students in a Korean college. They signed up for freshman English as intact groups by their choice of major. The students whose major field of study was pharmacy, law, education, or pre-medicine participated in the experiment. Before the first meeting, the intact sections were randomly assigned to either experimental or control groups. Pharmacy major and law major students were assigned to experimental groups, and education major and pre-medicine major students, control groups. At the beginning, 207 freshmen made up the initial population.

Two teachers participated in the experiment. They had similar academic backgrounds (Ph. D. or Ph. D. candidate 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.

3. Procedure

During the first meeting, a pretest for writing ability was taken with a writing task. Then, each practice began. For their both sections, the teachers followed the same systematic sequence in the course syllabus and assigned the same course

requirements.

Experimental group students wrote their journal entries (See Appendix A for a sample) on the six reading chapters. They wrote about each reading content with self-generated topics. Before writing, they were told that the journal entries should be at least three sentences in length (Staton et al., 1988) and those entries would be responded communicatively, centered on meaning, with no grading and no error correction. Control group students wrote their answers to comprehension questions (See Appendix B for a sample) on the same six chapters. They answered to the given questions about each reading content. Before answering, they were told that the answers would be responded evaluatively, based on the pre-determined content, with grading and error correction. Both writing practices were done as homework and responded by the researcher. These procedures continued over ten weeks. During the final meeting, both groups took the posttest with another writing task.

4. Data Collection

Data was collected from two different writing tasks on four different topics.¹ The same data for writing tasks was used in Min-Jong Song (2003, 2004, 2007a). For each writing task, there were two topics for those subjects to have a choice. The expected rhetorical form was narrative. For each test, the subjects got their topics one week before they actually wrote, allowed to jot down ideas or make outlines about their writing task and use them while they were actually writing. Each test was taken during the class time. For each test, time limit was 30 minutes.

5. Data Analysis

Scoring was done only for the 166 subjects who participated in the whole process of the experiment. Of those subjects, 87 belonged to the experimental group and 79, the control group. Two writing samples per each subject were collected. All the samples were appropriately coded and randomly mixed. Then, two raters seated at two separate tables rated independently each of the 332 coded samples on a scale of 1 to 6. They were asked to read each writing

¹ Topics on writing task A: My Dream in the Past/ Friendship in My Life. Topics on writing task B: My Hope for the Future/ Filial Piety in My Life.

sample for its general impression, valuing the communicative aspect. The 28 controversial samples of which the separate half-scores between the two raters made more than one point difference, the third rater arbitrated by scoring them. In that case, this research accepted the closest two scores from those three scores. Also, the middle score of the three scores was dropped when the scores of the other two disagreeing raters proved to be equidistant from that score, for the intent of this process was to get the greatest divergence between a pair of holistic scores for a given sample. These procedures for holistic scoring were all well established and previously used (Cooper, 1977). Accordingly, every sample received the two scores to which at least two raters agreed within one point difference (see Appendix C for a writing sample). The achieved inter-rater reliability was .83. 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 ANOVA.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results and discussions relating to the hypothesis and some supplementary (teacher, students' choice of major, teacher by treatment) variables.

1. Result Relating to the Hypothesis

The mean changes from pre- to posttest for experimental (writing dialogue journals) and control (answering comprehension questions) group were +0.559 and +0.333, respectively, an improvement in both cases. Table 1 indicates the mean changes in writing ability, pre- to posttest, for the two groups.

Table 1
Analysis of Writing Ability Mean Change Pretest to Posttest by Treatment

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 ability based on the holistic ratings by treatment. In this case, the treatment effect was

statistically significant, favoring the experimental group, $F(2, 166) = 5.0574$, $p = .0259$.

Table 2
Test of Significance for Holistically Scored Writing by Treatment

Source	df	F	Sig of F
Between groups	1	5.0574	.0259*
Within groups	164		

* $p < .05$.

It can be discussed that writing dialogue journals can be more effective than the traditional practice (answering comprehension questions). From this research and the others (Min-Jong Song, 2003, 2004), it was proved that dialogue journal writing was significantly better in improving students' writing ability and this result was compatible with other empirical studies about dialogue journal writing. Therefore, if all the conditions are same, writing dialogue journals would be an acceptable alternative.

2. Results Relating to Supplementary Variables

The answer to the initial hypothesis was confounded by two effects which appeared in the analysis of the data: a strong teacher and a strong effect of students' choice of majors. Those two effects and the interaction by teacher by treatment effect are reported and discussed here.

1) Analysis of Writing Ability by Teacher

The mean changes from pretest to posttest writing samples for the students of teacher 1 and teacher 2 group were +0.294 and +0.650, respectively, an improvement in both cases. Table 3 indicates the mean changes in writing ability, pretest to posttest, for the two groups.

Table 3
Analysis of Writing Ability Mean Change Pretest to Posttest by Teacher

Teacher	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Teacher 1`	1.824	2.118	+0.294
Teacher 2	2.047	2.697	+0.650

Table 4 presents an overview of the F test of significance for writing ability based on the holistic ratings by teacher. In this case, the teacher effect was highly significant, favoring the second teacher, $F(2, 166) = 13.1100$, $p = .0004$.

Table 4
Test of Significance for Holistically Scored Writing by Teacher

Source	df	F	Sig of F
Between groups	1	13.1100	.0004***
Within groups	164		

*** $p < .001$.

Here, the teacher effect favored the teacher 2. This research can offer two speculations on the probable reasons for this phenomenon: the academic proficiency of the students each teacher taught and the instructional mode and approach to reading each teacher used.

Concerning the academic proficiency, since most of the students for teacher 2 (law major and pre-medicine major students) had, on the average, higher test scores at the Scholastic Ability Test for the entrance exam than those of the students for teacher 1 (education major and pharmacy major students), teacher 2 group might have achieved greater results in improving their writing ability (see the following "Analysis of Writing Ability by Students' Choice of Major" for more detailed information).

Concerning the instructional mode and approach to reading, generally, both teachers taught their classes with the Grammar-Translation Method, involving students' individual presentation about the given reading content, and they apparently followed the transmission model of reading for meaning. However, teacher 2 taught students majoring in law with the eclectic method, involving students' group presentation about the given reading, and the teacher apparently followed the interactive approach to reading. She divided the whole class into several small groups, let one group present the given reading content, and had another group ask the presenters questions about the presented content. When there was some problem in the process, she helped to solve it. Also, she suggested to the whole class some ideas for the meaning on the reading content, made each small group discuss them together with its own ideas between its members, and then had each group present its opinion to the whole class. Therefore, the whole class could share multiple interpretations and perspectives their peers brought to a given text. Later, the students could write those

viewpoints together with their own opinions in their journal entries. This instructional mode and approach to reading might have greatly influenced law major students' improvement in writing ability (see the following "Analysis of Writing Ability by Students' Choice of Major" for evidence), which contributed to the greater result for teacher 2 group.

2) Analysis of Writing Ability by Students' Choice of Major

The mean changes from pre- to posttest writing samples for the students' choice of majors were +0.299 (pharmacy), +0.897 (law), +0.287 (education), and +0.382 (pre-medicine), respectively, an improvement in all cases. Table 5 indicates the mean changes in writing ability, pre- to posttest, for the students' choice of majors.

Table 5
Analysis of Writing Ability Mean Change Pretest to Posttest by Students' Choice of Major

Major	Pretest	Posttest	Change
Pharmacy	1.931	2.230	+0.299
Law	1.936	2.833	+0.897
Education	1.688	1.975	+0.287
Pre-medicine	2.167	2.549	+0.382

Table 6 presents an overview of the F test of significance for writing ability based on the holistic ratings by students' choice of major. In this case, there is a statistically significant difference between the mean changes for the students' choice of majors. By using Student-Newman-Keuls Procedure, it can be seen that the mean change for law major is significantly different from those for all the other majors (pharmacy, education, and pre-medicine) at the .05 level.

Table 6
Test of Significance for Holistically Scored Writing by Students' Choice of Major

Source	df	F	Sig of F
Between groups	3	9.1367	.0000****
Within groups	162		

**** $p < .0001$.

As Min-Jong Song (2007b) mentioned earlier, the characteristics of students'

choice of majors each might have influenced the effect of each treatment. Based on the scores at the Scholastic Ability Test, pre-medicine major students scored, on the average, higher than pharmacy major students, and law major students, much higher than education major students. It was speculated that students with higher test scores would take more serious and competitive attitude toward their study than those with lower scores. Also, it was expected that law major or education major students might be generally more interested in and more hard-working on the freshman English course than pharmacy major or pre-medicine major students, regardless of their academic proficiency objectively measured by the Scholastic Ability Test. From these perspectives, it can be discussed that law major students, who would take more serious and competitive attitude toward their study and who might be more interested in and hard-working on the freshman English course, improved their writing ability significantly different from all the other subjects.

3) Analysis of Writing Ability by Teacher by Treatment

The mean change from pre- to posttest writing samples for the experimental group by teacher 1 was +0.299, for the experimental group by teacher 2, +0.897, for the control group by teacher 1, +0.287, and for the control group by teacher 2, +0.382, respectively, an improvement in all cases. Table 7 indicates the mean changes in writing ability, pre- to posttest, for the four sections interacted by teacher by treatment.

Table 7

Analysis of Writing Ability Mean Change Pretest to Posttest by Teacher by Treatment

Teacher x Treatment	Mean Change
Teacher 1 x Experimental	+0.299
Teacher 2 x Experimental	+0.897
Teacher 1 x Control	+0.287
Teacher 2 x Control	+0.382

Table 8 presents an overview of the F test of significance for writing ability based on the holistic ratings by teacher by treatment. In this case, there is a significant interaction between teacher variable and treatment variable, i. e., the result for experimental group and control group each by each teacher differs significantly depending on which teacher is involved.

Table 8
Test of Significance for Holistically Scored Writing by Teacher by Treatment

Source	df	F	Sig of F
Within cells	162		
Teacher	1	13.17	.000
Treatment	1	7.62	.006
Teacher by Treatment	1	6.97	.009**

** $p < .01$.

It is seen that the interaction between the strong teacher (teacher 2) and the journal writing (experimental) group showed the greatest result, the interaction between the strong teacher (teacher 2) and the comprehension questions (control) group showed the second greatest, the interaction between the weak teacher (teacher 1) and the experimental group showed the third greatest, and the interaction between the weak teacher and the control group showed the lowest result. Then, it can be discussed that, in case of the interaction between the teacher variable and the treatment one, the teacher effect was stronger than the treatment one.

V. CONCLUSION

Writing dialogue journals about the reading content significantly improved students' writing ability. Then, it can be concluded that teachers of EFL reading courses might well consider using dialogue journals as a vehicle for improving students' writing ability. The other noticeable phenomena were that there was an outstanding teacher effect and students' choice of major had also a remarkable effect. In case of the interaction between a teacher variable and a treatment (writing dialogue journals or answering comprehension questions) variable, the teacher effect was stronger than the treatment one. Then, it can also be concluded that periodical teacher training for developing effective teaching methods is needed.

There were some limitations in this research. Writing journal entries could not be an ongoing process. Experimental group students wrote only one entry about the reading content of each chapter and this researcher also could not respond more than once to their each entry. Accordingly, the continuous interaction between a student and a respondent about a topic and elaboration on it for some time, which is customary in dialogue journal writing did not happen in this

study. Also, most of the subjects could be categorized as the top students based on their academic abilities at the school, which has also been recognized as one of the most competitive schools in Korea. Therefore, it is doubtful whether the same results may come out if the subjects are changed into students of different academic abilities.

REFERENCES

- Bailes, C., Searls, S., Slobodzian, J., & Staton, J. (1986). *It's your turn now! Using dialogue journals with deaf students*. Washington, DC: Gallaudet College, Pre-College Programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 294 396).
- Battle, M. V. (1986). Dialogical activities to improve communication of first-semester university freshmen through teaching reading literature and writing compositions interrelatedly (Ed. D. dissertation, Memphis State University, 1986). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47, 2060A. (University Microfilms No. AAC8619455; ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296 277).
- Blanton, L. L. (1987). Reshaping ESL students' perceptions of writing. *ELT Journal*, 41, 112-118.
- 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.
- 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.
- Kreeft, J., Shuy, R. W., Staton, J., Reed, L., & Morroy, R. (1984). *Dialogue writing: Analysis of student-teacher interactive writing in the learning of English as a second language*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 097).
- Lucas, T. (1990). Personal journal writing as a classroom genre. In J. K. Peyton

- (Ed.), *Students and teachers writing together: Perspectives on journal writing* (pp. 101-119). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Peyton, J. K. (1984). Dialogue journal writing and the acquisition of grammatical morphology in English as a second language (Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University, 1984). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46, 3019A. (University Microfilms No. AAC8527455).
- Peyton, J. K. (1988a). Dialogue writing—bridge from talk to essay. In J. Staton, R. W. Shuy, J. K. Peyton, & L. Reed (Eds.), *Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views* (pp. 88-106). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Peyton, J. K. (1988b). Why ask? The function of questions in dialogue writing. In J. Staton, R. W. Shuy, J. K. Peyton, & L. Reed (Eds.), *Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views* (pp. 162-182). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Peyton, J. K. (1990). Dialogue journal writing and the acquisition of English grammatical morphology. In J. K. Peyton (Ed.), *Students and teachers writing together: Perspectives on journal writing* (pp. 65-98). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Peyton, J. K., Richardson, G., Staton, J., & Wolfram, W. (1990). The influence of writing task on ESL students' written production. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 24, 142-171.
- Reyes, M. de la L. (1991). A process approach to literacy using dialogue journals and literature logs with second language learners. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 25, 291-313.
- Shuy, R. W. (1988a). Discourse level language functions: Complaining. In J. Staton, R. W. Shuy, J. K. Peyton, & L. Reed (Eds.), *Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views* (pp. 143-161). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Shuy, R. W. (1988b). The oral language basis for dialogue journals. In J. Staton, R. W. Shuy, J. K. Peyton, & L. Reed (Eds.), *Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views* (pp. 73-87). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Shuy, R. W. (1988c). Sentence level language functions. In J. Staton, R. W.

- Shuy, J. K. Peyton, & L. Reed (Eds.), *Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views* (pp. 107-142). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Song, Min-Jong. (2003). A promising practice for advancing Korean students' literacy. *English Teaching*, 58(2), 159-184.
- Song, Min-Jong. (2004). Isn't it time to activate dialogue journal writing in EFL environments? *Foreign Languages Education*, 11(4), 1-28.
- Song, Min-Jong. (2007a). A promising practice for improving writing quality and decreasing writing apprehension of Korean students. *Modern English Education*, 8(2), 113-135.
- Song, Min-Jong. (2007b). Teaching reading with an interactive approach. *Modern English Education*, 8(3), 220-242.
- Staton, J. (1984). Dialogue journals as a means of enabling written language acquisition. In J. Kreeft, R. W. Shuy, J. Staton, L. Reed, & R. Morroy (Eds.), *Dialogue writing: Analysis of student-teacher interactive writing in the learning of English as a second language* (pp. 153-203). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 097)
- Staton, J. (1985). Using dialogue journals for developing thinking, reading, and writing with hearing impaired students. *Volta Review*, 87, 127-154.
- Staton, J. (1988a). Discussing problems. In J. Staton, R. W. Shuy, J. K. Peyton, & L. Reed (Eds.), *Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views* (pp. 202-244). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Staton, J. (1988b). Elaboration of topics: "It's just not gonna come down in one little sentence". In J. Staton, R. W. Shuy, J. K. Peyton, & L. Reed (Eds.), *Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views* (pp. 277-311). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Staton, J. (1988c). Preface: A brief history and acknowledgments. In J. Staton, R. W. Shuy, J. K. Peyton, & L. Reed (Eds.), *Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views* (pp. ix-xii). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Staton, J., & Peyton, J. K. (1988). Topics: A window on the construction of knowledge. In J. Staton, R. W. Shuy, J. K. Peyton, & L. Reed (Eds.),

Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views (pp. 245-276). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Staton, J., Shuy, R. W., Peyton, J. K., & Reed, L. (Eds.). (1988). *Dialogue journal communication: Classroom, linguistic, social, and cognitive views*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Vanett, L., & Jurich, D. (1990). The missing link: Connecting journal writing to academic writing. In J. K. Peyton (Ed.), *Students and teachers writing together: Perspectives on journal writing* (pp. 21-34). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

APPENDIX A

A Sample of Experimental Group Subjects' Dialogue Journal Writing

Note: Investigator response is indented 5 spaces. Marginal comments by the investigator are inserted in the text, and bracketed.

After Reading "The Rivet Poppers"

This lesson rings an alarm bell to environmental contamination and insist we should change our attitudes. <I like this beginning a lot.> This lesson informs us of seriousness of environmental pollutions not by theoretical and high-brow explanation <I like this expression, too.> simply but by concrete things—airplane—or examples. Specially quotation from T. S. Eliot's "The Hollow Man" is very impressive. <Is it?> Futhermore, it is worthy of notice that the author of this lesson considers possibility of both "whimper" and "bang", while T. S. Eliot said "There is the way the world ends ... not with a bang but a whimper." <Wow, it seems like you have a lot of literary knowledge!>

But, the author doesn't show concrete ways to prevent environmental pollutions. <No.> In other words, "Concreted action" that is said by the author in this lesson is our parts. <Yes, we have to investigate it.> First of all, I think we should get out of insensibility of environmental pollution and recognize seriousness of that. <Good!> And, individual small actions like separate refuse collection or use of reclaimed articles are most necessary. <Sure. Why not?> By the way, the author of this lesson shifts the responsibility for present environmental pollution on to all countries evenly. However, that is unfair because industrially advanced nations exert a bad influence upon global environment in process of industrial development. <I agree with you to this point.> And the author takes a serious view of the Amazon basin and call the Brazilian to task for destruction of the Amazon

basin. But, to a developing country like Brazil industrial development very important and environmental pollution like the destruction of the Amazon basin is unavoidable. Who demand that the Brazilian stop industrial development to preserve the Amazon basin? Therefore, material and economical aid, like across-the-board reduction of tariffs of Brazilian commodities, is needed, when advanced countries request preservation of the Amazon basin to Brazil.

Euiyoung, I like your discussion a lot. It has a well-balanced opinion about the phenomena, especially in the last part. Your written English is also excellent.

APPENDIX B

A Sample of Control Group Subjects' Comprehension Questionnaire-Answers

Note: Student answers are indented 5 spaces. Investigators grading and error correction are not marked in this print.

Comprehension Questions on "The Rivet Poppers"

Department:

Name:

Please answer with full sentences in English for each question.

1. What is rivet-popping on Spaceship Earth and who are the rivet poppers, in general?

Rivet-popping on Spaceship Earth is the destruction of our ecosystems and it consists of aiding and abetting the extermination of species and populations of nonhuman organisms. The rivet poppers include such people as the President of the United States, the Chairman of the Soviet Communist Party, and most other politicians and decision makers; many big businessmen and small businessmen; and, inadvertently, most other people on the planet, including you and us.

2. What's the similarity between the ecosystems and well-made airplanes?

The ecosystems supplies the vital services for human beings. It is analogous to the parts of an airplane that make it a suitable vehicle for human beings. They tend to have redundant subsystems and other "design" features that permit them to continue functioning after absorbing a certain amount of abuse.

3. According to the author, why are the ecology-education of and concerted action by a great many people very important?

Because extinctions of other organisms must be stopped before the living structure of our spacecraft is so weakened that at a moment of stress it fails and civilization is destroyed.

APPENDIX C
Students' Writing Samples

A Sample of Low-Rated Essay (1.5 by the first rater, 0.5 by the second rater)

My Dreams in My Past

I had many dreams when I was young but I hadn't special dream that I would get accomplished something in my future. Anytime I played piano hard for pianist What time I drowed the picture for artist and doctor, scientist, musicial and so on. like that, Vaguely I used to forecast my future but the important thing, I wouldn't think that I will be a teacher. Other side I had dream that I must made happy family like everybody. for example my husbant have a special work, he also is sincerity, kind and lovely and my children are good like that, when I was young Vaguely I thought that I would have a good family and I would have a special job, after married I wish I don't rely on someone (parents, husband). But now, I studied hard for teacher. nothing I did think when I was young and nobod will know my married life. like that My dreams in my past is beautiful itselfes, when I was young That I had so dreams and thought was beautiful to me.

Min-Jong Song
Dept. of General Education, Sungkyul University
32-8 Anyang-8-dong, Anyang city, Geonggi-do, Korea
Tel: (031) 467-8920
Email: mjsong43@lycos.co.kr

Received in January, 2008
Reviewed in February, 2008
Revised version received in March, 2008