

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 703

FL 025 516

AUTHOR Song, Minjong
TITLE Experimental Study of the Effect of Controlled vs. Free Writing and Different Feedback Types on Writing Quality and Writing Apprehension of EFL College Students.
PUB DATE 1998-08-00
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Classroom Techniques; College Students; Comparative Analysis; *Dialog Journals; *English (Second Language); *Error Correction; *Feedback; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; Second Language Instruction; Skill Development; *Writing Apprehension; Writing Exercises; *Writing Instruction; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS Korea

ABSTRACT

An experimental study compared the effects of controlled and free writing exercises and of evaluative vs. communicative feedback on the writing quality and apprehension of Korean college students of English as a foreign language (EFL). Students in two sections of a freshman reading course wrote dialogue journals as practice in free writing, and received communicative feedback focusing on meaning and using no grading or error correction. Students in two other sections answered adapted comprehension questions as practice in controlled writing, and received evaluative feedback focusing on formal linguistic features, with grading and error correction. Two teachers taught the sections, each teaching one free-writing and one controlled-writing section. Changes in writing quality, as measured by holistic essay evaluation, and writing apprehension, assessed using an objective measure, were investigated. Results indicate that students writing dialogue journals and getting communicative feedback improved in writing quality and possibly experienced reduced writing apprehension, and that this change was greater than that for students practicing controlled writing and receiving evaluative feedback. Contains 28 references. (MSE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

AUTHOR: Song, Minjong
EFL Instructor at Ewha Womans University in Korea

ADDRESS: Song, Minjong
A-204, Samho Garden Apt.
32-8, Banpo-Dong, Seocho-Gu
Seoul, Korea

HOME PHONE: 011-82-2-535-6650

FAX: 011-82-2-595-6523

DATE: August 10th, 1998

TITLE: Experimental Study of the Effect of Controlled vs.
Free Writing and Different Feedback Types on Writing
Quality and Writing Apprehension of EFL College Students

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

Minjong
Song

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

This experimental study investigated the effect of controlled vs. free writing and evaluative vs. communicative feedback on writing quality and writing apprehension of Korean EFL college students. Of freshman English reading courses, students in two experimental sections wrote dialogue journals as a practice of free writing and received communicative feedback, and their progress was compared with the progress of students in two control sections who answered adapted comprehension questions as a practice of controlled writing and received evaluative feedback.

Two teachers taught the one-semester course, each teaching one section each of experimental and control sections. To students' dialogue journal entries, the experimenter responded, focusing on meaning, with no grade and no error correction; to students' answers to adapted comprehension questions, the experimenter responded, focusing on formal linguistic features, with grade and error correction.

Pre- and posttest data were analyzed, using ANOVA, on variables, (1) change in writing quality, measured by holistic rating of essay writing tasks, and (2) change in writing apprehension, measured by objective rating of the Writing Apprehension Scale (Daly & Miller, 1975).

Results showed that writing dialogue journals and getting communicative feedback significantly improved students' writing quality and possibly reduced their writing apprehension more than answering adapted comprehension questions and getting evaluative feedback. Those results were interpreted as supporting the use of free writing and communicative feedback in EFL courses.

This article reports my experimental study of how controlled vs. free writing and different types of feedback affect writing quality and writing apprehension of Korean college freshmen. Adapted comprehension questionnaires were used for controlled writing, and dialogue journal entries, free one. And, to those two kinds of writing, evaluative and communicative feedback were given, respectively. In this article, I'll introduce the study by discussing its theoretical background and the experiment itself.

Theoretical Background

In Korea, English has been taught as a foreign language (EFL) at all levels of educational settings, and writing instruction in English begins at the college level without any nationwide curriculum for it. However, at most colleges, the viewpoint of writing has been that writing is producing, involving transmission of the writer's message and making it clear for others. Accordingly, the teaching of writing there has put emphasis on the written product, and writing itself has almost always been served as an evaluative purpose, causing high writing apprehension of most student writers. These current viewpoint and teaching practice of EFL writing at most Korean colleges correspond to those of ESL writing in American language educational contexts especially from 1945 till 1970.

Then, let me (1) distinguish between EFL and ESL, (2) examine the history of ESL writing instruction in the USA since 1945, locating in the history each of basic writing instruction and advanced counterpart at a Korean college where I conducted my experiment in 1996, and (3) explain the background of the experiment.

English as a Foreign Language vs. English as a Second Language

According to Snow (1986), English can be a foreign language when it is taught as one subject in school and used typically only at instructional settings (e.g., English in South Korea); English can be a second language when it is taught to the speakers of other languages in settings either where it is the language of the majority and the media of T.V., radio, and newspapers (e.g., English in the U.S.A.), or where it is designated as an official language of government and education (e.g., English in the Philippines, English in Hong Kong, and, English in South Africa).

History of ESL Writing Instruction in the U.S.A. since 1945 - Controlled Composition Model

1945 was the beginning of the modern era in second language teaching in the USA. 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, the servant of the other language skills. In that context, Silva (1990) discusses that controlled composition model dominated ESL writing instruction. According to him, it is a formal accuracy-centered approach, in a word, emphasizing the correct use of formal linguistic features such as vocabulary, sentence structure, and mechanics. Accordingly, its teaching practice 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 write their composition on teacher-given topics adopted from the passages. They write, without any sense of audience and purpose, only by imitating and manipulating the passage contents. The teacher responds evaluatively to their composed product and corrects it, centering on the formal linguistic mistakes. Therefore, it is guessed that the students who learn to write English

composition by following this model may not improve their writing quality sufficiently, for, in measuring writing quality, the other features such as ideas, organization, and style are also included. Also, it is assumed that those students can become high apprehensive writers due to correction and evaluation on their written product. According to Faigley, Daly, and Witte (1981), high apprehensive writers find writing unrewarding and experience more than normal amounts of anxiety when they must write, consequently avoiding the situations that require writing. At the Korean college where my experiment was conducted, basic writing has been taught in freshman English courses for one year, where writing has been considered as subsidiary to the other language skills (speaking, listening, and reading). In teaching basic writing, most of the teaching aspects of controlled composition model have been prevalent.

ESL Version of the Current-traditional Rhetoric

Then, in the mid-sixties, there was an increasing awareness that ESL students needed to produce extended written discourse and controlled composition was not enough for that need. Therefore, a bridge between controlled and free writing was necessary. In that context, Silva (1990) again contends that ESL version of the current-traditional paradigm directed ESL writing instruction. That version of the paradigm 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. According to Silva in the same source, it is an organization- or format-centered approach, in a word, trying to provide ESL students with logical construction and arrangement of discourse forms. Accordingly, its teaching practice focuses on paragraph development 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, an expansion of paragraph principles to larger stretches of discourse, the teacher gives lessons in larger structural entities (introduction, body, and conclusion) and organizational patterns (narration, description, exposition, and argumentation). Students write their composition 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 paradigm also, the teacher responds evaluatively to their composed product and corrects it, centering on usage such as syntax, spelling, and punctuation, which may cause those students to become high apprehensive writers. At the Korean college where my experiment was conducted, advanced writing has been taught for the students who already took basic writing in freshman English courses. In teaching advanced writing, most of the teaching aspects of ESL version of the current-traditional rhetoric have been dominant. Also, at some other colleges, depending on their own curriculum, English writing instruction for their freshmen has been given by following this model.

Process-centered Approach to Writing

However, during the 1970s and the 1980s, controlled composition model and the traditional, product-centered paradigm were beginning to crumble, and instead, a new, process-centered paradigm was emerging. Scholars (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 recursive one in which pre-writing, writing, and re-writing overlap and intervene. They continuously argue that therefore, writing is not only a communication skill but a way of learning and

developing, for, most writers, both skilled and unskilled ones, 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 that context, Silva (1990) maintains that the new paradigm, process-centered approach to writing governed ESL writing instruction. According to him, it is a meaning-centered approach, in a word, declaring that content, ideas, and the need to communicate determine form. Accordingly, its teaching practice focuses on brainstorming, free writing, self-generated topics, drafting and redrafting, attending to errors only at the final stage, small-group activities, and teacher-student one-to-one conference, all of which can promote discovery of meaning and ideas. Students work through composing processes with their teacher's help - help for strategies for getting started (finding topics, establishing audience and purpose, generating ideas and information, and planning structure and procedure), for drafting (encouraging multiple drafts), and for revising (adding, deleting, modifying ideas; rearranging; and editing with attention to vocabulary, sentence structure, grammar, and mechanics). The teacher intervenes in their composing process, emphasizing it rather than their composed product, and responds communicatively, focusing on meaning, to each draft, with no grade. For those reasons, it is supposed that the students who learn to write English composition by following this approach can become low apprehensive writers. According to Faigley, Daly, and Witte (1981), those writers are confident in their writing ability, not avoiding the situations that demand writing but frequently enjoying it. Also, Faigley et al. in the same source 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. In a word, it may be said that their writing quality can be better than high apprehensive writers'. At most Korean colleges, this process-centered approach to writing has barely been tried, and especially, at

the college where my experiment was conducted, never, before the experimental period.

Background of the Experiment

As mentioned above, at most Korean colleges, EFL writing instruction has been given by following controlled composition model or ESL version of the current-traditional rhetoric in the USA, with evaluative feedback. As a result of that, generally, there have been some problems in writing quality and writing attitude of most Korean college students: They lack especially their own ideas in writing and apprehend a lot for writing act. So, to contribute to solve those problems, I thought of introducing, at the Korean TESOL conference, free writing and communicative feedback as a modified practice of process-centered approach to writing, expecting that the new writing mode and feedback type might improve those students' writing quality and decrease their writing apprehension. And, before introduction, to see whether the expectation would come true or not, I decided to conduct an experiment, at a college, with two different writing modes (controlled vs. free writing) and feedback types (evaluative vs. communicative feedback).

Experiment

Design and Hypotheses

I conducted the experiment at a Korean college, throughout the first semester of 1996-1997 academic year, by using four intact reading sections of freshman English. In the experiment, I managed to meet all of Hillocks' (1984; 1986) criteria for acceptable research conditions, to make it carefully designed and controlled, as follows:

- involving a treatment 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 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 and averaged;
- achieving .70 or higher inter-rater reliabilities on holistic scoring.

By setting up two experimental and two control sections, the experiment compared free writing and communicative feedback with controlled writing and evaluative feedback in their effect on students' writing quality and writing apprehension: For a duration of 14 week meeting period, students in experimental sections wrote dialogue journals about their reading contents as a practice of free writing and received communicative feedback from the respondent, the experimenter, over a ten week period, and their progress was compared with the progress of students in control sections who answered adapted comprehension questions about the same contents as a practice of controlled writing and received evaluative feedback from the same respondent over the same period.

To know the effect of each treatment on dependent variables, this experiment used a Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). Each treatment here was writing dialogue journals and getting communicative feedback or answering adapted comprehension questions and getting evaluative feedback, and the dependent variables and measurement instruments used were:

- writing quality on pre- and posttest, as measured by writing tasks;
- writing apprehension on pre- and posttest, as measured by a writing apprehension scale.

The two hypotheses in the experiment were:

Writing Quality

The experimental group, which was exposed to writing dialogue journals and receiving communicative feedback as treatment, 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 answering adapted comprehension questions and receiving evaluative feedback as treatment, with the level of significance set at $p < .05$;

Writing Apprehension

The experimental group, which was exposed to writing dialogue journals and receiving communicative feedback as treatment, 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 answering adapted comprehension questions and receiving evaluative feedback as treatment, with the level of significance set at $p < .05$.

Limitations in the Experiment

There were some limitations in the experiment due to a few constraints in the experimental setting.

- Instead of truly randomizing subjects, I used intact sections, randomized only by normal enrollment procedures, since the institutional procedures of the college did not permit it.
- I used reading sections, not writing sections, for, freshman English courses at the college consisted of speaking and reading section, and basic writing instruction had been customarily given in the reading section.
- The allotted time for reading section (2 hours per week) forbade

teaching/learning writing enough in the class. So, the two participating teachers just explained briefly to their students in the experiment, in the class, about how to work on each writing practice and each feedback type they would get; the students worked on their writing as homework. Teaching writing briefly in the class and students' working on controlled writing as homework had been customary for basic writing instruction at the college.

- To the students' writing homework, not the participating teachers but I, the experimenter, gave written response, for, even the teachers' working load concerning teaching reading was much for them. Before the experiment, usually, teaching assistants in English department at the college had responded evaluatively to freshmen's writing homework.

Subjects and Participating Teachers

The subjects in the experiment were all female, first-year students at a four-year college, aged around 19, who enrolled for the first semester of 1996-1997 academic year. In Korea, no clear picture of the typical EFL college students has been available, since there has been no nationwide standardized English proficiency test at the college level. However, the participating teachers and I all agreed that the subjects' English proficiency level was advanced as compared to the level of students at other colleges in Korea, for, the college had had a name-value for its competitiveness at the nationwide standardized entrance exam requiring high score. At the college, first-year students signed up for freshman English, a required course for them, by their choice of major field. Their meeting time and instructor were pre-determined by the schedule deputy before the semester began. In the experiment, the students who chose to major in pharmacy, law, education, and pre-medicine participated by signing up for the four reading sections of freshman English involved in it. They signed up during the regular registration time without

knowing that they were to participate in the experiment. During the first meeting, pretests for writing quality and writing apprehension were given to each section. Then, the four intact sections were randomly assigned to either experimental or control sections by coin toss. That was possible, since all those sections were taught with the same material. Lauer and Asher (1988) discuss how that kind of situation can happen. So, pharmacy major and law major were assigned to experimental sections, and education major and pre-medicine major, to control sections, and then, each treatment began. At the outset of the experiment, 207 freshmen made up the initial population and each section was around 50 students in size.

The two female participating teachers had similar academic backgrounds (Ph.D. or ABD in English) and teaching experiences in reading (3 years, both), and satisfactory past performances considered from their tenure-board. For the experiment, both taught the one-semester course, each teaching one section each of the experimental and the control sections: Teacher 1 taught pharmacy major and education major, and teacher 2, law major and pre-medicine major. Therefore, based on those conditions--their prior education, experience and ability in teaching reading, and each teacher teaching one section of each treatment, it was felt that the teacher effect would not endanger the validity of the experiment.

The responsibilities of the teachers were:

- to attend a few hours of pre-treatment orientation during which the key concepts in this experiment--controlled vs. free writing, answering adapted comprehension questions vs. writing dialogue journals, evaluative vs. communicative feedback--were explained by myself, the experimenter;
- to teach two reading sections of freshman English, one section as an experimental one, explaining about how to work on dialogue journals and communicative feedback, and the other section as a control one,

explaining about how to work on adapted comprehension questions and evaluative feedback;

- to attend some informal meetings with the experimenter during the semester to describe what was going on in their classrooms and their students' attitude toward each writing homework;
- to administer two kinds--writing task and writing apprehension scale--of pre- and posttest within allotted time for each.

The teachers agreed that the purpose of the experiment was to compare the effects of two different writing practices and feedback types in reading sections, and both treatments deserved to be tried in an identical manner. None of them were informed of the expected results of the experiment.

Procedures

Classes met for 100 minutes once a week. For both their sections, not to endanger the reliability of the experiment, the two teachers taught with the same instructional mode, the Grammar-Translation Method (Larsen-Freeman, 1986), followed the same systematic sequence in the course syllabus for reading lessons, and assigned the same course requirements except writing homework. Concerning teaching/learning writing, as mentioned before, the teachers explained only briefly about how to work on dialogue journals or adapted comprehension questions and each feedback type in the class, and the students in this experiment worked on either of them as their homework. In this one semester-length experiment, both experimental and control group students met for a duration of fourteen weeks and each group students wrote six dialogue journal entries (see Appendix 1) or answered six adapted comprehension questionnaires (see Appendix 2) about the same six reading chapters. Those chapters were covered through eleven weeks, since five of them were taught, each for two weeks, and one of them, for one week. Experimental group students wrote their entries before they began to learn

each of those chapters, or in the middle of their learning process, or after they learned it. They were told that the journal entries should be at least three sentences in length (Staton, Shuy, Peyton, & Reed, 1988). Here, writing dialogue journals can be a practice of free writing, for, those students wrote their entries about topics chosen by themselves from the reading contents, freely with their own ideas. To those entries, I, the experimenter, gave communicative feedback by responding solely to meaning, not correcting errors and not grading the entries. Meanwhile, control group students wrote their answers to adapted comprehension questions after they learned each of those chapters. Here, answering adapted comprehension questions can be a practice of controlled writing, for, those students made their answers to the questions, given by myself, adapted from the reading contents, by imitating and manipulating the contents. To those answers, I gave evaluative feedback by correcting their formal linguistic mistakes and grading. At the end of each class when their students were to submit writing homework, the two teachers collected and gave to me those students' dialogue journal entry or adapted comprehension questionnaire including answers. Then, after giving feedback, I gave back to the teachers before each following class and they returned to their students during it the entries or the questionnaires including answers. These procedures continued throughout one semester.

Data Collection

To know the effect of each treatment on writing quality and writing apprehension of the students in both groups, I had the two teachers administer to all of them pre- and posttest, before and after treatment, with two writing tasks and two writing apprehension tests.

For the writing tasks (see Appendix 3), there were four topics--my dream in the past, friendship in my life, my hope for the future, and filial piety in my life, and the expected rhetorical form of the tasks on those topics

was narrative. Of the topics, two were categorized into form A and the other two, form B, by coin toss, for those students to have a topic choice for each test. The two forms were also randomly crossed by coin toss for them to get one form for the pretest and the other form for the posttest. For each test, the students in both groups, got their two writing topics one week before they wrote, being permitted to jot down ideas or make outlines about their own writing task and to use them during actual writing. This followed some scholars' (Emig, 1971; Pianko, 1977; Sanders & Littlefield, 1975) claim that it is important to involve students in a writing task and also Bridwell's (1979) argument that it seems to increase students' involvement to give them time for thinking about their writing task before actually writing it. Each test 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 ability, and the two teachers supervised each writing session by giving the same instructions and time limit (30 minutes). For each writing session, the students were provided with papers on which they put their name, major field of study, and date for the test before starting to write. All of their written papers were collected as soon as each test was done.

For the writing apprehension tests, the Writing Apprehension Scale developed by Daly and Miller (1975) (see Appendix 4) was used in English version for both pre- and posttest. However, before the experiment, the Scale had never been used with those students either in English or in translation into Korean. For each test also taken during the class time, the two teachers again supervised by giving the same instructions and time limit (15 minutes), and the students were provided with questionnaires on which they put their name, major field of study, and date for the test before starting to work on them. All of their questionnaires including answers were collected as soon as each test was done. The Writing Apprehension Scale (Daly & Miller, 1975) consists of 26 questions, 13 positive statements about writing (e.g., "I like

seeing my thoughts on paper") and 13 negative statements about writing (e.g., "I don't think I write as well as most other people"), responded to on five-point Likert-like scale ("strongly agree," "mildly agree," "neutral," "mildly disagree," "strongly disagree"). The Scale has been scored on a five-point scale to give high apprehension a high number and low apprehension a low number. Thus, a "strongly agree" response to a negative question is scored as 5, and a "strongly agree" response to a positive question 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 questions) are considered to reflect "low apprehension," scores of 79 to 99, "high apprehension," and scores above 100, "very high apprehension". Daly (1985) discusses that the Writing Apprehension Scale has been widely used in composition research, and 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. Five factors make the Scale a useful measuring device for the experiment undertaken here--its face validity as a measure of writing attitude; the internal reliability of the test; its correlation with other measures; its broad use in composition research, and its ease of administration.

Data Analysis

Scoring of the writing samples and the writing apprehension tests was done only for the 166 students who met the following conditions:

- had neither learned English outside of Korea nor had foreign-born instructors who might have used free writing and communicative feedback to teach writing before the experiment;
- either wrote dialogue journal entries or answered adapted comprehension questionnaires more than five times throughout the experiment.

Two writing samples were collected from each of the 166 students, 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 measure, a 6-point scale (see Appendix 5) was adopted, which has been used in the TWE (Test of Written English). Two raters for the samples were carefully chosen by matching their academic background, teaching experience in ESL writing, and opinion about the nature of good writing, to achieve inter-rater reliability. They were not informed of the design or the purpose of the experiment; they were just asked to read for an overall impression of each writing sample (Cooper, 1977), valuing the communicative aspect of it, and also 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. While scoring, each of the raters rated 332 writing samples in three sessions to avoid a loss of reliability due to fatigue. Also, during each session, they freely availed themselves with breaks from their work to avoid exhaustion, frequently reviewing previously scored samples of their own to maintain consistency in their own judgments over time. Thus, all the samples were read by two raters, well trained and experienced, and each sample received two scores. On the 28 samples where the two raters disagreed by more than one point, the third rater, who had the same conditions as a rater as those of the two raters and knew nothing about the nature of the experiment, arbitrated by scoring them. In that case, this experiment 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 writing sample. Accordingly, every sample received the two scores to which at least two raters agreed within one point difference. After all the samples were scored, inter-rater reliability was calculated by using Kendall's revision of the Spearman rank order correlation coefficient (Kendall, 1948). This recalculation produced an inter-rater reliability of .83, a figure above the generally accepted minimum of .70 required to insure that ratings from holistic scoring are reliable (Hillocks, 1984, 1986).

Also, two writing apprehension questionnaires including answers were collected from each of the 166 students, and scoring of them by myself was mechanical and objective.

When the scoring of the two kind data was completed, whole group data for each kind were averaged for the whole group gains and the gains were subjected to statistical analysis for significance set at $p < .05$, using ANOVA.

Results

This section presents statistical analysis of the followings:

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

Analysis of Writing Quality by Treatment Based on Holistic Ratings

From the scoring process for the writing samples mentioned above, two pretest and two posttest half scores came out for each of the 166 students. For statistical procedure, both the pretest and the posttest half scores were combined, which resulted in a possible scale of 2 to 12, low to high possibility for the pretest as well as the posttest rating for each of them. The mean

changes from pretest to posttest for experimental and control group were +0.559 and +0.333, respectively, an improvement in both cases. Table 1 indicates the mean changes in writing quality, pretest to posttest, for the two groups (Insert Table 1 here).

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

Analysis of Writing Apprehension by Treatment Based on Objective Ratings

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

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

Conclusions and Implications

This section draws conclusions from the data analysis, offering implications for teachers and researchers.

Conclusions

The first hypothesis in this experiment concerning writing quality was supported by the analyzed data which showed that the treatment effect was statistically significant, favoring the experimental group, $p = .0259$. Therefore, it was suggested that writing dialogue journals as a practice of free writing

and receiving communicative feedback improved students' writing quality significantly more than answering adapted comprehension questions as a practice of controlled writing and receiving evaluative feedback.

The second hypothesis in this experiment concerning writing apprehension was not supported by the analyzed data which showed that while the treatment effect favored the experimental group, it was not statistically significant, ($p = .1048$). Therefore, it was suggested that the greater decrease achieved by the experimental group might have happened by chance. However, it could be noted that, in reducing students' writing apprehension, writing dialogue journals as a practice of free writing and receiving communicative feedback appeared to be at least as effective as or possibly better than answering adapted comprehension questions as a practice of controlled writing and receiving evaluative feedback.

Implications for Teachers

It was supported that free writing and communicative feedback could be used in EFL reading courses to improve students' writing quality and decrease their writing apprehension more effectively.

Implications for Further Research

First, besides dialogue journals used in this experiment, there are various kinds of journals that might be used as a practice of free writing in subject courses, for example, learning journals and response journals. The common features which these two journals share with dialogue journals are:

- they are not corrected for errors but responded for meaning;
- they are generally informal in their content, format, and language; and
- they are not individually graded, maybe graded as a whole later.

The specific features of these two journals are:

- for learning journals, generally peers respond briefly in the margin and a teacher may respond later, and topics include many things; and

- for response journals, generally peers respond briefly in the margin and a teacher may respond later as for learning journals, however, students respond only to their reading in this case.

Therefore, it would be useful to implement the other kinds of journals as a classroom procedure and to test their effectiveness.

Second, there may be various kinds of EFL context where free writing and communicative feedback can be used and tested as to their usefulness, besides the specific EFL context--freshman English reading course at a Korean college--where this experiment was conducted.

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

Finally, concerning the issue of generalizability for the results in this experiment, more data from larger population having more controls are needed for making those results more reliable.

REFERENCES

- 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.
- Kendall, M. G. (1948). Rank correlation methods. London: Griffin.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). Techniques and principles in language teaching. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lauer, J. M., & Asher, J. W. (1988). Composition research: Empirical designs. New York: Oxford University Press.

Marshall, J. D. (1987). The effects of writing on students' understanding of literary texts. Research in the Teaching of English, 21, 30-63.

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)

Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 229-259.

Raimes, 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.

Snow, M. A. (1986). Common terms in second language education. California Univ., LA: Center for Language Education and Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 259)

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

Stotsky, S. (1983). Research on reading/writing relationships: A synthesis and suggested directions. Language Arts, 60, 627-642.

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.

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 (pp. 246-280). New York: Longman.

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

Table 1

Analysis of Writing Quality Mean Change Pretest to Posttest by Treatment

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

Table 2

Test of Significance for Holistically Scored Writing by Treatment

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>F</u>	Sig of <u>F</u>
between groups	1	5.0574	.0259*
within groups	164		

* $p < .05$.

Table 3

Analysis of Writing Apprehension Mean Change Pretest to Posttest by Treatment

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

Table 4

Test of Significance for Writing Apprehension by Treatment

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

*p < .05.

Appendix 1

A Sample of Experimental Group Subject's Dialogue Journal Writing

Note: Student journal entry is printed flush left. Teacher response is indented 5 spaces. Marginal comments by the teacher are inserted in the text, and bracketed.

After reading "Professions for Women"

What does mean "the Angel in the House"? and How should live women at present?

The past days, excellent <What do you mean by this? You mean traditionally good?> women's features are typical. Women should had been silent and neat. She has to had concealed her opinion and had obeyed men's thoughts. She has to had sacrificed for men and her family all the time. In other words, women didn't have their just rights as the human beings. <No, they didn't.>

But in these days, women's social standings improve and their rights are protected. Finally we admit that women have a great personality, <ability?> therefore they can become independent for their own lives. As the result, many women can advance to the society. In recent years women who follow occupations have remarkably increased and they achieve their social status and self-fulfillments.

In this situation, how should live women for their future? Above all, women should make efforts for their developments. Modern society tends to recognize the capable human, so women has to develop their abilities and give full play to them for their social advances. Todays women's just rights don't be obtained without doing anything. It is acquired through the struggles and pains by the women who lived at past. Therefore women who lived at present time need to feel some responsibilities and they should work hard to their part for women's bright future. <What is women's bright future, specifically and concretely speaking?>

Euiyoung, you've written very enthusiastically and seriously. I like that. Also, your handwriting is very beautiful. However, I want you to write more personally, giving some examples taken from your family and your own experience.

Appendix 2

A Sample of Control Group Subject's Adapted Comprehension Question-Answers

Note: Comprehension questions are printed flush left. Student answers are indented 5 spaces. Teacher's grading and error correction are not marked in this print.

Comprehension Questions on "Professions for Women"

Department:

Name:

Please answer with full sentences in English for each question.

1. What are the characteristics of "The Angel in the House" and how does it have to do with professional women?

She was intensely sympathetic and immensely charming. She was utterly unselfish. She excelled in the difficult arts of family life. She sacrificed herself daily. In short she was so constituted that she never had a mind or wish of her own, but preferred to sympathize always with the mind or wishes of others. Above all she was pure. Her purity was supposed to be her chief beauty - her blushes, her great grace. Professional women should need to do battle with "the Angel in the House". It bothers them and wastes their time and so torments them that at last they kill it.

2. According to Virginia Woolf, what are the two experiences of her own professional life?

The first - killing the Angel in the House - she thinks she solved. "The Angel in the House" died. But the second, telling the truth about her own experiences as a body, she doesn't think she solved.

3. How does the author express those women who practise professions and what are the next steps for them?

They have still many ghosts to fight - many prejudices to overcome. There are many phantoms and obstacles, looming in her way. To discuss and define them is Woolf think of great value and important. It is necessary also to discuss the ends and the aims for which we are formidable obstacles.

Appendix 3

Students' Writing Samples

Sample of Highly-Rated Essay (4 by the first rater, 3.5 by the second rater)

My Dream in the Past

Hello. Let me introduce my dreams in the past to you, please. In fact, It is very hard to say "my dreams in the past." What do you suppose the reason is? The reason is that when I look back upon the past, it is very exciting that I had so many dreams.

When I was very small, I want to be a famous novelist. It seemed to me very interesting and wonderful to write a novel. Though you may not believe, I wrote 2 novels by myself at 8. Both were tragedies. My mother praised me and said that it was very fresh. Then I believed it and I was so happy. But the dream changed and I find out another great job.

My second dream was to be a journalist. At 14, I was interested in reading daily newspaper. Journalists looked very smart and chic. An active carrer woman as a journalist was my ideal. But it also changed when I became the middle school student.

Everything has changed. I realized that I like mathematics and science more than writing. Especially, I loved physics. It appeared great. A wise physicist like Einstein held the top place in my dream at 16. But to be a physicist was too hard for me. I knowed the fact very well. So the dream did not last long, either.

At 17, I became a high school student. Everything has changed again. My interest changed, too. In my chemistry and Biology class, I was so excited and I was so happy. Then I decided to be a medician. It was the best job for me in my high school days. Nevertheless, I took the entrance examination last winter, and my mark was unsatisfactory. I can't enter the medical college. So I choose the department of pharmacy. Pharmacy was also interesting as medicine.

Now, I am a student of the department of pharmacy of Ewha University. I like my subject very well. I believe that I will be a good pharmacist someday.

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.

My dreams in the 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, musical 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 sincery, 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.

Appendix 4

A Writing Survey

The survey 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 5

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE

TOEFL WRITING TEST SCORING GUIDELINES

Readers will assign scores based on the following scoring guide. Though candidates are asked to write on a specific topic, they may treat parts of the topic by implication.

Students should be rewarded for what they do well.

The followings are typed in the order of (1) general characteristics, (2) organization/development, (3) unity/coherence/progression, (4) syntax and usage, and (5) word choice for 6- to 1-point writing samples, each.

- a 6-point writing sample

- (1) Clearly demonstrates competence in writing on both rhetorical and syntactic levels though it may have occasional errors
- (2) Well organized and well developed; Uses appropriate details to support a thesis or illustrate ideas
- (3) Shows unity, coherence, and progression; Effectively addresses the writing task
- (4) Syntactic variety; Displays consistent facility in the use of language
- (5) Appropriate word choice

- a 5-point writing sample

- (1) Demonstrates competence in writing on both rhetorical and syntactic levels though it will have occasional errors
- (2) Generally well organized and well developed; May have fewer details than 6-point samples
- (3) Shows unity, coherence, and progression; May address some parts of the task more effectively than others
- (4) Some syntactic variety
- (5) Some range of vocabulary

- a 4-point writing sample

- (1) Demonstrates competence on both rhetorical and syntactic levels
- (2) Adequately organized; Uses details to support a thesis or illustrate ideas
- (3) Addresses the writing task adequately but may slight or ignore parts of the topic
- (4) Adequate but inconsistent facility; May contain some serious errors which occasionally obscure meaning

- a 3-point writing sample

- (1) Clearly demonstrates some developing competence in writing but it is flawed on either rhetorical or syntactic level
- (2) Inadequately organized or developed; Fails to support or illustrate generalizations with appropriate or sufficient detail
- (4) Simplistic sentence structure; A pattern or accumulation of errors
- (5) Frequent inappropriate choice of words

- a 2-point writing sample
- (1) Suggests incompetence in writing
- (2) Disorganized or very little developed; Little or no detail, or irrelevant specifics
- (4) Serious and frequent errors in mechanics, usage, or sentence structure

- a 1-point writing sample
- (1) Demonstrates incompetence in writing
- (2) Severely underdeveloped or no response at all
- (3) May be illogical or incoherent
- (4) Serious and persistent writing errors

Authored by the TOEFL staff at Educational Testing Service



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>Experimental Study of the Effect of Controlled vs. Free Writing and Different Feedback Types on Writing Anxiety and ...</i>	
Author(s): <i>Minjong Song</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.



Check here

For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2



Check here

For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here please

Signature: <i>Song Minjong</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Song, Min-Jong</i>
Organization/Address: <i>A-204 Samho Garden Apt. 32-8 Banpo-Dong, Seocho-Gu Seoul, Korea</i>	Telephone: <i>011-82-2-535-6650</i>
	FAX: <i>011-82-2-595-6523</i>
	E-Mail Address:
	Date: