


2000

The Affect of Writing on the Internet

Jane Hoelker

The School for International Training

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp_collection

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Discourse and Text Linguistics Commons](#), [First and Second Language Acquisition Commons](#), and the [Instructional Media Design Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hoelker, Jane, "The Affect of Writing on the Internet" (2000). *MA TESOL Collection*. 427.
https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp_collection/427

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Graduate Institute at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in MA TESOL Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact digitalcollections@sit.edu.

THE AFFECT OF WRITING ON THE INTERNET

By JANE HOELKER

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Arts in Teaching degree at the
School for International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont

March, 2000

Copyright Jane Hoelker 2000

This project by Jane Hoelker is accepted in its present form.

Date: 4/7/00

Project Advisor: Liane Larsen-Freeman

Project Reader: Michael Nieckoski

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank the faculty and students of the School for International Training and the Korean national university system in Seoul and in Pusan for the many insights they have given me into the process of learning, and into the art of teaching through intuition and into the science of teaching through the discipline of reflective practice. In particular, I would like to express my gratitude to Diane Larsen-Freeman and Michael Nieckoski for their assistance and continuing inspiration.

ABSTRACT

This paper is a description of the development, objectives, implementation and results of an advanced composition course conducted on the Internet with IWE (International Writing Exchange) of the Helsinki University of Technology. The purpose of the course was to motivate students of English who were discouraged during the difficult IMF era in Korea in 1998. During the 90's the majority of English Education majors at Pusan National University in Korea had studied and/or traveled overseas for extensive periods of time during their undergraduate career. But, in 1998 opportunities for overseas travel and study had been greatly curtailed due to IMF era-imposed austerity measures. Students were frustrated in their English study abroad plans, yet eager for overseas contact and direct communication with native English speakers. The first assumption of this course was that student motivation is increased through an international writing exchange on the internet. This enthusiasm results in a healthy quantity of work. In addition, the postings required by the program draw on a variety of rhetorical styles, thus providing students with practice in a number of modes. The second assumption was that internet English is the perfect scaffolding between spoken discourse and written discourse because it is more complex than spoken discourse, yet less complex than written discourse. Samples of student work are examined to illustrate these assumptions.

ERIC DESCRIPTORS

Second Language Learning
English (Second Language)
Second Language Learning
Writing (Composition)
Writing Skills

Materials/Media/Technology
Computers

IDENTIFIER

Course Description

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		
1. Introduction		p 1
a.	Background	
b.	The Context: The Year of the Tiger in Korea	
c.	The Theoretical Foundation of the Course: The Kolb Experiential Learning Cycle	
d.	Rationale for Working from the Internet	
e.	What is the HUT International Writing Exchange?	
1. Implementing the Course and Student Response		p 9
a.	Course Design	
b.	Orienting the Students to the Internet	
c.	Round Four	
d.	Round Five	
e.	Results of the Evaluation of Round Four	
f.	Results of the Evaluation of Round Five	
g.	Summary	
1. Discussion and Analysis of the Language Produced in Both Rounds		p 42
a.	Discussion and Analysis of the Quantity of Language Produced	
b.	Rhetorical Categories Used in Student Postings	
c.	Results of Language Analysis through T-units	
d.	Does Internet Language Provide Scaffolding between Oral Discourse and Written Discourse?	
1. Conclusion		p 61
Appendix A: Round Four Topics for Article		p 70
Appendix B: Round Five Topics for Article		p 71
Appendix C: Round Four Topics Repeated in Evaluation		p 72
Appendix D: Single Mention Comments in Round Four Evaluation		p 74
Appendix E: Round Four Response Chart		p 75
Appendix F: Round Five Repeated Topics in Evaluation		p 76
Appendix G: Round Five Single Mention Comments in Evaluation		p 78
Appendix H: Round Five Response Chart		p 79
Appendix I: Rhetorical Categories		p 80
Appendix J: Introduction Letter Topics and Word Count		p 82
Appendix K: Round Four Single Mention Topics in Introduction Letter		p 84
Appendix L: Round Four Postings Word Count		p 85
Appendix M: Round Five Postings Word Count		p 87
Appendix N: Computation of T-Units in Both Rounds		p 89
Appendix O: Comparison of Posting Length and T-Unit Length in Round Five		p 91
Appendix P: Analysis of Error Samples in Round Four and Five		p 92
Appendix Q: Summary of the Successes of PNU Participants in the IWE		p 93
Appendix R: Technical and Economic Terms		p 94
Bibliography		p 95

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This paper is a description of the development, objectives, implementation and results of an advanced composition course conducted on the Internet with IWE (International Writing Exchange) of the Helsinki University of Technology. The purpose of the course was to motivate students in an advanced English composition course who were discouraged during the difficult International Monetary Fund (IMF) era of financial restrictions in Korea in 1998. The motivational impact on students of opportunities to post their work on the Internet for an international audience is great, and the enthusiasm generated results in a healthy quantity of student work. In addition, the postings required by such a program draw on a variety of rhetorical styles, thus providing students with practice in a number of modes. It can also be argued that Internet English is the perfect scaffolding between spoken discourse and written discourse because it is more complex than spoken discourse, yet less complex than written discourse. To investigate this an analysis of the quantity of student work produced through tabulated numerical data and an analysis of the quality of language produced by the students through T-units will be discussed.

The Context: The Year of the Tiger in Korea

The Year of the Tiger (1998) on the Oriental horoscope fulfilled its prediction and brought sudden and unanticipated change into the world. Those of us teaching and living in Asia found ourselves coping with the challenge and the consequences of this change brought about by the financial crises in Asia: the devaluation of Asian currencies

including the Korean won; and the IMF era and the austerity measures imposed by the IMF on Asian economies, including the Korean economic system. The restrictions resulting from this change in my particular context in the English Education Department of Pusan National University (PNU) in 1998 were daunting. The variety of textbooks available for selection was severely limited. After numerous phone calls to book suppliers and publishers, I discovered that the books they had listed in their catalogues were not necessarily found on Korean bookstore shelves, nor would bookstores order them for the Korean market. In addition, students refused to purchase textbooks, pleading financial insolvency.

Photocopying privileges in the English Education Department were severely curtailed because the department budget was reduced by 50% in response to the IMF crises. In addition, I learned that publishers operate on a 4% profit margin in Korea. Even though Korea has not signed the International Copyright Agreement, I wanted to support the international publishers who make books available in the Republic of Korea (as well as the domestic publishers) by not photocopying and distributing their materials to a class who had not purchased the book. I requested a printer for my computer, but the department informed me that there was no money in the budget to purchase a printer for my office, even though the other offices were furnished with computers as well as printers. I had to walk across campus to the student computer laboratory to printout handouts for class that I composed, or information from the web that I researched.

Students, frustrated in their English study abroad plans, remained eager for overseas contact and direct communication with native English speakers. This frustration

was sorely exacerbated by the fact that 100% of the previous class in the English Education Department had enjoyed the privilege of living and studying overseas for an extended stay. In addition to their disappointed travel and study plans, students graduating in the next year or two were warned by the newspapers that job prospects were dismal. The students were discouraged by reading in the press that perhaps 1% of a graduating class might find employment upon graduation.

In the spring term of 1998 I was scheduled to teach oral conversation classes, and I was able to draw on my twelve years of teaching oral conversation lessons in Japan to teach the spring classes, in spite of the above difficulties. However, the fall term of 1998 saw me scheduled to teach an Advanced Composition Course. How could I furnish interesting and challenging material for the students in my Advanced Composition Course under these conditions? How could I encourage and motivate my students to look beyond these immediate obstacles to their goals and dreams, and seek inspiration from their bright futures that I was sure would arrive? Finally, how could I meet the expectations that my personal philosophy of education based on the David A. Kolb (1971) Theory on the Experiential Learning Cycle set?

The Theoretical Foundation of the Course: The Kolb Experiential Learning Cycle

David A. Kolb's theory on the Experiential Learning Cycle states that people learn in one of four styles. In addition, these four styles combine into a process of learning that is natural and efficient, guaranteeing a 90% retention rate according to McCarthy (1987). However, what impressed me the most about the lessons that I designed based on the Kolb theory was the interest in learning that the approach aroused in my students and

their resulting active involvement in the class activities. The Experiential Learning Cycle begins with an experience generated and controlled by the teacher (games, role plays, discussions, new experiences and field trips), moves through the second step of reflective activities (lectures and journal writing) and the third step of deduction (work stations, theory readings and laboratory experiments) to the final step, another experience, but one generated by and controlled by the student (experimenting in small group discussions with projects or individualized, self-paced learning activities). This final step seems to seal the learning and to anchor it. Later, when the students need to recall the learning, memory can be triggered by referring to the student-generated projects.

Therefore, in designing the tasks for the Advanced Writing Course, I had the students begin with a teacher-controlled activity, such as downloading samples of student Introduction Letters and writing their first draft of their Introduction Letter. As the teacher, I lead them in a discussion of the downloaded letters, what they liked about their letter and their partner's letter, thus reflecting on the work, and developing and testing a theory of criteria. Finally, students engaged in a student-controlled activity and wrote the final draft of their Introduction Letter. Throughout the course the class followed this experiential pattern of learning, that is of beginning with a teacher-controlled activity and spiraling through the process or the learning experience until they reached the state of expanded autonomy and engaged in a student-controlled activity.

Rationale for Working from the Internet

Walking home from the bookstore after another futile attempt to find an appropriate text, it came to me to find materials on the Internet that students could

download. Through my research on the Internet guided by Boswood (1997) and Warschauer (1995), I discovered the International Writing Exchange (IWE) organized and directed by Ruth Vilmi of Helsinki University of Technology (HUT) **Error!**

Bookmark not defined. Ruth Vilmi, professor in the Language and Communication Centre at HUT has presented at numerous international conferences on CALL, and maintains a website, offering among various courses, the International Writing Exchange opened to university students around the world as well as HUT students.

During the course of my research I discovered that finding an international e-mail exchange program that is readily accessible and that matches the needs of a particular group of students is not so easy. Unfortunately, a number of U.S. university based sites, such as the *Intercultural E-Mail Classroom Connections* at St. Olaf's **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, or the Australia based site for the international student list project at LaTrobe University **Error! Bookmark not defined.** could not be contacted from Pusan, but I was able to readily and consistently call up the Helsinki site. No other project that I could reach offered the level or variety of assignments that this project did. Many websites such as *Linguistic Funland TESL* **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, or *Frizzy University Network* **Error! Bookmark not defined.** make available imaginative games and activities for students to supplement English class work, but these were not of the maturity that the HUT assignments were. *The Purdue on-line writing lab (OWL)* **Error! Bookmark not defined.** offered conferencing on writing tasks and excellent handouts, but not a chance to correspond with overseas peers. Most international e-mail projects such as *Dave's ESL Café* **Error! Bookmark not defined.** offer a wonderful chance to

correspond, but not a chance to share articles exploring a mature theme suitable for university students such as Vilmi's project does. Finally, I felt that the tight structure of the course with regard to assignments and time would support me and ease my apprehension, as I began to teach my first course from the Internet. In addition, the number of assignments required by the IWE would grant the learners ample opportunity to practice writing which married well with my intuitive belief about writing as stated by Briere (1977): "... fluency and quantity, grammatically correct or not, are necessary predecessors to learning quality of expression."

The IWE program would satisfy the course requirements, the precepts of my personal teaching philosophy, and the needs of my students. Moreover, by offering ample opportunities for students to correspond with students from all over the world, the program would motivate my internationally focused learners. The types of writing required by the IWE posting regulations draw on a number of rhetorical categories, such as descriptive, narrative, comparison and contrast, exposition, and argument. Finally, students can download a variety of documents on these topics: (1) Why E-mail Is Different?, (2) exercises on common mistakes in the Introduction Letters, (3) how to make a signature file, (4) ice breaker suggestions, (5) how to critically read articles, (6) criteria for good writing, and (7) examples of student work. I designed the course, integrating student needs with the IWE calendar, and posted the course description.

To my pleasant surprise 34 upper level students were waiting for me on the first day of this elective course. Both the oral and written feedback from students throughout the course indicated that the opportunity to learn how to use the Internet and to

communicate with their international peers, especially since travel privileges had been curtailed by IMF restrictions, excited them and attracted them to this course. Although the physical support for learning and teaching is limited at PNU, the enthusiasm of the students for learning remains strong. Examples of this positive feedback will be included throughout this paper under the appropriate headings in Chapter Two. In fact, the success of this course might also be demonstrated by the fact that two English language professors at PNU, one a native Korean and the other a Czech professor fluent in English, have continued offering this course since my departure from Pusan.

What is the HUT International Writing Exchange?

The International Writing Exchange is an on-line writing course for individual students registered at the Helsinki University of Technology. English classes from other countries are invited to register through their teacher. Individual students matriculating at a tertiary institution in other countries may also register, provided they are committed to working seriously for a whole round. Students post articles on the site during a four-week round and respond to each other's articles. The HUT International Writing Exchange is not self-paced and the schedule requires that all postings be completed within the four-week time frame. The range of postings includes; (1) an introduction letter, (2) an article on one of the ten listed topics, or a topic of choice, (3) a response to another students' article, (4) an article on criteria for good writing, (5) a short posting selecting the most outstanding article for inclusion in the HUT electronic journal, and (6) a written evaluation of the IWE.

I was confident that the IWE material available for downloading from the site would be interesting and challenging for my students, and that once enthused by the materials and the opportunity to communicate via the Internet with students from overseas, my students would produce a healthy quantity of written assignments. In addition, sharing their own work with other students and reading what other students had posted on the IWE site would develop a keener and a deeper awareness of writing criteria in my students that they would internalize and integrate into their own writing. Thus, the quality of their writing would improve through the IWE experience. I was excited to begin this course with my students and hoped that together we could ride the tiger in the year 1998!

In Chapter Two I will describe how I implemented the Advanced Composition Course and the student response to the course throughout Round Four and Round Five of the IWE. Moreover, I will discuss the healthy quantity of work produced by the students and what is revealed about student motivation through the quantity. I will describe in Chapter Three the variety of rhetorical styles employed to complete the writing assignments, and the quality of the language produced based on an analysis of T-units. I will, as well, discuss if the student work posted on the IWE site supports the claim that Internet English provides scaffolding between written discourse and its structural and lexical complexity and oral discourse and its structural and lexical simplicity. Finally, I will conclude with a discussion of what I learned about learning from my students through their work on the IWE site, as well as what I learned about the art of teaching through intuition and the science of teaching through reflective research.

CHAPTER 2

IMPLEMENTING THE COURSE AND STUDENT RESPONSE

Course Design

The Advanced Writing Course was scheduled three times a week on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday for a fifty minute class over a twelve-week term, totaling 1800 minutes or 30 class hours. (The traditional 14-week term was shortened by two weeks at Pusan National University to save on fuel expenses during the IMF era.) Classes began on August 24th, Monday, and continued until November 20th, Friday, with classes cancelled (a) one week from August 31st to September 6th for a class trip, (b) approximately a week from October 1st through the 6th for the school autumn festival and (c) from October 9th through the 18th for midterm examinations.

Round Four of the IWE ran from September 14th, Monday, until October 14th, Wednesday. The ten class meetings, scheduled during Round Four, are dedicated to IWE assignments. Round Five ran from October 15th, Thursday, until November 14th, Saturday. Twelve class meetings, scheduled during Round Five, are dedicated to IWE tasks. The final three classes on November 16th through the 18th focused on writing resumes. These older students in the junior and senior classes requested assignments on writing resumes in English because they intended to apply to international firms within the next year. Since Round Four did not begin until September 15th, the initial six class meetings focused on orienting the students, the majority of whom were inexperienced with computers, to the Internet.

As explained in Chapter One, the HUT International Writing Exchange is not self-paced and the schedule requires that all postings be completed within the four-week time frame. The range of postings for one round includes: (1) an introduction letter; (2) a 500-word article on one of the ten listed topics, or a topic of choice; (3) a response to another students' introduction letter or 500-word article; (4) an article by the student explaining their criteria for good writing which they have collected after participating in the IWE; (5) a short posting selecting the most outstanding article for inclusion in the HUT electronic Journal; and (6) a written evaluation of the IWE. An optional assignment, the Collaborative Story, was added to Round Five. Any student can begin a story by posting an entry and any student enrolled in the IWE can continue the story with the next entry. If students are enrolled in two consecutive rounds, they do not post a second Letter of Introduction, because their initial Letter of Introduction is automatically moved forward to the next round.

To support the students as they work on the six assignments, these six tasks were given them to complete throughout the two rounds: (1) Common Mistakes in the Introduction Letter; (2) Ice Breakers for the Introduction Letter; (3) Why Is E-mail Different?; (4) Chat Shorthand Handout; (5) Peer Edit Checklist on Facts & Opinions; and (6) Peer Edit Checklist on Types of Sources.

The first assignment, composed of the most common mistakes made by students in their Introduction Letter in previous rounds and collected by Ruth Vilmi, offers three exercises, the first of which lists 21 sentences in which students write in the appropriate missing article. The second lists 16 sentences in which students fill in the appropriate

missing prepositions, and the third has 12 sentences for which students choose the appropriate verb out of the two offered. Next, the Ice Breakers for the Introduction Letter assignment has 30 questions or leaders, ranging from the basic, "Where do you live?" and "What was the last good movie you saw?" to the more thought provoking, "Nobody knows that I am . . .", or "One thing I would want to change about today's world is" The third assignment, Why Is E-mail Different?, is a five-page printout explaining 14 topics about e-mail that students have questions on; context, page layout (shorter paragraphs, terser prose), intonation (light emphasis, strong emphasis, extreme emphasis, mutter equivalents), gestures (smileys, pause equivalents, creative punctuation), and summary.

The Peer Edit Checklist on Facts and Opinions lists eleven questions to guide the students in expressing an opinion in a clear, logical manner as they write the 500-word article, while the Peer Edit Checklist on Sources offers eleven questions to guide the students in researching sources for their topic. These two checklists are discussed in more detail in the eighth and ninth meeting in Round Four.

Orienting the Students to the Internet

When I presented the syllabus during the first orientation class, the students stated that they were excited about participating in the International Writing Exchange because they had never had an opportunity before to communicate with students from around the world on the Internet. Students explained that while only a few of them had their own personal computer in their dormitory room, the others had access to a computer in their dormitory study hall, or in the two computer laboratories on campus. My first assumption

that the students would be motivated by writing on the Internet seemed valid. I wanted to capitalize on this excitement by having them begin writing their Introduction Letters immediately. The learners would be eager to correct any errors, be they spelling, organizational, or developmental, on this piece of written communication that they were excited to post for their overseas peers to read. And they would be eager to read and apply the documents on good writing that they would download from the IWE site to the their own work. I believed that the immediacy of this approach would further motivate the already enthusiastic students.

Students brought the printout of four documents (the IWE Basic Handout, an example of an Introduction Letter posted in a previous round, Common Mistakes in the Introduction Letter, and Ice Breakers for the Introduction Letter), secured in the three-ring binder according to instructions, to the **second** orientation class. I had told the class that we would make our own textbook by filing downloaded documents into a binder. The fact that the learners had succeeded in printing out the documents showed me that they had the basic computer skills, or had quickly acquired them, and that they were motivated by the course. We discussed the tasks, the schedule, and the posting checklist explained in the Basic Handout.

Next, in pairs the students read the example of the Introduction Letter they had brought to class and discussed what they liked and what they disliked in the letter. Then, the learners brainstormed the following topics for their Introduction Letter in small groups and wrote the topics on the board to share with the large class group; religion, birth date, name, age, address, appearance, habits, hometown, family, school, job,

occupation, pets, hobbies, favorite things, likes and dislikes, Kyonju (the ancient capital of Korea and a UNESCO-designated cultural center an hour's drive outside of Pusan), and the Korean perspective on blood type.

I pointed out to the students that the Korean perspective on blood type as a prime factor in determining personality was specific to Korea. Not many cultures outside of Korea believed (as they explained it to me) that type A blood, for instance, indicated a shy, reflective nature with an artistic bent; nor that people with type O blood were natural leaders with a bright personality and who enjoyed people and had an extensive social network, despite being a little lazy and displaying an occasional temper; nor that type B blood signified a homebody who, although usually enthusiastic, suffered at times from mood swings. In response the students asked me if they should avoid the topic. I suggested to them that, to the contrary, a cultural topic like blood type might prove fascinating to an audience outside of Korea and provoke a lively and interesting dialogue. I urged them to include the topic in their Letter of Introduction or in their 500-word article, if appropriate to their article topic. Finally, I told the students to choose their topic and write the first draft of their Introduction Letter for the next class. I anticipated that it would take several class meetings and homework assignments before the students would produce a letter that could be posted on the IWE. Mainly, I anticipated poor thought organization and non-specific vocabulary. Therefore, I planned to give the learners ample time to develop the first writing assignment.

The students arrived at the **third** class meeting with the first draft of their Introduction Letter, but to my disappointment the letters looked very short. The problem

encountered with the first assignment was not one of organization nor vocabulary, but of length. I asked the students what the word count of their drafts was, and they could not answer me because, either through lack of training or through thoughtlessness, they had not checked the word count. I then asked them to count the words, and tell me the word count. The average length of the letters was only 200 to 300 words, and the students said that they could not write longer letters because they did not know what else to write in their letters. So, I told them to discuss with a partner what other topics they could include in their letters. I also asked the partner to ask the author questions about sections of the letter that were not clear, or else to give the partner suggestions on how to expand a topic already introduced in the letter. The students were very enthusiastic about working together and giving each other advice. As the pairs worked on the task, I circulated among the groups and answered questions. The students said that working in pairs had proved so helpful that they could expand their letters to 500 words for the next class.

At the end of the third meeting, the class leader informed me that the class was cancelled the next week due to the class trip. This calendar change unexpectedly eliminated one week from the orientation schedule. Therefore, I advised the students to study the two printouts pertaining to the Introduction Letter (Common Mistakes and Ice Breakers) and apply the concepts to their Letter of Introduction. For homework the learners were to download and printout two documents from the IWE; Why Is E-mail Different? and one example of a student posting from a previous IWE round on the topic, Criteria for Good Writing.

In the **fourth** orientation class, I was pleased to see that all 34 students had brought printouts of both documents, secured the documents in a three-ring binder-- despite the one-week hiatus from class. In pairs they read the document, *Why Is E-mail Different?*, and asked and answered questions. They seemed able to discuss the material, eager to learn about the Internet and ready to cooperate with all my instructions.

Students brought the second draft of their Introduction Letter to the **fifth** orientation meeting. Even though students had printed out and discussed in class the checklist on posting instructions and the four-page article entitled, *Why Is E-mail Different?*, their Introduction Letters revealed that they had not applied the instructions to their task. I saw many format mistakes such as; no respect for large or small case letters, the signature file unaligned at the left margin, and the language words (English, Korean) written in small case letters. Although they were only to write *IWE* in the subject line, they were writing a variety of words. Finally, instead of using asterisks to precede and follow the word or phrases to be emphasized, many were capitalizing complete words or phrases to emphasize them, which we had defined on the printout entitled, *Why Is E-mail different?*, as *screaming* and contrary to Internet protocol. As I pointed out the mistakes, I sensed that the class was becoming discouraged. Therefore, to discover the areas that the class needed to focus on, I assigned small groups to each of the 14 topics in the printout, *Why Is E-mail Different?* The topics included; introduction, context, layout, shorter paragraphs, terser prose, intonation, light emphasis, strong emphasis, extreme emphasis, mutter equivalents, gestures, pause equivalents, creative punctuation, and summary. They were to write one question for their section of the document and hand it

into me. I promised the students that I would type up a questionnaire on the document composed of their questions. They seemed encouraged by this, and said that because the topic of writing e-mail was new to them, they realized now that it was not so easy to understand the content of the printout.

For the **sixth** orientation meeting, I told the learners to read silently the student posting on Criteria for Good Writing that they had brought to class. Next, I told them to discuss the ideas in the posting that they liked with their partner. I circulated among the groups, and asked and answered the group questions. Then, the students reported to the class and discussed the criteria they had determined important. I then asked the students to find a new partner in class, and to exchange Introduction Letters with the partner. They were to read their partner's letter and apply the criteria of good writing we had discussed to their partner's letter. Again, students were eager to share ideas and help their partner with suggestions on the Introduction Letter. For the final class activity, the learners revised the printout of their Introduction Letter, applying the ideas from the printout on criteria discussed in the class. I circulated, asked questions and pointed out any format mistakes I saw. The assignment was to e-mail me the Introduction Letter at my e-mail account. Those that were correctly formatted would receive an e-mailed response from me to post their letter to IWE.

Round 4

During the **first** class of Round 4, the students answered the questions on the questionnaire on Why Is E-mail Different? that I had prepared from their list of questions from the fifth orientation meeting in small groups. Eliminating the questions that

overlapped, I had collected and typed 14 questions for the questionnaire. The students participated eagerly and often called me over to their group to ask me questions.

The questionnaire included these 14 student-generated questions:

1. Location, time, frame of mind, mood, health cannot be assumed. Therefore, what should we try to give our correspondent?
2. Why shouldn't we overquote?
3. Why shouldn't we use all capital letters to spell words in our e-mail?
4. What should we write at the end of a message?
5. Why should the subject line summarize the message content?
6. Why is e-mail not as rich a communication method as a face-to-face phone conversation?
7. How many topics are proper in one message?
8. What does the punctuation at the end of this sentence mean: Why did you give my report to Jack instead of Jill!?
9. You are going to send your love story with Julie on e-mail. How can you conceal her name?
10. Why do we insert brackets? []
11. What can we use when we want to pause during a conversation?

12. What can we do to help the reader read more easily on a computer screen?
13. Why do we use terse prose on the internet?
14. What do these symbols mean? ☺ ☺

Because many students were intrigued by *smileys* and other chat shorthand symbols, I promised to bring in a handout on Chat Shorthand to the next class. In my office that evening, I eagerly opened my e-mail account to verify that my students' Introduction Letters were correctly posted. Unfortunately, no letters were correctly formatted. I returned the incorrect ones to their authors, and pointed out the section of the Introduction Letter that was incorrectly formatted for instance; signature file, or subject line, or the address of the receiver.

At the beginning of the **second** meeting, I reviewed the posting checklist with the class with a quick, three-question oral quiz. I then asked the students to give their partner a similar quick oral quiz. I told the class that I would check my e-mail again that evening in my office and hoped to find correctly formatted Introduction Letters in my account.

Next, I drew five chat shorthand symbols, for instance a smiley, on the board, and asked the students in pairs to guess what the symbols meant within a ten-minute time limit. Then, in the large class group volunteers guessed the meaning of the symbols, and I corrected the mistakes. Next, I distributed the *Chat Shorthand* handout, and discussed the contents with the class. Lastly, students wrote a short, five-item quiz for their partner on the symbols. Partners exchanged, completed and corrected the quizzes. The students said they enjoyed learning the chat shorthand symbols.

Then, I divided the class up into small groups to continue working on the questionnaire on Why Is E-mail Different? Again, I circulated among the groups and answered questions. The class worked actively. That evening I again reviewed the Introduction Letters in my account, guided the authors to the section of their letter that had errors in it, and instructed them to post the corrected letters to me the next day.

At the beginning of the **third** meeting a quick oral checkup revealed that the students remembered concepts from yesterday's work on Why Is E-mail Different? For instance, they answered correctly that we use simple, short words in writing an e-mail posting as well as short paragraphs. They responded that an e-mail letter is usually one screen or 25 lines long, and that correspondents use a terser prose than that used in general prose. Next, students completed the questionnaire on Why Is E-mail Different? in pairs. I reviewed their answers in the large class group.

That evening while sorting through the student letters in my e-mail account, I noticed that some students were repeating certain technical mistakes. Even though I had reviewed the format for a signature field on the board that day in class, students were using small case when they should be using large case and visa versa. Other students were spacing three or five spaces on the left margin before they started the signature file instead of starting flush on the left margin. In the next meeting the students would start composing the Article and I worried that the students would not succeed in posting their letter before their article. I went to the student computer lab to print out the letters of the students still having difficulty, circled the repeated errors and wrote a note on the printout requesting that they detect their errors in my presence.

A quick oral quiz at the beginning of the **fourth** meeting on Why Is E-mail Different? showed that students had learned yesterday's material. Written feedback indicated that the students had found the questionnaire very helpful. One student wrote, "The list of questions is useful. When we have the questions, to find the answers we should understand the meaning of the handout." Another wrote, "The handout is very long. The checklist helps us make a summary of the long handout." Next, students selected what topic they wanted to write on for their next assignment, the 500-word article, and began the first draft. (See Appendix A.)

The authors of the three Introduction Letters successfully posted on the IWE site were very excited when they arrived in the **fifth** class meeting. In addition, three more had successfully posted their letter into the Test category of the Article file. Once the students post their document successfully into the Test category, they can move it forward into the Article file. So, in effect six students have mastered the technical challenges of posting on the IWE site. The motivational impact of seeing six of their classmates meet the technical challenge of posting successfully on the IWE site was evident. The class urged me to review the posting checklist from the Basic Handout once again. Therefore, I wrote a quiz reviewing the five steps in the posting checklist on the blackboard. Volunteers wrote in the exact letters and symbols in each of the five steps just as they would for the actual posting on the site.

Next, in pairs students read the printout of the Introduction Letter posted on the IWE site by a student outside of PNU that they liked best and brought to class. (In some cases, students brought the same letter to this class as they had to the second orientation

class. In other cases, students chose another Introduction Letter to respond to.) The learners were eager to share their letters. After discussing the letters, the students began to write a response to the letter. The assignment was to post the response to the letter before the next class.

In the **sixth** meeting students discussed the draft for their 500-word article which they had begun in the fourth class meeting. First, students exchanged their draft with their partner, read the article, and asked and answered questions about the draft. To review quickly the chat shorthand symbols, I had one student write five symbols on the board and volunteers went to the board and identified the symbol. Then, I noticed that students began to add the chat shorthand symbols to their articles during the in-class revision period, which had been my intention. After class I continued to guide the students who came to my office seeking help on posting their Introduction Letter, and would continue doing so until the ninth class meeting when all but one would be successfully posted. That final student would successfully post both his Introduction Letter and Article after the third meeting in Round Five. How his difficulty is resolved is discussed in detail in the account of the third meeting. Vilmi and her teaching assistants kept the Round Four site open and late assignments continued to be posted past the official deadline. This flexible attitude to the deadline was encouraging to students experiencing difficulty meeting the technical challenge of posting to the IWE.

I noticed an attitude change in the **seventh** meeting. When I asked the students what their word count was, they immediately began calling it out. This is in marked contrast to the third orientation meeting when the class could not tell me what the word

count was for their Introduction Letter because they had neglected to count the number of words. In the third orientation meeting the class had not yet accepted word count as a criteria for writing. But, they had recognized it by the seventh meeting in Round Four.

Next, I explained to the class that I wanted them to develop their internal editor. I explained that great writers read their work out loud to verify that their word choice was the best possible and the thought well developed. I told them to listen to their partner read their article and then ask the partner questions about any section that was not clear and to discuss that section. The students were also to complete an interview sheet recording two things they liked about their paper, and two things they liked about the draft of two peers. Upon completing the interview process, the students reported to the large class group things that they had liked in their own or in another's paper. This discussion helped the students develop their writing criteria as well as validated the writers whose comments were put into circulation in the class.

For instance, I heard one student advise his partner who was writing on stress to include an example of a stressful situation from her own life. After reflecting on his suggestion, she then said that the final exam in her major had been the source of the greatest stress in her life thus far. Her partner responded that reading that personal example would be interesting to the IWE students, and she decided to add it to her article. Through collaboration she learned to value herself and her experience.

A second student had written on the topic, *The Importance of My Country*. Assertively she immediately asked for feedback on her writing. A community of writers is being forged through collaboration. Students trust each other and are direct in their

communication with each other. Her partner suggested that she write that without her country she could not live, but the writer pointed out that she had already included that idea. After she saw that the sentiment was indeed included, the student said that although she had never actually thought about the importance of her country before reading her partner's paper, now she had because they had discussed it together. Both students in the pair were learning to reflect on written work, to edit the content, and to deepen their criteria through collaboration.

In the **eighth** meeting, the class edited their partner's article with checklist #1 on *facts* and *opinions*. After editing the articles, the partners discussed the results. (Both checklist #1 and #2 are based on the IWE Handout, *Critical Reading of Articles*, under the heading, *Language Help*.) The students told me that the checklist helped them think about distinguishing facts from opinions, and even about finding facts and opinions in their partner's paper. The students claimed not only that they did not learn the difference between facts and opinions in school, but also that they had not realized there was a difference between them. I was surprised to discover that the students needed more work in this area. Their oral fluency had lead me to believe that the activity would be a review of previously acquired knowledge.

Checklist #1 contained eleven questions:

1. Are the statements chiefly facts or opinions?
2. Give the first example of a fact.
3. Give a second example of a fact.
4. Give a third example of a fact.

5. Give a first example of an opinion.
6. Give a second example of an opinion.
7. Give a third example of an opinion.
8. What is one weakness in the writer's reasoning?
9. What word would you the reader use to describe the tone of the article? (For example, angry, sarcastic, critical, amusing, anxious, etc.)
10. Does the author use emotional language in the article? If so, give two or three examples. Example: The deadly typhoon blasted a path of destruction throughout the country.
11. Did the author change your way of thinking about the topic of the article? If so, how?

The students are becoming more conscious of errors than they were in the beginning of the course. One student said to his partner that there were many mistakes in the paper. When the partner asked what the errors were, the first student said that it was not his job to correct so many (mechanical) mistakes. He told his partner that it was her task to correct her own mistakes as much as possible before giving him the article to read so that he could focus on aspects of macro revision of organization, or transition, for example. This feedback reveals that the students are developing their criteria from participating in the IWE. The learners are reading postings on the IWE from many students in many locales, they see the standard of production accepted by the IWE and are seeking to match that standard.

The students were confused about the meaning of *source* in the **ninth** meeting, as the peer editors completed checklist #2 on sources of information. Many said that their partner had solely used a personal experience as a source of information. I asked the learners what alternate and impersonal sources of information might they tap into when writing their article. They brainstormed and listed alternate sources on the board such as; television, the World Wide Web, film, books, magazines and newspapers. I suggested to the learners that they add impersonal sources of information to their article in addition to personal experience.

Checklist #2 listed eleven questions:

1. Ask your partner why he or she chose this topic to write on.
2. What is the topic of this article?
3. What is the main idea the author writes about this topic?
4. What is the source of the writer's information?
5. Is the source reliable?
6. What is the date (month/day/year) of the source? Is the source up-to-date?
7. For this topic, does it matter that the source is up-to-date? Explain.
8. Did the article interest you? If so, why and in what way? If not, why not?
9. Does any information in the article tell you about the culture of the author?
10. If so, how is it different in your area of Korea?

11. IWE participants vote on three articles to be placed in the electronic magazine on the Internet. What advice can you give this author to help their article win one of the three prizes?

During the **tenth** meeting held on October 7th after the six-day school autumn festival, I reviewed the difference between fact and opinion. The students had brought their Article and Checklist #1 on facts and opinions to class, again. In pairs the students searched their articles for examples of facts. Volunteers wrote their selections on the board for a large class discussion. Many students still classified opinions selected from their work as facts. I asked the class what a fact was. The class brainstormed and defined a fact as something real or actual, something that can be demonstrated, or something that can be objectively verified. Next, the class brainstormed and defined an opinion as a belief, a judgment or a feeling that is not supported by proof. The class then studied their articles for more examples of facts, and this time the majority offered good examples of facts. During the oral feedback session on the Peer Edit Checklist #1 on facts and opinions, students stated that it was helpful. While most learners neglected to add facts to support their personal opinion, some students did not add their personal opinion to complete their collection of facts. As one student wrote, "I only used facts. Now I realize that adding a personal opinion would make my article more interesting." Through collaboration this student learned to value self. Through collaboration she learned to appreciate her experiences as valid enough to be included in her writing.

Round 5

After an eighteen-day break from October 1st through the 18th (school autumn festival, and the midterm examination week) interrupted by one day of class, students returned to class. In an effort to provide scaffolding between Round Four and Round Five after the long break, students discussed in small groups the handout on Criteria for Good Writing that they had printed out from the collection of previous work on the IWE site. They then gave some examples to the large class group and composed their article on good criteria to be posted on the site. Their opinions on what good criteria were strong. Their experience is providing them with opportunities to test criteria and to determine for themselves what good criteria are.

During the **second** meeting of Round Five, students brought in an article from a previous Round (either Round One, Two or Three), along with one of the postings that had been voted into the electronic Journal for Round Four on the IWE site. In pairs they discussed what they liked in the article or disliked. Next, they wrote their vote for the article in Round Four that they had chosen for inclusion in the electronic Journal. The students were very excited about voting for the article they liked, as well as about the possibility of receiving a vote for their article. Vilmi and her teaching assistants kept the Round Four site open and late votes for the electronic Journal continued to be posted past the official deadline. This flexible attitude to the deadline encouraged the students from PNU and other participating universities, a number of whom complained that the four-week round was too short to complete all the assignments.

At this point the teacher from Temasek Polytechnic in Singapore proposed the Collaborative Story as an optional topic for Round Five. To demonstrate my appreciation

as a teacher for the project, as discussed under the first meeting of Round Five, in light of Vilmi's e-mail on October 10th, I posted a response in favor of the idea, and asked specific questions about the procedure. Vilmi decided to open the Collaborative Story site. A student begins a story by posting an entry and any student enrolled in the IWE can continue the story with the next entry. These five stories were begun in Round Five; Bad Memories, Alma, Via's Diary, The Bear, and The Unfortunate Condition. PNU students posted thirteen entries to the Collaborative Story site. (In fact, students were so motivated by the Collaborative Story site that they continued to post entries for a total of seven for up to two weeks after Round Five deadline.)

In the **third** meeting students wrote an Evaluation of Round Four of the IWE to be posted on the site. To explore their ideas students first completed three leaders: I liked . . .; For the next time I suggest . . .; and I learned . . . on an interview sheet. Students spent time considering how they wanted to complete these statements. Next, students interviewed two peers and wrote their statements down on the interview sheet. The students were animated as they exchanged ideas with their two peers. I noticed that students were clarifying information frequently and repeating answers back to their peers. They were motivated to understand exactly what their peer was thinking. One student said that she had especially enjoyed the cultural differences in the IWE. I asked her for an example and she said that Helsinki University of Technology had a Department of Forestry and Wood Processing, but that there was no such department at Pusan National University. Two qualities of IWE that students repeatedly stated that they liked were the chance to express their opinion, and learning about cultural differences. Several said that

the IWE should collect student suggestions for topics for the next round. Since the Round Five topics were already posted, it was too late to follow up on this suggestion for Round Five, but I promised the students to collect their suggestions for Round Six. Finally, they composed their posting. That the students were invested in the IWE and participating at a more involved level in the project is shown by their contributing topics to the next round. Vilmi and her teaching assistants kept the Round Four site open and late assignments on the IWE Evaluation continued to be posted past the official deadline which was encouraging to a number of the students who complained that the deadline was too tight.

All but one student, Student #28, had successfully posted their Introduction Letter and Article. Student #28 came to my office after classes to complain that neither his Introduction Letter nor his Article were posted on the IWE despite his having sent them. Together we reviewed the posting checklist to the IWE and the student claimed he had followed the steps. He showed me his Introduction Letter in the sent file of his account on my computer. I pointed out that he had typed the subject in small case letters (iwe) and the directions said to use upper case letters (IWE). The student claimed that it made no difference whether the subject was typed in small case or in upper case letters. I asked him to use my computer to post his Introduction Letter again with the subject in lower case letters and to send a copy to my account as a check. Together we opened my account, and the Introduction Letter had, indeed, been sent successfully to my account.

After student #28 had left, I explored the Forum section, which is an IWE site for open discussion on problems or opinions. I found a posting from a teacher explaining

that his students had failed to post because they had written the subject in lower case letters. He warned other teachers to make sure their students write the subject in upper case letters. I gave the student the URL the next day in class and asked him to download the teacher's letter and to bring it to me in my office that next evening after classes. Student #28 appeared in my office and read the letter to me. He said he understood what to do now and let me know the next day that his Introduction Letter and Article were successfully posted.

After classes a second student visited me in my office with all three final assignments (as explained in the posting below in detail). She was so excited about participating in the IWE that she could not stop working on the projects and handed them all into me that evening. We discussed her experience with IWE, and her positive comments prompted me to send Vilmi a posting through the Forum section listing the IWE successful experiences of the class.

The learners chose their topic for their Round Five Article in the **fourth** meeting. (See Appendix B.) I wrote the ten topics for the Round on the board and students discussed in small groups of four what topic was most interesting to them and why. Students began to write their article and were to complete it for the next meeting.

In the **fifth** meeting students exchanged articles with a partner and applied Checklist #1 on facts and opinions to their partner's paper. The discussion was lively, the students got on task immediately and were engrossed in reading their partner's paper. In the written feedback a student explained that, "This (time) is better because we are familiar with the types of questions now."

Students applied Checklist #2 on sources of information to a partner's paper in the **sixth** meeting. Again, the discussion was lively, students were deeply involved in reading their partner's paper and in discussing ideas. Now students were much more aware of how to incorporate researched information into their original work. While engaged in researching sources (Most had researched on the Internet.), they had been exposed to the various perspectives possible when studying a topic, and that their own experience might not have introduced them to. Moreover, they shared examples of facts and opinions from their peer's paper, thus demonstrating that they have learned the difference between facts and opinions well since Round Four.

For the **seventh** meeting in Round Five students brought in the third draft of their Article to be read in a small group of four students. Peers told each other what they liked about their Article. Next, students reported to the large class group what they especially liked about a peer's paper, as well as what was the most helpful comment made about their Article by their peers which helped students form and test criteria, and validated the good work of the writer.

Students wrote a response to an Article posted by a student other than a Pusan National University student in the **eighth** meeting. Each student brought in an article that they wanted to respond to. They read the article silently in class and noted two or three things that they wanted to comment on. Then, they read the article to their partner and explained what provoked their interest and their comments. Their partner discussed their notes and ideas, and then received input on their selected article and proposed response. The students began to write their posting.

When I announced in the next class that student #10 received a vote, the class was excited to see a PNU student name listed among the international participants in the statistics posting. (A recent review of the site revealed the original statistics posting has been replaced by a more extensive one. Perhaps the students from the other participating institutions, in addition to the PNU students, found the four-week round too short a time frame in which to complete the assignments, as did the PNU students, and sent in postings after the declared due date, thus compelling an update of the statistics.)

For the **ninth** meeting students brought to class a printout of the Round Four article on criteria. Volunteers wrote on the board points from their Round Four Criteria that they found to hold true for Round Five as well. In small groups of four the students discussed whether they agreed that the criteria on the board held true for both Round Four and Round Five. Then, students began to write their article on criteria in class, to be finished for homework and posted on the IWE site.

To brainstorm on the Evaluation posting for Round Five during the **tenth** meeting, students wrote comments on the board under two headings; What was good about Round Five?, and What I suggest for Round Six. In response to the students' request in the third meeting to send suggestions for Article topics to the IWE, I collected the following list of 21 topics and sent them to the IWE Forum site in the e-mail posted in the Forum section:

Titles:

1. Travel
2. A person I respect and why
3. Fashion

4. Dance/dancing
5. Hobbies outside of writing
6. A childhood memory
7. Music
8. Poetry/favorite poem
9. The rights of homosexuals
10. What we should do when we are in our 20's
11. UFO's
12. The most repressive moment in my life
13. My future dream
14. Change in the standard of beauty
15. Interesting habits
16. Friends/friendship
17. Love
18. Big mistakes in my life
19. Drama

Ruth Vilmi posted a thank you letter for the topic suggestions on the Forum site.

In a later posting dated February 7th Ruth Vilmi states that she will use some of the topics sent in by the PNU students through myself along with suggestions from another class.

I responded two days later that I would ask my students to complete the statistics.

Several students volunteered to calculate the statistics on Round Five and post them on the IWE site in response to Ruth Vilmi's request. The male student, well versed in the techniques of writing the statistics in html format, hesitated to agree when I requested his help with the project. But, when his two female peers requested his aid, he readily accepted the project. They came to my office several times after class to complete the project on my computer. Finally, the three posted the statistics on the IWE site on November 24th. When we called up the site together to see the statistics correctly formatted and successfully posted, the students told me it is a very exciting experience for them.

In the **eleventh** meeting, the students wrote their vote for their favorite article to be posted on the IWE electronic Journal. They brought in the printout of their favorite article to class to discuss with a partner. After they explained to their partner why they liked the article, their partner asked them questions. Volunteers then listed the good points of their selected article on the board for a large class discussion. (Students #5 and #11 received a vote, and were listed in the statistics for Round Six on the IWE electronic Journal. Vilmi had accepted the postings after the Round Five deadline and included them with the next round. The students were very proud of their success.)

For the **twelfth** meeting, the learners wrote how their criteria changed from Round Four to Round Five. In small groups they discussed the development of their criteria, when it occurred and what prompted the change. They then completed the writing assignment for homework.

Results of the Evaluation of Round Four

In the Evaluation postings on Round Four (See Appendix C.) 19 students out of the 34 participants volunteered that the IWE was a positive learning experience. For instance, student #1 wrote,

I enjoyed the IWE project and it's good for me. It's helpful to improve my ability of English Composition and to express my opinion. By sending some replies to my favorite article and other introduction, I learned to read other writing critically. And I know the pleasure of communicating with others by expressing my opinion and catching other()'s opinion.

Student #2 explained that she enjoyed participating in the IWE because she could

read what her peers wrote. "I think it was a golden opportunity to know other's articles. . . . I could have read many fine works by good professional writers. However, I could not read amateurs' fresh writing like mine."

In addition, 22 students explained how participating in the IWE developed their writing criteria. Student #2 stated, "I often (re)corrected my errors or regulated my opinion." Again, student #20 explained, "IWE was (a) good chance for me to exercise my English composition. . . . I could see other's format."

Without hesitation 15 students expressed their initial anxiety about using a computer or the Internet, even though that anxiety is later relieved through success and 26 students claim that they developed Internet and computer skills through participation in the IWE. Student #3 wrote,

But, one thing that I was afraid (of) was unfamiliarity of using computer, especially using (the) (I)nternet. . . . First of all to send my writing on the Internet was so fantastic. When I found my writing on the screen (after I made several mistakes and corrected it) it was really surprising and wonderful to me.

Student #21 explained his frustration in detail.

But personally, I had (a) harsh time to see my introduction I just tried to send it time and time again. One time, even though it is the same writing, it is on the invalid se(c)tion I don't understand the explanation what was wrong with mine.

Fear due to a lack of experience in using computers is described by student #27. "When I heard what we were going to do in IWE from my professor in the first class, I was very afraid (because) I had never used computers for sending my letters."

The power of the IWE to motivate students and to focus student attention on the writing and on the program is expressed by student #4, "Almost everyday I thought about my introduction, article and response to someone."

The opportunity to discuss cultural differences with students from other countries is cited by 22 students as an attractive feature of IWE, and 25 students appreciated the chance to express their own opinion and to exchange opinions with their IWE peers. For example, student #27 describes how participation in the IWE helps her surmount isolation and make international contact.

I have hoped that I could make many foreign friends. But in these days because of the economic crisis of our country, it is very difficult and expensive to go abroad.

So I can hardly meet someone from other countries. However, through IWE, I can make many foreign keypals and know their thought or opinion.

In addition, one student claimed that the IWE helped her learn how to read critically, another that the IWE offered her the chance to think deeply about one topic, and a third appreciated the opportunity to discuss common problems across cultures.

Enthusiasm for the IWE prompted students to offer suggestions to improve the IWE even more, and eleven students proposed that a greater variety of topics be offered and that student-suggested topics be included. Of the 34 students participating in the IWE, eight chose free choice topics. Of these, four wrote on the importance of Korea, while four wrote about how the International Monetary Fund (IMF) austerity measures imposed on the flagging Korean won affected their lives. (See Appendix A.) Of the other nine topics offered, one (plagiarism) failed to attract any writers. Religion proved

the most interesting, inviting five writers. The remaining seven drew between two and four writers. The Introduction Letters elicited 31 responses from PNU students, while the topic of stress attracted three responses from PNU students.

Three students requested that the round be longer than four weeks to give them enough time to post all the assignments. (See Appendix D.) A more user friendly Basic Handout is requested by two students, and two more students wish for improved computer facilities on the PNU campus. Award certificates for participants is suggested by two students. One student requested a more detailed explanation of why his article was sent to the Invalid Site, while another asked for more checklists to help her improve her written English.

Two students hope for more student interaction in future rounds. An examination of Round Four reveals ten exchanges resulting in a production of 2,797 words. Of these 2,541 words were prompted by PNU student writings, and 256 words were written by a PNU student in a response to a HUT student. (See Appendix E.) Of these exchanges, two were directed to student #5 whose article on religion drew comments from two students, one from Sogang University in Korea and one from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. In addition, an introduction letter by student #27 prompted a repeated exchange from a HUT student.

In total 153 comments for an average of 4.5 per individual were volunteered by the students in the Evaluation of Round Four. (See Appendices C and D.)

Results of the Evaluation of Round Five

The Evaluation postings by the students for Round Five (See Appendices F and G.) described their personal development in developing criteria for writing, in using the computer and the Internet, and the development in the program from Round Four to Round Five. For example, ten students state that participating in the IWE improved their writing skills, nine wrote that IWE improved their Internet skills, and twelve that because their Internet skills improved through participating in Round Four, participating in Round Five was easier.

Student #28 explained how participating in the IWE improved her computer literacy skills:

One of my friend(s) said that the more she participates in the IWE, the better her skill in computers is. . . . At first, I had to spen(d) more than 2 hours to type an article, nowadays I can type 400 to 500 in half an hour. What an amazing!!

Student #27 described her own success:

When I started round 4, I didn't know how to use computer for sending e-mail. So I had a lot of mistakes and my articles were in (the) Invalid section. Then I was very confused. But in round 5, I rarely had mistakes, so I could spare time and enjoy others' articles. Thank for this, IWE!!!

In addition, student #16 discussed how her self-confidence, computer skills and English language ability grew through the IWE experience:

Now, I (have) almost finished Round 5. It means that I have experienced IWE Round two times. And it means also that I come to have some confidence with it. While (doing) Round 4 I couldn't be sure if I'm doing the right thing. I (made)

some mistakes in sending E-mail and (was) always somewhat nervous about it. But while (doing) Round 5, I could do it more easily and comfortably with self-reliance. These days I seldom make a mistake.

This personal development on the part of the students in developing criteria for writing, and in using the computer and the Internet seems to have lead to enough ease with the medium and the skill of writing that students began to explore ideas and opinions on a deeper level. As student #12 writes:

. . . in Round 4, we could find more common topic that we could handle easily, but in Round 5, there are more difficult and conflicting ideas. Well and in round 5, I can find my friends who take part in this activity get many replies.

Again, student #6 explained how learned ease in computer literacy and in the skill of writing enabled the students to enter into deeper discussions on more difficult topics:

By the way, (in) Round 5 there are some differences from 4. One of (these) is some topics were different from 4, but they were more specific and a little difficult. To write them, we had to have a lot of knowledge (which) was (almost) professional. Although the topics were difficult, there were many good articles. I think the reason is (that) all of the students' writing skill . . . improved with Round 4. Of course(,) we could use a computer easily. To reach this level, we experienced trial and error. Although the process was a little difficult, it is very useful. So I am very pleased to participate (in) IWE.

Five students volunteered that Round Five was more interactive than Round Four which student #34 described:

Participants activities is livelier. Since they wrote their opinions and replies more diligently than they did in round 4, they made their IWE much better than ever. In Round 4, my classmates who joined IWE rarely get replies, however, in round 5, many students could get theirs.

In addition, student #31 stated that she read many more postings in Round Five than she did in Round Four. "In round 5 I could do more easily and comfortably than round 4. While I had no time to read other people's writings, in round 5 I read many writings." In addition, student #29 explained that students were replying to each other's postings more often. "... the number of writings were also increased. I think this proves that writers become more active. Many repl(ies) can be another evidence."

A survey of the interactions in Round Five supports these student assertions.

While there were ten responses producing 2,797 words in Round Four, there were 16 responses posted in Round Five (an increase of 60%), producing 3,575 words, an increase of 28%. (See Appendix H.) Of these two were a repeated exchange between student #3 and her correspondent from Missouri. Five students (#1, #2, #20, #22 and #34) received two responses from their peers. Round Five topics were more varied and interesting than Round Four topics to 21 students. A review of the postings in Round Five shows 46 were made by 34 students, an increase of 12 or 35%. (See Appendix H.) The Collaborative Story category elicited thirteen postings and generated four stories in a month. Of these, Alma, drew five participants. The free choice category attracted six participants and produced two topics on the part of the students; Shopping in Pusan and a Description of PNU. One topic (communicating with computer scientists) failed to draw participation.

CHAPTER 3

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF
THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF LANGUAGE PRODUCEDThe Quantity of Language Produced

An analysis of the quantity of language produced in Round Four and Five reveals a consistent attainment of goals. The word count of the three major assignments falls

<i>Assignments</i>	<i>Average Word Count for IWE Postings with a goal of 500 words</i>
Orientation Introduction Letter	450 words
Round Four Article	470 words
Round Five Article	466 words

within a general range; the Orientation Introduction Letter (450 words); the Round Four Article (470 words); and the Round Five Article (466 words). These averages are close to the goal of 500 words per Article set by Ruth Vilmi, the IWE administrator. (See Appendices J, L and M.)

Although the word count of the remaining assignments in both rounds also falls within a general range, an analysis of the Round Five reveals a slight decline in word count in two assignments (the Response, and the Evaluation). For instance, the Round Four Response posting by PNU students totals 7,414 words and averages 218, while the Round Five Response totals 6,289 words and averages 185. The Round Four Criteria assignment totals 5,348 words and averages 157, and the Round Five Criteria increases to a total of 5,995 words or an average 176. While the Round Four Evaluation task totals

7,405 words or averages 217, the Round Five Evaluation declines to 4,468 words total, or 131 average despite a more active Round Five with more numerous exchanges as

Table 1: Summary of Round Four Word Count

ROUND FOUR 15.09.98--14.10.98	A. Article B. Response by PNU student C. Criteria D. Evaluation E. Total words				
	A	B	C	D	E
Total	15,564	7,414	5,348	7,405	35,731
Student	#5	#30	#30	#5	#5
Highest word count	930	448	340	420	2,300
Student	#25	#11	#2	#32	#32
Lowest word count	392	110	103	88	1,168

Note: the average word count produced per student during Round Four is 1,051.

discussed under the previous heading, Round Five Evaluation, in Chapter Two.

Table 2: Summary of Round Five Word Count

ROUND FIVE 15.10.98--14.11.98	A. Article B. Response by PNU student C. Criteria D. Evaluation E. Collaborative Story F. Total words					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Total	15,852	6,289	5,995	4,468	3,432	36,036

Note: the average word count produced per student during Round Five is 1,060.

Student	#1	#3	#28	#6	#6	#6
Highest word count	792	264	319	228	364	1,544
Student	#17	#7	#12	#13&33	#31	#15
Lowest word count	232	99	88	88	168	756

The increased language production in the Round Five Evaluation posting might result from the expansion and development of student criteria through their IWE experience. If the students feel that they have learned a great deal in one area, it can be argued that they will be motivated to express that newly acquired knowledge and awareness.

The slight decline in word production in the other Round Five tasks could be accounted for by the fact that while seven weeks were required by the students to complete the Round Four tasks due to unfamiliarity with using the Internet, only three weeks were available to complete the Round Five assignments before the official deadline. Nonetheless, Round Four produced an average of 1,051 words, and Round Five 1,060 which is an average increase of nine words per student in Round Five.

The new category of Collaborative Story, instituted in the first week of Round Five, inspired the production of 3,432 words from thirteen PNU students, the first posting of which occurred on October 23rd or approximately one week after its announced opening. The response of those thirteen students to the Collaborative Story category was quick, it was maintained and it was of a healthy quantity (101 words per PNU student). A new Collaborative Story posting by a PNU student resulted every two or three days over the 37-day posting period from October 15th to November 24th. As noted in Chapter Two, this category motivated the students to write so much that they continued to post to this category

ten days after the official deadline. Fortunately, Vilmi permitted postings after the official deadline.

Table 1 above shows that student #5 wrote the highest word count in three categories in Round Four; the 500-word Article, the Evaluation of IWE, and the total word count for all four articles in Round Four. Student #30 produced the highest word count for two assignments; response by a PNU student and the Criteria article. Studying Table 2 above reveals that student #6 wrote the highest word count in three categories in Round Five; the Collaborative Story, the Evaluation of IWE, and the total word count for all six articles in Round Five. No one student produced the lowest word count in more than one task.

The Rhetorical Styles Used in Student Postings

In analyzing the rhetorical style used by the students as they completed both rounds, I referred to the article on Rhetorical Categories contributed by Lou Spaventa (1998) to the IWE Basic Handout which explains seven modes and gives topic examples for each; description, narrative, exposition, cause and effect, argument, process analysis and comparison and contrast. (See Appendix I.) Table 3 summarizing the use of rhetorical styles in both rounds is found at the end of the following detailed explanation.

Orientation

In the Introduction Letter, initiated during the Orientation Period as the first writing assignment of the IWE, fifteen students utilized the narrative mode. For instance, eleven narrated a story in the Letter about how they decided to become an English teacher, three a story about a trip, and one a story about living alone. (See Appendices J and K.) In addition,

the class described eight topics (self, family, Korea, hometown, PNU, boyfriend, Hangul the Korea alphabet system, and pet) for a class total of 72 times. The expository style was practiced 40 times by students as they discussed: their hobby; the language of English; university studies; the IWE; my future career as a riot police officer; current events (the Clinton scandal and the IMF); food; my future dream of studying Spanish; living near Haeundae Beach; the special color of the sea; and historical myths. In discussing the above topics in the expository mode, students explained how and why things are the way they are and also included some argument, some description, some analysis and/or some narrative in their compositions.

Round Four

An analysis of the 500-word Article in Round Four reveals that 18 students employed the expository style to develop their topics. The student number is followed by their topic: #2 and #5 stress; #3 celebration; #6 the Pusan International Film Festival; #7 English; #10, #12, #32 and #33 my favorite writer; #11, #13 and #26 religion; #15 a Korean celebration; #17 the Internet; #18 drugs; #19 the importance of Korea; and #20 and #31 the IMF.

Argument was the style employed by six students to develop their 500-word Article in Round Four: #23 A Great Hobby--Writing; #24 Why Is Korea Important in the World?; #25 The Importance of My Country--South Korea; #27 Why Is South Korea Important?; #30 Writing as a Hobby; and #34 Writing Is Easy and Useful. These students held an opinion on a topic after reading a text, explained that opinion in a step by step manner, and laid out the points in the argument, as described in the article on rhetorical categories by Spaventa.

Narrative was the style used by student #4 writing her Article about the IMF, and student #29 in his article on a Korean celebrations.

An examination of the responses sent by PNU students to other students participating in the IWE reveals that a combination of rhetorical modes is used in each student response. For example, description is used 31 times as the writers describe themselves, nine times to describe their native country Korea, twelve times to describe their keypal's country, eight times to describe a country other than their native country or their keypal's native country, twice to describe their family and once to describe their university. On the other hand, the narrative mode is used by 25 students: eleven learners discussed their hobby; six discussed the IWE, using the Internet and the computer; six discussed how the IMF has limited travel and full and part time job prospects for university students; one student discussed his return to student life despite having a family; and one discussed his English teacher in Canada. Finally, the expository style, which often contains some argument, description, narrative with an attempt at analysis, is used by 20 writers in discussing three topics. Fourteen learners write about their future career or major, or that of their keypal. Four send input to their keypal about the form or content development of the keypal's Article. In addition, two discuss the Article topic.

All students utilized process analysis (explaining how to do things) when they wrote their article on the criteria for good writing that they developed in Round Four.

In writing their Evaluation article for Round Four all writers employed the expository style with a heavy emphasis on the narrative as they described what happened during the

learning process, what they learned, how they mastered problems, and what they learned from their mistakes. At the end of their Evaluations the students entered a short process of analysis and made recommendations for future rounds of IWE.

Round Five

Round Five saw the descriptive style used by six learners as they used detail and spatial organization to develop their 500-word Articles: #4, #6, #15 and #25 Shopping in Pusan; and #22 and #27 PNU. The expository mode was employed by 13 writers in developing their Articles: #11 and #31 family; #13, #14 and #17 celebration; #20, #29 and #34 film; #23 and #24 PNU; and #28, #32 and #33 body language.

Argument was used by ten students to explore their 500-word Article topic, and the stronger argumentative tone of most of the Round Five titles is evident when compared to the Round Four titles (in paragraph two under the heading *Round Four*: #1 Why Earlier Drinking is Dangerous (?); #3 Why is Body Language Important in our Communication?; #7 Frozen Embryos; #12 The Right of Frozen Embryos; #16 White Superiority in American Movies; #18 The Facts and Seriousness of Drinking of Youths; #19 I Love My Family; #21 Drinking at an Early Age in Korea; #26 Drinking at an Early Age; and #30 Family Is the Most Important System in our Society. In six instances in Round Five titles students employed the superlative (once), and lexis (five times) that indicate the author's opinion such as, *dangerous, important, right, seriousness, and superiority*, in their titles. Round Four saw students utilize only lexis like *great* and *important* in four instances. The argumentative tone did not affect grammar choice in Round Four titles.

The four students (#2, #5, #8, and #9) writing on the environmental topic of *Green: business strategy, acting green versus being green* employed the cause and effect mode to explore their topic.

Student #10 wrote her Article on celebrations in the narrative mode.

An examination of the responses from PNU students in Round Five shows that 33 utilized the expository style. Many used the narrative mode in the beginning of their response to explain a situation that they had experienced similar to the one discussed by their keypal. Then they moved to some analysis of the dynamics of the situation or the human relationships in the situation which often resulted in an attitude change and a behavior modification. Self-description was employed to introduce nine responses. Finally, five students used the process analysis to give their keypal feedback on the format or the topic development of their Article.

The Collaborative Stories are written in the narrative style with students utilizing the descriptive mode occasionally to describe a character. In writing the Criteria article, the learners used the process analysis mode. On the other hand, to write the Evaluation article students compared and contrasted Round Four with Round Five, drew conclusions, and made recommendations for Round Six.

Summary of the Use of Rhetorical Modes in Both Rounds

The rhetorical modes employed by the PNU students include; narrative (N), description (D), exposition (E), cause and effect (C & E), argument (A), process analysis

(PA) and comparison and contrast (C & C). A summary of the use of rhetorical modes in Rounds Four and Five follows. (See Appendix I.)

Table 3: A Summary of the Use of Rhetorical Modes By PNU Participants

A. Rhetorical styles						A. 500-word Article (5)					
B. Introduction Letter (Orientation)						B. Response from PNU Student (5)					
C. 500-word Article (4)						C. Collaborative Story (5)					
D. Response from PNU Student (4)						D. Criteria Article (5)					
E. Criteria Article (4)						E. Evaluation Article (5)					
F. Evaluation Article (4)						F. Total for Both Rounds					
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
N	15	2	25		*	1		13			56
D	72		31			6	9				118
E	40	18	20		34	13	33				158
C/E		7				4					11
A		6				10					16
PA				34			5		34		73
C/C										34	34

*Expository mode employed with a heavy emphasis on the narrative (N).

While it can be argued that some of the instances of rhetorical use above vary in length from a few sentences to entire articles, nonetheless, each instance of use indicates the students' ease in using the mode and some awareness of the mode. It is encouraging to note that every mode has been employed by some members of the class during their participation in the IWE.

The most frequently used style is the expository style and the second is the descriptive. The mode utilized the least often is the cause and effect with seven in Round Four and four in Round Five, although it was used in both rounds. The next is the argument style that increased from six in Round Four to ten in Round Five. This increase might indicate that students do move forward in mastering a variety of rhetorical styles simply

through practice, but the slow pace could be accelerated by teacher direction, instruction and introduction of successful examples of previous student work. For example, 34 students used the comparison and contrast style in writing the Round Five Evaluation Article; however, the teacher provided scaffolding by guiding the class through a discussion with an interview sheet the day before assigning the Round Five Evaluation Article. It seems that the teacher needs to interject and direct the learning process by providing scaffolding for the students. For example, the narrative mode does not really emerge as a distinct mode used in a posting of a goodly length until the students are challenged by the Collaborative Stories introduced in Round Five.

It can be said that the expository style is a good mode for students to begin writing in their L2 since it allows them to write in shorter lengths in a variety of styles but in one posting, and that a posting of some length. Students can become discouraged if they produce a composition of what they consider is a short length, or a much shorter length than they could produce in their L1. Yet, students do need to learn to be able to distinguish the individual modes, to pry out them out, to expand and develop them, and to decide when it is appropriate to use them. For instance, the Round Five response article by student #8 to a posting by a Japanese participant describing the summer festival of *Tanabata* could have easily been developed into a comparison and contrast composition. But the responder simply narrated what Koreans do during *Chilwoel Chilsuk*, the Korean equivalent of the Japanese celebration. She failed to explain at what points the two stories are similar and different. In

her conclusion she introduces a third element, the feast of western lovers Saint Valentine's Day, without clearly connecting it to the two oriental festivals already mentioned.

In addition to introducing successful examples of previous student work, the teacher can guide the development of student writing skill through topic selection. The choice of topic can prompt students to produce an assignment of a good length and utilizing a clearly defined rhetorical mode, such as the process analysis that the students wrote for the Criteria Article in both rounds. The topic tapped into their immediate experience and they composed interesting and well-organized postings (especially in Round Five) listing the steps they had determined as essential in producing good writing.

Results of Language Analysis through T-Units

In order to compare objectively the correct use of language in both rounds and, thereby, assess the progress the class had made in written expression, the T-unit was employed in this study. A T-unit as explained by Hunt (1965) is a, "minimal terminable unit, . . . minimal as to length, and each . . . grammatically capable of being terminated with a capital letter and a period". More than one T-unit may occur within one sentence. For instance, this sentence contains two T-units: I had never used the Internet before this course, and I was very excited to post my Letter of Introduction for everyone to read.

Moreover, a T-unit as a measure of length of writing by an L2 learner is an objective measurement of writing proficiency, free from reflecting or analyzing errors in structure resulting from the influence of the writer's L1 as explained by Larsen-Freeman and Strom (1977). Also, as they state the L2 learner is more mature cognitively than an L1 learner

mastering the same level of material, and not likely to limit the written production to less than a T-unit, that is to utterances of a few morphemes in length. Therefore, the total number of T-units used by the student was counted. In addition, the number of words per T-unit was totaled because as learners master how to embed and to use subordinate clauses, they pack the T-unit with more meaning than they did when a beginning writer. As they perceive relationships in the topic being developed, they select more structures to express those dependencies, developments and relationships. Furthermore, the more sophisticated, advanced and specific vocabulary pool that they develop through writing practice enables the writers to reduce strings of main clauses into words and phrases.

Finally, the number of error-free T-units was counted. Only T-units free from spelling, punctuation, capitalization and syntax mistakes were included in the count. The e-mail attributes discussed in the fourth orientation class in Chapter Two under the heading Course Design were respected as valid: context; page layout (smileys, pause equivalents, creative punctuation); intonation; and summary. Internet structures were not disqualified as incorrect T-units. T-units containing poor lexical choices were eliminated from the count as well. Although initial judgement might lead us to suspect that beginners would manifest the greatest number of errors with intermediate writers making fewer and advanced writers even fewer, research has shown that that is not exactly the case. As Larsen-Freeman and Strom (1977) state, "The acquisition of grammar structures is not linear." I was curious to begin this study and see what my class of writers had produced in this course conducted on the Internet. I was also curious to see if I could speculate from the study results why the written

production of advanced writers did not display a linear production in the mastery of grammar structures, if that proved to be the case.

First, I decided to study the language used by the students in their first major posting of 500 words in the IWE, the Introduction Letter, and their final major posting of 500 words, the Round Five Article through the T-unit. (See Appendix N.) Analysis shows that the average number of correct T-units, and the average number of total T-units used by each student was higher in the Letter than in the Round Five Article. The average number of correct T-units employed was 23 compared to 18 in the Round Five Article, and the average number of total T-units was 47 compared to 40. These results might seem to indicate that not only did the learners not improve their writing skill through participation in the IWE, but in fact declined from their initial level.

However, if we examine the number of words written in each 500-word task and the average number of words in each T-unit, we see an increase in word count from 450 in the Introduction Letter to 466 in the Round Five Article, and an increase in the average number of words in each T-unit from 10 in the Introduction Letter to 12 in the Round Five Article. In fact, the highest word count achieved by a single student increases from 620 words by student #15 in Round Four to 792 by student #1 in Round Five.

It could be argued that students were exploring topics at a greater depth in Round Five than in the beginning of the course, as first suggested in Chapter Two under the heading, *Results of the Evaluation of Round Five*, by students #12 and #16, thereby requiring more complex structures to express these more profound thoughts, insights, and relationships.

Furthermore, under the same heading in Chapter Two students #34 and #29 observed that Round Five was more interactive because students were replying to each other's postings more often than in Round Four. This increased response to student postings could have challenged students to think through more thoroughly their positions on issues. Explaining that enlarged perspective would have required more complex structures.

Secondly, I decided to compare the length of each Round Five Article with the length of the T-units used in the Articles. (See Appendix O.) Analysis of the chart reveals a pattern of four groups within the class. The Articles with the highest word count (792 to 517) contained T-units ranging in count from 17 to eleven words per T-unit. Then, the Articles with the next highest word count (494 to 468) grouped themselves in the range of twelve to nine words per T-unit, while the third group (468 to 408) ranged from fourteen to ten words. Finally, the fourth set of Articles (406 to 232) included T-units from twelve to seven words.

I speculated that as the writers gained in experience and confidence, they explored topics more thoroughly and more deeply which resulted in greater word counts and T-unit length. The learners would pack T-units with meaning as they learned how to conjoin or to relativize ideas, and as their vocabulary pool expanded to include more sophisticated and more specific words. However, as they wrestled with expressing ideas at a greater scope and a greater depth, they might encounter structures that they had not practiced often, thereby making mistakes utilizing the structures. This might account for the movement among the four groups from productions of lesser word length and T-unit length in group D to an expanded word count and T-unit length in group C to a higher word production but a

decreased T-unit length in group B with an increase in both word count and T-unit length in group D.

Therefore, I decided to examine the kinds of errors in the student productions to see if more basic errors were made in the compositions of lesser word count and T-unit length and if the more complex errors were made in those of a higher word count and T-unit length. (See Appendix P.) For the study I chose the students who had the highest and the lowest scores in the Introduction Letter (students #15 and #24) and in the Round Five Article (students #1 and #17) for a total of four samples. I then included the Round Five Articles written by students #15 and #24 as well as the Introduction Letter produced by students #1 and #17 for a total of eight samples. The four categories of the samples from the Introduction Letter range from 285 words to 380 to 540 to 620. The word count from the four categories of examples from the Round Five Article is 232, 351, 455 and 792. The errors are charted in the order in which they manifest in the categories, beginning with category one and moving to the final category and ranging from the most frequent to the less frequent in the hopes of discovering a pattern.

The four most repeated mistakes manifest in the first or the second category, or the compositions with the lowest and the second lowest word count: an expression that conveys meaning but that a native speaker would not use for a total of 42 errors; the article for a total of 42 mistakes; the preposition for a total of 29 errors; and vocabulary for a total of 22 mistakes. These persist throughout all seven or eight categories. An example of an expression that a native speaker would not use is, "In this sense, my university get a

possibility to develop more and more," by student #24. A second example is, "On the earth who (has) the real right to (a frozen) embryo?" by student #12.

Four error types appear in the first category, but number only one or two and do not repeat much in the other categories: missing word(s); tense; time transition word; and place reference. Of these, the missing word problem displays once in categories three and four, three times in category six, and twice in the final category. The tense error appears twice in the fourth category.

The second category sees six mistakes: adverb; participle; spelling; modal; aspect; and subordinate coordinator. Only a few repetitions of these errors occur in the other categories. For instance, the adverb is not used correctly three times in category two, once in category four and twice in both categories six and seven. The participle error appears once in categories two, four and seven. Spelling poses a problem only once in category two and twice in category six, while mistakes with the modal are made only once in both category two and six. Finally, only one error is made with aspect and one with a subordinate coordinator in category two.

Three errors manifest in category three: the plural; the conjunction; and voice. Once it appears, mistakes with the plural occur once in both categories four and five, twice in category six, and once in both categories seven and eight. Errors are made with the conjunction once in category three, four and six, while one is made with voice in category three. Mistakes with subject verb agreement occur once in category five and twice in

category eight. An error with the gerund manifests once in category six and with the collective noun twice in category eight.

To sum up, errors group into two rather distinct sections in this short study: those that appear at the beginning of the course in compositions of all levels (low, mid-level, and high word count) and those that reflect student effort to embed, to subordinate, that is to show relationships among concepts. A third group of errors appear in the first category, but they do not display in any other category. The mistakes that indicate student attempts to pack more meaning into their compositions, into their sentences and into the T-units composing the sentences are; the participle, the subordinate coordinator, the conjunction, the gerund, and the collective noun. Other errors in this second group suggest student effort to utilize more complicated structures such as the modal that expresses nuance or adds affect on the part of the speaker to the verb, aspect, and voice. These appear in the compositions of higher word count in the Introduction Letter and in the compositions written in the later part of the course in Round Five which seems to indicate that the writing skill of the PNU participants in the IWE has improved as a result of the course. Thus, it would seem that errors should be carefully studied by an instructor to verify if they indicate mistakes, or if they indicate practice and effort on the part of the student to express more at a greater depth. Indeed, the results of this short study on the language through T-units would seem to substantiate Briere's (1977) finding, introduced in Chapter One, that, "... fluency and quantity, grammatically correct or not, are necessary predecessors to learning quality of expression."

Does Internet Language Provide Scaffolding between Oral Discourse and Written Discourse?

The fourth study investigated the midground between spoken and written discourse that e-mail language occupies (Bruner, 1983; Cazden, 1988). Is e-mail English appropriate as nontraditional scaffolding for language learners moving from the less formal spoken word to the more formal written word?

The IWE offers a variety of tasks that move from the formal 500-word Article in each round to the reflective pieces (Criteria, Evaluation) to the *chatty* Response posting. The Introduction Letter includes a mix of all three task styles because students chat informally about themselves and their interests, for example, reflect on aspects of their life as a student and formally present perspectives on current events or their hometown. The Collaborative Story is not included in every round.

For this short study I chose the work from both rounds of Student #19 who placed at the upper edge of group B in the study comparing posting length and T-unit length in Round Five (See Appendix O.), Student #18 who placed in the middle of group C, and Student #17 who placed at the bottom of group D.

The Response postings of all three learners in both rounds display a lowered T-unit count. I examined the construction of T-units in all six Response postings and found that basically students were utilizing the simple S-V-O sentence construction. A discussion of any variations on the S-V-O construction follow. Table Four summarizes the detailed comments below at the end of the discussion. Student #19 used three questions in the

Table 4: Analysis of Task Style through T-units

ORIENTATION & ROUND FOUR					ROUND FIVE					
A. Introduction Letter					A. 500 word Article					
B. 500-word Article					B. Response					
C. Response					C. Criteria					
D. Criteria					D. Evaluation					
E. Evaluation					E. Collaborative Story					
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
S #19	48	42	33	10	24	47	20	19	17	38
	434	540	247	110	286	516	162	170	100	340
	9	13	8	11	12	11	8	9	6	9
S #18	38	44	27	21	12	39	14	12	14	
	360	494	196	276	104	450	121	132	130	---
	10	11	6	13	9	12	9	11	9	
S #15	69	46	30	16		38	20	16	17	
	620	418	200	153	---	351	150	220	144	---
	9	9	7	10		9	8	14	9	

Round Four Response posting to draw his reader into his discussion in an attempt to initiate a dialogue. In Round Five posting the writer used one question. Student #18 used one tag question and one question in the Round Four Response, while using one complex sentence in Round Five. Student #15, the lowest placed writer in the above mentioned study discussed in Appendix O, employed a larger range of structures in the Round Four posting than either Student #19 or #18: two compound sentences; one tag question; and one question. In Round Five this student used one question. Thus, it would seem that students responded to the more chatty situation with structures that invite response from their peers and direct

Table 5: Summary of Structures Used in Rounds Four and Five Response Postings

	S #19	S #18	S #15
ROUND FOUR			2
Compound sentence			

	<i>Tag Question</i>	1	1
	<i>Question</i>	3	1
ROUND FIVE	<i>Question</i>	1	1
	<i>Complex sentence</i>	1	

communication.

The opportunity to read Response postings written in a casual, conversational style allows the learners to examine and study through collaboration what this community of writers (both they and their peers) send to the site. Thus, the reading and writing skills support the speaking and listening skills, making the four skills interactive and supportive of one another.

The IWE organizes a virtual conference, *the VLC*, occasionally. A VLC was scheduled after the close of the term. I offered students the use of my single office computer for this adventure in communication, but none showed for the opportunity scheduled at 3 A.M. Korean time. I would like to engage in such a synchronous (real-time) event with my students in the future, investigate the language produced, and track the scaffolding students offer each other to facilitate communication; encouraging negotiation by repeating; rephrasing; simplifying language so the peer can understand it; asking questions so the peer has something to talk about; and extending the peer's utterance. This brief study of this asynchronous (time-delayed) interaction through the Response postings in Rounds Four and Five persuaded me that such a study would be worthwhile.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the students were motivated to participate in the IWE project from the initial stages of the project to its conclusion. The course description attracted 34 students to register for the class. In the first Orientation meeting, students gave oral feedback that they were excited about the Advanced Writing Course being offered through the Internet. By the second class meeting all 34 students arrived in the classroom with the four required documents downloaded from the site and filed in a binder. During the fifth meeting format mistakes appeared in the writing assignment, the Introduction Letter, that the students brought to class. Though discouraged with the mistakes, the students remained motivated throughout the course, collaborated with each other, followed all teacher suggestions to improve their work, completed work tasks to correct errors, and came to the instructor's office after hours to discuss persistent problems.

In Round Four six students had successfully posted their Introduction Letters (three to the Letter site and three to the Test site, just one step away from posting on the Letter site) which greatly motivated the rest of the class. All but one of the students would succeed in posting the Letter by the ninth meeting. Throughout both Round Four and Five, student discussion remained active as writing criteria, correct structures and advanced vocabulary were being circulated in the class while students discussed samples

of student-generated work. Peers asked each other questions to further the discussion and often requested clarification of a partner statement.

That students were exploring writing criteria and language was observed by the teacher in class. In the eighth meeting during Round Four, for example, a peer told his partner that she should catch as many of her writing mistakes (errors in the mechanics of writing) before presenting him with her paper. During the tenth meeting of the same round another student wrote that while the other students learned how to add facts to support their arguments, she had learned that adding her personal comment to her composition would make it more interesting to her reader. It seems that the collaborative approach has fostered a spirit of community and trust in this writing class. Students trust each other enough to speak directly to each other and value their personal experiences.

Enthusiasm for the class remained high. Before the second meeting of Round Five the participating teacher from Singapore suggested opening a Collaborative Story site. Students were so enthused by this new offering that they continued to post a total of seven contributions up to two weeks after the Round Five dead line. Moreover, one student came to visit me in my office after hours to hand in all three assignments before their due date. She said she was so excited about the IWE that she could not wait to complete the assignments.

After the tenth meeting I sent Vilmi the titles suggested by my students for Round Six to begin in February. She sent an e-mail of appreciation, repeated the appreciation in

her posting of February 7th which introduced Round Six, and asked if the PNU students were interested in compiling and posting the statistics for Round Five. Three volunteers came to use my computer after class in my office, and I saw how enthused they were they saw the posting appear on the site after they sent it in.

Students #5 and #11 each received one vote to be included in the IWE electronic Journal. Even though students actually needed two votes or more to be included, the class was proud that two PNU students had received recognition that they were writing well from their peers. This positive feedback substantiated Ruth Vilmi's own positive comment in her October 11th posting to the Forum.

Another criteria for the IWE is how many of the 34 students in the Advanced Composition Course experienced success. Of the 34 students enrolled in the class, 19 had one or more opportunities to experience success above the success of completing the postings for each Round. (See Appendix Q.)

Like many of my teaching colleagues, I complained that students did not assume responsibility for their work. But, through collaboration students take on much of the responsibility that teachers have harbored in the past. Perhaps this collaborative approach to work and to authority affects, at least in part, the energy, the enthusiasm of the students in this course. After all, students cannot assume responsibility until they assume authority. Because someday my students will have to write in English without me, I think

the IWE offers a good opportunity for them to practice with support and in collaboration what they might well have to do alone in the future.

The very source of student frustration was the source of their motivation: The affect of writing on the Internet. The technical challenge of learning how to post successfully on the IWE site did frustrate the students, especially in the initial stages of the project. However, once they mastered the technical expertise required by the project, they began to explore topics at a greater scope and at a greater depth as indicated by four pieces of evidence: (a) their written and oral feedback; (b) the quantity of work produced; (c) the quantity and quality of the rhetorical modes employed; as well as (d) the quality of the language. The source of their motivation was the source of their frustration: The affect of writing on the Internet. As they wrestled with the above mentioned technical challenge, they remained sustained by the excitement of being able to exchange opinions with participants from around the world and the promise of being witnessed by an international audience of their peers.

In evaluating Round Four 19 students volunteered that the IWE was a positive writing experience, and 22 that it improved their writing skill. Although 15 attested to initial computer anxiety, 26 claimed that it developed their Internet skills. Student #4 described the affect of writing on the Internet in these words, "Almost everyday I thought about my introduction, article and responses to someone." What motivated the writers? Interest in learning about cultural differences was cited by 22 students and the chance to

express and exchange opinions with overseas peers by 25 others. Several students suggested that the length of a round be increased to five or six weeks, and Vilmi did follow this suggestion for Round Six, begun in February.

In the student Evaluations of Round Five, ten claimed that participating in the IWE improved their writing skills, nine that it improved their Internet skills and 12 stated that because their Internet skills had improved in Round Four, participating in Round Five was easier than Round Four. The Article postings from the 34 PNU students increased from 33 in Round Four (one student did not post an Article) to 46 in Round Five, even though students in Round Four required seven weeks to post all assignments and in Round Five only three. Did computers make these students better writers? Computers do not make students better writers, but they apparently did make the students more productive, and as Briere (1977) has indicated, quantity is important because it appears that students must produce a certain quantity before they achieve a level of quality in their writing.

Students #6 and #12 wrote that this improvement in Internet and computer skills led to enough ease that students began to explore opinions and topics at a deeper level. Indeed, student #29 claimed that students were replying to each other more often in Round Five. Moreover, five students volunteered that Round Five was more interactive than Round Four. Examination of the exchanges in Round Four show that students produced ten exchanges for a total of 2,997 words, while in Round Five they produced 16

(a 60% increase) for a total of 3,575 words or an increase of 28%. PNU students were excited to receive responses from students overseas at the University of Missouri at Columbia, at HUT in Finland, at Super Elec in France, at the Technical University in Czechoslovakia, at Nagoya University of Foreign in Japan, as well as students at a Korean institution, Sogang University.

The second benefit from improved skills on the Internet and the computer was increased time to read peer postings as attested to by students #15, 19, 21 and 31. First, this increased amount of time dedicated to reading peer work helps students develop awareness of how they respond to what their peer wrote. They then can refer back to their own writing and become aware of how their words are being read by others. Secondly, reading the response postings, written in a casual, conversational style, allows the reading and the writing skills to support the spoken discourse. The learners examine and study what they send and what others have sent to the site. Writing for the Internet makes the four skills more interactive and supportive of one another.

Analysis of the quantity of language produced shows that the average word count per student increased from 1,051 in Round Four to 1,060 in Round Five. The total number of words written in Round Four for the Criteria posting increased from 5,348 in Round Four to 5,995 in Round Five. Perhaps the students had more to say in Round Five because they are eager to discuss what they learned about writing criteria, and perhaps

they are secure in their knowledge because it is based on recent and solid writing experience with the IWE.

Examination of the use of rhetorical modes in the course indicate that every mode was utilized by some students during the two rounds. Although the instances of use of the styles vary in length, nonetheless each instance indicates some ease in use and awareness of the modes. The most frequently employed rhetorical style was the expository mode. Perhaps this student choice indicates that the expository style is a good choice for L2 beginning or intermediate writers to employ because it enables them to produce compositions of a good length since it draws upon a variety of styles such as narrative, descriptive or cause and effect. Students complain of being discouraged if they produce work of what they consider to be a short length or of a length shorter than what they produce in their L1. Even if arguing that the expository style is a good choice for beginning or low intermediate L2 writers, nonetheless they do need to learn how to distinguish the modes, to pry them out and expand them, and to decide when it is appropriate to use each rhetorical style. Through careful selection of the topics offered to the students the teacher can guide the students in choosing a style to practice. For instance, a topic such as Writing Criteria would lead the learners to develop a process analysis assignment on the steps involved in writing a good composition.

Analysis of the discourse utilized by the writers through T-units revealed that the average number of words per T-unit increased from ten in Round Four to twelve in

Round Five, thus indicating that students were learning how to pack T-units with more meaning by conjoining, relativizing and incorporating more sophisticated and advanced vocabulary into their compositions. As they explored their topics at a greater scope and at a greater depth, they explored relationships and practiced how to express those newly perceived relationships through correct grammar. Further study of the word count of the Round Five Article and the number of T-units in each Article showed that as students pushed their writing to greater lengths, they also pushed the T-unit to greater length until they reached a point at which the number of T-units declined but the word count continued to expand. This seems to indicate that the students are balancing the mastery of two skills: writing a composition of a longer length, and perceiving and expressing the relationships among ideas that appear when topic development is expanded. Student attention is directed at the skill that needs greater effort until that skill is accomplished with ease and the student attention can swing back to the second skill.

To sum up, I learned that as my students were learning how to perceive and express the relationship of thoughts through their writing experience, I was learning to perceive the relationship among the features, the processes and the components of their learning process. In addition, I learned (or relearned at the profound level of experience) that motivation is the key element to learning. Students can surmount great frustration through persistence, provided that they want to complete the task or learn the material and provided that they receive appropriate support from the instructor and through

collaboration from their peers. I learned great respect for my students as they conquered that initial Internet anxiety and grew in confidence. In the future I will support the learners as they wrestle with the technological challenges of the Internet and the computer through discussions of how they are mastering valuable workplace skills such as word processing and electronic communication in this course.

Finally, I learned that teacher decisions in the classroom need to be based on more than intuition, the natural inclination as a result of my personality. Intuition can be an initial guide. But, the numbers I accumulated through analyzing the students' work inform my teacher judgment and give me, as an instructor, a security and an authority in the decisions I make. The student feedback, both oral and written, support those numbers, infuse them with meaning, balance and, thus, inform my future intuitive decision.

Appendix A: Round Four Topics for Article

Topics selected by PNU students	Topics to which PNU students responded	Numbered sequence	ROUND FOUR Keywords: topics for articles
0	0	1	Plagiarism: plagiarism & student work
4	0	2	Celebrations: celebrations
3	0	3	Writing: writing as a hobby
4	3	4	Stress: stress--can we avoid it?
2	0	5	Communicating: communicating with people on the Internet
1	0	6	Drugs: which drugs, if any, should be legalized
5	0	7	Religion: importance of religion
2	0	8	Global: should English be the global language?
4	0	9	Writer: my favorite writer
4	0	10	Your choice: The Importance of Korea
3	0	10	Your choice: IMF
0	31		Introduction letter
Total students: 33	Total students: 34		

Appendix B: Round Five Topics for Article

Topics selected by PNU students	Topics to which PNU students responded	Numbered sequence	ROUND FIVE Keywords: topics for articles
2	1	1	Embryos: the future of frozen embryos
4	5	2	Celebrations: celebrations in my culture
4	6	3	Films: popular films
4	2	4	Green: business strategy, acting green versus being green
0	0	5	Communicating: communicating with computer scientists
4	10	6	Drinking: drinking at an early age
4	7	7	Family: importance of the family
4	1	8	Body: understanding body language
3	3	9	University: the best & the worst of my university
4	0	10	Your choice: Shopping in Pusan
1	0	10	Your choice: Description of PNU
4	0	Collaborative story	Story: Bad Memories, 23 Oct 1998
5	0	Collaborative story	Story: Alma, 28 Oct 1998
3	0	Collaborative story	Story: Via's Diary, 11 Nov 1998
1	0	Collaborative story	Story: The Bear, 24 Nov 1998
0	0	Collaborative story	Story: The Unfortunate Condition, 25 Nov 1998
46	35	<i>Postings initiated by 34 PNU students.</i>	

Appendix C: Round Four Topics Repeated in Evaluation

-
- A. Students
 - B. IWE is a good project
 - C. Participation improved my writing in English
 - D. Participation improved my Internet skills
 - E. Initially I had anxiety about working on the Internet
 - F. Expressing & exchanging opinions
 - G. Cultural differences
 - H. Recommend greater variety of topics & student-suggested topics
 - I. Single mention topic in Appendix C
 - J. Total comments per student

Note: Students volunteered a total of 153 comments (including both repeated and single mention topics), or an average of 4.5 per individual

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>
1.	X	X			X	X	X	X	6
2.	X	X	X		X	X	X		6
3.	X	X	X	X	X				5
4.	X	X							2
5.	X	X	X	X	X			XX	7
6.			X	X	X				3
7.			X		X			X	3
8.	X					X		X	3
9.		X	X		X		X		4
10.		X	X			X	X		4
11.	X	X	X	X	X				5
12.					X	X			2
13.			X	X	X	X	X	X	6
14.		X	X	X	X	X			5
15.	X		X			X		XX	5
16.	X	X	X			X		X	5
17.			X	X	X		X		4
18.	X	X	X		X	X			5
19.			X	X	X	X		X	5
20.	X	X	X		X	X			5
21.		X		X	X				3
22.	X	X	X		X	X			5
23.	X	X			X	X	X	X	6
24.			X		X	X			3
25.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		7
26.		X	X	X					3

Appendix C: Round Four Topics Repeated in Evaluation p2

-
- A. Students
 - B. IWE is a good project
 - C. Participation improved my writing in English
 - D. Participation improved my Internet skills
 - E. Initially I had anxiety about working on the Internet
 - F. Expressing & exchanging opinions
 - G. Cultural differences
 - H. Recommend greater variety of topics & student-suggested topics
 - I. Single mention topic in Appendix C
 - J. Total comments per student

Note: Students volunteered a total of 153 comments (including both repeated and single mention topics), or an average of 4.5 per individual

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>
27.		X		X	X	X			4
28.		X	X		X	X			4
29.	X			X	X	X	X		5
30.			X	X		X			3
31.	X		X	X	X	X			5
32.	X	X	X		X	X	X		6
33.	X	X	X					XX	5
34.	X	X	X				X		4
<i>Total</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>22</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>153</i>

Appendix D: Single Mention Comments in Round Four Evaluation

Student	Comments
1.	Learned to read critically through participating in the IWE
	Recommend a longer round
5.	Recommend user friendly Basic Handout
6.	Recommend a longer round
7.	Participating in Round Four gave me a chance to think deeply about one topic when I wrote my 500-word article & read peer articles on the same topic
8.	Learned problems common across cultures
13.	Recommend improved university computer facilities
	Recommend improved university computer facilities
15.	Recommend more checklists to improve written English
16.	Recommend awarding certificates to participants
19.	Recommend more explanation of why article is sent to Invalid site
23.	Recommend more active exchange
27.	Recommend a longer round
	Recommend user friendly Basic Handout
33.	Recommend awarding certificates to participants

Total: 11 single mention comments, one duplicated & one comment repeated three times

Appendix E: Round Four Response Chart

ROUND FOUR	Type of posting by PNU student	Response from	Word count	Type of posting by PNU student	Word count
15.09.98-14.10.98					
2.	Response letter to HUT student Introduction Letter	HUT	196		
3.	Article on celebration: the Korean festival of Chu-suk	American student, University of Missouri at Columbia	143		
5.	Article on stress	Vietnamese student, University of Missouri at Columbia	182		
		Sogang University	312		
11.	Article on religion	Sogang University	280		
		University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	340		
17.	Article on the Internet	Sogang University	364		
21.	Introduction Letter	Vietnamese student, University of Missouri at Columbia	360		
27.	Introduction Letter	HUT	364	Response to response from HUT student	256
Total:	2,797 words produced in 10 exchanges		2,541		256

Appendix F: Round Five Repeated Topics in Evaluation

-
- A. students
 - B. Enjoyed Round Five
 - C. Participation improved writing in English
 - D. Participation developed Internet skills
 - E. Improved Internet skills made participation in Round Five easier
 - F. Cultural differences
 - G. Communicate with students overseas
 - H. Expressing & exchanging opinion
 - I. Round Five topics were more attractive, varied & controversial
 - J. Unchanging format makes participating in Round Five easy
 - K. Collaborative story is a new & interesting category
 - L. Round Five is more interactive than Round Four
 - M. Single mention topics in Appendix G
 - N. Total comments per student

Note: Students volunteered a total of 121 comments (including both repeated and single mention topics), or an average of three per individual

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>
1.	X	X	X			X		X			X		6
2.									X	X			2
3.	X				X	X		X	X			X	6
4.				X				X	X			X	4
5.				X				X		X		X	4
6.				X			X					X	4
7.		X	X				X						3
8.	X			X		X							3
9.	X	X					X					X	4
10.								X				X	2
11.	X			X				X		X			4
12.								X			X	X	4
13.								X		X			2
14.	X			X									2
15.				X				X		X		X	4
16.						X		X		X			3
17.				X							X	X	3
18.	X					X	X				X	X	4
19.					X			X				X	3
20.		X			X		X	X			X		4
21.		X			X							X	3
22.	X	X	X			X		X					5

Appendix F: Round Five Repeated Topics in Evaluation p2

-
- A. students
 - B. Enjoyed Round Five
 - C. Participation improved writing in English
 - D. Participation developed Internet skills
 - E. Improved Internet skills made participation in Round Five easier
 - F. Cultural differences
 - G. Communicate with students overseas
 - H. Expressing & exchanging opinion
 - I. Round Five topics were more attractive, varied & controversial
 - J. Unchanging format makes participating in Round Five easy
 - K. Collaborative story is a new & interesting category
 - L. Round Five is more interactive than Round Four
 - M. Single mention topics in Appendix G
 - N. Total comments per student

Note: Students volunteered a total of 121 comments (including both repeated and single mention topics), or an average of three per individual

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>
23.	X		X	X				X					4
24.				X				X					2
25.		X			X			X			X		4
26.	X	X	X				X				X		5
27.			X	X			X	X			X		5
28.			X				X						2
29.					X						X		2
30.		X	X	X			X	X					5
31.					X			X		X		X	4
32.					X							X	2
33.								X		X			2
34.		X	X				X	X			X		5
<i>Total</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>121</i>

Appendix G: Round Five Single Mention Comments in Evaluation

Students	Comments
3.	Both Round Four & Round Five topics are interesting
4.	Voting for Journal article develops writing critical thinking skills
5.	Liked miscellaneous topics
6.	Round Five topics required more knowledge, I used internet skills helped Ss write in depth
9.	Round Four topics are easier
10.	Round Four topics are difficult, & Round Five topics required more knowledge, I used internet skills helped Ss write in depth
12.	internet skills helped Ss write in depth
15.	Spent free time <i>reading</i> IWE articles instead of watching TV
17.	Letting students suggest topics will motivate them to participate more
18.	Round Five is better than Round Four
19.	Participated more actively in Round Five & Round Four than in Round Four
21.	I can <i>read</i> many articles
31.	Had time to <i>read</i> many articles because I was in Round Five than in Round Four
32.	Round Five topics are easier
<i>Total: 14 single mention comments</i>	

Appendix H: Round Five Response Chart

ROUND FIVE 15.10.98- 14.11.98	Type of posting by PNU student	Response from	Word count	Type of posting by PNU student	Wor cour
1.	Response to article on religion	Sogang University	216		
	Response to article on drinking	HUT	158		
3.	Introduction letter	American student, University of Missouri at Columbia	385	Response to response letter	168
	Response letter to article on film	Sogang University	216		
7.	Article on frozen embryos	Sogang University	330		
15.	Article on my university, pros & cons	Sogang University	144		
18.	Article on drinking	Super Elec, France	80		
20.	Article on film	Sogang University	288		
	Article on film	HUT	112		
22.	Response to article on drinking	Sogang University	156		
	Article on PNU	Sogang University	315		
26.	Article on drinking	Sogang University	234		
27.	Article on PNU	Technical university Brno, Czechoslovakia	169		
32.	Article on body language	Nagoya University of Foreign Studies, Japan	74		
34.	Article on film	Sogang University #1	266		
		Sogang University #2	264		
<i>Total:</i>	<i>3,575 words produced in 16 responses</i>		<i>3,407</i>		<i>168</i>

Appendix I Rhetorical Categories
(Downloaded from the IWE Basic Handout)

Written by Lou Spaventa at **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1. **NARRATIVE:** telling a story, almost always in the first or third person and in the past. What's important here is the time order of the story and links between what happens. Good stories also have an element of the unpredictable, and keep the reader interested in what happened next.

Examples: overcoming the odds, a cross-cultural experience, my favorite place

2. **DESCRIPTION:** descriptive writing demands close attention to detail and very often makes use of spatial organization. When describing people, writers often use behavior to illustrate a person's character. What did the person do and what does that tell you about him or her? A third category of descriptive writing (beyond places and people) is classification of things according to characteristics they share or in which they differ: for example, an essay on different methods of transportation would fit in this area.

Examples: my family portrait, a working woman, utopia

3. **EXPOSITION:** describing how things are. Exposition is often the writing we read in magazines telling us why things are the way they are. It may contain some argument, some description, some analysis and some narration, but its main purpose is to explain.

Examples: one precious thing, language, the meaning of (a film)

4. **CAUSE AND EFFECT:** this writing tries to explain why things happen and differs from exposition in that it usually does not present a clear cut answer and deals with a subject on which writers have differing opinions.

Examples: social problems, appearance and success, industrial development and global pollution

5. **ARGUMENT:** is probably the most popular form of academic writing for students. You read a text or use some other information to form an opinion on a topic. Then you write your opinion in a step by step manner, laying out clearly the points in your argument. EFL students often have trouble with the form of argument in English. English requires a linear connected style when presenting an argument for consideration.

Examples: person of the century, abortion, what kind of family is typical

Appendix I Rhetorical Categories p 2
(Downloaded from the IWE Basic Handout)

Written by Lou Spaventa at **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6. **PROCESS ANALYSIS:** how to do things. Recipes for cooking fit into this category as does how to fix a flat tire or figure out the Tokyo subway system. Process analysis essays seek to teach people how things work.

Examples: how (it) works, how to . . . , how a man (woman) becomes a man (woman) in my culture

7. **COMPARISON AND CONTRAST:** in this type of essay the topic is being discussed in terms of similarities (comparison) and differences (contrast). Drawing up a list of similarities and differences before you write will really help you lay out the essay. It is also common in such essays to finish by deciding for some reason whether the similarities outweigh the differences or visa versa and what this means.

Examples: Marriage across cultures, cats and dogs, the world at war, the world at peace

Appendix J: Introduction Letter Topics and Word Count

A. Students	A. English
B. Self	B. Single mention topics (detailed in Appendix J)
C. Family	C. Number of topics (total of 24 topics volunteered by students & an average of four topics per student)
D. Korea	D. Word Count (average per student 450 words)
E. Hometown	
F. PNU	
G. Hobby	
H. Trip	
I. Future as an English teacher	

	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>
1.		X	X	X	X							4	540
2.		X					X	X				3	371
3.		X	X		X	X	X		X			6	480
4.		X			X		X				X	4	430
5.		X			X		X		X			4	480
6.		X					X	X				3	462
7.		X					X				X	3	558
8.		X			X	X	X		X			5	390
9.		X	X	X		X	X		X			6	560
10.		X	X				X				X	4	420
11.		X			X		X					3	440
12.		X	X					X			X	4	560
13.		X								X		2	539
14.		X				X			X			3	528
15.		X	X		X		X		X		X	6	620
16.		X					X		X			3	400
17.		X	X				X		X			4	380
18.		X					X			X	X	4	360
19.		X	X				X		X			4	434
20.			X		X							2	405
21.		X					X					2	400
22.		X										1	416
23.				X		X				X		3	288
24.		X	X		X		X			X		5	285
25.		X			X					X		3	400
26.		X	X		X		X			X		5	480
27.		X	X		X		X			X		5	518
28.		X			X					X	X	4	532
29.		X	X		X					X	X	5	407
30.		X	X		X				X	X		5	451

Appendix J: Introduction Letter Topics and Word Count p2

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M
A. Students													
B. Self		X									X	3	432
C. Family											X		
D. Korea					X		X				X	6	405
E. Hometown											X		
F. PNU											X		
G. Hobby											X		
H. Trip											X	4	420
I. Future as an English teacher											X	3	502
<i>Total</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>21</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>131</i>	<i>15,293</i>	

Appendix K: Round Four Single Mention Topics in Introduction Letter

Students	Comments
4.	Describes her boyfriend
7.	Hangul, the Korean alphabet
10.	Pet
12.	Discusses her studies
15.	Narrates story of how she met her boyfriend
18.	Describes the IWE & why it is a good idea
28.	Explains why he has chosen his future career as a riot police officer
29.	Narrates her life living alone
31.	Discusses current events; IMF, the Clinton scandal
32.	Discusses food her future dream of studying Spanish living near Haeundae beach (near Pusan city) the special blue color of the sea
33.	Discusses historical myths & why she likes them
<i>Total: 15 single mention comments</i>	

Appendix L: Round Four Postings Word Count

-
- A. Students
 - B. 500-word Article
 - C. Response by PNU student
 - D. Criteria Article
 - E. Evaluation of IWE Article
 - F. Total word count

Note: the highest and the lowest score in each category are in bold

A	B	C	D	E	F
1.	555	420	112	144	1,347
		9/22 168			
2.	465	9/24 180	103	276	1,192
3.	602	--	144	143	889
		9/23 180			
4.	405	10/9 252	156	363	1,786
		9/24 170			
5.	930	10/9 110	190	420	1,820
6.	455	204	144	234	1,037
7.	420	144	135	330	1,029
8.	495	187	182	228	1,092
9.	468	135	144	150	897
10.	560	221	169	121	1,0491
11.	434	110	110	264	918
12.	616	270	--	225	1,111
13.	560	130	130	252	1,072
14.	435	169	198	165	967
		9/25 200			
15.	418	9/30 231	153	210	1,212
16.	481	--	--	370	851
17.	380	154	130	228	892
18.	494	196	276	104	1,070
19.	540	247	110	286	1,183
20.	408	189	182	308	1,087
21.	416	231	139	130	916
22.	--	156	130	176	525
		9/29 270			
23.	336	10/8 276	308	144	1,334
24.	420	196	176	168	1,077
25.	392	117	122	210	841
26.	319	154	140	242	855
27.	520	240	112	273	1,045

Appendix L: Round Four Postings Word Count p2

-
- A. Students
 - B. 500-word Article
 - C. Response by PNU student
 - D. Criteria Article
 - E. Evaluation of IWE Article
 - F. Total word count

Note: the highest and the lowest score in each category are in bold

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>
28.	407	210	198	204	1,018
29.	385	126	192	204	907
30.	384	448	340	140	1,312
31.	352	169	286	294	1,101
32.	408	150	117	88	763
33.	624	234	144	121	1,123
34.	480	170	176	190	1,016
Total	15,564	7,414	5,348	7,405	35,731
Average per student	458	218	157	217	1,051

Appendix M: Round Five Postings Word Count

-
- A. Students
 - B. 500 word Article
 - C. Response by PNU Student
 - D. Criteria Article
 - E. Evaluation
 - F. Collaborative Story
 - G. Word Count

Note: the highest and the lowest word count in each category is in bold

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
		11/3 180				
1.	792	11/3 190	102	140	--	1,404
2.	552	182	182	180	--	1,096
3.	444	264	154	160	--	1,022
4.	470	198	165	170	264	1,267
5.	624	198	128	119	224	1,293
6.	572	224	156	228	364	1,544
7.	520	99	270	120	--	1,009
8.	300	220	154	132	--	806
9.	408	117	143	154	--	822
10.	468	228	234	104	252	1,286
11.	330	180	154	110	--	774
12.	484	130	88	120	336	1,158
13.	380	253	160	88	--	881
14.	406	132	190	108	--	966
15.	351	126	135	144	--	756
16.	517	150	220	110	--	1,137
17.	232	169	143	182	--	726
18.	450	121	132	130	--	833
19.	516	162	170	100	352	1,300
20.	533	200	210	132	--	1,075
21.	494	228	140	99	238	1,199
22.	440	195	187	--	324	1,146
23.	570	180	225	120	225	1,320
24.	455	168	260	133	--	1,016
					11/98	
25.	460	156	169	108	220	1,353

11/27

240

Appendix M: Round Five Postings Word Count p2

-
- A. Students
 - B. 500 word Article
 - C. Response by PNU Student
 - D. Criteria Article
 - E. Evaluation
 - F. Collaborative Story
 - G. Word Count

Note: the highest and the lowest word count in each category is in bold

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
26.	468	135	198	150	--	951
27.	380	247	228	154	--	1,009
28.	342	220	319	140	--	1,021
29.	608	132	156	126	--	1,022
30.	430	160	143	121	--	854
31.	574	208	182	180	168	1,312
32.	432	110	176	90	--	808
33.	380	196	132	88	225	1,177
34.	470	231	190	228	--	1,119
Total	15,852	6,289	5,995	4,468	3,432	36,036
Average per student	466	185	176	131	101	1,060

Appendix N: Computation of T-Units in Both Rounds

LETTER	ARTICLE
A. Student Number	A. Number of Correct T-units
B. Number of Correct T-units	B. Percentage of Correct T-units
C. Percentage of Correct T-units	C. Number of Total T-units
D. Number of Total T-units	D. Article Word Total
E. Introduction Letter Word Total	E. Average Number of Words Per T-unit
F. Average Number of Words Per T-unit	

Note: The highest and the lowest scores achieved in each category are in bold.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1.	16	33	48	540	11	32	56	57	792	14
2.	24	56	43	371	9	11	30	35	552	16
3.	22	47	47	480	10	18	56	32	444	14
4.	23	42	52	430	8	18	37	49	470	10
5.	25	53	47	480	10	19	46	41	624	15
6.	15	29	51	462	9	25	45	46	572	12
7.	20	40	50	558	11	21	49	43	520	12
8.	24	57	42	390	9	11	41	27	300	11
9.	22	42	52	560	11	11	38	29	408	14
10.	14	33	43	420	10	18	53	34	468	14
11.	21	48	44	440	10	10	32	31	330	11
12.	21	54	39	560	14	12	27	45	484	11
13.	38	62	61	539	9	21	51	41	380	9
14.	15	44	34	528	16	9	11	31	406	13
15.	34	49	69	620	9	16	42	38	351	9
16.	13	36	36	400	11	10	32	31	517	17
17.	32	64	50	380	8	9	28	32	232	7
18.	19	50	38	360	10	21	54	39	450	12
19.	27	56	48	434	9	24	51	47	516	11
20.	14	30	46	405	9	21	45	47	533	11
21.	17	47	36	400	11	13	33	40	494	12
22.	19	50	38	416	11	20	49	41	440	11
23.	25	68	37	288	8	32	63	51	570	11
24.	12	41	29	285	10	15	42	36	455	13
25.	35	69	51	400	8	31	60	52	460	9
26.	41	62	66	480	7	18	33	55	468	9
27.	37	66	56	518	9	26	62	42	380	9
28.	23	56	41	532	13	15	52	29	342	12
29.	18	47	38	407	11	10	25	40	608	15
30.	29	55	53	451	9	20	48	42	430	10

Appendix N: Computation of T-Units in Both Rounds p 2

LETTER

- A. Student Number
- B. Number of Correct T-units
- C. Percentage of Correct T-units
- D. Number of Total T-units
- E. Introduction Letter Word Total
- F. Average Number of Words Per T-unit

ARTICLE

- A. Number of Correct T-units
- B. Percentage of Correct T-units
- C. Number of Total T-units
- D. Article Word Total
- E. Average Number of Words Per T-unit

Note: The highest and the lowest scores achieved in each category are in bold.

<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>
31.	26	54	48	432	9	15	37	41	574	14
32.	26	57	46	405	9	13	43	30	432	14
33.	22	43	51	420	8	26	76	34	380	10
34.	37	64	58	502	9	27	54	50	470	9
<i>Ave</i>	23	49	47	450	10	18	44	40	466	12

Appendix P: Analysis of Error Samples in Round Four and Five

A. not a native speaker expression	F. adverb
B. article	G. participle
C. preposition	H. spelling
D. vocabulary	I. modal
E. missing word(s)	J. aspect
F. tense	K. subordinate coordinator
G. time transition word	L. plural
H. reflexive pronoun	M. conjunction
I. place reference	N. voice
	O. subject verb agreement
	P. gerund
	Q. collective noun

<i>task</i>	Orientation			letter	Round		Five	article	
Words	285	380	540	620	232	351	455	792	
T-units	10	8	11	9	7	9	13	14	
S#	S #24	S #17	S #1	S #9	S #17	S #15	S #24	S #1	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Error Type									Total Errors
A	3	2	10	2	9	7	5	4	42
B	4		9	6	5	7	2	9	42
C	4	4	6	1	3	5	4	2	29
D		2	2	6	1	3	5	3	22
E	1		1	1		3		2	8
F	1			2					3
G	2								2
H	1								1
I	1								1
J		3		1		2	2		8
K		1		1			1		3
L		1				2			3
M		1				1			2
N		1							1
O		1							1
P			2	1	1	2	1	1	8
Q			1	1			1		3
R			1						1
S					1			2	3
T						1			1
U								2	2
Total	17	16	32	22	20	33	21	25	186

Appendix Q: Summary of the Successes of PNU Participants in the IWE

Students	Successes
	<i>Note: a response can be to an Introduction Letter or to a Round Four or Five Article</i>
1.	Responses from two peers
2.	Response from a peer
3.	Responses from three peers
5.	Responses from two peers Round Four highest total word count for all assignments Round Four highest word count for Article Round Four highest word count for Evaluation posting
6.	Round Five highest word count for all assignments Round Five highest word count for Collaborative Story postings Round Five highest word count for Evaluation posting
7.	Response from a peer
11.	Responses from two peers
15.	Highest word count for Introduction Letter Round Four highest total T-units Round Four highest total correct T-units Response from a peer
17.	Response from a peer
18.	Response from a peer
20.	Responses from two peers
21.	Response from a peer
22.	Responses from two peers
23.	Round Five highest number of T-units correct
26.	Round Five highest number of T-units used
27.	Responses from two peers
30.	Response from a peer Round Four highest word count in the Criteria posting
32.	Response from a peer
34.	Responses from two peers

Appendix R: Technical and Economic Terms

<i>Term</i>	<i>Definition</i>
1. article	A composition on one of ten topics offered on the IWE; one article is required (among other assignments) to participate in each round which lasts four, five or six weeks. Participants are encouraged to respond to an article that interests them.
2. signature	A signature file is a special file automatically placed at the end of outgoing messages by most e-mail programs; most authorities advice limiting a signature file to four lines; overly long signatures have been blamed for clogging the Internet; most e-mail programs allow the user to turn off the automatic signature feature, but most users prefer to leave the feature on.
3. post	To publish an article on or submit to a mailing list or Usenet newsgroup.
4. smiley	A combination of special characters that portray emotions; such as ☺.
5. spam	Trashy, unsolicited e-mail often from some unknown organization or person; thousands of copies of the same piece of unwanted e-mail, sent to either individual e-mail accounts or Internet newsgroups; junk e-mail; unsolicited commercial e-mail (UCE); spam messages often consists of unsavory advertising for get-rich-quick schemes or even pornographic offers; the name spam comes from the Monty Python skit in which a group of Vikings sing the word spam repeatedly in a march tempo, drowning out all other discourse.
6. IMF	The International Monetary Fund which imposed austerity measures on the Korean economy in 1998 after the financial crises and devaluation of the won (among other Asian currencies) in the autumn of 1997.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boswood, Tim, ed. (1997). *New Ways of Using Computers in Language Teaching*. Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL, Inc.
- Briere, Eugene. (1977). Quantity Before Quality in Second Language Composition, *Language Learning* 27 (June): 141-152.
- Hunt, K. 1965. *Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels (Research Report No. 3)*. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Kolb, David. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane and V. Strom. (1977). The Construction of a Second Language Acquisition Index of Development, *Language Learning* 27 (June): 123-134.
- Levine, J., C. Baroudi, and M. L. Young. (1998). *The Internet for Dummies*, 5th ed. Foster City, California: IDG Books Worldwide, Inc.
- McCarthy, Bernice. (1987). *The 4MAT System*, 2nd ed. Barrington, Illinois: Excel, Inc.
- Spaventa, Lou. (1998). Rhetorical Categories. *The International Writing Exchange*. Retrieved February 22, 2000 from the World Wide Web: **Error! Reference source not found.**
- Vilmi, Ruth. (1998). New 1999 handout. *The International Writing Exchange*. Retrieved February 22, 2000 from the World Wide Web: **Error! Reference source not found.**
- Warschauer, Mark. (1995). *E-Mail for English Teaching*. Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL, Inc.