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論文提要內容：

幾十年來，過程寫作常因為『重內容輕形式』和『輕忽寫作成品』而導致批評聲浪不斷。近年來，部落格網誌的四大特色—自我表達、自我反省、互動和發布—吸引學者和語言學習者的注意。本文旨在探討部落格融入『過程寫作』之教學如何影響四名台灣高三學生的寫作表現。文獻探討涵蓋過程寫作、部落格和三項共通因素—回饋、自我反省日誌和電子檔案評量。

本研究的對象是研究者所教授的過程寫作班的四位高三學生。本研究的程序以寫作循環（writing cycle）為主軸。資料包括多次校訂（multiple revisions）、兩篇草稿（前後測）、學生寫作態度問卷、教師日誌（teacher’s log）和訪談紀錄。首先，以 Yagelski’s coding schemes (1995) 和 Johnson’s (1994) 內容和組織指標（indicators of content and organization）解讀多次校訂，以了解學生的校訂類型（types of changes in multiple revisions）。接著，分析前後測分數的差距（score differences）及文章長度（the length of essay）探討多次校訂與前後測草稿的關聯性，再找出前後測草稿中的內容與組織指標，以顯示學生在兩篇草稿的進步程度。訪談資料則用於探討部落格的功能、學生遇到的困難和需要何種教師支援。至於學生的寫作態度，則以前後測問題的分數差距
（score difference）為主，再以訪談紀錄作為佐證資料或疑點澄清。最後，與教室情境有關的發現，則以教師日誌和訪談資料為主。

本研究的主要發現如下：

1. 學生有自己偏好的校訂類型（types of changes in multiple revisions）。
2. 寫作班的四位高三學生在內容和組織方面有顯著進步。
3. 班級部落格在過程寫作的每個階段都有不同功能。
4. 多次校訂的枯燥須加以克服，以及建議實施老師與學生間的迷你會議。
5. 在信心、焦慮、實用性與偏好四方面，學生寫作態度改變。
6. 教室情境所衍生的幾項發現。

最後，本研究對過程寫作在實際教學上應用與未來研究方向提供建議。
ABSTRACT

Over the past decades of practice in process writing, criticism over “the stress on content over form” (Badger & White, 2000) and the neglect of final writing product (Barnes, 1983) has never ceased. Considering that blog has attracted scholars and learners for its unique features — self-expression, self-reflection, interactivity, and publication, this researcher integrated blog into the instruction of process writing to investigate the writing performance of the four 12th graders. The literature review covered studies on process writing, blog and three elements commonly found in both process writing and blog — feedback, self-reflection journals and e-portfolio.

The participants of this study were four 12th graders of Taiwan’s high school in a blog-mediated process writing class taught by the researcher. The procedure revolved around the process writing cycle, in which these four participants repeated the recursive writing process. Data included multiple revisions, two drafts (pre-test and post-test), questionnaires on students’ writing attitude (pre-test and post-test), the teacher’s logs and interviews. First, to obtain what types of changes students made in multiple revisions, the 48 multiple revisions were coded by Yagelski’s coding schemes (1995) and Johnson’s indicators of content and organization (1994). Second, to investigate if the four participants made progress in content and organization, this researcher touched on four aspects of analysis: 1) the score differences between the pre-test and post-test drafts, 2) the length of essay, 3) a connection analysis between the multiple revisions and the two drafts and 4) a draft analysis using Johnson’s indicators of content and organization (1994). Third, the interview data helped to explore how the blog functioned in each step of process writing model, and to present the challenges students
encountered and the teacher support they needed. Fourth, to discover if these students experienced any attitude changes, she also calculated the score differences between the pre-test and post-test questionnaires in students’ writing attitude and verified the questionnaire results or clarified the unclear points with interview data. Finally, some other classroom-context-related findings were also revealed in the analysis of the teachers’ logs and the interview data.

The major findings were listed as below: 1) students showed preference for making some types of changes in multiple revisions; 2) the four students in the blog-mediated process writing class gained significant progress in content and organization; 3) the class blog functioned differently in each step of process writing model; 4) the boredom of doing multiple revisions and the teacher-student mini conference were the challenges encountered and the teacher support recommended; 5) there were writing attitude changes in the four categories — confidence, anxiety, usefulness and preference; and 6) several findings were also revealed in the context of classroom.

Some pedagogical implications and recommendations for future research on process writing were presented at the end of the thesis.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of this study. It first explains how the researcher is motivated to conduct this study, describing the context of and the rationale for this study. Then the purpose of the study and its significance are stated.

1.1 Background & Motivation

Of the four language skills, writing tends to receive the least amount of attention. Most instruction in English as a Second Language (ESL) focuses on developing students’ skills and abilities in listening, speaking, and reading while ignoring the development of students’ writing skills (Edelsky, 1982; Edelsky & Smith, 1989). This lack of attention to writing instruction has also led to a neglect of research in writing compared to other skills (Graves, 1984). Another scholar, Harris (1985) concluded that only 2% of ESL instruction covered writing activities. Of this two percent, 72% was related to the mechanical aspect of writing, such as syntax, punctuation, and spelling. Yet for L2 or EFL learners, writing is an essential skill for communicative or academic purposes.

Apparently, writing has not got as equal attention as reading in Taiwan’s schools – a statement made in a study on the theses written by in-service English teachers. Analyzing 62 ETMA (Master of Arts in English Teaching) theses at National Taiwan Normal University from 2002-2006, Chuang (2007) observed that 23 theses focused on reading while only 11 on writing – an indication that reading is still the primary focus of English teaching in Taiwan. In both General Scholastic Test and Department Required Test, writing only takes up approximately one-fourth of the test
while reading dominates the rest. With writing as the secondary focus in high schools, it is no wonder that more than twenty thousand students got zero on English composition in 2009, according to a report issued by the College Entrance Examination Center (CEEC) (as cited in Lee, 2009). Encouragingly, however, Chuang (2007) pointed out there has been an increasing attention to writing research ever since the writing sections (translation and composition) were required in both General Scholastic Test and Department Required Test.

Mixed opinions on the draft of English composition in the College Entrance Exam have long existed. Despite supportive voices from some high school English teachers (Chang, 1996), several professors (Lee, 2009; Yang, 2003) suggested that writing should be abolished, for it only signifies an enormous gap of English teaching between rural and urban areas or it displays an unfair evaluation of one-time draft without proper consideration that “writing is a thinking process” (Zamel, 1982), where students need to write and revise again and again until they come up with a satisfactory final product. Still others (Chang, 2009; Lee, 2009) even pointed out that there has long been a two-peak distribution of English composition score. Even though the English education has started in elementary schools, it doesn’t help students get more interested in English. It seems to end up that the younger students get to learn English, the earlier they quit learning English.

Although many published writing guidebooks are available on the market, they either fail to teach students how to develop writing competence through a step-by-step process writing model or ignore the necessity of developing content by connecting the real life experience to the writing. Four writing guidebooks written by local English teachers (Lee, 2003; Lin, 2009; Liu, 2005, 2009) include only students’ composition samples together with sentence pattern practices or fragments of writing strategies, to name a few, brainstorming or outlining. Even one of the best selling writing books in
Taiwan, *Writing from Within*, written by native speakers (Gargagliano & Kelly, 2001), though discussing writing strategies systematically, pays little regard to building content by writing about the real-life experience, with which students can write more and with greater fluency and satisfaction (Perl, 1980). Another two books, *Smart Writing for Senior High* (Shih et al, 2004) and *Classroom Composition for Senior High* (Chen et al, 2007), do cover themes closely related to teenagers’ life and introduce outlining and brainstorming strategies, but fail to provide a writing process model to help students develop their writing ability step by step. This inspires the present writer to design a writing course where students can write about their real life experience following a recursive process writing model.

Other than insufficient resources, the way writing is taught in Taiwan’s high schools is also more product-oriented than process-oriented. Since students are only required to write a one-time essay in the two Entrance Exams (General Scholastic Ability Test and Department Required Test), most of the English teachers in high schools focus on training students how to write a one-time essay within a time limit. Seldom do they ask students to write in the process writing model: prewriting, drafting, revising, editing and publishing (Applebee, 1986). Most teachers just give students a topic to write about in a given time limit, ignoring the fact that “writing is a process through which meaning is created” (Zamel, 1982). In such a case, students care less about how to develop their writing ability through a necessary writing process than what scores they will get from this one-time essay. What’s worse, some students memorize some sample essays or follow a fixed formula to fit in the format required for the Entrance Exams. With limited teaching hours and constant focus on the final product of one-time essay, most English teachers in high schools are reluctant to implement the process writing model in writing practice. As a result, the one-time essay writing practice is popular in the English writing class of high schools.
in Taiwan while the process writing is never a grave concern.

Stress on product over process can also be found in local theses on writing. A search in Electronic Theses and Dissertation System revealed that most writing-related theses focus on syntax, collocation analysis or error analysis while several explored the use of model essays in writing class. On the other hand, theses on process writing strategies (Chang, 2002; Huang, 2002; Huang, 2004) are comparatively few.

Even in the United Kingdom and the United States, where process writing has been widely practiced over several decades, there still remained some unresolved issues regarding the practice and deficiency of process writing. Despite the fact that process writing was introduced to the L1 context for several decades, product approach has still been dominant in the UK and the United States (Purves, 1992). In the United States, Harris and Graham (1996) argued that few activities were practiced in the classroom to help students to develop their writing process, even though process writing started to be implemented in America. In the UK, it was believed that the introduction of a product-focused National Literary Strategy discouraged recursive writing, a core concept of process writing (Hilton, 2001). Meanwhile, opponents of the process writing often criticized it for its loose structure (Baines, Baines, Stanley & Kunkel, 1999) and failure to see product as important as the writing process (Barnes, 1983). Barnes (1983) even questioned if Zamel’s process-oriented approach would ultimately improve students’ final writing product, which is indispensable in the real life, especially for college courses. In this regard, more and more scholars (Blake, 1995; Dyson, 1992; Lensmire, 1993) called for teachers and students to connect process with product and reversed their concept that the process can be isolated from the product. Therefore, how to improve the final product in the process writing classes becomes a new trend of today’s process writing.
Though process writing prevails in L1 and L2 context, few studies on process writing have been conducted in an EFL classroom (Pennington & Brock, 1992; Pennington, Brock & Yue, 1996; Pennington & Cheung, 1995; Pennington & So, 1993). With limited research on process writing in EFL context and controversies over the practice and deficiency of process writing in either L1 or L2 context, the researcher feels the need for further investigation to explore a proper way to implement process writing in EFL context.

Despite the practice difficulties and deficiencies of process writing, technology may offer a satisfactory resolution. In recent years, the use of computer in writing has started to overthrow the traditional writing habits. In the United States, students are reported to use word-processing tools and online resources in writing practices (Applebee, 2009). The abundance of online resources provides students with inspirations and reference to enrich the writing content while word-processing tools are used to improve the accuracy of final written products. It seems that the computer may be a good facilitator for the development of content and the improvement of final products. Supposedly, in a process writing class combined with the use of computer, the content would be well developed and the attention to final products be equally paid.

Providing basic word-processing function and links to online resources, blog has become a new form of publication popular among teenagers and teachers (Lowe & Williams, 2004). Without a doubt, blog and process writing do have some features in common: self-expression (content), self-reflection (journal), interactivity (commenting) and publication (e-portfolio). With these four unique features, blog may be a good medium to reinforce the practice of process writing. First, the text-based and text-rich content makes blog an ideal forum where students develop their writing content through self-expression. Second, originally an online journal in a reverse
chronological order, blog may also serve as a great platform for students to document their writing process online through self-reflection. Then, leaving comments on the blogs, students improve their writing through interaction with others. Finally, as a new form of publication (e-portfolio), blog may also help students develop a sense of audience in mind. To sum up, with these four features, – self-expression, self-reflection, interactivity and publication – the blog provides a great chance to improve the practice of process writing. However, few studies have been seen to practice a process writing model in a blog-mediated environment.

To explore the possible relationship between process writing and blog, a blog-mediated process writing was therefore designed. Since most local research on blog-mediated writing has been conducted in college (Hsiao, 2006; Lin, 2007; Peng, 2007; Wang, 2006), this present researcher feels the need to explore how the high school students respond to the process writing class in the mediation of blog.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study aims to explore if process writing is effective in a blog-mediated writing class for senior high school students. More specifically, its purpose is to investigate the following: 1) whether process writing in a blog-mediated environment influences students’ writing performance, 2) how blog helps students in each step of process writing, 3) challenges students encountered plus with teacher support, and 4) their writing attitude.

1.3 Significance of the Study

This study will provide useful insights or implications to English learners, English writing instructors, book publishers, and interested researchers. For English learners, a new focus on meaning over form should be reminded in writing practice. For English
writing instructors, it is hoped that the findings may provide another perspective and alternative to the teachers of EFL high school writing. For book publishers, they may be encouraged to publish more writing textbooks connecting the technology with process writing. For interested researchers, they may explore more potential issues on teaching EFL writing in a computer mediated communication environment.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter mainly discusses studies on process writing and blog mediation. Studies also touch on three elements commonly found both in process writing and blog, i.e., feedback (including face-to-face peer review, teacher’s feedback and computer-mediated peer review), self-reflection journal and e-portfolio.

2.1 Process Writing

When defined, process writing often refers to its counterpart “product writing.” Known as a traditional paradigm and based on a behaviorist theory of learning, product writing focuses on the completed written product and language rules. The writing approach didn’t switch to the writer’s cognitive process until Emig (1971) used “think aloud” protocol to collect information about L1 high school students’ thinking process while writing.

As its name suggests, process writing emphasizes “process,” “making meaning,” “invention” and “multiple drafts” rather than “accuracy” and “pattern” (Raimes, 1991). A typical process writing class features the common use of journal, peer collaboration, revision and stress on content over form (Badger & White, 2000). According to Brown (2000), process writing is more writer-focused while product approach pays a great deal of attention to model composition, form and accuracy. To sum up, process writing centers on how students write and learn in the process of writing.

2.1.1 Process Writing Model
Flower and Hayes (1981) established the cognitive model of writing process, including planning, writing and reviewing. Many other researchers have addressed different stages in the process model. Applebee (1986) proposed a five-step process model: prewriting, drafting, revising, editing and publishing. A few years later, Tompkins (1994) revised it as a model with planning, drafting, revising, editing and publishing. Tribble (1996) later provides a four-stage model, including prewriting, composing/drafting, revising and editing. Although researchers provide different stages of process model, the core procedure of process writing remains the same. For example, in Tompkins’ model, the “planning” stage is very similar to Applebee’s “prewriting” stage while Tribble’s model skips the “publishing” stage. Among all these models, Flower and Hayes’ three-stage model has been recognized as the most typical and widely used. However, Applebee’s five-step process model was adopted in this study for two reasons: distinctive definition of every step and unique publishing step closely connected to blog format.

Harp and Brewer (1996) further described the process model as a recursive process. The “recursive” writing process means moving back and forth or non-linear. In other words, writers may not follow the exact order of these stages. For example, they may brainstorm first before writing a draft. While revising, they may come up with more ideas, so they may go back writing a second draft. The procedure may go on and on until the writer is satisfied with his work. To sum up, process writing is writer-centered, which is quite different from the traditional writing cycle where the teacher assigns students a topic for them to write about, and then corrects the written product with a red pen. That is to say, process writing is more learner-centered whereas product approach is more teacher-centered.

2.2 Previous Studies on Process Writing
2.2.1 Studies in L1 Context

As the popularity of process writing prevails, there has been much research spelling out its benefits on writing. In the States, Goldstein and Carr (1996) conducted a study analyzing the data drawn from the 1992 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in writing. The study reported that students become better writers if process writing is encouraged in class. Again, gathering relevant data from NAEP, Applebee (2009) made a survey on how students approached their school writing tasks after twenty years of process writing practice in high schools. Designed in multiple response questions to investigate how many students used process writing-related activities in writing tasks, the survey obtained some interesting results. According to the survey, over 60% of students reported that they almost always make changes to fix (revise) mistakes, and over 30% of them write more than one draft (multiple drafts), while only 15% of them use strategies involving interaction with others, like brainstorming (prewriting). And 25% ~28% of them work with others in pairs or small groups. This indicates that process writing goes in parallel with product writing in the L1 context, with product writing overweighing process writing.

2.2.2 Studies in L2 Context

With few original process writing models in second language writing, most writing models in L2 context were directly borrowed from L1 writing research (Cumming & Riazi, 2000). As one of the original models developed in L1 context, process writing was gradually adopted in second language writing. Two pioneers, Zamel (1983) and Barnett (1989), held a positive view about the effect of process writing on advanced learners in an ESL context. Cumming (1989) also came into the similar positive results in her research. Unlike Zamel’s study focusing on how advanced ESL learners developed the writing process, Raimes (1985) found that less
skilled ESL writers could also be engaged in the discovery of meaning as well as advanced ESL writers. Raimes (1985) further discovered “the attention to writing process is necessary but not sufficient.” Students need to spend more time on everything. In other words, they should develop four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) to acquire the background knowledge they need in developing their writing ability in L2.

2.2.3 Studies in EFL Context

Studies on process writing in EFL context are comparatively scarce. Take for example two studies, conducted by Pennington (1996) and Sasaki (2000) respectively. Pennington (1996) gained mixed results in his study on 8 classes of Hong Kong’s secondary school students, finding that the teacher’s and students’ attitude toward process writing was positively correlated. That is, students’ attitudes toward the practice of process writing in class varied based on teachers’ behavior before and during the instruction. On the other hand, In her study on three paired groups of Japanese EFL writers (experts vs. novices, more-skilled vs. less-skilled student writers, novices before and after six months of instruction), Sakaki (2000) disclosed the following findings:

The results revealed that a) before starting to write, the experts spent longer time planning a detailed overall organization whereas the novices spent a shorter time making a less global plan; b) once the experts had made their global plan, they did not stop and think as frequently as the novices; c) L2 proficiency appeared to explain part of the difference in strategy use between the experts and novices; and d) after 6 months of instruction, novices had begun to use some of the expert writers’ strategies. (p. 259)

However, the debate between content and form has never ceased ever since process writing was adopted in EFL context. Seeing writing as “a process of
discovering meaning” (Zamel, 1982), process writing has long laid stress on content over form (Badger & White, 2000). Teachers are seen as facilitators, who should give positive feedback on the content rather than offering red-pen correction to ensure the accuracy in form. In fact, the direct red-pen correction should be avoided lest too much of it obstruct the learners from generating ideas (Barnett, 1989). Learners are encouraged to develop content first, leaving the form related errors till the final writing. In a word, meaning should always be treated first before the language skills.

However, EFL learners think differently. Contrary to the concept of thinking of writing as self-expression, writing in an EFL context often indicates a pressing need for academic or professional success (Leki, 1990). For EFL learners, a good final product may offer far more direct and solid benefits than the abstract writing process of “discovery meaning” (Zamel, 1982), and the form deserves as equal attention as the content. The neglect of final writing product (Barnes, 1983) and the stress on content over form (Badger & White, 2000) would make it impossible to satisfy EFL learners’ needs. Therefore, how to strike a balance between content and form remains a controversial issue when it comes to the practice of process writing in an EFL context. In this regard, we may come up with a possible solution by using computers. As mentioned before, the access to online resources and the word-processing tools may help learners both in content and form, thus eventually improving the quality of final product. Based on the fact that 90% of today’s bloggers are young adults (Nussbaum, 2004), blog, with links to online resources and word-processing tools as well, seems to be an ideal choice to strike a balance between content and form. Next, a review regarding previous studies on writing through blog is introduced.

2.3 Previous Studies on Writing through Weblogs

2.3.1 Weblogs in Education
Weblogs or blogs, have been widely used ever since 1997. Now educators are drawn by the charm of blog as well. Originally as online personal journals in a reverse chronological order, blogs have a lot of benefits in developing students’ reading and writing skills. Unlike chatroom, a synchronous form of communication, blogs provide a less pressured asynchronous forum for readers and writers to interact by leaving comments and connecting to related links on the Internet, and thus help them to become regular writers and/or readers (Ducate & Lomicka, 2008). The co-authored community blogs (or class blog) may help students achieve collaborative assignments under the teacher’s guidance (Armstrong & Retterer, 2008). Blogs can also help students express and reflect to the degree of deep learning (Bartlett-Bragg, 2003). Through micropublishing, students develop a sense of ownership and authorship if they know they are writing for a real audience (Godwin-Jones, 2003). From Vygostky’s sociocultural perspective, students’ knowledge is constructed through the social interaction with others over time, and weblogs do offer a forum for interaction.

Ferdig & Trammell (2004) also made the following statement:

> The four benefits of student blogging include: 1) the use of blogs helps students become subject-matter experts; 2) the use of blogs increases student interest and ownership in learning; 3) the use of blogs gives students legitimate chances to participate; and 4) the use of blogs provides opportunities for diverse perspectives, both within and outside of the classroom. (p. 16)

Oravec (2002) claimed that blogging may also enhance critical thinking, literacy, and promote the use of the Internet as a research tool. With so many researchers advocating the advantages of blogs, blog-mediated studies are now a new territory to explore.

### 2.3.2 Previous Studies on Writing through Blog

Many researchers are now more interested in the application of blog in language
learning. Lowe and Williams (2004) pointed out three reasons:

Educators are in favor of integrating blogs into language learning because they are easy to establish, they give students opportunities to write to a real audience, and they enable two-way communication between authors and readers. (p. 183)

Besides, weblog is a convenient tool to facilitate writing because of its text-based context. As the Internet prevails, teachers are more willing to integrate blog into their writing practice.

It is not surprising that educators are beginning to explore the possibilities of using blog in L1 or L2 writing. In studies that incorporated blog into writing in the collaboration projects, positive results were achieved (Boling, Casteck, Zawilinski, & Barton, 2008) and the students were reported to have high involvement (Witte, 2007). The easy-for-use blog makes it easy for both students and teachers to publish their written works online. Writing blog, hence, can offer students an interactive way to improve their writing skills and to encounter or develop new ideas through discussion with others. Studies on free written self-expression on the blog without consideration of errors among college students in L1 context reported positive effects on writing, too (Murray & Hourigan, 2008; Smith, 2008). In a word, the above studies, incorporating blog into writing either in L1 or L2 context, proved that blog can benefit students in collaboration projects and self-expression.

Although research related to blogs in the EFL writing is in the beginning stage, there are still many interesting findings. Bloch (2007) described how blogging helped Abdullah, a Somali student, to develop literacy, concluding that blogging is not only a new literacy tool but also a pathway to academic writing. In a study on an EFL class, Oladi (2005) found that students achieved more confidence by participating in a blog course, where they gained authorship throughout the course. She concluded that blogging provides a forum for students to express their voice. Two studies (Ducate &
Lomicka, 2008; Ward, 2004) also reported that students, either as blog readers or blog writers, gained benefits from blogging. Lee’s (2006) case study suggested that social network and online community were very helpful for students who were learning Korean. Many other studies (Armstrong & Retterer, 2008; Horvath, 2009; Miura & Yamashita, 2007; Soares & Naval, 2008) also echoed positive results of blogging in EFL writing. Still, there is little research regarding the integration of blog into process writing in an EFL setting.

2.4 Common Elements in Process Writing and Blog-mediated Research

In process writing, feedback (including peer review and teacher’s feedback), self-reflection journal and e-portfolio are three significant elements helping students to develop individual writing process. With the features of interactivity (commenting) (Ducate & Lomicka, 2008), reflection (journal) (Barlett-Bragg, 2003) and publication (e-portfolio) (Godwin-Jones, 2003), weblogs, though not paper-based, also possess the above three elements in computer-mediated mode. The following review will focus on these three elements commonly found both in process writing and blog-mediated research.

2.4.1 Feedback (Peer Review and Teacher’s Feedback)

The following will discuss two different kinds of feedback in process writing: peer review and teacher’s feedback. Then, computer-mediated peer review (comment on the blog) will also be discussed.

2.4.1.1 Peer Review

Peer review, also referred to as peer feedback, peer response or peer editing, has long been considered one of the key features of process writing. The National Conference of Teachers of English (NCTE, 1985) sees peer review as a primary
source of learning in the following statement:

Students should be encouraged to comment on each other’s writing, as well as receiving frequent, prompt, individualized attention from the teacher. Reading what others have written, speaking about one’s responses to their writing and listening to the responses of others are important activity in the writing classroom. Textbooks and other instructional resources should be of secondary importance. (NCTE 2)

Research concluded that active participation in peer review leads to improved writing skills (Althauser & Darnall, 2001). In the most widely accepted Hayes and Flower’s planning-writing-reviewing process writing model, peer review is frequently practiced to help the learners to improve their problems on content, organization, grammar and style (Jacob, et al, 1998; Keh, 1990).

Regarding how to conduct an effective peer review, scholars have varied views. It is believed that training sessions are required to help students offer specific and meaningful feedback (Berg, 1999) and the use of worksheets or checklists in the peer review should reinforce the efficiency of peer review (Damashek, 2003; Gleason, 2001; Roskelly, 1992).

Concerning the implementation of peer review in class, two aspects should be taken into account: the size of the peer review group and the form of training. The size of peer review group should always be kept small: three or four people at most (Rollinson, 2005; Zhu, 2001), and the paired peer review is “preferred by most EFL students” (Min, 2005). As for the pre-training sessions, watching a video on peer review (Zhu, 2001) and offering a broad categories under which they needed to write comments (Tsui & Ng, 2001) are recommended. Considering that it’s too time-consuming to watch a video, the researcher takes the 2nd approach providing a worksheet with listed categories as a guideline to conducting a paired peer review.

Arguments on the implementation of peer review have never stopped, even
though there were many studies spelling out the advantages of peer review. Peer review offers students the need to write to an audience (Rolliston, 2005), encourages a two-way interaction and collaboration in a communicative process (Liu & Carless, 2006), and proves useful not only for those who receive it, but for those who provide it, as it allows students to develop the ability to judge others’ works according to the given standards and this ability will later be transferred to their own works (Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, 2006). In a study aiming to explore the benefits of peer review, Tsui & Ng (2000) discovered that even though learners in ESL context favor the teacher’s feedbacks, peer review still possesses the following benefits: a) enhancing a sense of audience; b) raising learners’ awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses; c) encouraging collaborative learning, and d) fostering the ownership of text. However, there were still several voices in objection to the practice of peer review. For example, Hyland and Hyland (2006) suggested that foreign language learners generally value teacher’s feedback more. Moreover, several studies have also shown that students are unwilling to give peer review for the following reasons: a) they perceived their ability not to be good enough to provide peer feedback; b) they see it as the teacher’s job to provide feedback, and c) they resist having power over their peers or their peers having power over them (Hanrahan & Isaacs, 2001; Liu & Carless, 2006).

Other than the controversies over the implementation of peer review, there still remain some problems when conducting a peer review in both L1 and L2 context. In L1 context, students tend to give “false impression of the essay’s strengths” (Ransdell, 2001) or “comments typically found in the peer reviews were generally uncritical” (Althauser & Darnall, 2001). What’s more, teachers often avoid group work, feeling guilty when they are ‘not actually teaching’ (Roskelly, 1992). A survey found that many teachers considered peer review to be additional work with marginal results
(Belcher, 2000). As for peer review in L2 context, Nelson & Murphy (1993) pointed out two reasons why L2 learners held a different view on peer review. First, since English isn’t their native language, L2 learners may feel doubtful about the validity of their peer’s responses. Second, many L2 learners think that the teacher, usually regarded as the only authority in the classroom, may be the only reliable source to make valid and credible comments. Another major complaint about the peer review is that students, especially untrained L2 learners, do not know how to give specific, meaningful and helpful peer responses (Ferris, 2003). One thing that deserves our mention is that peer review groups are less successful among Chinese students because of their reluctance to criticize others (Carson & Nelson, 1994). In a nutshell, arguments about the practice of peer review still remain inconclusive.

2.4.1.2 Teacher’s Feedback

Research on teacher’s feedback doesn’t lead to solid or conclusive results, either. In a research review regarding the effectiveness of teacher feedback, Semke (1983) suggested that no matter how the teacher’s written feedback was delivered, there was no evidence that it would produce significant improvements in students’ writing. However, in a study examining over 1600 comments written by teachers, Ferris (1997) concluded that “a significant proportion of the comments appeared to lead to substantive student revision.” In comparison with peer feedback, teacher feedback seems more preferable to learners. In a survey on 81 ESL university students, Zhang (1995) found that most of the respondents (94%) preferred teacher feedback over peer or self-directed feedback. In general, most research comes to the similar conclusion that learners prefer teacher feedback to peer feedback, though learners welcome peer feedback as well (Hu, 2005; Jacob et al., 1998; Tsui & Ng, 2000). In short, teacher’s feedback is more valued than peer feedback. Students’ attitudes toward peer review
are varied, but they generally believe peer feedback can be useful.

Concerning the teacher’s feedback, there are two kinds: direct feedback and indirect feedback (Bitchener et al., 2005). Direct feedback means the teacher identifies an error and provides the correct form, while the indirect feedback means the teacher indicates an error without providing a correction. In a Chinese EFL writing context, teachers usually try to review students’ essays word by word and correct every single problem they find. The great efforts are very time-consuming but not always valued by students. Teachers don’t need to correct every mistake; instead, they can use indirect feedback. Concerning the way to practice indirect feedback, Hyland (1990) suggested “minimal marking” by using correction codes; that is, the teacher marks errors with correction codes, which identify the type of errors. This way, students are given a space for active correction instead of reading the teacher’s correction written in red pen. Teachers may as well leave comments at the end or on the margin of essays; however, their criticism should be toned down and paired with praises (Hyland & Hyland, 2001). Based on the above arguments, the present researcher chose to give indirect feedback in this study. Errors marked in correction codes and content-related comments on the drafts served as cues for students’ discussion when conducting a peer review. It was expected that the combination of teacher’s feedback and the peer review would help students to solve questions through interaction and collaboration.

The studies on peer review and teacher’s feedback provide us a brief summary of practice and effect of these two kinds of feedback. Studies related to another kind of feedback will be discussed as below. That is, computer-mediated peer review (CMPR), mainly referred to comments on the blog.

2.4.1.3 Computer-mediated Peer Review (CMPR)
As technology advances, the computer-mediated peer review (CMPR) has become a new mode in practice and research. Two broad options are available: one is synchronous writing, where students communicate with each other in real time via the Internet chat site, and the other asynchronous writing, where students communicate in a delayed way, such as via e-mail, BBS or blog (Hyland, et al., 2006).

Three advantages were reported in CMPR (Warschauer, 1997). First, students are allowed to take a more active role when seeking feedback. Then comments are stored in the database for later printout. Most important of all, students will feel less pressure in a CMPR than in a face-to-face peer review (FFPR). It’s especially true of Chinese ESL learners who are reluctant to criticize others in a FFPR because of its particular culture where they “generally work toward maintaining group harmony and mutual face-saving to maintain a state of cohesion” (Carson & Nelson, 1994).

Several studies concerning the effect of CMPR gained positive results. First, in a study aiming to compare the difference between CMPR group and FFPR group, the former group was reported to produce a higher percentage of revision-related comments (Liu & Sadler, 2003). Then Catera & Emigh’s (2005) study of a blog project further revealed two major findings: a) the amount and quality of peer feedback influenced students’ motivation to post comments, and b) peer feedback was equally important and motivating as tutor feedback. With so many positive results on CMPR, attention is drawn to investigate if CMPR could replace the traditional FFPR. In Ho and Savingon’s (2007) study, investigating the use preference of FFPR and CMPR, 72% of the learners indicated that they preferred the combination of these two. Li (2009) further suggested that the new emerging CMPR be used only as a supplement to reinforce the FFPR. In this regard, the present researcher decides to use the two-step procedure (FFPR → CMPR) in this study, hoping that students can benefit from peer reviews in different modes while making revisions.
2.4.2 Self-reflection Journal

As a means to facilitate reflective practice and encourage critical thinking, journal writing has been promoted by educators in many fields (Bain et al., 1999). A journal is one type of writing assignment that requires the writer to think about something, and to record his/her thoughts about it. As Hedlund et al. (1989) put it:

As a literary form, the journal falls roughly between the diary and the log: it consists of regular, though not necessarily daily, entries by which the writer focuses and reflects upon a given theme, or a series of events and experiences. (p. 108)

Many studies have reported the benefits of journal writing, such as a tool to convey the importance of writing (Yinger, 1985) and a way to engage students more in learning (Connor-Greene, 2000). Offering a first-person account of language learning or teaching experience, learning journal serves as a means to develop reflective practice, thus helping to build up the process of one’s own learning (Carroll, 1994). As a reflective tool, the learning journal can promote and document the personal growth, development and transformation and provide opportunities for learners to make meaning from experiences through reflection (Diamond, 1991).

Journal writing has been used extensively to enhance reflection. Several studies suggested that reflection is enhanced in the computer mediated environment because students have an easy access to journals, more time to read, re-read or compose thoughtful messages (Burge, 1993; Davie & Wells, 1991). In the present study, the self-reflection journal is considered a requisite as a means to document learners’ writing process, as a reference to make revisions and as a source of data collection.

2.4.3 E-portfolio
Portfolio has been widely used as a learning and assessment tool in Europe, the United Kingdom, and United States (Council of Europe, 2006; Hamp-Lyons & Condon, 2000; Klenowski, 2002). While producing their portfolios, learners have an opportunity to monitor their own progress and take their own responsibility for learning. By documenting growth over time through collection of their works, portfolios can help students reflect and confirm their learning efforts (O’Malley & Pierce, 1996). Hence, the core concept of portfolio lies in self-assessment guided by learners (Hirvela & Pierson, 2000). As the web and multimedia technologies advance, the focus on portfolios has been shifted from paper-based portfolio to e-portfolio.

There are several different definitions on e-portfolios, but Barnett’s (2005) is the most frequently quoted.

E-portfolio uses electronic technologies as the container, allowing students/teacher to collect and organize portfolio artifacts in many media types (audio, video, graphics, and text) and using hypertext links to organize the material, connecting evidence to appropriate outcomes, goals or standards. (p. 5)

With the evolution of networks and the web, it is easier for students to create, store, and publish their academic work online, namely, an e-portfolio. In the United States, Europe and Australia, e-portfolios have started to be implemented in the classroom (Batson, 2002).

Compared with the paper-based form, e-portfolio possesses more of other benefits. First, e-portfolio is easier to maintain, edit and update than its paper counterpart; students’ works can be collected, stored and managed electronically, taking very little or no physical space, and the peer and teacher feedback can be enhanced as well since the Internet is available at any time or any place (Heath, 2002). Meanwhile, the online environment helps students be more aware of their peers as the audience and thus create their community of writers (Wall & Peltier, 1996). In short,
the open web space system provides a cyber space for e-portfolio storage and also serves as basis for students-centered empowerment and motivation for meaningful learning, thus promoting their autonomy (Barrett, 2004).

The weblog is good for e-portfolio assessment for three reasons (Chan & Ridgway, 2006). First, weblogs document learners’ progress and blogging helps them to improve their ideas and insights through self-evaluation. Second, the use of weblog also helps the teacher make assessment because weblogs offer a clear and permanent record of students’ progress. Most importantly, living in a digital world, learners embark on personal explorations and learning adventures on the blogosphere, thus fostering their reflection.

In addition to the above benefits of using weblog as e-portfolio, Chen and Bonk (2008) further proposed several others. Weblog posting presents a formative assessment through reflection and reveals students’ thinking, understanding, and errors in learning. These postings also help students explore a topic or idea in great depth or even develop it into a paper or thesis. Instructors may also reflect on where they should alter their teaching approaches or revise related teaching materials. The above-mentioned studies inspire the researcher to include e-portfolio in the present study for data collection and assessment.

2.5 Research Questions

Although process writing has been prevailing in L1 context for decades, arguments over the suitability of practicing process writing in an EFL context has never stopped for a mere reason: the neglect of final writing product (Barnes, 1983) and the stress on content over form (Badger & White, 2000). Aiming to strike a balance between content and form and explore possible ways to improve the final written product, the present study hopes to find if process writing can be effectively
practiced in the mediation of weblog. Listed below are the research questions raised.

1. What types of changes students made in the multiple revisions in the blog-mediated process writing class and what information does the revision analysis provide?

2. To what extent does the weblog-mediated process writing class contribute to the development of students’ writing ability in content and organization?

3. How does weblog help students in each step (pre-writing, drafting, revising/editing and publishing) of process writing?

4. What challenges are involved and what kind of teacher support is needed in the blog-mediated process writing class?

5. What are students’ attitudes toward writing after taking the blog-mediated process writing class?

6. What other findings can be derived from this blog-mediated process writing class in term of the context of the classroom?
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The present study aimed to investigate how the instruction of process writing integrated with blog influenced the individual performance of these four 12th graders of high school in process writing. The research method falls into four sections, where participants, instruments, procedure and data analysis were described respectively.

3.1 Participants

The participants of the present study were four 12th graders of a public senior high school situated in the northern part of Taiwan. This school is ranked among the above average with the percentile rank of BCT (Basic Competence Test) score at 88-90. The four participants were selected from an elective writing class taught by the researcher. This writing class was targeted at the 12th graders mainly because they were capable of expressing themselves in English with larger vocabulary and a better writing skill while preparing for the two-paragraph or picture-prompted writing in the entrance exam.

At the beginning of the present study, several individual inquiries were made, and then four of the students, three girls and one boy, gave their consent to be the future participants. In the blog-mediated writing class, they were informed to do their best to revise, reflect, read and comment. At the end of the study, individual portfolios were produced as a means of data collection for assessment.

Two features differentiated these four participants from the other 12th graders of this high school. One feature is that these four participants came from the researcher’s regular English classes, categorized as social science classes. They were well
acquainted with the teacher’s teaching style as the researcher had been their English teacher ever since they were in Grade 11. Likewise, the researcher had come to know their personality through the active interaction with them over the past year. The other one is that they had a stronger motivation to improve their writing skill, willing to get more involved in repeating more of the writing cycles in the writing class, though informed that lots of writing time and efforts were demanded in the syllabus.

3.2 Instruments

In this case study, the instruments we need include: 1) drafts on Topic 1 and 5, 2) questionnaires on students’ writing attitude, 3) the class blog, 4) students’ self-reflection journals, 5) the teacher’s logs, 6) students’ portfolios, 7) self-evaluation form on portfolio and questionnaire on the writing class, 8) CEEC scoring criteria (Chang, 2004), 9) Yagelski’s coding schemes (1995), 10) Johnson’s indicators of content and organization (1994), and 11) semi-structured paired interviews.

3.2.1 Drafts on Topics 1 and 5 as Pre-test and Post-test

Five topics were assigned to be written in the writing class. The drafts on Topic 1 and Topic 5, serving as the pre-test and post-test respectively, were graded by two raters, the researcher herself and another invited fellow English teacher with over 15 years of English teaching experience. The grading was to compare if there was any significant improvement on the part of students in content and organization, the two main indicative factors of process writing. Meanwhile, the drafts on Topic 2, 3 & 4 were seen as the part of practice in the training sessions of process writing. One thing deserves mentioning is the establishment of inter-rater credibility between the two raters. Before grading these drafts, the two raters scored ten writing samples to reach the consensus on the criteria of the evaluation. When disagreement happened, the two
raters discussed until they reached an agreement. To measure the reliability, the scores on the ten writing samples were collected. Cronbach’s alpha reached 0.8 in the five categories of modified CEEC Scoring Criteria, indicating there was inter-rater reliability.

3.2.2 Questionnaires on Students’ Writing Attitude (See Appendix A)

At the beginning and the end of the course, the questionnaires on students’ writing attitude (Chang, 2002) were answered by students in order to investigate if participants experienced any attitude change. Collaboratively designed by Chang and Tsai (2002), the 36-item five points Likert-scale questionnaire standardizes the measurement of statements in four categories: confidence, anxiety, usefulness and preference (see Appendix B, English version). To measure students’ responses more accurately, the statements of these items are randomly arranged rather than listed in categories in case that these students answer the questions based on the perceived ideas.

3.2.3 The Class Blog (See Appendix C)

According to Campbell (2003), three different types of blogs fit pedagogical purposes: the tutor blog, run by the class teacher; the learner blog, run by each student in the group individually; and the class blog, run by the teacher and students collaboratively.

As 12th graders, these four participants did not seem to have much time managing individual learner blogs. The class blog was therefore selected to serve as the forum for them to document and publish their writing process. Established at www.blogger.com, provided by Google, the class blog, whose format and layout was managed by the teacher, offered the co-authoring function which allowed at most 100
authors to post entries under their names.

Two major reasons explained why the teacher favored the class blog over the learner blog. First, for the teacher and the four participants as well, it would be a hassle when clicking on to the web pages of individual learner blogs backwards and forwards. What’s more, by keeping all the entries in the class blog, it was more likely to establish a sense of learning community. Most important of all, registered under the teacher’s name, the class blog could be kept intact to function as the database of the present study.

3.2.4 Students’ Self-reflection Journals

Self-reflection journals were chosen to replace Emig’s ‘composing aloud’ method (1971) for several reasons. Owing to the limited teaching hours and financial support, it was very unlikely to practice Emig’s ‘composing aloud’ in this study. Most important of all, ‘composing aloud’ is also criticized as a “difficult, artificial, and at times distracting procedure” (Voss, 1983), whereas many studies have stated the benefits of journal writing. As a means of reflection, learning journal helps to build up one’s own learning process (Carroll, 1994) and document the personal growth, development and transformation (Diamond, 1991). Reflection is enhanced in the computer-mediated environment because students have an easy access to journals, with more time to read, re-read or compose thoughtful messages (Burge, 1993; Davie & Wells, 1991).

In the present study, the self-reflection journal was considered a requisite as a means to document learners’ writing process, as a reference to make revision and as a source of data collection. After each peer review activity, these four participants were asked to write a self-reflection journal (see Appendix D), regarding the writing process and the suggestions from peers and the teacher. To encourage students to
write more in a journal, the teacher suggested that they write their journals in paragraphs instead of Q & A form. A guideline to self-reflection journal was hence revised (See Appendix E) to contain the following information.

1) How does the brainstorming help?
2) Is there any difficulty in the writing process?
3) What’s the teacher’s feedback on the written draft?
4) Summary of the suggestions listed on the peer review sheet.
5) What do you feel about the topic?

It is hoped that summarizing the teacher’s and peers’ feedbacks and reflecting the writing process in a journal can help these four participants spot their problems before making revisions. These participants were also encouraged to add in the journal something related to English learning problems, personal feelings, and perception toward the teacher’s instruction.

### 3.2.5 The Teacher’s Logs

To record how students developed the writing process, the teacher wrote logs after class, including the teacher’s observation on individual participants, and teacher-and-student interaction in class.

### 3.2.6 Students’ Portfolios

Over a period of time, in Europe, the United Kingdom, and the United States, portfolios have long been recognized as a great tool to assess students’ performance (Council of Europe, 2006; Hamp-Lyons & Condon, 2000; Klenowski, 2002). For the teacher, portfolios can provide a panoramic view of students’ learning process. For students, it offers a good chance for them to reflect on how and what they have learned when compiling a portfolio.
At the end of the semester, individual portfolios were handed in, including: a) written drafts, b) peer review sheets, c) checklists, and d) content on blogs (revisions, self-reflection journals, brainstorming and comments). Other than the e-portfolio on the cyberspace (the class blog), the paper-based portfolios served as a hard copy of database for the evaluation of learners’ performance and for research purpose.

3.2.7 Self-evaluation Form on Portfolio and Questionnaire on the Writing Class

In order to conduct the interviews, the four participants were asked to fill out the self-evaluation forms on portfolio, and questionnaires on the writing class (see Appendix F). The self-evaluation forms on portfolio aimed to help participants to reflect on their writing process as well as how they felt about the two drafts on Topic 1 & 5 (pre-test and post-test drafts). Questionnaires on the writing class helped the researcher to conduct the subsequent interviews with these four participants.

3.2.8 Modified CEEC Scoring Criteria

The drafts on Topic 1 (pre-test) and those on Topic 5 (post-test) of these four participants were graded based on a modified CEEC (College Entrance Examination Center) scoring criteria (Chang, 2004), which fall into five categories: organization (5 points), content (5 points), vocabulary (4 points), grammar (4 points) and mechanics (2 points). The CEEC scoring criteria were modified to enlarge the score gap of each category as below: organization (25 points), content (25 points), vocabulary (20 points), grammar (20 points) and mechanics (10 points) (see Appendix G), for the purpose of helping the researcher to examine the amount of progress more precisely.

3.2.9 Yagelski’s Coding Schemes for Revision Analysis across Cases (See Appendix H)
To code for frequency and types of revisions in these 48 revisions (4 participants wrote 3 revisions on 4 topics), Yagelski’s coding schemes, (1995) and Johnson’s indicators of content and organization (1994) were adopted. Given that content and organization were the limelight of this study, Johnson’s indicators of content and organization acted as the primary coding schemes in counting content and structural changes while Yagelski’s coding schemes, as secondary sources, provided standards for categorization. In Yagelski’s coding schemes, the types of revisions were categorized into four changes: a) surface changes, b) stylistic changes, c) structural changes, and d) content changes. The first three referred to what Faigley and Witte (1981) called “meaning-preserving” changes, which showed writing conventions (surface changes), word choice (stylistic changes); and the organization of the text (structural changes) respectively. The fourth referred to the content that affected the meaning of the text. One thing worthy of note in Yagelski’s coding schemes is that grammar-related revision was categorized into the surface changes.

3.2.10 Johnson’s Indicators of Content and Organization

According to Johnson (1994), indicators of content and organization illustrated the existence of content and organization in an essay. Three types of indicators of content were therefore defined: 1) explanation: giving definition or further explanation for the purpose of clarification, 2) details: providing more information, and 3) examples: illustrating the writer’s ideas more clearly. Likewise, there were three types of the indicators of organization: 1) topic sentences: expressing the main idea of a paragraph in one sentence, 2) supporting sentences: giving details, examples or explanation to support the topic sentence, and 3) transition words: connecting sentences closely and logically. Based on Johnson’s definition above, an addition of detail, example or explanation in the revision was seen as one content change.
Likewise, a new supporting sentence or topic sentence was also regarded as one structural change. Moreover, Johnson’s indicators of content and organization (1994) were adopted in the draft analysis to support the findings of progress in content and organization.

3.2.11 Semi-structured Paired Interviews (See Appendix I)

To clarify the unclear points in the gathered data, the researcher conducted one-hour paired interviews with these four participants at least four times. Paired interviews took the place of individual interviews for the participants’ preference. According to Lohm (2008), paired interviews can reduce the discomfort in interviews, provide more time for thinking, and elicit more responses through interaction. Questions were asked in the interviews to answer the four research questions or supplement the findings derived from revision analysis, draft analysis and questionnaires. If a vague statement was made, a further one-to-one interview would be conducted to ask for more specific details.

3.3 Procedures

The present study was conducted in the process of six steps: 1) the draft on Topic 1 (pre-test) and the writing attitude questionnaire (pre-test), 2) writing cycles, 3) the draft on Topic 5 (post-test), 4) questionnaire on students’ writing attitude (post-test), 5) the self-evaluation form on portfolio and questionnaire on the writing class, and 6) the interviews. The research procedure was displayed as below:
First, the drafts on Topic 1 were written and questionnaire on students’ writing attitude were filled out as pre-test (step 1). For the rest of semester, the writing cycles repeated as the training sessions of process writing (step 2). Then, drafts on Topic 5 were written as post-test (step 3). At the end of semester, questionnaires on students’ writing attitude were filled out again as post-test (step 4). In the 2nd period of the same week, self-evaluation form on portfolio and questionnaire on the writing class were filled out (step 5). Finally, semi-structured paired interviews were conducted (step 6).

To offer a better picture of the process writing model used in this study, writing cycles were introduced as below.

3.3.1 Writing Cycles

According to Applebee (1986), the process writing model should include five
steps: pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing and publishing. However, these steps are not necessarily followed in a linear line. The writer can go back and forth till he/she is satisfied with the final essay; that is to say, some steps of process writing cycle are repetitive and recursive. Therefore, a writing cycle was devised to carry out what the process writing preaches, i.e., recursive writing. The procedure of writing cycle was listed as follows:

![Writing cycle diagram]

Based on Perl’s (1980) findings, students write more with greater fluency and satisfaction when their writings relate to them personally. With this consideration in mind, five topics highly related to teenage life were chosen to write in the semester-long course. Each writing cycle went through three stages and lasted at least three weeks (2 hours/week). At stage one, the written drafts were handed in. At stage two, revision 1 (R1) was requested to be posted on the blog after referring to the teacher’s feedback on the draft and the peer feedback on the peer editing sheet (peer
review). At stage three, revision 2 (R2) was published on the blog after finishing the checklists or referring to comments on the blog. Though two revisions were the minimal requirement for each writing cycle, the researcher encouraged learners to write as many revisions as they wished. Then, revision 3 (R3) was also posted on the blog after referring to the update comments on the blog from the teacher or peers. One thing worthy of note was that the topic “My personal profile” (Topic 1) was chosen to fit the pre-test that should exclude any variables involved, including brainstorming activity, to name just one.

To encourage students’ active error correction, this researcher replaced the traditional red-pen error correction with error marking in UCI correction symbols (See Appendix J) while offering comments on the content and organization on the margins of drafts. Such kind of practice should help students not only improve their writing product (academic or professional success) but develop the writing process (making meaning).

With the marked errors and the teacher’s feedback on the margins of the drafts, the peer review was conducted through peer editing sheets (See Appendix K). By documenting the teacher’s and peer’s feedback and reviewing the writing process in a self-reflection journal, R1 was posted on the blog. During the weekend, students first read each other’s revisions and then leave revision-related comments on the blog.

To facilitate the practice of the writing cycle in the study, this researcher gave a brief introduction to process writing in class. Also, to fit the unique feature of a reverse chronological order of blog, some format rules on the publication of essays on the blog were also established. What’s more, the structure of essay (e.g., topic sentences, the main idea, and supporting sentences) was also presented in class as part of training session of the peer review.

To further ensure that R1 followed the process writing model focusing on the
3.3.2 Timetable for Teaching Activities and Data Collection

As a summary of this study, a timetable serves as an excellent framework of what the teacher did (teaching activities) and what data he/she collected (data collection). Teaching activities refers to how the researcher assisted students in completing a series of tasks while data collection relates to what data the researcher collected. The breakdown for both was presented in the timetable below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Teaching Activities</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep.</td>
<td>1. Introduction to syllabus &amp; class blog</td>
<td>1. Drafts on Topic 1 (pre-test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Questionnaire survey on students’ writing attitude (pre-test)</td>
<td>2. Questionnaire sheets on students’ writing attitude (pre-test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Writing drafts on Topic 1 (My personal profile)</td>
<td>3. The teacher’s log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>1. Introduction to process writing and the structure of essay</td>
<td>1. The teacher’s log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Training sessions on peer reviews</td>
<td>2. Students’ self-reflection journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Multiple revisions on Topic 1 &amp; Topic 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Practice of Writing cycle 1 (My personal profile) and 2 (A thank-you letter)

Nov. 1. Practice of Writing cycle 3 (Star signs and I)
2. Blog Management: A review on the previous writing cycles

1. The teacher’s log
2. Students’ self-reflection journals
3. Multiple revisions on Topic 3

Dec. 1. Practice of Writing cycle 4 (What’s in my name)
2. Writing the draft on Topic 5 (My best friend)
3. Questionnaire survey on students’ writing attitude
   (post-test)

1. The teacher’s log
2. Students’ self-reflection journals
3. Multiple revisions
   4. Drafts on Topic 5 (post-test)
   5. Questionnaire sheets on students’ writing attitude (post-test)

Jan. 1. Collection of portfolio
2. Filling out self-evaluation form on portfolio & questionnaires on the writing class

1. Individual portfolios
2. Self-evaluation forms on portfolio & questionnaire sheets on the writing class

Feb. End of semester

1. Data transcribed from audiotaped semi-structured paired interviews

### 3.4 Data Analysis

To answer the six research questions, this researcher collected data including multiple revisions (48 revisions), the two different drafts as pre-test and post test (Draft on Topic 1 and Draft on Topic 5), the same set of questionnaires on students’
writing attitude (pre-test and post-test questionnaires), the teacher’s logs and semi-structured paired interviews.

In response to Research Question One, the 48 revisions of these four participants were collected and coded by Yagelski’s coding schemes (1995) to count how many changes the four participants made in the four categories: surface changes, stylistic changes, structural changes and content changes. Since Yagelski’s coding schemes only offered rough standards for structural and content changes, Johnson’s indicators of content and organization (1994) were adopted as the guideline to counting content and structural changes. After these revisions were analyzed, several semi-structured paired interviews were asked for verification and clarification.

As to Research Question Two, the two drafts (pre-test and post-test) were graded by two raters with modified CEEC scoring criteria. First, score differences between the pre-test and post-test drafts were calculated to show the gained points. The gained points, indicating progress in the five categories (content, organization, vocabulary, grammar and mechanics), were also transformed into percentages of progress. Besides, the total numbers of words in two drafts (length of essay) were also counted to see if fluency was achieved. Second, the percentages of progress made by each participant were compared with the total numbers of changes he/she made in revisions to see if there was any connection between the progress in the two drafts and the practice of multiple revisions. Third, Johnson’s indicators of content and organization (1994) were applied in the draft analysis to support the above findings of progress in content and organization. Finally, the interviews helped this researcher to verify the findings or clarify the unclear points.

Answering Research Questions Three and Four, questions were asked in the interviews to find out how blog functioned in each step of process writing model or what challenges students encountered and what teacher support they could need.
As to Research Question Five, the same set of questionnaires on students’ writing attitude (36 question items designed in five-point Likert scale) were collected to calculate the score differences between pre-test and post-test questionnaires. Then, this researcher explained the questionnaire results to see if the four participants experienced any attitude change.

In answering Research Question Six, data from the teacher’s logs and interviews will be investigated to see if some other findings were derived from the blog-mediated process writing class in term of the context of classroom.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the study are presented in the six research questions respectively. First, the 48 revisions are analyzed to find out what types of changes these four participants made in the multiple revisions. Second, the two drafts are graded and analyzed to explore their individual progress in content and organization. Third, data from the interviews explain how the blog helped in each step (pre-writing, drafting, revising/editing and publishing) of process writing and what challenges and teacher support were. Fourth, the questionnaire results together with the interview data pinpointed if these students experienced any writing attitude changes after taking this writing class. Last, based on mostly on the teacher’s logs and the interview data, this researchers elaborates findings derived from the context of classroom

4.1 Research Question One: What types of changes students made in the multiple revisions in the blog-mediated process writing class and what information does the revision analysis provide?

To answer Research Question One, the researcher adopted Yagelski’ coding schemes (1995), standards for categorization, and Johnson’s indicators of content and organization (1994), the guideline to counting structural and content changes, to code the revisions of the four participants in four categories – surface change (mechanics and grammar), stylistic changes (vocabulary), structural changes (organization) and content changes (content). One thing worth notice is that grammar related revision was categorized into surface changes in Yagelski’s coding schemes.

The number of changes per topic for each participant is listed from Table 4.1a–
Table 4.1d. In these tables, R1, R2 and R3 stand for revision 1, revision 2 and revision 3 respectively. This researcher will discuss the individual difference when making revisions.

Table 4.1a Numbers of Changes per Topic Written by Connie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Topic 1</th>
<th>Topic 2</th>
<th>Topic 3</th>
<th>Topic 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total numbers of changes in Connie’s revision showed a tendency to decrease. That is, Connie made the most changes in R1, fewer in R2 (with the exception of R2 on Topic 1) and then the fewest in R3. In making R1, she made changes in all of four categories. In R2, the total number of changes dropped sharply and the attention to the four categories was less obvious. In R3, the total number of changes drastically decreased because she only made minimal changes in one or two categories.

Table 4.1b Numbers of Changes per Topic Written by Tina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Topic 1</th>
<th>Topic 2</th>
<th>Topic 3</th>
<th>Topic 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Tina’s case, the total number of changes didn’t necessarily follow a tendency to decrease. There were two times when the total numbers of changes decreased in R2, but rose slightly in R3 (Topic 1 and 3). The preference for paying attention to errors in the four categories in R1 only happened twice (Topic 1 & 3). Like Connie, Tina made the most changes in R1. However, the tendency to decrease wasn’t always found from R1 to R2 or from R2 to R3.

### Table 4.1c Numbers of Changes per Topic Written by Ice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Topic 1</th>
<th>Topic 2</th>
<th>Topic 3</th>
<th>Topic 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.1c, the total number of changes in Ice’s revisions didn’t tend to decline. Unlike Connie’s and Tina’s R1, Ice’s didn’t always make the most changes in R1. On the contrary, the total numbers of changes in R2 outnumbered those in R1 for two times (Topic 2 & 3). While making revision on these four topics, Ice never made structural and content changes until R2.

### Table 4.1d Numbers of Changes per Topic Written by Sherry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Topic 1</th>
<th>Topic 2</th>
<th>Topic 3</th>
<th>Topic 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sherry’s pattern was more like Ice’s than Connie’s because her R1 didn’t always have the most changes (Topic 2). The total number of changes in her revisions didn’t show a tendency to decline, either. The total number of changes in her R2 outnumbered that in R1 once (Topic 2). Except that she made several content changes in R1 twice (Topic 1 & 4), she followed Ice’s strategy that she didn’t make structural and content change until R2.

Concerning these multiple revisions, two finding are worthy of attention: the tendency to decrease in the total number of changes and the personal preference when making revisions. It was found that the total number of changes decreased as the number of revisions increased. The tendency to decrease was the most obvious in Connie’s revisions. It indicated that she made the most changes in R1, fewer in R2 and the fewest in R3. However, the tendency to decrease didn’t always exist in the other three participants. For example, Tina only have tendency to decrease in Topic 4, Ice had it in Topic 2 and 4 and Sherry had it in Topic 1, 3 and 4.

Another finding is the personal preference in making revisions and it decided what type of errors they would correct. For example, Connie tended to fix the errors in the four categories in R1 while Ice didn’t fix content and structural errors until R2. Tina’s preference for making changes of all of four categories was more like Connie’s while Sherry’s preference for making structural and content changes in R2 was more like Ice’s, though their preference was comparatively weak. In other words, there were some exceptions in Sherry’s and Tina’s revisions. Personal preference in making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Surface</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stylist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
revisions also divided these four participants into two groups. One group (Connie and Tina) established a pattern, paying equal attention to errors in the four categories in R1 while the other group (Ice and Sherry) established another opposite pattern where they left structural and content errors untouched in R1 and later fixed them in R2.

The numbers and percentages of changes by type are displayed from Table 4.2a to Table 4.2d. The four participants’ revisions will be discussed respectively in the four categories: surface change, stylistic changes, structural changes and content changes. The data in Table 4.2a to Table 4.2d were explained in terms of three things: 1) tendency to decrease, 2) personal preference in making revisions, and 3) the total number of changes by type.

### Table 4.2a Numbers/Percentages of Changes by Type for Each Revision by Connie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revision 1</th>
<th>Revision 2</th>
<th>Revision 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>16 (24.6%)</td>
<td>4 (13.8%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic</td>
<td>15 (23.1%)</td>
<td>9 (31)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>16 (24.6%)</td>
<td>4 (13.8%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>18 (27.7%)</td>
<td>12 (41.4%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Connie’s revisions, the tendency to decrease appeared in the four categories. That is, surface changes, stylistic changes, structural changes and content changes appeared most in R1, fewer in R2 and the fewest in R3. When doing R1, her attention is equally distributed to errors in the four categories. In R2, the primary focus fell on content and the secondary focus on style. In R3, stylistic changes were paid more attention than the other three types. Moreover, the tendency to decrease in Connie’s revision is comparatively sharper than the other three participants.

Personal preference in making revisions could be also seen from the total
numbers of changes in these categories, which were listed according to the order of high-to-low: content changes (32), stylistic changes (29), surface changes (22) and structural changes (21). It seemed that Connie preferred making content changes. Her second favorite was stylistic changes while the least favorites were surface and structural changes. However, the difference in the total numbers of these changes was very small. To sum up, when making revisions, Connie tended to alter the content of essay and changed her wording (vocabulary) rather than make surface changes (mechanics and grammar) or change the structure (organization) of essay. The finding indicated that Connie was a bold writer, daring to expand her ideas and experiment with words when making revisions.

Table 4.2b Numbers/Percentages of Changes by Type for Each Revision by Tina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Revision 1</th>
<th>Revision 2</th>
<th>Revision 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>29 (55.8%)</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>3 (14.3%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic</td>
<td>11 (21.2%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>4 (19.1%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>4 (7.7%)</td>
<td>6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>8 (15.4%)</td>
<td>7 (38.9%)</td>
<td>8 (38.1%)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Tina’s case, the tendency to decrease only showed in surface changes. The number of changes in the other categories fluctuated instead of showing any sign of tendency to decrease. In making R1, Tina made the most surface changes while the stylistic changes ranked the second. In R2 & R3, content (7) became the primary focus while structure (6) was the secondary. However, the difference in the numbers of these two types of changes was very small. In a word, in the multiple revisions (R1, R2 and R3), these four types of changes took turns to be the focus of attention. Specifically speaking, surface and stylistic changes are the focus of revision in R1.
while structural and content changes in R2 and R3.

Obviously, Tina had different personal preference in making revisions. The total numbers of changes in these four categories were listed in the order of high-to-low: surface changes (36), content changes (23), stylistic changes (16) and structural changes (16). The fact that surface changes came out first meant that Tina was a conservative writer, who fixed obvious mistakes most of the time. However, she was as good at enriching the content, since content changes came out the second.

Table 4.2c Numbers/Percentages of Changes by Type for Each Revision by Ice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revision 1</th>
<th>Revision 2</th>
<th>Revision 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>24 (61.5%)</td>
<td>4 (12.9%)</td>
<td>1 (7.7%)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic</td>
<td>15 (38.5%)</td>
<td>6 (19.4%)</td>
<td>3 (23.1%)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (32.3%)</td>
<td>4 (30.8%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (35.5%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Ice’s case, the tendency to decrease only showed in the first two categories: surface and stylistic changes. Concerning structural and content changes, the tendency to decrease didn’t start until R2. Apparently, Ice took the opposite strategies in making revisions. In R1, the surface and stylistic changes were the primary and secondary focus but structure and content changes didn’t exist. Not until R2 did structural and content changes become the primary focus.

The total numbers of changes by type were listed in the order of high-to-low: surface changes (29), stylistic changes (24), content changes (16) and structural changes (14). Concerning the personal preference in making revisions, Ice presented another kind of writer. The fact that content changes came out the third showed that Ice was even more conservative than Connie and Tina because he made surface and
Like Ice, Sherry had the tendency to decrease shown in the first two categories: surface and stylistic changes. Concerning structural and content changes, the tendency to decrease didn’t exist; the numbers of content and structural changes fluctuated. In R1, the surface and stylistic changes were the primary and secondary focus with several content changes and no structural changes. Not until R2 did content changes (8) become the secondary focus; however, Sherry made a comparatively fewer number of structure changes (2). There is one last thing worthy of attention. Unlike the other three, whose total numbers of surface and stylistic changes were dramatically reduced in R2, Sherry still corrected a lot of errors in these two categories. A possible explanation is that Sherry did not fix as many errors as the others in R1, but she later found out these errors in doing R2.

The total numbers of changes by type were listed in the order of high-to-low: surface changes (44), stylistic changes (26), content changes (16) and structural changes (6). Sherry’s personal preference in making revisions was much like Ice’s. That is, she was as conservative as Ice for they prefer making surface and stylistic changes. The only difference between them is that Sherry made much fewer changes in structure. This implied that Sherry preferred not to alter the structure of essay to a
certain extent.

To compare the individual preference for specific types of changes and which revision was the focus of attention, Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 are produced.

**Table 4.3 The Total Numbers of Changes by Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Connie</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Ice</th>
<th>Sherry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.3, it was clear that Connie beat others in content (32), stylistic (29) and structural (21) changes while Sherry came out the first in surface changes. The total numbers of changes by type showed their revision preference and thus decided what their revisions would be like or what kind of writers they were. Based on the fact that Connie made so many changes in these three categories, Connie’s revisions were very likely to be totally different from her original drafts. The fact that Sherry made the most surface changes implied that she was a writer focusing on surface errors.

A brief discussion on the winner in the total numbers of changes by type may also help us explain why he/she had such preference. According to Table 4.3, Connie made the most changes (104) while Ice the least (83). There might be two possible explanations. One is that Ice wrote better drafts, so he didn’t need to revise so many errors. The other is that Connie was willing to invest more time on doing revisions. Overall, the four participants did show personal preference in certain types of changes. Comparatively speaking, Ice and Sherry preferred making surface and stylistic
changes; Tina favored surface and content changes more than the others and Connie showed preference for content and stylistic changes in particular.

**Table 4.4 The Total Numbers of Changes per Revision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Connie</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Ice</th>
<th>Sherry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revision 1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of the tendency to decrease in Table 4.4 was also a clue to help the researcher know which revision was the focus of attention. In Connie’s revisions, the level of the tendency to decrease dropped sharp from R1 to R3 (65→29→10). Thus, it was concluded that Connie paid a lot of attention to correcting errors in the four categories in R1 and found few things to be fixed in R2 and R3. Tina also had a similar sharp drop in the tendency to decrease from R1 to R2 (52→18), but a slight rise from R2 to R3 (18→21). The only difference between Tina and Connie was that Tina still revised a lot in R3. On the contrary, Ice didn’t have a sudden drop in the level of the tendency to decrease from R1 to R3 (39→31→13). It implied that Ice paid nearly equal attention in R1 and R2, though the level of attention suddenly dropped in R3. Sherry’s tendency to decrease was very similar to Ice’s (44→32→16). Based on the above, a phenomenon appeared. The tendency to decrease from R2 to R3 declined dramatically in three participants (However, in Tina’s case, the total number of changes in R3 slightly rose.) It indicated that fewer changes were made in R3. In other words, R3 may be too much or unnecessary for them. As a result, the tendency to decrease serves as a good reference for how many revisions are tolerable.
or suitable for EFL learners.

The interviews confirmed the two things: the revision preference and the tendency to decrease. Ice and Sherry were asked why they didn’t make structural and content changes until R2. They responded that it took less time to fix surface and stylistic errors which were already marked on the drafts. They said there were too many activities scheduled in R1; and if they wanted to finish R1 in class, the best strategy was to focus on the most apparent errors first. Contrary to them, Connie made changes in the four categories in R1. In the interview, Connie answered that she wanted to fix all errors once and for all even though she had to spend another two hours other than class time to finish R1. Tina also mentioned that she spent another hour at home finishing R1. Therefore, the preference happened depending on the amount of time they decided to spend on R1. With more time at hand, it was no wonder that Connie and Tina were able to fix errors in these four categories in R1.

The tendency to decrease in the numbers of revisions was highly positively correlated with the amount of time they spent on revisions. Three participants (except Sherry) said that they spent most time on R1, the less time on R2 and the least time on R3. It appears that these participants spent the least amount of time in R3 out of exhaustion and weariness. As mentioned before, there was a slight rise in Tina’s tendency to decrease from R2 to R3. It is an intriguing finding with a bit of irony. Even though she complained about the boredom of doing the third revision, Tina was still able to make quite a few changes in R3. Contrary to Tina, Sherry was the only one who said that she spent equal time finishing these three revisions. Although she spent equal time in R3, she still had a sharp drop in the tendency to decrease from R2 to R3. The fact that Sherry spent equal time in R3 also indicated that she had more tolerance for multiple revisions than the other three.

Next, Research Question Two will be answered in detail respectively according
to the data acquired from the two drafts (pre-test and post-test drafts), the multiple revisions, and interviews.

4.2 Research Question 2: To what extent does the weblog-mediated process writing class contribute to the development of students’ writing ability in content and organization?

In response to the first research question, two raters, the researcher and one invited colleague of the researcher, scored the drafts based on the adapted CEEC scoring criteria (Chang, 2004). The scores of the pre-test and post-test drafts of these four participants are listed in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5 Scores of Pre-test and Post-test Drafts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Connie</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Ice</th>
<th>Sherry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content (25%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11/12)</td>
<td>(16/12)</td>
<td>(14/15)</td>
<td>(15/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21/24)</td>
<td>(22/23)</td>
<td>(23/23)</td>
<td>(23/22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization (25%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12/16)</td>
<td>(16/12)</td>
<td>(13/16)</td>
<td>(14/18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21/24)</td>
<td>(22/23)</td>
<td>(22/23)</td>
<td>(22/20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar (20%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To further analyze the progress of these four participants, the researcher displays the gained points on the post-test drafts of these four participants in Table 4.6. The gained points for every category were also transformed into percentages through division: gained points/the points of each category. For example, Sherry gained 7 points in content (25 points), so the percentage of gained points in content was 28%, a figure obtained from “7/25.”

Table 4.6 Percentages of Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Connie</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Ice</th>
<th>Sherry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11/12)</td>
<td>(12/10)</td>
<td>(12/12)</td>
<td>(14/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13/16)</td>
<td>(14/18)</td>
<td>(15/17)</td>
<td>(17/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11/12)</td>
<td>(12/10)</td>
<td>(10/12)</td>
<td>(13/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13/16)</td>
<td>(15/18)</td>
<td>(15/17)</td>
<td>(16/17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7/7)</td>
<td>(8/7)</td>
<td>(7/7)</td>
<td>(7/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8/8)</td>
<td>(8/8)</td>
<td>(8/8)</td>
<td>(8/8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses represent scores from the two raters.
Another method, discussed in several studies, was also able to indicate the progress in content. According to Akyrel & Kamish (1977) and Sasaki (2000), the length of draft (the numbers of words) is also an indicator of “fluency,” which often implies that students write more in content. In Table 4.7, the numbers of words written in pre-test and post-test are displayed.

### Table 4.7 The Numbers of Words in Pre-test and Post-test Drafts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Connie</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Ice</th>
<th>Sherry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four participants’ progress in content and organization of the two drafts were presented below, including the gained points/percentages of progress, an cross analysis to examine if there was any connection between revisions and two drafts, and a draft analysis to identify the progress in content and organization with Johnson’s indicators of content and organization. Finally, all of the findings were further corroborated with the interview results. The following will be presented from one case to another in order to present the abundance of data gathered.

**Connie’s Case**
The percentages of progress in Connie’s case shown in Table 4.7 were listed here in the order of weight: content (44%), organization (34%), grammar (15%), vocabulary (15%) and mechanics (10%). Concerning her multiple revisions in the four categories, the total numbers of changes were listed in the order of high-to-low: content changes (32), stylistic changes (29), surface changes (22) and structural changes (21). Connie’s significant progress in content and organization was probably achieved by paying constant attention to content and structural changes in multiple revisions. In the category of content, the progress in content in the post-test draft was positively correlated with the total number of content changes. Fluency, another indicator of content, was also achieved in Connie’s drafts (pre-test draft: 156 words; post-test draft: 180). And her structural changes, though ranked the last (21) in these categories, actually ranked the first [21>16 (Tina) >14 (Ice) >6 (Sherry)] among these four participants. In comparison, the progress in vocabulary (stylistic changes) didn’t seem to be so significant, though she had also made a lot of practice in multiple revisions.

Draft Analysis

**My personal Profile (Pre-test)**

My name is Connie, Wu. But it is not a familiar name to my classmates. They always call me “Bibi” in daily life because my Chinese name is Bi-Ru Wu. I live in a harmonious and happy family. My parents support me with all their mind and try to give me the best. My brother is 11 years older than me. He always takes good care of me since I was a little girl.

In addition to my family, I study in a interesting class in senior high school. I like to get along with them because I feel less stress and more comfortable there. Sometimes, I got to the library to study with my friends on weekends. It is a good place for me because the atmosphere there is pleasant and I feel we are pursuing a large goal together. I like this feeling very well and I hope I can achieve my dream successfully. (156 words)
This draft will be discussed in terms of content and organization. To begin with, two major content problems were found in Connie’s pre-test draft. One was that the draft provided insufficient personal information. The other was that details or explanations only led her draft to a wrong direction.

In the first paragraph, Connie mentioned her names and family. Although these details tried to give more information on her names and family, the information didn’t really explain what kind of person she was. The second paragraph even went to a wrong direction. That is, the whole 2nd paragraph described few things about her. First, she talked about her class without any effort to describe how interesting her class was. Later, she mentioned why she liked her classmates. Then out of a blue, she talked about her feelings of studying with friends in library. In the end, the mention of her future dream came out abruptly.

The content problems mentioned above also led to the poor organization. The major organization problems are badly written topic sentences and the malfunction of supporting sentences. First, the two topic sentences were not related to what the topic was about. To be worse, each of the two topic sentences failed to govern the main idea of each paragraph. The first topic sentence, “My name is Connie,” apparently didn’t cover the ideas of the first paragraph. The second topic sentence, “In addition to my family, I study in an interesting class in senior high school,” didn’t further explain what she was; instead, it led the draft to another topic: My class. Second, the supporting sentences lost its function of providing more information on the topic sentences. These supporting sentences led her draft to other irrelevant ideas one after another. Concerning the use of transition words, “in addition” was used, but not appropriately. In general, Connie’s “My personal profile” was a big failure because it
was unable to provide information on herself, such as hobbies, interests or her personality.

**My Best Friend (Post-test)**

Shelly is my best friend. She is a transferred student from other junior high schools. At first, we didn’t know each other at all. Because I couldn’t associate her name with her face, I seldom talked to her in the class. Not until she sat next to me did I know her. From then on, we talked pleased about our daily life, interests, and our family or private things. We shared both happy or sad things each other. Some of our classmates might be shocked by our great laughter.

The longer we spend together, the deeper I knew about her. She is an optimistic, energetic, and frank girl. For example, she always looks things on the bright side and tells me that we will success as long as we work hard. When I was depressed on my bad grades, she would leave alone and then talked a joke to me. Although she always corrects someone’s faults directly, she is a nice girl that she will pay all her heart to all of us. She is my best friend for life! (180 words)

(Topic sentences are underlined)

The content problems in the post-test draft were obviously fewer than those in the pre-test draft. The sentences, aiming to present details, explanation or examples, succeeded in providing the readers with the necessary plots or information on her best friend. In the first paragraph, these sentences (details) helped readers know how they met each other and became best friends later. In the second paragraph, Connie provided explanations or examples good enough to describe her best friend’s personality and philosophy of life.

The fewer content problems also led to the more tightly organized structure of the post-test draft. The supporting sentences, which included better written details, examples or explanation, supported the topic sentences well. The second topic sentence was written well enough to be a good introduction to the 2nd paragraph. By reading the topic sentence of 2nd paragraph, readers could anticipate that they were going to read about her best friend’s personality in the paragraph.
Connie’s significant progress in content and organization should be based on three things: the topic sentence (the main idea), supporting sentences (detail, example, explanation) and transition words. In the pre-test draft, Connie’s topic sentences were unable to introduce or summarize the main idea of that paragraph. However, in the post-test draft, the topic sentence of 2nd paragraph functioned as a good introduction to the upcoming narration. Connie also wrote better supporting sentences, which were able to provide sufficient details or proper examples. Moreover, she made good use of transition words. She used “at first” and “for example” to state the sequence of time or give examples. It is apparent that Connie used transition words with more accuracy. In Connie’s case, the progress in content and organization seemed to be positively correlated. In the interview with Connie, she confirmed that process writing did improve her content and organization. With constant practice in content changes, she knew how to enrich her content by giving examples or details. In brainstorming activities, she practiced how to organize her thoughts.

**Tina’s Case**

The percentages of progress in Tina’s case, shown in Table 4.7, were listed in the order of weight: content (34%), organization (34%), vocabulary (28%), grammar (25%) and mechanics (0%). Concerning her multiple revisions, the total numbers of changes by type were listed in the order of high-to-low: surface changes (36), content changes (23), stylistic changes (16) and structural changes (16). Without a doubt, the significant progress in content of these two drafts was probably made by paying constant attention to content changes in multiple revisions. Fluency, another indicator of content, was also achieved in Tina’s drafts (pre-test draft: 196 words; post-test draft: 202 words). The significant progress in organization was also achieved because Tina’s structural changes ranked the second among these four participants. Even though the
surface changes ranked first, they didn’t directly led to the progress in mechanics and grammar as significant as that in organization. In Connie’s case, the significant progress was made in content (44%) and organization (34%), while the progress in vocabulary (15%) and grammar (15%) was not so much. In comparison, Tina’s progress was more balanced because the percentages of progress in the four categories (content, organization, grammar and vocabulary) were over 25%.

Draft Analysis

My Personal Profile (Pre-test)

My name is Tina. I am seventeen now and I have lived in Taipei since I was born. I’m fond of sleeping a lot every day. Luckily, from the kindergarten to high school, it only takes me five to ten minutes to get to school. Sometimes, I feel bad because I don’t have the chance to visit and to know well with other place – the schools which I go to are so close to my house. But on the other hand, I feel great when I was really tired and eager to get back home.

Most of my friend and classmates would think I am just like a kid, not a high school student, because I’m not that tall, which is mean I’m pretty short. So I have a dream – that is to grow up like a tree. But it seems quite difficult to reach, so I just don’t think too much right now.

I like to sing and many things could make me laugh, so I’m always in a good mood. So do my family. As a result, I have a happy family and I wish to bring happiness to every one who knows me. (196 words)

(Topic sentences are underlined)

Tina had many inconsistent ideas in the pre-test draft. However, the jumping ideas didn’t go to a wrong direction. Most details mentioned in the pre-test draft were mainly about her.

In the first paragraph, Tina mentioned her name, the place she lived and her fondness for sleeping. She later complained that she had no chances to go to other places because her schools were always very close to her home, but living close to school was also a convenience when she was tired. Basically these ideas were not
well-connected either, but the links between sentences were stronger than those in Connie. She ingeniously connected the detail of her living place with her fondness for sleeping in the subsequent sentences. The second paragraph was mainly about her height. She described how small she looked and expressed her dream to grow taller. Unfortunately, these details were not placed in a logical order. The third paragraph talked about her hobbies and her personality and her hope to give happiness to people around her. In comparison, paragraph three might be the best part of her draft because the details or explanation were able to introduce what was coming next.

Even though Tina had few problems in content, it didn’t mean that her organization was fine. Two topic sentences were found respectively in paragraph 1 and 3, while the first sentence of paragraph 2 was not really a topic sentence. The good topic sentence only appeared in the third paragraph because it provided a good introduction to the rest of the sentences. However, the two other topic sentences didn’t function well. “My name is Tina” didn’t give any clue of what the reader was going to read. The failure to write a topic sentence in paragraph two made the readers unable to identify the main point of that paragraph. Actually, the content in paragraph 2 was good, but the order of expressions was awful. If “My dream was to grow up like a tree” was written as a topic sentence of paragraph 2, the organization of that paragraph will come out the best. Similar problems also existed in supporting sentences. She did provide details, explanations, or examples for supporting sentences, but the connection between these supporting sentences were not strong enough to explain the topic sentences. Besides, Tina used two transition words, “on the other hand” and “as a result” more properly than Connie. All in all, Tina’s “My personal profile” was full of detail, examples or explanation, but the poor arrangement of the content led to a problematic organization.
**My Best Friend (Post-test)**

Zhi Lin is my best friend. With a pair of big eye and a little chubby in shape, she is an optimistic and humorous girl. When we just came into the same class as freshmen, we didn’t know each other well. But after a series of school competitions, we became best friends. Practicing hard for the competition together, I found that we had a lot in common. For example, we all like sports and sings. Most importantly, we always laugh at the same things while others considered it not funny. It always gives me a feeling as if she’s the one who really knows me.

**Initiative and easy to get along with are another reasons why we are so match too.** Because when I get into a new place, I always don’t know how to start a conversation with others and stay silent. So, I’m very glad that she had came to talk to me first. Although we are not in the same class now, we still keep in touch constantly. We promises each other that through a year long hard-working time, we can get into the same university in the future. I will always remember the promise and do my best. (202 words)

(Topic sentences are underlined)

Compared with the pre-test, Tina’s post-test had fewer content problems. The details, and examples, commonly found in the draft, provided necessary information to support the ideas. In the first paragraph, details helped readers know how her best friend looked like, how they met and what made them become good friends. In the second paragraph, the ideas were many, but they were not always related. She gave an example to describe how her good friend’s personality helped her overcome shyness. However, the rest of the paragraph went to a wrong direction: their dream for the future.

Concerning Tina’s progress in organization, she used transition words appropriately, but she didn’t do so well in topic sentences and supporting sentences. The progress in organization was also discussed by analyzing topic sentences, supporting sentences and transition words. In the first paragraph, ideas were well arranged but the topic sentence was not good enough to govern the main idea of the whole paragraph. Even though there were some mistakes in word usage, the topic
sentence of 2nd paragraph did predict what readers were going to read. On the contrary, the supporting sentences of paragraph 1 were far better than those of paragraph 2. In paragraph two, after providing an example of how her friend came to her first, she wrote on another irrelevant topic: their dream of the future. The two transition words, “for example” and “most importantly,” were also used properly when giving examples or emphasizing her tone. To sum up, her skills in organizing these supporting sentences improved and the habit of writing a good topic sentence was developing.

To sum up, Tina made significant progress in content and organization. Regarding content, the details in some supporting sentences sometimes failed to keep the ideas sticking to the topic. In the interview, she confirmed the practices of doing multiple revisions also helped her develop ideas. Concerning organization, one of her topic sentence in the post-test draft proved that her ability to write a good topic sentence was developing. However, her use of transition words was still very good. In the interview, she said that she believed that brainstorming is necessary for a sound organization.

**Ice’s Case**

The percentages of progress in Ice’s case were shown in Table 4.7 in the order of weight: content (34%), organization (32%), vocabulary (25%), grammar (20%) and mechanics (10%). Concerning his multiple revisions in the four categories, the total numbers of changes by type were listed in the order of high-to-low: surface changes (29), stylistic changes (24), content changes (16) and structural changes (14). Ice’s progress was in the same order as Tina’s. He also made more balanced progress over 20%. Although the total numbers of content and structural changes ranked the third and fourth, Ice still made much progress in these two categories. Fluency, another indicator of content, was also achieved in Ice’s drafts (pre-test draft: 153 words;
post-test draft: 235 words). He ranked the first in the increase of words among these four participants. It may help explain why his progress on content ranked the first in the percentages of progress. Moreover, the constant practice in surface and stylistic changes did help Ice make progress in grammar and vocabulary as well. However, the order of these changes in multiple revisions didn’t positively correlate with that of the percentages of progress in the post-test draft.

Draft Analysis

My Personal Profile (Pre-test)

My name is Ice. I grow up in a common family. I have a father, a mother and a little sister. My father goes to work every day. My mother is a housewife. My little sister is a senior high school student, too. My mother teaches me that I have to study hard, because I am the only son in my family, and I have to support our family in the future.

The senior high school which I study is Cheng Yuan High School. I chose this high school results from my uncle’s suggest. I learn many difficult subjects and recognize many friends in this school. I wish I can get into a good university. I do my best to study for reaching my goal, being a judge. I want to perform the justice for the world. I hope my family in the future will be happy and fortune due to my efforts. (235 words)

(Topic sentences are underlined)

Ice had two kinds of content problems: too many random thoughts and little personal information. In the first paragraph, he introduced his family members and his parents’ expectation. Except for his name, no personal information was disclosed. In the second paragraph, he talked about his high school life and his hope for the future. Again, nothing was mentioned about his hobbies, interest or personality. Details, examples or explanation in “My personal profile” didn’t provide any necessary personal information, not to mention providing a support for the main idea.

Other than the irrelevant content, the draft was also loosely structured without a
sense of organization in mind. The topic sentences in “My personal profile” were unable to give a summary of a paragraph. Supporting sentences didn’t provide more details and further explanation, either. And transition words were not found. In brief, the arrangement of sentences proved that he didn’t know what organization was.

**My Best Friend (Post-test)**

No doubt, my best friends are Chun-Chi and Kuei-Feng. Because they are my best friends, my senior high school life is very brilliant. What make me and Chun-Chi become friends is online-game. In the beginning of the second year of my high school, I felt lonely, because there wasn’t any friends in the class. Soon after, I occasionally heard that we played the same online-game. I began to talk to him, and gradually became good friends. Kuei-Feng is Chun-Chi’s friend at first. Through Chun-Chi, I made friends with Kuei-Feng, and found he is an easygoing and outgoing person. To date, he becomes my best friend, too.

Both Chun-Chi and Kuei-Feng console me when I feel frustrated, and correct my behavior. After second mock exam, I was very sad. Because my grade was not well, Kuei encouraged me, and said, “The next time will be better.” When I heard this sentence, a warm feeling surged out my heart. Kuei’s suggestion resulted in my courage. Recently, I said something that will hurt somebody, but I did not know. One night, Chun-Chi corrected my mistake on Messenger. At that time I was shocked, I did not really know that I had hurt somebody. He taught me that I had to note more about my words and deeds, and that I should make an apology. Both of them are my best friends and also good brothers. I will value our friendship. (235 words)

(Topic sentences are underlined)

On the contrary, the content of “My best friend” not only presented the main idea more clearly but also provided more details, examples or explanation. The details in the first paragraph successfully explained how he knew his two best friends through online games. In the second paragraph, he provided two examples of how his best friends treated him when he was sad or did something wrong. In general, these sentences were more related to the main idea.

Likewise, the two topic sentences in “My best friend” (the post-test draft) were
ingeniously written to summarize these two paragraphs respectively. Unlike Tina and Connie, Ice took time thinking up complicated and meaningful topic sentences and the efforts proved worthwhile. Moreover, two features differentiated Ice’s post-test draft from the others’. One feature was that he used timeline to describe an event. This way, the readers felt like reading a story or being placed in the scenario through his words. Besides, these supporting sentences, described in the order of time, were closely connected. The second feature was that he wrote good conclusive sentences to conclude how he saw their friendship. Still, there was no sign of transition words, but he started to use adverbs (example: no doubt) to emphasize his points.

Overall, Ice’s progress in content and organization were the greatest of these four participants for three features. First, the topic sentences were meticulously written; second, the post-test draft was narrated in a timeline, and best of all, he wrote conclusive sentences as well. Based on these three features and a good structure, the content was delivered in a systematic way. In the interview, he revealed that brainstorming was a big helper. He said that he developed a habit of doing brainstorming before writing, though he used to jot down his ideas on paper before taking this class. Most important of all, he did the brainstorming based on the structure of essay: introduction → body → conclusion. He further added that he spent an average of 20 minutes on brainstorming and he re-read many times to make sure the sentences were well-connected. Compared with the other participants, he spent more time on brainstorming. Apparently, spending a certain amount of time on brainstorming and having the habit of re-reading the previous sentences helped him make progress in organization and content at the same time.

Sherry’s Case

The percentages of progress in Sherry’s case were listed in the order of weight:
content (28%), organization (20%), vocabulary (20%), grammar (20%) and mechanics (10%). One thing worthy of note is that Shelly made equal percentage of progress in three categories: organization, vocabulary and grammar. Concerning her multiple revisions in the four categories, the total numbers of changes by type were listed in the order of high-to-low: surface changes (44), stylistic changes (26), content changes (16) and structural changes (6). Sherry also made balanced progress in the four categories (over 20%), but her growth of progress wasn’t as large as Ice’s and Tina’s. Like Ice, Sherry’s order of these changes in multiple revisions didn’t positively correlate with the percentages of progress in the post-test draft. The surface changes ranked the first, but the progress in grammar didn’t seem to rank accordingly. Though her total number of content changes ranked the third, the progress in content ranked the first. Fluency, another indicator of content, was also achieved in Sherry’s drafts (pre-test draft: 163 words; post-test draft: 230 words). She ranked the second in the increase of words among these four participants. It may help explain why her progress in content ranked the first in the percentages of progress even though the total number of content changes only ranked third in her multiple revisions. Concerning organization, Sherry made the least structural changes of these four participants, and thus her progress in organization wasn’t so much as the other three participants’.

Draft Analysis

My Personal Profile (Pre-test)

My name is Sherry Chang. I’m an ordinary seven years old girl and have a positive attitude toward life. I have been lived in Nei-hu since I was born, and I am an only daughter in my family, so my parents are high expected on me.

I have two interests, one is playing electric guitar, I had learn it for two years but I have temporary stopped it to prepare for the big exam next year; the other one is singing, although my voice isn’t as beautiful as any singer, I still love to sing good songs, they can deeply affect my emotion, as I am depression
or frustration, an positive song can make me delight and find my enthusiasm to the future again.

I also love to think about my future, and I want to have a job relates to foreign language, but I’m still not good enough in English, so I hope that I can keep processing in my school life. (163 words)

(Topic sentences are underlined)

Comparatively speaking, Sherry wrote a far better pre-test draft than the other three participants. The fact that her score on the pre-test draft beat the other three participants in content, organization, grammar and vocabulary also supported this point. Generally speaking, the details, examples or explanation successfully provided a general picture of who she was, what she liked and what she wanted to do. Compared with the other two paragraphs, the first paragraph had some random thoughts because the details were not always related to one another.

Aside from the minor punctuation problem that she often used comma at the end of sentence, the topic sentences were so well-written that they provided an overview of what the reader was going to read. Details in supporting sentences were often closely connected, except for several bad examples in the first paragraph. No transition word was found. Overall, Sherry was equipped with a general idea of content and organization.

My Best Friend (Post-test)

A person could meet a lot of friends in his or her life, but the best there is only one. My best friend is my cram school classmate – Shi-Pei, who was also called “Pei-pei”. I was too shy to talk to others actively while I was a elementary school student, so I always sat alone silently in the cram school. Sometimes she sat beside me and told me some funny jokes or interesting things in her daily life to make me happy, and she also encouraged me to talk to others. Gradually, I was deeply affected by her passionate personality and became an outgoing girl. We have known each other for ten years; and our friendship is as good as the beginning! Thanks to her that I can deal with others easily and make many good friends.
What I learned from Pei-pei is that we must have strong passions when making friends and often care for our friends with considerate thoughts. When our friends in need or at a loss or even in despair, we should reach out to them, give them proper advice or encouragements. The best way to keep friendships to me is also my most grateful part for Pei-pei that she never gave up on me and she always helped me without hesitation. With strong gratitude, I decide to be a mercy and passionate girl like her. (230 words)

(Topic sentences are underlined)

Based on the fact that Sherry had a general idea of content and organization while writing the pre-test draft, the progress in content and organization in “My best friend” was indicated in a more sophisticated narrative skill. Concerning the content, details, examples or explanation were presented in a proper but complicated description to introduce how they became friends, how they got along, how her friend helped her overcome shyness and finally her gratitude.

Regarding organization, the topic sentences seemed to be written with some efforts. What’s more, her topic sentence of 2nd paragraph didn’t only refer to her friend’s personality but also expressed her own view about friendship. However, the links between supporting sentences were not as strong as Ice’s. Still, there was no sight of transition word.

Of these four participants, Sherry was the only one equipped with the concept of content and organization while writing the pre-test draft. The fewer problems in content and organization may explain why Sherry didn’t make progress in these two categories as significant as the other participants. In her post-test draft, a unique narrative skill was developing though the organization didn’t improve as much. In a word, Sherry’s strong suit lay in content. In the interview, she admitted that she only spent 10 minutes on brainstorming and she seldom re-read to check the cohesion between sentences. Again, the time spent on brainstorming and the habit of re-reading
decided why her organization was weaker than Ice’s.

To conclude, two findings were discovered on how much blog-mediated process writing class contributed to the development of students’ writing ability in content and organization were displayed. First, blog-mediated process writing helped students achieve the greatest progress in content and the progress in organization was placed the second. Second, the preference for making some type of changes didn’t always positively correlate with its percentages of progress. For example, Sherry’s surface changes ranked the first, but her progress in grammar and mechanics didn’t rank accordingly. Third, fluency was found in these four participants and the greatest increase in words also raised the percentage of progress in content. Data obtained from the draft analysis also corroborated the finding that the progress in content and organization were improving. The habit of writing a topic sentence (the main idea) was developing and most of their supporting sentences contained the topic-related ideas (details, examples and explanation). However, the use of transition words was not so common either in the pre-test and post-test drafts. In the interviews, they all ascertained the findings and approved that blog-mediated process writing did help them the most on content and organization. However, different participants made progress in different categories. For example, Ice improved both content and organization; Sherry beat the others in content and Connie and Tina were starting to write better topic sentences.

Other than significant progress in content and organization, these four participants made progress in grammar and vocabulary as well. There were two possible explanations: error marking on the draft and the context of computer lab. To encourage students’ active learning, error marking methods replaced the traditional red-pen correction. These marked errors on the draft provided students with chances
to solve problems collaboratively or individually. On the other hand, designed as a process writing class with the integration of blog, the class was taught in a computer lab; when doing revisions, it was evitable that these students made the best use of online resources or Microsoft Word. The interviews with these four participants corroborated the teacher’s speculation. First, they confirmed that the error marking method did force them to be active learners. Through discussion with peers or search for answers online, their knowledge of vocabulary and grammar increased or was reinforced. They also mentioned that these revisions were typed first in the environment of Microsoft Word, whose grammar and spelling checkers reminded them to fix grammar and spelling errors.

4.3 Research Question 3: How does blog help students in each step (pre-writing, drafting, revising/editing and publishing) of process writing?

According to the data gathered in the interviews, the class blog offered these following things in each step of the writing process: 1) links to both the online resources and the collection of old essays in pre-writing, 2) a collection of old essays for inspiration while drafting, 3) spelling check function and formats indispensable for editing and revising, and 4) a medium to share their essays with their friends in the cyberspace.

Pre-writing

In pre-writing stage, the class blog served as an information provider. On the right side bar, Links to other websites helped these participants to look up words in several online dictionaries (the most frequently used one is Google Dictionary) or search for information on related websites (e.g.: Kelly’s Star Signs & Behind the Names). Also, a click on Label on the blog connected them to a collection of old
essays written by the researcher’s former students. A variety of information resources on the blog helped them to build up the framework of brainstorming.

**Drafting**

Even in drafting, the collection of old essays on the blog offered these participants some ideas of difficult expression or of how to organize their thoughts if they were experiencing a writer’s block. These four participants agreed that most of the narration in the old essays was very similar or close to their living experiences and thus inspired them a lot.

**Revising/Editing**

From the interviews with the participants, the class blog were said to be useful in revising and editing their essays. The word editing function helped them to correct spelling errors and mark the changes in the multiple revisions in different colors. This way, they could see how different the multiple revisions were from the original drafts. Furthermore, their multiple revisions (R1, R2 and R3) on each topic were piled up to fit the reverse chronological order, thus offering them an easy reference to their writing process.

**Publishing**

When asked if the blog was a good medium to publish their essays, they expressed their satisfaction with this function. They further explained how reluctant and embarrassed they felt at first when told to post these personally related essays on the blog. However, since everyone was required to do so and they could thus read others’ essays, they gradually found blog an easy-to-access forum to share essays with others. What’s more, through publication, they shared each other’s revisions and leave
comments, thus getting inspiration for making the next revisions. Ice’s account below explained the benefit of publishing on the blog very well.

After publishing essays on the blog, I can invite friends to give comments. If these essays were written on paper, I won’t be able to show them to so many of my friends and ask for their comments as well.”

(From the 1st paired interview with Ice and Sherry, April 27th, 2010)

In a word, the publication function on the blog expanded the audience to many, not just the teacher any more. After reading each other’s essays, they often left comments, and thus another form of communication appeared. The two emerging phenomena, “audience” and “commenting,” will be discussed respectively in “the nature of blog-mediated process writing” and “the commenting function on the blog.”

4.4 Research Question 4: What challenges are involved and what kind of teacher support is needed in the blog-mediated process writing class?

From the teacher’s logs, several students seemed bored with doing revision 3 (R3). Connie and Tina both confirmed my speculation. Since they fixed most of the errors in R1, they found R3 redundant. (Even so, sometimes the total numbers in Tina’s R3 outnumbered R2.) Three revisions seemed too overwhelming and too repetitive. Ice also expressed a similar view. Sherry was the only one who didn’t experience burnout or exhaustion. She claimed she really enjoyed writing so much that she didn’t mind doing three revisions.

However, a student’s repulsive attitude toward multiple revisions might change as well. At first, Ice was very reluctant to do multiple revisions. After several topics, he started to feel a sense of satisfaction when seeing his progress in the piled up multiple revisions on the class blog. Meanwhile, the more topics he wrote, the less time he would spend on revisions. The following excerpt from Ice’s statement
described how the hassle of doing multiple revisions became a source of joy where he found a sense of achievement.

At first, I really hated doing so many revisions because I thought it was a waste of time to do so. I would rather spend the time on the other subjects. However, I feel a sense of achievement when seeing my revision become longer and longer.

(From the 2nd paired interview with Ice and Sherry, May 5, 2010)

Obviously, these four participants held different views on the number of revisions. Thus, the issues seem unresolved because of their varied opinions. It seems that it is impossible to make everyone happy about the number of revision. The researcher suggested that a minimal number be set up but more revisions be encouraged as well.

As for the teacher support, all of them, except Tina, agreed that it would help them a lot if there were a teacher-student mini conference. They suggested that the conference be scheduled after the peer review so that they could consult with the teacher on those problems they could not solve with their peers. Sherry explained why she would like to have a teacher-student conference.

I would like to have a teacher-student conference. Even though it may last only for a couple of minutes, this mini conference can make me feel the teacher focuses only on me in the face-to-face communication.

(From a class break, May 13th, 2010)

However, Tina held a different view on this matter, thinking it was unnecessary to set up a teach-student conference because the conference would be very likely to become a routine. She believed that most students would turn to the teacher for help if they had any questions. Through the researcher’s observation, Tina seemed very timid and shy if the teacher was around. An excerpt from the interview may well explain why Tina preferred not to have a teacher-student mini conference.
It’s really my personal problem. I get extremely nervous when asking the teacher questions. I feel the same way asking all of the teachers, not just you alone. I feel there is a distance between students and the teacher, so I would rather deal with problems by myself.

(From the 1st paired interview with Connie and Tina, May 4th, 2010)

4.5 Research Question 5: What are students’ attitudes toward writing after taking the blog-mediated process writing class?

Table 4.8 Results on Writing Attitude Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Confidence (10-question items)</th>
<th>Anxiety (8-question items)</th>
<th>Usefulness (9-question items)</th>
<th>Preference (9-question items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Ice</td>
<td>Sherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.7)</td>
<td>(2.8)</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values enclosed in parentheses are the mean scores
Before and after the semester-long writing class, the four participants were asked twice to fill out the same questionnaire concerning the writing attitude as the pre-test and post-test questionnaires respectively. The questionnaire results could help the researcher further analyze if these four participants experienced any attitude change in four categories: confidence, anxiety, usefulness and preference. Since the thirty-six question items were randomly listed, the results should be more likely to reflect what these participants were actually thinking of (See Table 4.8). These data on attitude changes, gathered from the questionnaires and the interviews, will be discussed case by case. Since every category had different number of question items, the mean scores became the main reference for the discussion of attitude changes. For the convenience of reference, the difference scores between pre-test and post-test questionnaires are listed in Table 4.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Connie</th>
<th>Tina</th>
<th>Ice</th>
<th>Sherry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>-0.875</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Connie’s Case**

According to the questionnaire results, Connie had positive attitude changes in the categories of anxiety (-0.875), usefulness (0.11) and preference (0.45). The anxiety decreased the most, while preference ranked the second and a slight rise in usefulness. In the interview, Connie confirmed that blog-mediated process writing improved her writing speed and thus she felt more confidence in writing. She still felt
nervous, but the degree of anxiety decreased. Since the preference was enhanced, the teacher asked her where else she wrote English. She responded that she wrote English on more occasions. For example, in regular English classes, she wrote down a series of English words for the definition of new word instead of the corresponding Chinese translation.

**Tina’s Case**

The questionnaire results revealed that Connie had slightly positive attitude changes in anxiety (-0.125) and preference (0.22). Intriguingly, her confidence decreased (-0.8) and useful remained the same. When asked why she had less confidence at the end of semester, she responded that she felt that way because she now knew writing wasn’t that simple. In other words, after acquiring some writing skills in this class, it seems that she starts to feel that she isn’t really that good.

**Ice’s Case**

According to the questionnaire results, Ice had huge positive attitude changes in the four categories: confidence (0.9), preference (0.77), anxiety (-0.5) and usefulness (0.22). His attitude toward these categories was revealed in several excerpts of the interview. First, he talked about confidence and anxiety.

My confidence increases a lot. I used to have great dread of writing essays, and I was unable to write any essays. After taking this class, I can write one and know how to think up more ideas. Anxiety decreases when I find that I can finish an essay on time. At first, I was unable to do so. For example, I couldn’t finish my first essay on time, but after writing several more, I can manage to write an essay in one hour now.”

(From the 2nd paired interview with Ice and Sherry, May 4th, 2010)

Second, usefulness was mentioned.
As for the usefulness, I guess writing might be useful in the future job; in addition to the practical purpose, we have to write an essay on entrance exams.

(From the 2nd paired interview with Ice and Sherry, May 4th, 2010)

Last, he also expressed how the increase of preference led him to use more English outside the context of school.

After taking this class, I start to expose myself to English more. At First, I would rather avoid English, but now I start to expose myself to all-English content. When I bump into English websites, I will go on to read the content. We visited the websites of “Kelly’s Star Signs” and “Behind the Name” in class and that was not as difficult as I had thought. Now I won’t get as afraid as before. Sometime when I talked to friend on MSN or publish an entry in my blog, I would write in English.

(From the 2nd paired interview with Ice and Sherry, May 4th, 2010)

As a straight “A” student, Ice used to see English as a subject. His preference for English might be the lowest of these four participants. The only reason for him to take this class is to have more chances practicing English writing outside the regular English class. However, his attitude change in the category of preference was so enormous that he was starting to use English on MSN. It could be seen as an amazing change for a Chinese student whose Chinese typing is much faster than his English typing.

Sherry’s Case

One the contrary, Sherry had negative results in these four categories: preference (-0.44), confidence (-0.3), anxiety (0.25) and usefulness (-0.22). When informed of the questionnaire results, Sherry was shocked and unable to explain what happened. She felt very puzzled why the questionnaire was unable to reflect her real thoughts. Since the questionnaire was confirmed invalid, the researcher tried to get more
reliable information in the interview. At first, she explained her real feelings about these categories.

I don’t know why I get these weird results. Actually I have more confidence after taking this class. I used to hate writing essays. I was so afraid back then, because I didn’t know how to write one. Approximately in the mid semester, my attitude changed because I could see my progress through my grade on the drafts.

(From the 2nd paired interview with Ice and Sherry, May 4th, 2010)

Later, she talked about why she felt so much anxiety.

I guess it is because I feel a lot of time pressure. My essays are long and I am often the last to hand in. When I see my classmates finish writing, I get more anxious. I feel inferior because I can’t finish my essay as fast as they do.

(From the 2nd paired interview with Ice and Sherry, May 4th, 2010)

Then, she talked about her preference for writing.

To be honest, I always love studying English and I never mind if I have to spend much time on it. Sometimes I may have to write three essays in a week, one in this writing class, another in regular English class, and the other in cram school, but I never get burned out or annoyed. I love writing particularly after taking this class. At first I had great dread of writing, but gradually I love writing in English in particular.

(From the 2nd paired interview with Ice and Sherry, May 4th, 2010)

She further explained why she favored writing over the other three skills (listening, speaking and reading).

I guess it is because writing is a way to express my feelings and it is fun trying to express myself in English. I do a lot of reading in class, but I didn’t write any until taking this class. After several practices, I have more confidence in writing. I guess these practices also help me like writing more. Another reason is my personality. I get extremely nervous and my mind goes blank when I have to speak in English and I cannot correct what I say once it is spoken out. But writing is different, I have enough time and many chances to revise what I want to express. I feel more comfortable and less stressed while writing in English.

(From the 2nd paired interview with Ice and Sherry, May 4th, 2010)
In short, these four participants all had positive attitude changes in the four categories, though sometimes their answers to the questionnaire didn’t always reflect their real attitude. Other than providing four categories, the questionnaire seemed a little redundant in data collection. The direct interviews proved to gather more authentic and real responses from these participants. One thing worthy of note was the slight positive attitude change in the category of usefulness. This result was predictable based on the fact that these four participants chose to be enrolled in this writing class. They must have believed that English writing could be useful; otherwise, they would have chosen another elective course instead.

4.6 Research Question 6: What other findings can be derived from this blog-mediated process writing class in term of the context of the classroom?

The context of blog-mediated process writing class also offered some interesting findings. Through the teacher’s logs and data gathered from the interviews, the researcher discussed the findings in terms of these six aspects: 1) the comparison of usefulness among peer editing sheets, checklists and journals, 2) the commenting function of the blog, 3) attitude toward errors, 4) the nature of blog-mediated writing class – workshop format, 5) the learner type, and 6) the writing process – re-reading and “thinking in English.”

4.6.1 The Comparison of Usefulness among Peer Editing Sheets, Checklists and Journals

To facilitate the process of making revisions, peer editing sheets, checklists and journals were provided. In R1, students needed to finish peer editing sheets, which helped them to revise the draft with the peer, and write a journal, in which they reflect on their writing process. To keep participants on the right track, checklists specifically
designed to focus on content and organization were offered in R2 to help them find out what is missing in R1.

When asked about the importance and necessities of these three in this class, these participants’ opinions varied. Connie preferred journal over editing sheet, and the checklist couldn’t help her identify her content or organization problems. Tina agreed with Connie. Ice voted for checklist, which helped to spot content and organization problems, and journal, in which he documented his writing process. Sherry seconded the value of checklist but disapproved the significance of journal. When asked to choose the most indispensable, they chose journals without objection.

For Connie and Tina, a list of content and organization checkers on the checklist didn’t help them identify content and organization problems in their essays. For Ice and Sherry, the peer editing sheet was not functional because most of the time peers only helped them with surface changes, which they could easily fix without outside help.

All of them agreed that writing English journals helped them develop their writing ability. By answering these questions listed in the guideline to the journal, they reviewed their writing process again and hence making revisions became less difficult. All in all, they thought writing journals could be kept while the other two abolished. It seems that more explanation and training sessions are required if the peer review and checklist are to be incorporated into the writing class.

4.6. 2 The Commenting Function of the Blog

Chatting became the main function of commenting. The researcher informed these four participants to make revision-related comments on the blog, nevertheless, the commenting still went toward another direction: chatting. At first, some of them did offer revision-related suggestions. Before long, their comments were more like
chatting, even though these comments did reveal the fact that they had read the essays. Tina’s explanation might speak out what was on their mind. She thought it was not her position or found it inappropriate to pick out errors lest she should hurt her friends’ feelings. Her explanation just echoed the findings in a study conducted by Carson & Nelson (1994), which indicated that Chinese students were reluctant to criticize peers because of the specific culture.

When asked if they also made comments for someone from other classes, they said they did not do so because it was odd to talk to a stranger on the blog. Besides, the commenting gradually became one of their ways to talk to friends outside the class. Sherry reported how she felt about commenting:

I find it fun to make comments. Their comments were made according to the content of our essays. So it’s not only casual chatting. It becomes a way of communication to help us express our opinions on others’ essays.

(From 2nd paired interview with Ice and Sherry, May 5, 2010)

Other than chatting, these comments still offered them some ideas of how to revise the content of essays. For example, one of his classmates asked Ice how he got his nickname in the comment. So, Ice decided to add a paragraph on his nickname in the essay of “What’s in my name.” Since blog could be accessible to everyone in the class, Sherry added a paragraph on her nickname as well. In short, it appears that commenting serves not only as a communication forum but also a source to get more ideas, which might be used in revisions.

4.6.3 Attitude toward Errors

Since L2 and EFL learners write for different purposes, their attitudes toward errors varied as well. Based on Barnett’s concept (1989) that too much red-pen correction might interrupt students’ flow of thought, process writing has deliberately
overlooked errors to fit the spirit of stress on content over form (Badger & White, 2000). However, these four EFL learners believed that form should be as important as meaning. They argued that even though the content and organization were fine, people might still have problems understanding their essays if there were too many grammar and vocabulary errors. Writing in the L1 or L2 context may be seen as “a process of discovering meaning” while that in the EFL context is more academically oriented.

Tina’s narration depicted their attitude toward errors:

I count on the teacher to pick out errors for me, though I myself can also do that once in a while. At least the teacher should circle these errors. I guess I can fix them by myself. To me, it’s very important to correct these errors. I don’t mind if my drafts are full of red-penned marks. These marks don’t bother me at all. It’s an inevitable process. I won’t feel that my flow of thought is interrupted at all or I may lose my confidence in writing. These errors marked with UCI correction symbols are indispensable in correcting grammar and vocabulary mistakes. We want all of these four categories covered. Otherwise, people won’t be able to understand what I want to express in my writing.”

(From the 2nd paired interview with Connie and Tina, May 11th, 2010)

However, when asked what suggestions they would like the teacher to offer on their essays, they all responded that it had better be related to the content and organization. A possible explanation is that they need more guidance on content and organization than on grammar and vocabulary, both of which they can easily acquire in a regular writing class. Apparently, these students who used to focus on form were starting to shift their focus on meaning instead. This focus shift to meaning was another significant finding to these EFL learners, who have received English education emphasizing form over the meaning.

4.6.4 The Nature of Blog-mediated Writing Class - Workshop Format

Given that many variables interacted with each other in this class, the differences
between a regular writing class and this blog-mediated process writing class were also enquired in the interviews to clarify the nature of blog-mediated writing class. They all agreed that there were many striking differences between these two. For the convenience of comparison, these differences are listed in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10 Regular Class vs. blog-mediated Process Writing Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular Writing class</th>
<th>Blog-mediated Process Writing Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time limit</td>
<td>20-30 minutes</td>
<td>one hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>collaborative or individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision</td>
<td>none or one</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error corrected</td>
<td>corrected</td>
<td>marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>paper</td>
<td>paper or online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>few</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>the teacher</td>
<td>the whole class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Designed in the workshop format, the blog-mediated process writing class presented many advantages. At the beginning of the class, the teacher offered a topic or instruction on the content and organization. For the rest of time, students chose to work individually or interactively. Most important of all, students became active learners while fixing errors or doing class activities.

Once the essays were posted online, the audience was expanded from the teacher to the whole class and thus the opportunity of interaction increased and more comments poured in. The following excerpts of the interviews with these four participants gave many concrete differences between these two kinds of classes.

In a regular class, we just write according to picture prompts or guidance lines, but in this class, we have more resources. I can also discuss with classmates more often and the time for writing is longer. And we need to do several revisions in this class.
We have more resources in this class because we have this class in the computer lab. We have easy access to online resources and we also have time discussing with classmates and reading more essays.

(Interview with Tina on May 4th, 2010)

In a regular class, I write one draft with one revision and then get my grade. After that, I just leave it behind. But in process writing, I have to do multiple revisions which make me think of more ideas to perfect my revisions.

(Interview with Sherry on April 27th May 5, 2010)

In a regular class, I only copy down the teacher’s corrections. I won’t read it over and over again. The process writing makes me think more.

(Interview with Ice on April 27th May 5, 2010)

When asked if the process writing eventually helped them in the regular writing class, they all offered an affirmative answer. Three of them, except for Sherry, applied the ideas they had come up with in the process writing class to the regular English class even though the topics were different. They believed that their essays became more organized because they gradually developed the habit of doing brainstorming before writing. If time permitted, they might as well write one topic sentence for each paragraph. And their responses once again confirmed the finding on the first research question in which students writing ability improved in content the most.

4.6.5 The Learner Types

Gender differences and personality traits may also determine what type of learners these four participants were. It seems that the females preferred collaboration while the males only favored the solitary study. When asked if they discussed with
peers in the peer review, three female participants said they often did so, but Ice, the only male student, provided a negative answer because he preferred to solve problems by himself. He also believed that the checklist was more useful than peer editing sheet concerning the content and organization problems. On the contrary, these female students were more likely to solve problems by collaborating or interacting with peers. It appears that the gender difference determines what strategies they would take when they encountered problems. Gender difference also decided what features these participants’ essays had. Although Ice was the only students who didn’t go to cram school, his essays were best of all because of his strong ability in organization. The reason why he had a stronger organization skill deserved a further study, but it is generally believed that men were more inclined to be logical and organized.

Different personality trait also decided what measure they took if they were facing problems beyond their capacity. When asked if they would turn to the teacher for help, they said they could if they had to. In Taiwan, the teacher is still regarded as the sole authority in the classroom, and it is more and more common that students behave well but seldom ask the teacher any questions in class. Nevertheless, Tina presented a different perspective on this matter. She admitted that, instead of asking for the teacher for answers, she preferred to solve problems by herself or through discussion with others. Tina believed the way of searching for possible solutions without the teacher’s help was another form of learning. Here is the excerpt from the interview:

I prefer finding possible solutions by myself. If I come up with the answer, I will remember it longer. The answer I have sought for will be more likely to become part of my knowledge. If the teacher just tells me the answer, I will forget it very soon. Even though sometimes I don’t come across the right answer, it’s fine with me. Finding solutions is another form of training. I still benefit a lot from the process. Asking for the teacher’s help is a way to learn, but finding a solution by myself is still another way. There is no right or wrong here.
(From the 1st paired interview with Connie & Tina, May 4th, 2010)

Clearly, Tina and Ice were more independent learners, who preferred to take things into their own hands, while the other two were more like cooperative learners, who liked to get outside help. Their personality trait determined how they developed their individual writing process in this writing class.

From the researcher’s observation, these four participants also had some other features that made them different from each other. Connie was the hardworking type because she always spent long hour working on revision. Tina seemed absent-minded, but she had her own perspective on learning. Sherry saw writing as a fun thing because she never got tired of making revisions. Contrary to these girl students, Ice didn’t have such enthusiasm for English. He took this course out of pragmatic purpose. Unlike these three girls, who also took English classes or write English essays in cram school, Ice only received English education at school. Besides, Ice was not so willing to spend more time studying English as these three girls, so he never wrote outside the school. Ironically, his essays were often the best of all because he was so good at content and organization that his essays were very logical. It appears that enthusiasm doesn’t guarantee the success in this writing class. Some were born writers, while others might only make limited progress.

4.6.6 The Writing Process

Concerning the thinking progress, two matters will be covered: whether participants re-read what they had written while drafting and the new “thinking in English.”

Raimes (1985) found that writers often re-read their drafts to try out possible ideas. Re-reading what they had written was seen as a way of “paying attention to
what is still vague and unclear (Perl, 1984). In this study, whether these four participants would re-read what they had written was investigated. When asked if they often re-read their draft while writing, all of them gave a positive answer except Sherry. When asked why, Ice and the other two girls said that they re-read in order to make sure the next sentence was closely connected with the previous one. Instead, Sherry seldom re-read what she had written. Different from others, she read old essays on the blog for inspiration if she had problems thinking up the next sentence. The habit of re-reading explained why Ice’s essays were well-organized while Sherry’s were rich in content but loose in structure.

One last thing worthy of note is the new emergence of “thinking in English.” Leki (1990) summarized that “the shifting to L1 can be a very useful strategy for generating ideas and stimulating more complex thinking in L2.” When asked if they translated ideas from L1 to L2, they admitted that they did think up the content in Chinese first and translated their thoughts into English later. However, in the middle of the semester, the percentage of translation decreased but thinking in English increased. The percentages of “thinking in English” in these participants were said to range from 30-50% respectively. It is suggested that the new “thinking in English” results from the constant writing practice and large exposure to English content. With a large amount of vocabulary input through extensive readings in regular English classes and the constant writing practice in this class, it seems that the second language acquisition was starting to be internalized and integrated in their mind. However, a further study is still needed to verify which acting factor brings “thinking in English” into play.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION

This study discovered a series of findings by answering the six research questions. Basically structured on the major findings in Chapter Four, the chapter is divided into four sections. First, the findings are summarized and discussed, and then the pedagogical implications are provided. Later, the limitations of this study and recommendations for further studies are also discussed.

5.1 Summary of the Findings and Discussion

The blog-mediated process writing class was mainly instructed through the process writing model (pre-writing, drafting, revising/editing and publishing), coupled with process writing related activities or tools (brainstorming, self-reflection journal, peer review and portfolio) in the mediation of blog. Based on the abundance of data gathered from the blog-mediated process writing class, this case study investigated the following: 1) types of changes these students made in the multiple revisions in the blog-mediated process writing class, 2) how these four EFL 12th graders developed their writing ability in a semester-long blog-mediated process writing class, 3) how the blog helped them in each step of process writing model, 4) what the challenges they faced and what teacher support they would need, 5) their attitude toward writing, and 6) other findings derived from the blog-mediated process writing class in term of the context.

5.1.1 Research Question One

From the revision analysis, this researcher came up with the two following
findings: the tendency to decrease and the revision preference. First, the tendency to decrease showed which revision was the center of attention. For example, a sharp drop in the tendency to decrease between two revisions showed that the writer’s attention decreased as the number of revision increased. To be more specifically, these four participants made the most changes in R1, less changes in R2 and the least changes in R3. Moreover, the tendency to decrease in the multiple revisions also implied how many revisions were tolerable to these EFL writers. Second, the revision preference divided them into two types of writers: bold writers and conservative writers. Bold writers preferred making changes in the four categories while conservative writers favored making surface or stylistic changes.

The finding concerning the tendency to decrease in the multiple revisions seemed to be quite contrary to Yagelski’s finding that his L1 writers made more changes in R2 than in R1. However, the difference between the two studies required a closer examination. In Yagelski’s study, R1 was made according to the peers’ feedback while R2 was made based on the teacher’s feedback. Since students tended to value the teacher’s feedback more highly (Hu, 2005; Jacob et al., 1998; Tsui & Ng, 2000), it was not unexpected that they made more changes in R2. On the contrary, R1 in this study was made based on the teacher’s feedback on the drafts plus the suggestions from a peer review. The combination of two kinds of feedback logically explained why the four participants made most changes in R1. In a sense, the total numbers of these multiple revisions in these two studies couldn’t be compared because students in these two studies had different types of revision reference.

The finding of revision preference was also contrary to Yagelski’s study (1995), whose L1 writers tended to make more surface (31%) and stylistic (50.7%) changes than structural (4.2%) and content (14.1%) changes. However, in this study, the four participants fell into two types of writers: the conservative writers, who preferred
making surface and stylistic changes and bold writers, who favored making four types of changes. Since the numbers of participants and revision in Yagelski’s study outnumbered those in the present study (Yagelski: 21 students with 154 revisions; this study: 4 students with 48 revisions), it was not surprising that Yagelski noticed the existence of a trend that most students favored making surface and stylistic changes. If more cases were covered in this present study, it might be likely that the researcher also came up with the same result as found by Yagelski.

5.1.2 Research Question Two

Aiming to find out how much the weblog-mediated process writing class contributed to the development of students’ writing ability in content and organization, this study discovered three findings: 1) blog-mediated process writing offered the greatest progress in content and organization, 2) the total numbers of changes by types in revisions didn’t always positively correlate with the percentages of progress, and 3) fluency was found in these four participants. By analyzing the two drafts with Johnson’s indicators of content and organization, the above findings were further corroborated with two findings. First, the habit of writing a topic sentence (the main idea) was developing in the post-test draft. Second, most of their supporting sentences in the post-test draft contained the topic related ideas (details, examples and explanation). Another finding worthy of note was that these four participants also made progress in grammar and vocabulary, though the gained points were not as significant as those in content and organization.

These findings above roughly matched the results in a study conducted by Gallego De Blibeche (1993). The study targeting at two groups of elementary level college students of Spanish: the experimental group, which received prewriting discussion, free writing, pair work, drafting and peer review, and the control group,
which received direct grammar instruction, including grammar exercises and wrote
drafts. The results showed that both groups had equal gains on content, organization,
vocabulary, grammar and error reduction, but the former outperformed the latter in the
improvement in composition length (an indicator of fluency to measure content) and
quality of organization. Even though there was no control group, the primary findings
in this present case study conformed to those of the previous study: a process writing
group could make overall progress, but the progress in content and organization
proved more significant than that in vocabulary and grammar. It echoed Barnett’s
belief (1989) that in process writing, “less correction of grammatical errors, together
with honest attention to content, can sometimes reduce — and seldom promotes —
grammatical mistakes in future composition. It implies that in process writing, once
the meaning is developed, the form will be achieved as well.

5.1.3. Research Question Three

In the interviews, the positive functions of weblog in the process writing model
were approved. All of these four participants agreed that blog was beneficial in each
step of the process writing model. According to the data gathered in the interviews,
the class blog offered these four things: 1) links to the online resources in prewriting,
2) a collection of old essays for inspiration, 3) spelling checker, editing functions and
the reverse chronological order format, and 4) a publishing medium. The above
findings echoed the statements that blogs promote the use of the Internet as a research
tool (Oravec, 2002). Most important of all, the class blog in this study also
exemplified the features of self-reflection (Barlett-Bragg), interaction (Ducate &
Lomicka, 2008) and publication (Godwin-Jones, 2003), all of which were closely
connected to the commonly found activities or tools in process writing: journal,
feedback and portfolio.
5.1.4 Research Question Four

The fourth research question was to discuss what challenges they had in this class and what teacher support they would need. Speaking of challenges, learners seemed to show different tolerance for the number of revisions. Only one participant felt it was fine to do R3 while the other three found it boring to make R2 or R3. Therefore, how to keep students focused or interested in doing multiple revisions seems to become an important issue. In addition to the peer editing sheets and checklists in this class, the teacher should come up with some other activities to keep students more engaged in making revisions.

Regarding the teacher support, the teacher-student conference was suggested to offer help to solve problems that they were unable to handle by themselves or with the peers’ help. If there is any teacher-student conference, it is suggested to be scheduled after the practice of peer review. Their request for teacher-student conference echoed Zamel’s statement (1983) that the writing problems should be solved with the joint effort of the teacher and students. In the process of discovering meaning, the teachers should offer timely help as facilitators (Barnett, 1989). However, not all of them reached an agreement on the practice of the teacher-student conference. One participant showed her concern that the teacher-student conference might end up a routine practice. Considering that Chinese students are shy in nature, the teacher should pay attention to individual difference while conducting a teacher-student conference in class. A suggested approach is to create a less threatening atmosphere in the teacher-student conference to reduce their anxiety while asking the teacher for help.

5.1.5 Research Question Five
The fourth research question was if they had any attitude change toward writing after taking the blog-mediated process writing class. The writing attitude questionnaires got mixed results in the following categories: confidence, anxiety, usefulness and preference. The interviews with these two participants further verified the invalidity of the questionnaire results. Overall, the interview confirmed that these participants did experience attitude change after taking this class. Their confidence increased and anxiety decreased while the usefulness didn’t change much and their preference was enhanced. To some extent, this finding was very similar to Pennington’s study (1996), where students held positive attitude toward process writing on the condition that the teacher thought highly of process writing in class. Based on the fact that this writing class was designed by this present researcher in the spirit of process writing, it was very likely that students’ attitude changes were positively correlated with the teacher’s attitude toward process writing. On the other hand, the inconsistency between the questionnaire results and interview data created some doubts on the truthfulness of their responses in the interviews. There were a lot of probabilities that students’ responses in the interview was meant to cater to the teacher’s needs.

5.1.6 Research Question Six

The following findings on the blog-mediated process writing in term of the content of classroom were discovered. The findings will be discussed in terms of the six aspects: 1) the comparison of usefulness among peer editing sheets, checklists and journals, 2) the commenting function on the blog, 3) attitude toward errors, 4) the nature of blog-mediated writing class – workshop format, 5) the learner type, and 6) the writing process.

When referring to the usefulness of peer editing sheet, checklists and journals in
this writing class, journals came out first. The four participants all confirmed the usefulness of journal, which helped them review their writing process and indirectly enhance their writing ability as well. The use of journal in this study proved that journal can serve as a means to develop reflective practice, thus helping students to build up the process of their own learning (Caroll, 1994). From the teacher’s observation, journals writing though full of grammar mistakes or wrong expressions did help them develop individual learning process through self-expression.

The commenting function of the blog should be a forum for participants to offer revision-related comments. However, its function was far beyond that. Chatting became the dominant function in commenting. The “chatty” style of comments of the blog was also mentioned in Smith’s study (2008). Participants talked about whatever came to their mind and saw it as another way to talk to friends. For these students in the present study, commenting became another means of communication with others instead of a source of revision-related suggestions. Although they were asked to leave only revision-related comments, the chatting function inevitably appeared. Moreover, the chatting function was also another form of self-expression. Even though leaving comments was part of required assignment, these students still chose to use comments for self-expression. Another possible reason for leaving “chatting” comments came from the reluctance to criticize others. Carson & Nelson (1994) discovered that Chinese students were more reluctant to criticize peers because of the specific culture. In order not to ruin the harmonious relationship with peers, these students chose to leave chatty comments lest their revision-related comments should hurt their friends’ feelings.

Concerning their attitude toward errors, these four EFL writers still held a rather conservative view that errors should be found and corrected. This finding was quite opposite to the concept of process writing that errors should be deliberately neglected
lest “considering form and accuracy too soon obstructs the mental activity necessary
to generate and communicate ideas (Barnett, 1989). In the eye of the four EFL
learners, form (language) is as important as content (meaning). Smith (2008)
discovered that writing on the blog helped students free their voices and take risks
making errors in the cyberspace. Based on the fact that the four EFL writers insisted
that errors be found and corrected, it seemed that the writing on the blog didn’t help
them to realize the purpose of writing on the blog: self-expression.

Designed in the workshop format, the blog-mediated process writing class
presented many advantages worth mentioning. Several striking advantages were listed
as below: 1) students became active learners when correcting errors, 2) the audience
was expanded to many, 3) a diversity of activities designed to satisfy different
demands, 4) access to many resources, and 5) more ample time to write and revise.
Just as Yagelski (1995) observed, “the workshop style format of the course allowed
students to do their planning, drafting, and revising during class meetings, giving
students ample time to work on revisions and providing ready access to their peers
and to the teacher for advice about their revisions.” The present study proved that the
workshop format was the suitable context for process writing where students
developed writing ability with the help from the teacher and peer in the process
writing cycle.

Gender and personality difference also determined what strategies these four
participants took when dealing with problems. The only male student preferred to
solve problems through self-learning rather than through discussion with others. In
contrast, the other three females would rather get helps from friends and take part in
the discussion sessions. Logical thinking may be another gender difference because
the only male’s essays were more logical and better organized than those of these
females. The personality trait also divided these participants into independent learners,
who preferred solving problems by themselves, and cooperative learner, who would like to get answers through discussion or outside help. These four participants in this study were very like Raimes’ students (1985) who didn’t possess some features characterizing themselves as a group. Considering the fact that this study was a case study in nature, this present researcher paid much more attention to individual differences rather than similarities characterizing them as a group.

Concerning the writing process, two features were covered: the habit of re-reading and “thinking in English.” Re-reading was used to help writers to think up better connected sentences while writing (Perl, 1984). Perl (1984) further stated that the habit of re-reading best signified the recursive feature of writing process. Therefore, the habit of re-reading determined the quality of organization. The girl who didn’t always re-read proved to make the least progress in organization while the only boy with the habit of re-reading beat the other participants with the tightly connected organization. The other feature caught my eye was the increased percentage of “thinking in English.” At the beginning of the semester, all of the four participants admitted that they translated their ideas from Chinese into English in writing. However, in the mid-semester, the percentages of “thinking in English” grew ranging from 30% to 50% respectively among these participants. Over decades of practice of process writing, Leki (1990) concluded that “the shifting to L1 can be a very useful strategy for generating ideas and stimulating more complex thinking in L2.” In this study, the growth of “thinking in English” seems to imply that these participants were in the beginning stage of second language acquisition.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications

The research findings above provide some pedagogical implications as below. First, the multiple revisions should be considered to be put into practice in
English writing class. Judging from the collected data, it is apparent that these four participants made significant progress both in meaning and form. If given ample time for discussion and self-learning, students are capable of making progress in content and organization through multiple revisions.

Second, the writing workshop format would be another alternative context good for teaching process writing. Abandoning the traditional classroom context, the blog-mediated process writing class was taught in the form of the writing workshop, in which students were encouraged to work either collaboratively or individually. In this blog-mediated process writing class, a variety of activities along with the online resources were provided to guide them to make revisions accordingly. The concept of seeing writing as a lonely and private writing practice was overthrown. Through a series of activities, they gradually gained support and confidence by interacting with each other. It is suggested that writing should no longer be seen as a lonely torture. By offering the adequate resources and support, there may still be some fun in writing. Just like what Smith (2008) depicted in her study, “writing in networks like Web 2.0 becomes less an individual, isolated act of composition – one that can be read and assessed in traditional ways – and more a connected and communally experienced act.”

Third, it is appropriate to replace the traditional error correction with error marking. In the real life, people usually do not appreciate something they get easily. This attitude may as well explain how students see the teacher’s error corrections. More often than not, the teacher’s corrections on the essays are often taken lightly. Students either copy down the teacher’s corrections or read and forget about them. Students themselves rarely have chances to think about how to correct errors on their own. However, the errors marked with UCI symbols offer them opportunities to think up the correct answers. Sometimes their answers may not be 100 percent accurate, but
what counts is the self-learning process. Just like what Hyland (1990) advocated, “minimal marking” by using correction codes would give students a space for active correction. In this study, the error marking was proved again to offer students a chance to be active learners when correcting errors.

Fourth, the stress on content over form (Badger & White, 2000) is suggested to be another new guidance in teaching writing. In Taiwan, both teachers and students pay so much attention to language rather than on meaning that students feel a lot of limitations or pressure when trying to express themselves in English. What they fear most is nothing more than making mistakes, especially grammar or vocabulary errors, at which they might be laughed. With three years of traditional grammar training in junior high school, students are bound with these grammar rules and unable to express themselves in English because they are too afraid of making mistakes. The new focus on meaning may shift the traditional concept that accuracy and grammar account for everything. Instead, meaning should come first, and the form can be fixed in the final drafts (Barnett, 1989). Besides, Raimes (1985) noticed that “if ESL students are given enough time, show enough ways to explore topics, and given enough feedback, they will discover and uncover the English words they need as they write.” It seems that process writing can gradually release students from the spell of grammar and accuracy, thus helping them explore a proper way of self-expression.

Last but not the least, process writing also presents a useful approach to language acquisition. Whether in L1, ESL or EFL context, writing is often placed the last in language learning (Graves, 1984) because it takes too much time both in practice and in evaluation, and it is inevitable that there might be some bias in the scoring process. In Taiwan’s English education, the most common way to study English is by analyzing a reading text. Students are often crammed with endless grammar rules or vocabulary but lack enough practice time to output what they have learned in English,
i.e., speaking and writing. On the other hand, for those who easily get nervous or embarrassed, the fear of speaking in a foreign language is often too overwhelming to conquer. Writing isn’t as stressful as speaking. Students can take time writing or revising their thoughts over and over again until these expressions are the closest to what they intend to express. To sum up, process writing may be a proper teaching approach with which students develop their language ability in doing multiple revisions. What’s better, the text-based content of blog makes itself a convenient tool in teaching reading and writing. Also, the blog can serve as a forum where students experience how their reading and writing are evolving at the same time. Just like what was described in Smith’s study (2008), blog created a safer place for students to take risks and make errors, and thus helped them free their voice.

5.3 Limitations of the Study

The present study on the four 12th graders of high school in the northern part of Taiwan under a semester-long instruction of process writing in the mediation of blog to observe their development of writing ability and perception toward process writing, nevertheless, has some limitations.

Owing to the restriction of time and man power, only four cases were investigated in the study. Even though case study is not intended to generalize the findings, yet, if there are more cases involved, it may be possible to categorize a trend in the development of individual writing process.

Another restraint worthy of note is the difference between ESL and EFL contexts. Unlike ESL learners, who may see writing as a process of discovering meaning or a way of communication, writing in EFL context often bears a pressing need for academic performance. In consequence, for EFL learners, the accuracy of form is seen as equally important as that of meaning. With this consideration in mind, the
researcher adopted the red-pen error marking, using UCI symbols, to replace the
traditional red-pen correction in this study. These marked errors were required to be
corrected in the subsequent revisions through discussion or self-help. Eventually, it
may thus improve their accuracy in vocabulary and grammar as well. Therefore, the
finding that the four participants showed progress in both meaning and form was quite
contrary to the general conception that process writing only helps students to improve
meaning.

Given that it would be too time-consuming to grade every revision in order to
assess how much progress every participant made in respective revision, the
connection between the total numbers of revisions and progress in writing ability was
unable to explore. Concerning the possibility that too many revisions may become a
bore, three revisions per topic was the minimal requirement for these four participants
in this study. Therefore, revision 4 was not seen in any of these four participants.
Owing to the fact that none of these participants wrote more than 3 revisions, it is also
impossible to ascertain if there is a positive connection between the progress and the
number of revision.

The correlation of variables is another major concern of this study. In the middle
of semester, under the instruction of the process writing class, the four participants
experienced a new emerging “thinking in English” in their mind. It appears that they
are starting to replace the translation (L1→L2) skill with L2 thinking. In a class
combining the process writing model with the blogging forum, there exist too many
variables to analyze how many variables or what variable directly contribute to the
emergence of “thinking in English.” Meanwhile, other than the context of the writing
class, all of these four participants also take regular English lessons, which may be
another interacting variable resulting in the increased percentage of “thinking in
English.” Undoubtedly, these variables correlate and interact with each other and it is
unlikely to analyze how a single variable acts in this study.

The blog-mediated process writing class was designed as a small class for several reasons. First, in a small class, participants had sufficient time to interact with each other in the more relaxing and less stressful workshop format. Second, the small size of the class can also give the teacher sufficient time to pay equal attention to individual writing process. Based on the fact that the study only focused on the four participants in one classroom, it is unlikely to determine whether these findings could be duplicated if it were a big class. A quantitative study is therefore suggested to explore the possible findings if the availability of computer in the context and more members of participants involved are taken into account.

5.4 Recommendations for Further Studies

In this present study, the findings were listed as below: the benefits of process writing in the development of writing ability, especially in content and organization; the usefulness of the blog in every step of the process writing model; the challenges of keeping learners interested in doing multiple revisions and the suggestion of teacher-and student mini conference; and finally the attitude changes in four categories: confidence, anxiety, usefulness and preference. The context of classroom contributing to other interesting findings were also discussed from these aspects: 1) the comparison of usefulness among peer editing sheets, checklists and journals, 2) the commenting function of the blog, 3) attitude toward errors, 4) workshop style format of the writing class, 5) the learner type, and 6) the writing process.

Even though this study serves as a good example of exploring these complicated factors in the researcher’s context, there are still some suggestions for further research.

First, studies aiming to compare the difference between a process writing class
and a blog-mediated process writing class are recommended. The comparison between these two will help further clarify how the blog-related factors help to reinforce the practice of process writing.

Then, another suggested study should aim to associate self-expression with free writing. Since one unique feature of blog is self-expression in journal form, a study on how students freely express themselves without consideration of making errors on the blog is also recommended. Corresponding to the core concept of process writing — stress on content over form, a self-expression related study should be able to derive some other interesting findings which are more highly correlated to meaning rather than form (language).

Finally, the commenting function of the blog should also be an interesting research direction to explore how commenting influences learners in language learning. As a source to gather ideas for revisions, commenting on the blog is often diverted to chatting, another form of self expression loved and welcome by all. It seems that learners enjoy chatting with their friends in the asynchronous forum. A further study is therefore necessary to explore the possibility of building up an online learning community through commenting.
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Appendix A

Questionnaire on Writing Attitude

親愛的同學

這是一份用來了解你(妳)對英文作文態度的問卷。答案沒有對錯之分，請依照你(你)的感受回答。你(妳)的熱心填答，將會對老師在教學上的改進有所助益。謝謝你(妳)的幫忙！

台北市立 XX 高中教師
詹惠玲 謹啟
九十八年九月十日

第一部分:基本資料

填答說明:請在你(妳)認為合適的答案方格中打勾或在橫線上填入答案。

1. 填表日期: ____________
2. 班級: ____________
3. 學號: ____________
4. 姓名: ____________
5. 性別: □男 □女
6. 除了學校英文課之外，妳每週大約花多少時間自己學習英文?
   □1—3 小時 □4—6 小時 □7—9 小時 □10 小時以上
7. 你(妳)於何時開始學習英文?
   □國小一二年級 □國小三四五年級 □國小五六六年級
8. 妳(你)曾在英語系國家居住過嗎？若有請註明多少時間。
第二部分：對英文作文的態度

填答說明：請圈選你（妳）認為適合的答案，不要考慮太多，也不要遺漏任何一題。
（1 是「非常不同意」，2 是「不同意」，3 是「無意見」，4 是「同意」，5 是「非常同意」。）

1. 為了以後求學的需要，我必須精通英文作文  
2. 未來的工作中，英文寫作會是很重要的能力之一  
3. 學好英文作文，讓我可以認識更多外國朋友  
4. 學習英文寫作可以增加另一項與人溝通的管道  
5. 要用英文來寫自傳，我信心十足  
6. 英文寫作應是一種愉快的學習歷程  
7. 我喜歡在英文寫作課中分享彼此作品的活動  
8. 在我的日常生活中，英文作文沒有太多用處  
9. 我喜歡用英文在網路上聊天  
10. 我的印象中英文寫作是很枯燥無味的  
11. 若不是考試要考，我實在不太想學英文作文  
12. 為了父母或老師的要求，我才勉強去寫英文作文  
13. 我害怕我會在英文寫作課中被老師當掉  
14. 我喜歡參與英文寫作課中的學習活動
15. 我喜歡和別人討論有關英文作文相關的事情
16. 我會多花一些課外的時間練習英文作文
17. 我通常會用英文寄送電子郵件給我的朋友
18. 寫英文作文時，我覺得蠻自在的
19. 我覺得我有寫好英文作文的天份
20. 我很害怕英文造句練習
21. 寄卡片給朋友時我會使用英文寫祝賀詞
22. 我會把握任何可以學習英文作文的機會
23. 學習英文作文是值得的
24. 學習英文作文滿足了我對英文學習的需求
25. 為了寫好英文作文，我會多方蒐集中相關的題材
26. 上英文作文課時，我喜歡和老師在課堂上互動
27. 學習英文作文提高了我對英文學習的興趣
28. 我會試著用英文來作筆記
29. 我會試著用英文來寫日記
30. 我會在網絡上用英文來 Post 我的東西
31. 如果有機會，我會爭取參加英文作文比賽
32. 如果有別的選擇，我就不會選英文作文課
33. 寫英文作文時，我總是感覺文思枯竭無從下筆
34. 我會不好意思和同學分享我所寫的英文作文
35. 想到要上英文作文，我就一個頭兩個大
36. 我對英文考試中作文部分比較沒有把握
Appendix B

Questionnaire on Writing Attitude (English version)

Factor I: Confidence

5. I feel confident when writing a self-introduction in English.
6. Writing is a lot of fun.
7. I like to have my classmates read what I had written.
14. I enjoy actively taking part in writing activities.
15. I love to discuss the issues related to writing.
16. I would like to spend more time practicing writing outside the classroom.
18. I feel comfortable when writing compositions.
19. I think I am gifted in English writing.
26. I enjoy interacting with the teacher in the writing class.
27. Learning English writing increases my motivation in English language learning.

Factor II: Anxiety

32. I will not take English writing classes if there is another choice.
33. I have terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course.
34. I am afraid of sharing my composition with my classmates.
35. My brain goes blank when it comes to English writing.
36. In an English test, I am not so confident of the writing part.
10. In my impression, English writing classes are boring.
13. I am afraid of being flunked in English writing course.
20. I am afraid of making sentences in English.

Factor III: Usefulness
1. To further study, I have to be good at English writing.

2. English is one of the important qualifications in many careers.

3. English writing skill can help me make friends with more foreign students.

4. English writing skill offers us another way to communicate with others.

8. English writing is not very useful in my daily life.

11. If not for examinations, I would not learn English writing.

12. I force myself to learn English writing to please the teacher and my parents.

23. It is worthwhile learning English writing.

24. English writing skill is helpful for my English learning.

Factor IV: Preference

9. I love chatting on the Internet in English.

17. I often send English E-mail to my friends.

21. I love to write a get-well card and other cards in English to my friends.

22. I will grab any chance to learn how to write compositions.

25. I will collect a variety of reference tools for English writings.

28. I will try to take notes in English.

29. I will try to keep a diary in English.

30. I will post my writing on a BBS in English.

31. If I have the chance, I will participate in an English writing competition.
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Class blog

November 4, 2009

Dear all,

After two months of constant writing, I believe now you all have a better idea of what process writing is. Unfortunately, owing to the time limit, most of you don’t have time reviewing your old writings or interact with others.

Since the process writing emphasizes the importance of discovering meaning, you have to make a second revision to enrichify your content and solidify your organization. To facilitate the process of writing revision 2, you will be given two checklists to locate the areas which need your revision. Try to add more details or examples to expand your main ideas. And always think about you have a topic sentence in each paragraph. Is the structure complete with introduction, body and conclusion in the two-paragraph essay? Those are more important than making changes in grammar, word choice and punctuation.

6.2, follow the format requirement because it will record your writing process in order. The writing process we follow in this class is:

- brainstorming
- draft
- peer review
- teacher’s feedback
- revision 2
- journal
- comments
- checklists
- revision 2

Therefore, please keep in mind that each entry should be complete with these items:

- journal 2: what you add in content and organization and what you have learned from others’ writings
- revision 2
- brainstorming 2
- revision 1
- journal 1
- brainstorming

Do not delete your old revisions. Once you delete it, it will be impossible to retrieve. Just place your revision 2 and journal 2 next to your revision 1 and journal 1 to show what you have added according to comments and checklists, also the revised part should be marked in a different color. I suggest you do revision 2 in this order:

- read others’ writings (at least 3) and have comments-write the checklists—write the revisions 2

It’s never a waste of time to revise your writing. Instead, you have renewed chance for improvement. If you have any questions on revision 2, you may come to ask for help from me or your classmates with regard.

Your teacher,

Gloria

posted by gloria on November 04, 2009

Labels: 12th-bulletin board; format; 演習
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Guideline to Self-reflection Journal

First of all, you can post as many entries as you wish in your self-reflection journals. Blogging is meant for diary writing, so you can write about English learning problems, personal feelings and perception toward the teacher’s instruction. However, after a peer review, please write a short self-reflection journal (at least 50 words) to document comments from teachers or peers. You may choose to write either in English or in Chinese, and the choice won’t affect your grade. The journal should include:

1) What difficulty have you encountered when writing on this topic?
2) Describe how you finished writing the draft.
3) Suggestions from the teacher and peer.
4) How would you revise the draft? What would you like to add?

Please post it on your blog, for you may receive comments from your peers and it’s easy to keep a record. Your blog is your venue to the outside world. Let your voice to be heard. You may post as many journals if you like to keep track of your English learning process.
Appendix E

Revised Guideline to Self-reflection Journal

October 2, 2009

Dear all,

There are several things I have to add in the self-reflection journals. You have to write it in paragraphs, not only answering these four questions. Here are things you may talk about.

In the first paragraph, please write about how brainstorming helps you in writing the draft or what you think of or what difficulties you encounter in the writing process. For example, do you like the topic? Or what do you learn from writing it up?

In the second paragraph, give your grade and gloria's feedback and suggetions. Most of all, please write something back to Gloria concerning this topic.

In the third paragraph, tell me what you learned from your peer review sheet. Tell me specifically what your peer's comments and advice, such as topic sentences, the main idea, grammar, word usage or any other related stuff. Also don't forget to thank your peer.

In the last paragraph, tell me what you think of the topic. Do you like it or not and what you learn from writing it up? And tell me what you will do to revise your draft.

That's all for the revised self-reflection journal. I know you may think I am too
demanding. But writing a journal is a good way to reflect on your thinking process. Among the journals I have read so far, I have to say I like 吳孟軒's the best. Reading his journal is fun. Just don't limit your thoughts to the form. You may take it as a chance to talk to your teacher or peers.

Your teacher,

Gloria
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Self-evaluation Form on Portfolio & Questionnaire on the Writing Class

Date: ___________  Your name: ___________  Class Number: ___________

(Answer these questions in Chinese)

Please evaluate your writings on these topics: My personal profile, A thank-you letter, Star sign and I, What’s in my name and My best friend.

I. On content and Organization

1. Your best essay in your portfolio (topic): ______________________________

   The advantages: ____________________________________________________

   How you feel when writing this essay? _________________________________

2. Your worst essay in your portfolio? _________________________________

   The disadvantages: ________________________________________________

   Difficulties: ______________________________________________________

3. Compare your first draft (My personal profile) and the last draft (My best friend).

   (1– poor, 2 – not bad, 3 – good, 4 – very good, 5 – excellent)

   1) My personal profile          2) My best friend

   Organization  12345  Organization  12345
   Content       12345  Content       12345
   Vocabulary    12345  Vocabulary    12345
   Grammar       12345  Grammar       12345
   Mechanics     12345  Mechanics     12345

4. Does your last essay (My best friend) show any improvement in content and organization?

   If yes, the improvement in content: _________________________________

   If yes, the improvement in organization: ____________________________
II. Writing Cycles

5. How do you brainstorm before writing a draft?

6. How does the blog help you in brainstorming?

7. How does the blog help you when you write a draft?

8. Which is more useful when you make revisions? Mark it with 123456 (1 – most important, 6 the least important)
   1) Teacher’s feedback on draft. ( ) Why. 
   5) Teacher’s comments on blog. ( ) Why. 
   6) Peer’s comments on blog. ( ) Why. 

9. When you edit your essays on the blog, how do you feel about the following features? (useful, annoying, necessary …)
   1) word-processing function: 
   2) format & label: 
   3) neat and clear layout of your essay: 

10. Do you enjoy sharing your writings with others? Yes No. 
    Why?

11. Do you enjoy reading others’ essays? Yes No. 
    Why?

12. Do you enjoy leaving comments on others’ writing? Yes No. 
    Why?
III. Challenges and teacher support

13. What’s the difference between this process writing class and your regular writing class?

________________________________________________________________________

14. Circle your choice: several revisions on single topic or writing on many topics with no revision Why ______________________________________________________________________

15. How do you feel about writing before taking this process writing class?

________________________________________________________________________

16. How do you feel about writing after taking this process writing class?

________________________________________________________________________

17. What other things should the teacher do to help you in this process writing class?

________________________________________________________________________

18. How do you feel about this semester’s writing class?

________________________________________________________________________
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A Modified CEEC Scoring Criteria

大學聯考作文評分標準

表1：英文作文分項式評分指標

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>等級</th>
<th>項目</th>
<th>優</th>
<th>可</th>
<th>差</th>
<th>劣</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x5</td>
<td>主題（句）清楚切題，並有具體、完整相關細節支持。</td>
<td>(5-4分)</td>
<td>(3分)</td>
<td>(2-1分)</td>
<td>(0分)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>主題不夠清楚或突顯，部分相關敘述發展不全。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>主題不明，大部分相關敘述發展不全或與主題無關。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>文不對題或沒寫（凡文不對題或沒寫者，其他各項均以零分計算）。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x5</td>
<td>重點分明，有開頭、發展、結尾，前後連貫，轉承語使用得當。</td>
<td>(5-4分)</td>
<td>(3分)</td>
<td>(2-1分)</td>
<td>(0分)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>重點安排不妥，前後發展比例與轉承語使用欠妥。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>重點不明、前後不連貫。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>全文毫無組織或未按提示寫作。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x5</td>
<td>全文幾無文法錯誤，文句結構富變化。</td>
<td>(4分)</td>
<td>(3分)</td>
<td>(2-1分)</td>
<td>(0分)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>文法錯誤少，且未影響文意之表達。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>文法錯誤多，且明顯影響文意之表達。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>全文文法錯誤嚴重，導致文意不明。</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x5</td>
<td>用字精確、得宜，且字詞單調、重複，用字、拼字錯誤多，只寫出或抄襲與題意</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
本大題總分 20 分，主要評量考生是否有能力撰寫一篇語法正確、語意通順，並且內容統一、組織連貫的英文作文。採整體式評分，分為五等級：特優（19-20 分）、優（15-18 分）、可（10-14 分）、差（5-9 分）、劣（0-4 分），閱卷委員於閱讀完考生試卷後，於腦海裡產生一個整體（holistic）分數，再以分項式評分標準檢閱是否符合整體印象分數，分項式評分標準包含下列 5 項：

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>項目</th>
<th>評分標準</th>
<th>例</th>
<th>評分標準</th>
<th>例</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

內容（5 分）、組織（5 分）、文法、句構（4 分）、字彙、拼字（4 分），及體例（2 分）（詳見表 1）。另外，字數不足，扣 1 分；未分兩段在體例部分，扣 1 分；未使用適當書信格式（如未書寫稱呼語及信末署名），扣 1 分。

\(^1\)改編自張武昌等（民 93）「英文寫作能力測驗規劃研究（VI）」研究報告。台北：大考中心。95 年學測在「項目」部份再行修改，定稿。
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Yagelski’s Coding Schemes for Revision Analysis (1995)

I. Surface Changes
   a. punctuation
   b. spelling
   c. capitalization
   d. pluralization
   e. word form corrections other than pluralizations (e.g., subject-verb agreement; tense changes)
   f. substitutions (e.g., fewer for less)
   g. corrected typographical errors (e.g., the for hte)
   h. corrections on bibliographic format

II. Stylistic Changes
   a. lexical — stylistic word substitutations (e.g., several for a few; increase for grow)
   b. phrasing
      1. syntactic (meaning-preserving rewording, including adding or deleting words: e.g., to avoid an awkward construction)
      2. structural (meaning-preserving sentence restructuring: e.g., “When we went outside” for “Having gone outside”)

III. Structural Changes
   a. organization (within paragraphs; within essay)
   b. paragraphing (moving whole paragraphs; creating new paragraphs from existing ones)
IV. Content Changes

a. addition of new material (new subject matter or ideas — as distinct from
   simply adding new words to tighten a phrase or sentence, as in II.b. above) to
   develop subject or clarify points

b. deleting material (deleting subject matter or ideas — as distinct from deleting
   words to make a sentence or phrase tighter; as in I.c above)

c. altering an idea, argument, etc. (e.g. changing from pro to con on an issue;
   shifting focus from description to narration)
Appendix I

Interview Items

Interview I:

1. How does the process writing help you on content and organization?
2. How does the blog help you in the prewriting period?
3. How does the blog help you in the drafting period?
4. When revising, how does the blog help you?
   - Revision 1
   - Revision 2
   - Revision 3
5. When revising, what do you pay attention more? Content, organization, word usage or grammar?
6. What do you think of using the blog to publish your essays?
7. How does the journal help you?
8. How does the peer editing sheet help you?
9. How does the self-checking list help you?
10. Which one is more useful when making revision? Teacher’s comments or peer’s comment?
11. What are the differences between the regular writing class and the blog-mediated process writing class?
12. The advantages and disadvantages of process writing.
13. What kind of teacher support is needed in this process writing class?
14. Do you have a different view about writing after taking this class?
   - Confidence
   - Anxiety
   - Usefulness
Interview II:

1. Tell me your writing attitude after taking this class?
2. While writing, what are your habits? Pausing? Reread? Without stop? L1 → L2
3. What kind of teacher support should you need in this process writing class?
4. How much time do you spend on brainstorming and gathering information respectively? How many essays on average would you read for reference?
5. How do you deal with the difficulties? For example, if you don’t know how to express it, what would you do?
6. Would your peer give you the ideas on how to give examples or details?
7. If you only correct errors in R 3, is it okay for you to repeat errors in R1 or R2?
8. We use real names to publish essays on the blog and maybe that’s why you feel embarrassed first. Is it better to use pseudo names to publish your essays? What are the benefits of using real names and pseudo names?
9. Journals don’t help sherry. Can you tell me why it doesn’t help?
10. How do you feel chatting with your classmates on the blog? How do you feel about their comments? What have you gained from reading comments on the blog?
11. Is it a waste of time to make so many revisions? If not, what do you gain from making these revisions?
12. In your opinion, what is the real purpose of writing in this class?
13. How is your organization different?
14. If peer’s and teacher’s feedback are all about the essay? Which one will you value most?
## Appendix J

### UCI (University of California, Irvine) Correction Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agr</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>Between you and <em>I</em>, each one of us needs <em>their</em> own job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs</td>
<td>comma splice</td>
<td>I had a question, I asked the professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dm</td>
<td>dangling modifier</td>
<td>After talking to him, the information was clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frag</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>If you were a scientist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id</td>
<td>idioms / set expressions</td>
<td>He was involved <em>on</em> the engineering projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>mixed constructions</td>
<td>He decided to go to school is because he felt better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>num</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>He finished his <em>researches</em>; now he needs more <em>equipments</em> and <em>times</em> to do his <em>works</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>punctuation</td>
<td>Though odd this story is true.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red</td>
<td>redundancy</td>
<td>This <em>class</em> seems easy, so I'm going to take this <em>class</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ref</td>
<td>unclear pronoun reference</td>
<td>My essay is in my car and my keys are under the seat. Will you please bring <em>it</em>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ro</td>
<td>run-on</td>
<td>No one knows the answer it is hard to solve each problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp</td>
<td>spelling</td>
<td><em>Achieving</em> dreams is <em>important</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s-v</td>
<td>subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>Everybody <em>have</em> traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>tense</td>
<td><em>I will</em> be in class yesterday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vb</td>
<td>verb form</td>
<td>He is <em>enroll</em> in French, and he is <em>try</em> to <em>added</em> another class. He will <em>has</em> to spend more time study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wf</td>
<td>word form</td>
<td>We will become <em>independence</em> thinkers and writers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ww</td>
<td>wrong word</td>
<td>He was <em>very</em> tired that he left.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>^</td>
<td>insert</td>
<td>She will be enrolled just time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delete</td>
<td></td>
<td>He fell off <em>of</em> his bicycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td>Researchers have found evidence of insecticides in our ocean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~//</td>
<td>parallelism</td>
<td>Winning and <em>lose</em> is part of playing the game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>add a space</td>
<td>It's <em>infront</em> of the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>move here</td>
<td></td>
<td>The boy revised his work who was sitting next to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transpose</td>
<td></td>
<td>She's on time usually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rephrase</td>
<td></td>
<td>He hasn't got a clue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??</td>
<td>Not understandable</td>
<td>It's like which that you need.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Peer Editing Sheet

Topic: ___________________________ Date: _______________________

Writer’s name: ________________ Peer editor’s name: ____________

Please write down your name with class and number, such as 30112 xxx.

1. What’s good in the writing?

______________________________________________________________________________

2. Is there a topic sentence?  Yes  No

If yes, write down the topic sentence.

______________________________________________________________________________

If not, please help her to think up a topic sentence.

______________________________________________________________________________

3. Does the writing have the main idea? Yes  No

If yes, please write down the main ideas.

______________________________________________________________________________

If not, what’s your suggestion for improving the main idea?

______________________________________________________________________________

4. Do supporting sentences explain the main idea more clearly?

If yes, please write down one of the supporting sentences.

______________________________________________________________________________

If not, point out irrelevant supporting ideas.

______________________________________________________________________________

5. Give your suggestions for grammar mistakes (tense, verb-subject agreement)

______________________________________________________________________________

6. Any suggestions for the usage of words and idioms?

______________________________________________________________________________
7. Any suggestion for spelling and punctuation?
Appendix L

Checklist on Process Writing & Essay – revised from online resources

Checklist for Process Writing

Topic: ________________    Date: _________    Your name: ________________

(Please write down your name this way: 30211xxx)

I. Prewriting (Brainstorming)

_____ Web (brainstorming web) has a specific main idea

_____ At least five ideas around the main idea.

II. Drafting

_____ Rough draft handed in

_____ Has thought about the purpose of writing

_____ Has a clear concept of audience in mind

_____ Format is followed correctly (two-paragraph essay)

_____ Many ideas from brainstorming are present

III. Revising

_____ Work on alone to make changes to make ideas closely related

_____ Make changes in word choice

_____ Peer editor gave at least three comments

_____ Makes changes to reflect peer editor’s suggestions

IV. Editing

_____ Peer editor has marked necessary changes in grammar, word choice, spelling and punctuation.

_____ Changes have been made accordingly.

V. Publishing

_____ Good copy posted on blog
Checklist for Essay

I. In terms of content, the essay ....

   ____ Includes main ideas (topic sentences), clearly explain “who, where, why, what and how”
   ____ Includes examples and details (supporting sentences)
   ____ Information relevant to the topic
   ____ Knows the reader’s needs
   ____ Express ideas descriptively and clearly

II. In terms of organization, ....

   ____ Includes introduction, body and conclusion. If not, circle those included.
   ____ Includes a topic sentence in each paragraph
   ____ Express ideas from general to specific (from ideas to examples)
   ____ Use transitions properly. (“First of all,” “In contrast,” “However,”….”)