

영어교육, 60권 4호 2005년 겨울

The Effects of Dialogue Journal Writing on Korean High School EFL Writing Education

Chan-Kyoo Min (Korea Nat'l Univ. of Education)*

Jin Kim (Yeoido Girls' High School)

Min, Chan-Kyoo & Kim, Jin. (2005). The effects of dialogue journal writing on Korean high school EFL writing education. *English Teaching, 11(2)*, 71-86.

This study aims to examine the effects of dialogue journal writing in the Korean EFL classroom. Thirty-seven eleventh-grade English students in three proficiency groups participated in a 10-week writing interaction session with their teacher. To examine two research questions, data have been collected from a pre-test and a post-test in which students wrote a letter on a familiar topic. In addition, a questionnaire was administered to measure students' attitude change toward writing in English. The data were analyzed with SPSS to determine the cognitive as well as affective aspects of the experiment. The results showed that dialogue journal writing can be an effective technique to teach writing in the Korean EFL classroom because it provides more communicative opportunities to practice writing in English. Comparing the results of the pre-tests and post-tests indicated that the quality, the quantity, or the syntactic complexity was improved in each proficiency group of students. It also suggested that program development for teaching writing, especially giving responses, is needed.

I. INTRODUCTION

For quite some time in ESL settings, dialogue journal writing has been aimed at developing learners' writing skills. As an accumulative writing method based on student-generated topics, sharing opinions, and communication between teacher and student, dialogue journal writing appears not only to provide a meaningful context for communication, but to decrease student writing apprehension or anxiety. In addition, it is believed to be an effective teaching tool for manipulating and organizing ideas and thoughts in an expressive and logical style.

Despite the usefulness of dialogue journal writing to improve student writing ability in

* The first author is Chan-Kyoo Min and the second is Jin Kim.

ESL settings, this relatively new approach to teaching writing has not been widely applied in the EFL classroom. Recently, writing has become an important language skill for Korean learners of English as they have more chances to exchange emails with others in foreign countries. As a result, teaching English writing has been encouraged more than before at school. In this environment, a more effective approach to teaching writing is needed; one focusing on the application of process-oriented and learner-based writing techniques. In this sense, dialogue journal writing can be a new approach to relatively basic writers of English in the Korean high school classroom.

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

1. Teaching Composition in the Korean EFL Classroom

In the traditional Korean EFL classroom, writing was the language skill taught to develop student ability to construct correct sentences. Writing instruction thus centered on controlled practice which focused on the correct formation of formal features. In addition, the approach to teaching writing tended to be production-based rather than process-based, i.e. focusing on accurate use. Students were not encouraged to develop thinking strategies, improve their ability to utilize appropriate rhetoric, or logically organize their ideas and thoughts. This approach to teaching writing increased anxiety levels and caused fear to increase among students. Consequently, writing became the language skill to avoid in the EFL classroom.

A few decades ago, a new concept of writing in the EFL classroom arose. Writing was considered a “wrap-up” language skill with which learners were able to internalize the input, develop “noble expressions” (Curren, 1976), and organize their thoughts in a creative way. The goal was to implement a more effective approach and technique to teaching writing in the classroom. It was argued that process-oriented learning would overcome anxiety and writing blockades by following a step-by-step process. In addition, learners would gain a sense of control and confidence over their writing. However, students were not to feel at ease in writing (Minjeong Song, 1997).

According to the achievement standards of English for Grade 10 (English as the national common basic curriculum) and Grade 11 (English I as an elective course) in the 7th Curriculum of Korea, developing the ability to write fluently rather than accurately and writing to communicate are emphasized in the beginning level. Moreover, daily life-related writing activities such as writing letters or resumes, practicing recommendation forms, and taking telephone messages are prioritized and an integrated writing approach with listening, reading and speaking is pursued. In reality, however, more focus is placed on reading and

listening ability than on writing. Instead of translating Korean into English at the sentence level, more chances to write and construct paragraphs on one certain subject are needed (Chan-Kyoo Min, 1994).

Recently, by some English teachers, the technique of keeping a journal or daily log has been implemented to achieve a greater sense of ease in writing. This process helps learners to feel more relaxed and therefore, more comfortable with the written language. Learners do not need to follow a prescribed process of collecting, organizing, manipulating, and editing ideas. They may write freely on familiar subjects and need not worry about grammar, spelling, and punctuation, but instead try to express themselves as clearly as possible. The purpose is to practice writing in such a manner as to make the hand and brain become one, and thus, more comfortable with the written language.

2. Benefits of Dialogue Journal Writing

A dialogue journal is a written conversation in which the student and teacher communicate periodically (daily, weekly, or so on depending on the educational setting) on certain topics over the semester or course period (Peyton, 1993). The ultimate goal of dialogue journal writing is to help the teacher and student engage in authentic communication which provides a unique opportunity to express personal and meaningful ideas (Chung, 2001).

Dialogue journal writing enables the teacher and student to build a strong personal connection through extended and sustained communication (Peyton, 1993). Students may write on a variety of topics such as personal interests, current issues, or complaints about the school, classroom activities, and the actions or decisions of the teacher without disrupting the rest of the class. The teacher may also apply individualized teaching techniques, making it possible to manage a class of students with different abilities and interests (Peyton & Reed, 1990). Furthermore, dialogue journal writing can create opportunities to use writing as a means of genuine communication which is not so common in EFL settings. Unlike in assigned classroom writing tasks, in dialogue journal writing, students attempt to use various language functions such as complaining, reporting, questioning, promising, and so on; the optimal language learning condition for students (Peyton, 1993; Minjeong Song, 1997).

Writing in a variety of contexts is important for students to develop writing proficiency and for teachers to recognize the full range of students' English facility in writing. Dialogue journal writing appears to play a significant role in writing programs not only at the initial stages, but also at higher levels as it may offer students an opportunity to practice focusing on topics that they choose to explore (Peyton, Staton, Richardson & Wolfram, 1988).

3. Previous Studies

The usefulness of dialogue journal writing for the development of writing proficiency has been empirically supported by studies done in different educational settings. First, in the ESL setting, there are quite a number of research studies which have investigated the effects of dialogue journal writing as a tool for promoting writing proficiency as well as for adjusting to the target culture (Chung, 2001; Peyton et al., 1988; Shin, 2003). Writing a journal appeared to be a valid means for adult ESL students (including immigrants and refugees) to learn English as well as to gain a further understanding of the new culture (Parker, 1999). Chung (2001) demonstrated that journal writing helped students improve their writing competence and develop a positive attitude towards writing in the target language.

Recent research in EFL settings also shows that journal writing encourages students to use various language functions as well as reduces writing apprehension. Minjeong Song (1997) suggests in her study on the use of journals in a reading course, that writing dialogue journals improved students' writing quality; furthermore, it appeared to improve reading comprehension and reduce writing apprehension. Research done in Japan on the effects of feedback in journal writing suggests that meaning-focused feedback seems to result in greater positive motivation and facilitates improvement in journal entries (Duppenhaler, 2002).

Recently several studies on journal writing in Korean EFL classes have shown that writing quality changes with respect to vocabulary, content, grammar, and mechanics (Jeongshim Cho, 2001; Chung, 2001; Lee, 1988). These studies imply journal writing to be an effective and practical application in the EFL classroom at various school levels. However, these studies failed to find the value of dialogue journal writing according to differentiated levels of student writing abilities.

III. METHOD

Aiming the development of writing education approaches for the 7th English national curriculum, this study examines the applicability of dialogue journal writing to the level-differentiated classroom. To investigate how effective the technique of dialogue journal writing is to English writing in the Korean high school, the following research questions were proposed:

- 1) Do Korean high school students, who write dialogue journals, develop a positive attitude towards writing in English?
- 2) Do Korean high school students, who write dialogue journals, improve their writing

ability?

1. Participants

Thirty-seven eleventh-grade female students participated in the study. They were taking English level I and English Conversation for 4 and 3 hours a week respectively. Among them, 11 students had been overseas (to both English and non-English speaking nations) for a period of time. In the pre-test, some students earned higher scores than the achievement standards set for 11th-graders, while others showed difficulties to reach the achievement standards set for grade 10. To find out more typical features of each differentiated level, this study assigned the six high scorers from the top to “high-group,” six students around the average score to “mid-group,” and six low scorers from the bottom to “low-group”.

2. Procedures

After having undergone one hour of orientation, students were required to write 10 journal entries during the ten-week period. As there was no writing class for English, students had to find their own time to write journals such as recess, lunch hour, or after school. Students are asked to submit their journals to the teacher,

1) Pre-treatment

All students were required to complete a questionnaire on their attitude toward writing, prior experiences of writing practice, and expectation of writing fluency through writing journals. In order to obtain writing samples for a comparison to writing done after treatment, a writing assignment was then given. Students were required to write letters. The high-, mid-, and low-groups were determined based on scores from this pre-test.

2) Writing Dialogue Journals

Students were required to write a minimum of five sentences for each entry and to bring their journal notebooks to class on Mondays. Every Thursday morning the notebooks were returned along with the teacher’s responses. Responses focused on content and rarely involved error correction unless the error impeded intelligibility. Except for the schedule and the minimum sentence requirement, students were free to decide what, when, and how much to write. After the 5th exchange, students were asked to respond to an in-treatment questionnaire on the difficulties of writing journals and the strategies used to overcome

those difficulties.

3) Post-treatment

To measure the effectiveness of journal writing, students were asked to write a letter as another writing assignment. After the post-test, students completed a post-treatment questionnaire on their attitude toward writing, their impression of journal writing, and the expectation for error correction in their writings.

3. Measurement and Analysis Instruments

1) Questionnaires

This study employed questionnaires after journal writing activities to examine improvement, if any, in student attitude and reduction in writing apprehension. These questionnaires were constructed by the researcher on the basis of the studies by Jeongshim Cho (2001) and Youngjoo Yoon (2001). Questionnaires consisted of three general categories of questions about participants' attitudes toward English learning, English writing, and expectations of dialogue journal writing.

2) Writing Assignments

Writing a letter to a friend is similar to writing dialogue journals, in that a letter to a friend is one of the typical forms of informal writing (Peyton et al., 1988). This task was assigned for testing purposes with a pre-determined topic. The pre-test topic was "my favorite things" and the post-test topic was "an unforgettable moment." Students were informed that the writing tasks would not affect their school records, and they were given 30 minutes to write freely after a 5-10 minute pre-writing activity.

To measure the quality of writing tasks and to find specific aspects of change, a discrete scoring system was used. As an assessment measure, a 100-point scale was constructed by the researcher based on the work of Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1992) (See Appendix). Writings were assessed with respect to content (30), organization (20), grammar (20), vocabulary (25), and mechanics (5) by three raters. The three evaluators, including the researcher, who are experienced English teachers, were trained to achieve inter-rater reliability. Each writing sample was read by the evaluators separately and the mean of the scores from each evaluation became the score of the students. The achieved inter-rater reliability was as follows:

TABLE 1
Achieved Inter-rater Reliability

Criteria	Content	Organization	Grammar	Vocabulary	Mechanics	Total
Pre-test	.9840	.9812	.9702	.9720	.9842	.9805
Post-test	.9928	.9870	.9868	.9840	.9828	.9964

To measure writing quantity and the willingness to write, the number of words was counted. As the ability to produce complex clause structures and to use various clause connectors is an important aspect of writing development (Peyton et al., 1988), the number of clauses per t-unit and the number of different clause connectors were measured as a marker of syntactical complexity of writing. T-unit is “a main clause plus all subordinate clauses and non-clausal structures attached to or embedded in it (Hunt, 1970)” and the typology of clause connectors was adopted from those of Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999).

3) Each Dialogue Journal Entry

As was done in the pre-test and post-test, the number of words, the number of sentences per t-unit, and the number of different clause connectors for each journal entry were analyzed to measure any changes in writing quantity, willingness to write, and the syntactical complexity of writing.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Responses to the Questionnaire

To make it easy to interpret the general tendency of responses, each response was allocated a value ranging from one to five according to a five-point scale. The average values shown in Table 2 shows that most responses was above the neutral level, which suggests that students believe dialogue journal writing to be helpful in reducing writing apprehension and promoting the motivation to learn writing.

In specific, more than half of the students wanted to continue dialogue journal writing because this approach promoted their interest in general English learning including reading comprehension. Even more students felt that dialogue journal writing was helpful to encourage them to write in English with less anxiety than before. Furthermore, thanks to the interaction on the personal basis, a close relationship has been developed between the teacher and the student, which helps promote learning environment.

TABLE 2
Responses to Research Questions on Writing Attitude
upon Completion of the Ten-week Journal Writing

Questionnaire items	strongly agree		neutral	strongly disagree		average
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
	Number of students		Percentage of students			
Did DJW (dialogue journal writing) promote your interest in English learning?	3	15	17	1	0	3.57
Was DJW helpful for your reading comprehension?	8.10	43.24	45.95	2.70	0	3.57
Was DJW helpful for learning writing?	3	19	11	4	0	3.84
Did your anxiety about writing in English decrease through DJW?	8.11	51.35	29.73	10.81	0	3.57
Did your self-confidence increase enough in writing whatever idea you want to express through DJW?	6	20	10	1	0	3.30
Did DJW enable you to understand better and feel closer to your teacher?	16.22	54.05	27.03	2.70	0	4.03
Do you want to continue DJW?	4	17	12	4	0	3.76
	10.81	45.95	32.43	10.81	0	
	4	9	19	4	1	
	10.81	24.32	51.35	10.81	2.70	
	11	18	5	2	0	
	29.73	48.65	16.22	5.41	0	
	7	14	16	0	0	
	18.92	37.84	43.24	0	0	

2. Analysis of Discrete Ratings of Overall Writing Quality

Each student in this study wrote two letters, one as a pre-test and one as a post-test writing sample. Those papers were discretely assessed through the scoring process stated above. The mean change from pre-test to post-test was +7.72, signifying an improvement in overall writing quality as well as in each individual component. Table 3 presents the mean changes and an overview of the t-test of significance for overall quality based on the discrete ratings.

The mean change for the number of words was +11.92, which suggests increased writing quantity and the willingness to write. The t-test shows the improvement to be statistically significant. The number of sentences per t-unit and different clause connectors also show statistically significant improvement in their mean changes. Table 3 and 4 indicate that the treatment of dialogue journal writing was statistically significant in overall writing quality and syntactical complexity.

TABLE 3
Test of Significance for Discrete Scored Writing Quality

Component	Score		M	SD	Change	Sig. of t
Content	30	pre-test	18.69	4.52	3.00	5.593 * * *
		post-test	21.69	4.19		
Organization	20	pre-test	12.64	3.40	1.69	5.019 * * *
		post-test	14.33	2.98		
Grammar	20	pre-test	11.53	3.18	1.03	3.825 * * *
		post-test	12.56	3.07		
Vocabulary	25	pre-test	13.42	4.75	1.86	4.668 * * *
		post-test	15.28	4.21		
Mechanics	5	pre-test	3.58	0.69	0.14	0.842 NS
		post-test	3.72	0.88		
Total	100	pre-test	59.86	15.27	7.72	6.539 * * *
		post-test	67.58	14.35		

*** : p< .001 NS : no significance

TABLE 4
Test of Significance for Writing Quantity and Syntactic Complexity

	Post-test pre-test	M	SD	Change	Sig. of t
Number of words		61.53	27.41	11.92	3.178 * *
		49.61	28.79		
Number of sentence per t-unit		1.176	.202	0.078	0.317 *
		1.098	.133		
Number of different clause connectors		1.94	1.49	0.66	2.870 * *
		1.28	1.26		

*** : p< .001 ** : p< . 01 * : p< .05

TABLE 5
Analysis of Overall Writing Quality Mean Change
According to High-, Mid-, Low-level Groups

Group		Content		Organization		Grammar		Vocabulary		Mechanics		Total	
		M	Change	M	Change	M	Change	M	Change	M	Change	M	Change
1: Pre-test													
	2: Post-test												
Whole class	1	18.69		12.64		11.53		13.42		3.72		67.58	
	2	21.69	3.00	14.33	1.69	12.56	1.03	15.28	1.86	3.58	0.14	59.86	7.72
High	1	24.8		17.0		16.2		20.3		3.8		82.1	
	2	26.8	2.0	18.0	1.0	17.0	0.8	21.2	0.9	4.8	1.0	87.8	5.7
Mid	1	18.8		12.7		11.0		13.7		3.7		59.9	
	2	22.0	3.2	14.8	2.1	12.5	1.5	15.2	1.5	3.7	0	68.2	8.3
Low	1	13.8		8.2		7.8		6.7		3.0		39.5	
	2	16.7	2.9	10.3	2.1	9.5	1.7	10.7	4.0	3.0	0	50.2	10.7

For a more detailed examination, Table 5 shows the changes of discrete components of writing quality according to the high-, mid-, and low-level groups. Even though the high-level group was the only group to show improvement in mechanics, specifically in paragraph indentation, a remarkable improvement in other areas could be seen from the low-level group.

In the low-level group, the content and vocabulary of the post-test writing sample, compared to the pre-test, were improved by 2.9 and 4.0 points respectively. At the same time, the low-level group also showed the greatest growth in the number of words, that is, the writing quantity (see Table 6). Even though there was a slight increase in the number of sentences per t-unit, the number of different clause connectors indicated that the low-level group began to show initial interest in the logical relationships between sentences.

TABLE 6
Analysis of Writing Quantity and Syntactic Complexity

Group		Number of words		Number of sentences per t-unit		Number of different clause connectors	
		M	Change	M	Change	M	Change
Whole class	1: Pre-test	49.61		1.10		1.28	
	2: Post-test	61.53	11.92	1.18	0.08	1.94	0.66
High	1	87.7		1.2		3.0	
	2	102.8	14.1	1.3	0.1	3.2	0.2
Mid	1	36.2		1.1		1.2	
	2	51.8	15.6	1.1	0.0	1.8	0.6
Low	1	23.2		1.0		0.0	
	2	42.3	19.1	1.0	0.0	0.8	0.8

The high-level group, compared to the mid-level group and the low-level group, exhibited less increase in every aspect of the quantity and complexity in Table 6. However, this group used a greater variety of clause connectors (3.0) and many more words (87.7) in their initial writing sample.

3. Analysis of Each Dialogue Journal Entry

As the mean changes of each aspect from pre-test to post-test of the 37 students' two writing samples may not provide enough information, additional writing samples were required for examination. Each dialogue journal entry might reflect the gradual changes in students' writing proficiency. Among the analysis of changes from each dialogue journal entry, the number of clause connectors presented some noteworthy results as shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7
Change of the Number of Different Clause Connectors
in Each Dialogue Journal Entry

Group	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	Average
Whole class	2.08	2.42	2.25	2.46	2.60	2.19	2.31	1.94	1.97	2.33	2.26
High	4.33	5.00	4.50	4.83	5.33	5.00	4.50	3.50	4.17	5.67	4.68
Mid	2.33	2.33	2.33	2.00	1.50	2.50	2.67	1.83	2.00	2.50	2.20
Low	1.50	1.67	1.67	1.17	0.83	1.33	1.33	0.83	0.83	0.50	1.17

The number of average use of variety of clause connectors in the high-level group indicated that they were practicing cohesiveness and coherence at the discourse level, beyond the sentence level. While the mid-level group and the low-level group used one or two kinds of common connectors such as ‘so’, ‘but’ and ‘because’, the high-level group experimentally attempted to use various clause connectors in their journals such as ‘even though’, ‘on the other hand’, ‘since’, ‘nevertheless’ and so on.

V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

1. Conclusion

In this study two research questions were investigated through an experiment on the ten-week use of dialogue journals with the teacher. First, the responses on the questionnaires suggested that dialogue journal writing provided more communicative opportunities for practice writing in English. This increase in communication led students to have a more positive attitude and increased self-confidence toward writing in English as well as toward the relationship with their teacher. Although writing anxiety decreased slightly, students still felt uncomfortable in fully expressing their thoughts. This finding also suggested a possible limitation of the study, namely that the ten-week period might not be long enough to reduce pervasive writing apprehension completely.

Second, the writing quantity and the syntactic complexity of samples from the entire class were significantly promoted and improved, as measured by the analysis of the mean changes from the pre-test to the post-test. As such, it can be concluded that teachers of EFL might well consider using dialogue journals as a vehicle for developing students’ writing proficiency.

Third, through a comparison of the mean changes from pre-test to post-test and an analysis of each dialogue journal entry, the writing abilities of the three different groups

showed a diverse but systematic pattern. This result suggested that using dialogue journals may help teachers to individualize the writing process.

The low-level group showed the greatest improvement among the three groups in writing quality and quantity between pre- and post-tests, although there was little increase in writing quantity in each entry. Therefore, journal writing suggested its advantages as an appropriate writing practice for the lower writing ability group, especially in terms of vocabulary gains, since students had to use a number of basic words repeatedly in meaningful contexts and they could personalize what they learned.

Compared to the low-level group, the mid-level group showed a continuous increase in the number of words used in their journal entries. This increase reflects increases in students' willingness to write and writing quantity in the pre-test and post-test and in journal writing entries. In addition, the content improvement in writing quality of the post-test was prominent. Through these analysis results, it would be safe to assert that dialogue journal writing was most effective for this mid-level group especially in motivating them to learn writing and to express their ideas in writing. Journal writing allowed them to practice focusing on their topic and developing their theme as well as to attempt to use new expressions in the context of informal interaction.

The high-level group initially used more words and more complex structures than the other two groups, and showed qualitative, rather than quantitative changes in their writing. In other words, they tended to use journal writing as a safe and informal chance to experiment with more difficult structures and idiomatic expressions for substantive content and clear statement of ideas. In addition, they began to show increased interest in the relationship between paragraphs, beyond the sentence level, which might be reflected in their uses of paragraph indentation and the increase in uses of variety of connectors.

2. Implication

These findings have several important pedagogical implications for both teaching English writing in general and teacher training programs in regards to dialogue journal writing as an effective and practical tool.

First, for teachers working with students of mixed proficiency levels, the use of dialogue journal writing can be a good way to understand the writing ability of individual students as well as to provide individualized help for their special learning needs. As teachers have to teach 4 to 8 classes a week and each class has more than 30 students it is nearly impossible to give all students continuous and personalized written responses. Therefore, it would be more practical to find other times to use journals in school curricula such as optional activities, extracurricular activities, after-school, summer, or winter school

programs. Further research is required on the various ways of using the dialogue journal in its form, response type, and so on.

Second, in order to give individualized responses, teachers themselves need to be better-trained in controlling words and structures. Furthermore, strategies to maintain writing journals and to give responses which are comprehensible but challenging to students, require a great deal of practice. If teachers could take appropriate pre-service or in-service training programs, they could share their experiences and inspire one another. Therefore, the development of programs for teaching writing, especially in giving responses should be continued for more effective implementation of dialogue journal writing.

REFERENCES

- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cho, Jeongshim. (2001). *A study of the effects of dialogue journal writing on the writing ability and attitude of EFL students*. Unpublished master's thesis. Korea National University of Education, Chungbuk.
- Chung, H. (2001). *Reflective journal writing in the foreign language classroom (Korean II)*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Southern California.
- Curren, C. (1976). *Counseling-learning in second languages*. Apple River, IL.: Apple River Press.
- Duppenthaler, P. M. (2002). *Feedback and Japanese high school English language journal writing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Temple University, Philadelphia.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1992). Collaborative oral/aural revision of foreign language writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1(3), 255-276.
- Hunt, K. (1970). Syntactic maturity in school children and adults. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development (Serial No. 134)*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, Jongjin. (1998). *The effects of dialogue journal writing on English writing ability*. Unpublished master's thesis. Ewha Women's University, Seoul.
- Min, Chan-Kyoo. (1994). English education and teaching English writing. *English Teaching*, 48, 171-186.
- Ministry of Education. (1997). *The 7th Curriculum of foreign language* (I). Seoul: Daehan Textbook Co.
- Parker, J. A. (1999). *Dialogue journal writing and adult ESL students: A tool for learning language and culture*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Alberta.

- Peyton, J. K. (1993). *Dialogue journals: Interactive writing to develop language and literacy*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 789)
- Peyton, J. K., Staton, J., Richardson, G., & Wolfram, W. (1988). *Beyond writing assignments: The influence of communicative context on ESL students' writing* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 295 496)
- Peyton, J. K., & Reed, L. (1990). *Dialogue Journal Writing with Nonnative English Speakers: A handbook for teachers*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Shin, S. (2003). *The reflective L2 writing teacher*. *ELT Journal*, 57(1), 3-9.
- Song, Minjeong. (1997). *The effect of dialogue journal writing on overall writing quality, reading comprehension, and writing apprehension of EFL college freshmen in Korea*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Yoon, Youngjoo. (2001). *A study of teaching methods for English writing using a mind map technique in a pre-writing stage*. Unpublished master's thesis. Korea National University of Education, Chungbuk.

APPENDIX

Criteria for Discrete Ratings of Overall Writing Quality

Component scale	Criteria
Content	
30-27	Excellent to very good: knowledgeable; substantive, thorough development of thesis; relevant to topic assigned.
26-22	Good to average: some knowledge of subject; adequate range; limited thematic development; mostly relevant to topic, but lacks detail.
21-17	Fair to poor: limited knowledge of subject; minimal substance; poor thematic development.
16-13	Very poor: shows little or no knowledge of subject; inadequate quantity; not relevant, or not enough to rate.
Organization	
20-18	Excellent to very good: fluent expression; clear statement of ideas; solid support; clear organization; logical organization; logical and cohesive sequencing.
17-14	Good to average: adequate fluency; main ideas clear but loosely organized; supporting material limited; sequencing logical but incomplete.
13-10	Fair to poor: low fluency; ideas not well connected; logical sequencing and development lacking.
9-7	Very poor: ideas not communicated; organization lacking, or not enough to rate.
Grammar	
20-18	Excellent to very good: accurate use of relatively complex structures; few errors in agreement, number, tense, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions.

17-14	Good to average: simple constructions used effectively; some problems in use of complex constructions; errors in agreement, number, tense, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions.
13-10	Fair to poor: significant defects in use of complex constructions; frequent errors in agreement, number, tense, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions; lack of accuracy interferes with meaning.
9-7	Very poor: no mastery of simple sentence construction; text dominated by errors; does not communicate, or not enough to rate.
Vocabulary	
25-22	Excellent to very good: complex range; accurate word/idiom choice; mastery of word forms; appropriate register.
21-18	Good to average: adequate range; errors of word/idiom choice; effective transmission of meaning.
17-11	Fair to poor: limited range; frequent word/idiom errors; inappropriate choice, usage; meaning not effectively communicated.
10-5	Very poor: translation-based errors; little knowledge of target language of vocabulary, or not enough to rate
Mechanics	
5	Excellent to very good: mastery of conventions of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraph indentation, etc.
4	Good to average: occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraph indentation, etc., which do not interfere with meaning
3	Fair to poor: frequent spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing errors; meaning disrupted by formal problems.
2	Very poor: no mastery of conventions due to frequency of mechanical errors, or not enough to rate
Total	_____ / 100

Applicable level: Secondary school

Key words: EFL writing education, dialogue journal, teaching and learning approach

Chan-Kyoo Min
 Dept. of English Education
 Korea National University of Education
 San 7, Darakri, Gangnaemyeon,
 Cheongwongun
 Chungbuk 363-791, Korea
 Tel: (043) 230-3535
 Fax: (043) 232-7175
 E-mail: ckmin@knue.ac.kr

Jin Kim
Yeoido Girls' High School
40-2, Yeoido-dong, Youngdeungpo-gu
Seoul 150-888, Korea
Tel: (02) 780-5350
Fax: (02) 780-9901
E-mail: winijini@chollian.net

Received in August, 2005
Reviewed in September, 2005
Revised version received in November, 2005