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Problem

Questions have been raised regarding the number of limited-English-proficient students who enter undergraduate schools every year. This study was designed to look at the effectiveness of the Writing Workshop model in improving English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) college students’ writing skills in a small liberal arts university in Puerto Rico.

Method

Students registered in two Intermediate English-as-a-Second-Language writing classes were asked to take a pretest-posttest related to writing skills and a pretest-posttest related to composition skills to indicate their level of agreement for each of the 22
statements on a Likert-type (survey) instrument—strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4)—related to their attitudes toward learning and writing in English. They were also asked to indicate to what extent the Writing Workshop helped them improve their writing skills on a Likert-type (survey) instrument—never (1) to very much (5). Descriptive statistics and a paired samples $t$ test were used to answer the research questions. The sample size was 35; however, some fluctuations were registered because of absences to class.

Results

The results indicated that, in general, participants in the survey had a positive attitude toward learning and writing in English. There was a significant difference in writing skills based on the pretest and posttest ($p<0.05$). There was a positive difference in composition skills based on pretest and posttest ($p<0.05$) for the Writing Workshop class with the highest percentage of limited-proficient students. Finally, students from both groups acknowledged that the Writing Workshop had helped them to better understand the writing process. Students perceived classroom environment, peer response, collaborative writing and speaking as the components that helped them the most in improving their writing skills.

Conclusion

In general, the Writing Workshop has been effective in helping students improve their writing skills. This study provides evidence of the Writing Workshop as a promising tool that can be used to enhance ESL students’ writing skills in Puerto Rico.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

After four centuries of Spanish colonization, Puerto Rico became a U.S. territory through the Treaty of Paris on December 10, 1898 (Resnick, 1993). In 1902, the Official Language Act granted official status to both English and Spanish, and in 1917, the Jones Act granted U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans. The island, then a U.S. colony, was granted the Commonwealth status in 1952 (Resnick, 1993). In other words, Puerto is an unincorporated territory of the United States, with a semiautonomous local government restricted by both the U.S. constitution and the Federal Acts (Clachar, 1997).

Schweers and Vélez (1992) indicate that one of Puerto Rico’s most persistent concerns is its unsettled political status. The island has three political platforms: statehood, commonwealth, and independence. Each platform has its linguistic agenda. Statehood advocates Spanish and English, commonwealth partisans recommend English as a second language, and independence sponsors support the Spanish-only attitude.

Therefore, as stated by Clachar (1997), the teaching and learning of English in Puerto Rico occurs in a highly charged political and ideological context. Puerto Rican’s nationalism could be one of the most incisive explanations for resistance to the learning of English (Clachar, 1997). This may explain why Rubinstein (2001) states that 91% of Puerto Ricans think of themselves as Puerto Ricans first and Americans second.
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This political and ideological context has favored the disruptive shifts between English and Spanish that have dominated language instruction in Puerto Rico. Until recently, the issue of bilingual education was not well accepted in the public schools of the island. Bilingual education is offered mostly by private schools. The prestige of these private schools depends on the strength of their bilingual education, and mostly affluent parents can afford to send their children to such bilingual schools. Despite the government effort to establish bilingual schools throughout the country, Spanish remains the language of instruction in public schools. Even though English is a required subject in all school grades, less than 20% of the population is fluent in English (Resnick, 1993).

Research done by Clachar (1997), Resnick (1993), Schweers and Vélez (1992), and Torruellas (1990) identifies Puerto Rico’s socio-political status as one of the reasons for the resistance to the learning and spread of English. Furthermore, the Department of Education identifies deficiencies in textbooks, teaching methods, and teacher preparation as other reasons for the failure of public bilingual education (Resnick, 1993). Pousada (1996) also argues that “ill-prepared teachers who are unsure of their English rely on mechanical methods of teaching that disguise gaps in their background and give them control over reluctant students” (p. 505). Therefore, when these students enter the university, their lack of proficiency poses a challenge for the college English teacher.

Clachar (1997) also indicates that since most college textbooks are written in English, many students settle for developing their reading skills, and do not consider other skills as essential. The reality is that because of Puerto Rico’s commonwealth status with the United States, English is necessary for those who want to succeed in both cultures despite the political dilemma that surrounds the learning of English on the island.
Furthermore, students who are planning to pursue graduate studies in the main land must be able to understand and write English correctly. Clachar's study (1997) also revealed that Puerto Rican students recognize the need to learn English and have the desire to learn it. The challenge is to provide these students classroom instruction that will encourage them to develop their writing skills while they study in a local university.

**Historical Background of English-as-a-Second-Language Writing**

Throughout the history of English as a Second Language (ESL) there have been different approaches to the teaching and learning of ESL writing. Before the 1960s, most ESL classes were given to immigrants who desired to pass the citizenship exam and obtain a factory job that required few literacy skills (Leki, 1992). In 1966, the Audio-Lingual method, rooted in behaviorist theories, was the dominant language methodology. Writing was then the last in order of language skills to be learned (Leki, 1992).

The post-Sputnik era brought an influx of foreign students to the United States, consequently it became relevant to teach these students the English they needed to function in the academic arena. Students learned to write in English in a very structured classroom, practicing bits of language in sentence pattern, striving for grammatical perfection (Leki, 1992). Controlled composition, still widely used today, provided the text and students were asked to manipulate linguistic forms within the text (Raimes, 1991). Then, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, guided writing replaced controlled writing. Students answered questions that would help them form paragraphs and essays (Reid, 1993).

These aforementioned approaches could be classified as traditional or teacher-centered approaches because instruction was mostly prescriptive and product-centered.
(Smith, 2000). The teacher, then, had complete control and organized and directed writing activities as whole-class activities (Deen, 1991).

The paradigm shift toward a process approach occurred when ESL teachers shifted their perspectives and began to examine native speakers classes for strategy insights. Arapoff (1969), Lawrence (1975), and Zamel (1982) were some of the first ESL researchers and teachers to begin to point out the advantages of process writing in the classroom. "Students were encouraged to explore a topic through writing, to share drafts with teacher and peers" (Reid, 1993, p. 31) because as stated by Zamel (1980), "the act of composing should become the result of a genuine need to express one's feeling, experience, or reactions, all within a climate of encouragement" (p. 74).

This paradigm shift caused writing instruction to move from teacher-centered to learner-centered. Reid (1993) indicates, "since the middle of the 1980s many ESL writing teachers have discovered, accepted, and implemented the approaches and philosophy associated with process writing" (p. 31). One of these approaches is the Writing Workshop (Clippard & Nicaise, 1998; Paulson, 1992; Rothermel, 1996; Ziegler, 1981). Ziegler (1981) defines Writing Workshop as a "state of minds" with an atmosphere that supports all aspects of writing, not just putting words down on paper.

Writing Workshop provides learners and teachers a more interesting and more appealing experience because of the interpersonal climate it creates in the classroom (Montgomery, 1992). Samway (1992) indicates that Writing Workshop, first implemented with native speakers, can be structured for students learning English as a second or additional language. Research has also demonstrated that Writing Workshop can be successfully used with bilingual students and ESL students in the United States.
(Paulson, 1992; Peyton, 1994; Stokes, 1984), Japan (Matsumoto, 1997), and Canada (Ping, 2000). Therefore, the Writing Workshop could provide ESL teachers in Puerto Rico the tool that they need to move away from a teacher-centered writing classroom to a learner-centered writing classroom, to motivate and involve their students in learning to write in English, and by extension to read and speak it.

**Statement of the Problem**

Many college students in Puerto Rico have difficulties expressing themselves in English, whether written or spoken, even after studying English for 12 years. This problem suggests that the ESL writing curriculum does not seem to meet the needs of the limited-proficient students.

For the past 8 years, I have enjoyed teaching English as a Second Language. However, one course that has caused me to think about teaching strategies has been the intermediate ESL writing course. Students in this course do quite well in reading comprehension and grammar activities; however there is no significant improvement in their writing skills at the end of the semester. Informal students' evaluations seem to indicate that the teacher-centered approach that is actually used does not help enhance the students' writing skills. Therefore, it was thought that shifting to a more student-centered approach might help improve students' basic writing skills.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this investigation was to study the effectiveness of Writing Workshop as a model for teaching English writing skills to students enrolled in intermediate English as a Second Language class at Antillean Adventist University.
Research Questions

Following are the research questions addressed in this study:

1. What are ESL students' attitudes toward learning English?

2. What are ESL students' attitudes toward writing in English?

3. What is the effectiveness of the Writing Workshop approach on ESL students' writing skills?
   3a. How is Writing Workshop related to writing skills as measured by writing skills pretest and posttest?
   3b. How is Writing Workshop related to students' compositions as measured by composition pretest and composition posttest?

4. What are students' perceptions of their experiences in Writing Workshop?
   4a. How are students' perceptions of their experiences in Writing Workshop related to reading as assessed by the Assessment of Classroom Activities Survey?
   4b. How are students' perceptions of their experiences in Writing Workshop related to writing as assessed by the Assessment of Classroom Activities Survey?
   4c. How are students' perceptions of their experiences in Writing Workshop related to speaking as assessed by the Assessment of Classroom Activities Survey?
   4d. How are students' perceptions of their experiences in Writing Workshop related to peer response as assessed by the Assessment of Classroom Activities Survey?
4e. How are students' perceptions of their experiences in Writing Workshop related to collaborative writing as assessed by the Assessment of Classroom Activities Survey?

4f. How are students' perceptions of their experiences in Writing Workshop related to dialogue journal as assessed by the Assessment of Classroom Activities Survey?

4g. How are students' perceptions of their experiences in Writing Workshop related to individual conference as assessed by the Assessment of Classroom Activities Survey?

4h. How are students' perceptions of their experiences related to feedback as assessed by the Assessment of Classroom Activities Survey?

4i. How are students' perceptions of their experiences related to classroom environment as assessed by the Assessment of Classroom Activities Survey?

4j. How are students' perceptions of their experiences related to teacher's role as assessed by the Assessment of Classroom Activities Survey?

Rationale

Research suggests that Writing Workshop can help ESL students improve their writing skills because it involves more social interaction, collaborative writing, personal input, and peer feedback (Hawes & Richards, 1977; Oates, 1997; Paulson, 1992).

In the Writing Workshop environment, the lives of students provide the content for the writing tasks. Writing on self-selected topics has been found to benefit students...
with writing deficiencies (Clippard & Nicaise, 1998). Furthermore, Peelen (1993) indicates that workshops that rely on peer interaction can accommodate learners of varied backgrounds and abilities.

Clippard and Nicaise (1998) conducted an intervention study to examine the efficacy of a Writer Workshop approach for improving the writing skills of a small group of fourth- and fifth-graders who had significant writing deficiencies. The study was a quasi-experimental, pre/post nonequivalent design. In their findings they indicated that Writer's Workshop students scored significantly higher than non-Writer's Workshop students on writing samples, especially on the pre/post intervention sample. Furthermore, Stokes (1984) states that Writing Workshop helped her ESL college students move from product to process. She also points out that the workshop activities designed for young writers can be appropriate for writers of all ages.

Results from different studies (Hyland, 2000; Paulson, 1992; Peelen, 1993; Stretch, 1994) indicate that Writing Workshop could be an effective tool to help ESL or limited-English-proficient students improve their writing skill. Most of the studies cited previously present the Writing Workshop as a strategy worth being used in the ESL classroom. The premise of this study was that using a Writing Workshop not as a classroom strategy, but as a course in itself, could help students in Puerto Rico improve their writing skills, and by extension their overall English skills and attitude toward the language.

The assumptions for this study were:

1. The Writing Workshop helps improve ESL writing because it encourages the students to become involved in the writing process by using their own topics (Stretch,
It has been proven that when students write on self-selected topics, the quality of their writing improves (Atwell, 1987; Peelen, 1993).

2. The Writing Workshop promotes a more active role of the learners in the learning process. When students participate in a Writing Workshop, they learn to share ideas, to review, and to comment on each other's writing (Atwell, 1987).

3. The Writing Workshop fosters a positive attitude toward ESL learning. The Writing Workshop presents writing as a social act and makes it a more appealing experience because of the positive classroom experience (Montgomery, 1992).

**Theoretical Background**

Writing is the door to the world of communication. It is a skill that varies from individual to individual, from language to language, and from community to community. Therefore, writing can be one of the main problems that students face when acquiring a second language. The English-as-a-second-language writing process has evolved over the years from grammatical exercises to paragraph composing, to free writing, and from the reductionist approach to the collaborative approach.

The different approaches that have permeated ESL instruction can be summarized within two types of instruction: Teacher-centered instruction and student-centered instruction. Traditionally, most foreign (second) language classrooms have been teacher-centered. Deen (1991) defines the teacher-centered approach as an approach where the "teacher rather than being a facilitator or advisor, has complete control" (p. 154). Zamel (1987) indicates that this form of instruction affects students' creative thinking and writing skills.

In 1986, Applebee (as cited in Smith, 2000) indicated that students should be
encouraged to take increasing responsibility for their own learning. This statement indicated the need to move from a teacher-centered approach to a more student-centered one. The process approach, referred to earlier, has laid the foundation for student-centered instruction in writing. Theories such as Expressivism and Social Constructionism provide a theoretical background to student-centered instruction.

Expressivism started in the first decades of the 20th century. The Expressivists refer to writing as "an art, a creative art in which the process—the discovery of the true self—is as important as the product" (Berlin, 1988, p. 484). Teachers advocating the Expressivist view focus on sincerity, integrity, spontaneity, and originality in composition. They are also nondirective and use assignments that encourage self-discovery activities such as personal essays and journal writing in which the students write freely (Johns, 1990; Reid, 1993).

The central point of Expressivism is that free writing allows students to use language as an aid to thinking and discovery without worrying about grammar evaluation, teacher-imposed topics, and grade (Reid, 1993). Peter Elbow (1989), a strong advocate of free writing, presents free writing as a relatively risk-free way of transferring ideas into words that helps students discover the meaning of their writing.

The second theory that has helped frame student-centered writing instruction is the Social Constructionism theory. Social Constructionists view writing as a manifestation of internalized social interaction (Wynn & Cadet, 1996). Moreover, Faigley (1986) indicates that Vygotsky also views writing as a deeply social act and as much more than simply absorbing bits of knowledge or mastering discrete skills. It is a communicative social interaction process. Writing becomes a social act because it
involves the collaboration of the teacher, the students, and their peers.

Writing theorists view writing as embedded in social interaction (Coe, 1987; Murray, 1992; Murphy, 1994). Social interaction in a writing classroom leads to collaborative writing. Murray (1992) states that collaborative writing helps prepare students to write for the real-world contexts in which they must write. Collaborative learning in the ESL writing classroom includes small-group work for idea generation, for gathering and organizing material, as well as for peer revision—three important tools in the Writing Workshop, a student-centered approach to writing.

**Importance of the Study**

Because of Puerto Rico's commonwealth status with the United States, mastering English has become a must for those who want to truly succeed in both cultures. Therefore college graduates should be able to read and write English at least at a high intermediate level.

Furthermore, as stated by Warschauer (2000): “A large and increasing number of people, even if they never set foot in an English-speaking country, will be required to use English in highly sophisticated communication and collaboration with people around the world” (p. 518). Therefore, students need to be able to write, interpret, and analyze information in English. Many students will also need to “carry out collaborative long-distance inquiry and problems as part of their jobs and community activities” (p. 523).

Consequently, ESL educators need to teach the writing skills necessary for the kind of tasks required by the World Wide Web-based communication if they want their students to be ready to face this communication era (Warschauer, 2000). For this reason, ESL teachers will have to find new strategies to help their ESL students build or improve
their English skills and work collaboratively.

Finally, we live in a communicative era where electronic mail is replacing telephone calls, and distance learning is bringing the opportunity to study in an American university while residing in a foreign country. Therefore, if faculty at Antillean Adventist University, and by extension in Puerto Rico, wants their students to be competitive, they must give them the linguistic tools that they need to be so. This research seeks to discover the pedagogical value of the Writing Workshop for the teaching of ESL writing in Puerto Rico.

**Definition of Terms**

*Collaborative learning*: Pedagogy that uses thoughtfully organized group activities as a means of enhancing academic achievement (Reid, 1993).

*Collaborative writing*: Two or more people working together to produce one written document in a situation in which a group takes responsibility for having produced the document (Hirvela, 1999).

*ESL*: “English as a second language; often limited to students studying English in an English speaking country” (Reid, 1993, p. 290).

*Freewriting*: A pre-writing activity that requires writers to put all their ideas on paper quickly, without revisions to words and sentence structure that could “interrupt” thought; also called brainstorming and quick writing (Reid, 1993).

*Peer review groups*: Student writers who work collaboratively and develop an interactive relationship through writing, talking, reading, and learning about their own and other’s writing; also called peer response, peer evaluation, or peer editing (Reid, 1993).
**Prewriting:** Initial stages of writing; can involve freewriting, listing, looping, outlining, and so on.

**Revision:** A sequence of changes, often recursive, in a piece of writing; changes that occur continuously through the writing of a piece of discourse.

**Teacher-centered instruction:** Instruction where the teacher, rather than being a facilitator or advisor, has complete control. A teacher-centered classroom is a class in which many activities are primarily organized as whole-class activities directed by the teachers (Deen, 1991).

**Learner-centered instruction:** This is a teaching approach that (1) includes learners in the educational decision-making process, whether those decisions concern what learners focus on in their learning or what rules are established for the classroom; (2) respects and encourages the diverse perspectives of the learners during learning experiences; (3) accounts for the learners’ differences in cultures, abilities, styles, developmental stages; and (4) treats the learners as co-creators in the teaching and learning process, as individuals with ideas and issues that deserve attention and consideration (McCombs & Whisler, 1997).

**Writing Workshop:** This is an approach that encourages students to become involved in the writing process by using their own topics. Students are encouraged to examine their own writing processes and to view their writing as a continuing dialogue between themselves and the emerging text (Stokes, 1984). Writing Workshop includes generating ideas, developing and revising material, receiving and giving feedback from their peers, discussing the writing process with their peers, and sharing ideas with their peers, or writing group (Ziegler, 1981). In the Writing Workshop, writing is a social act,
students talk together, work together, and 25 students maybe reading different books, working on individualized and very different writing projects all at once (Bullock, 1998).

**General Methodology**

This study uses a descriptive, quasi-experimental design to investigate the effect of Writing Workshop (WW) on ESL students' attitudes and their learning outcomes in ESL writing. Two ESL intermediate writing courses at Antillean Adventist University participated in the study. Theses two courses were taught using the Writing Workshop. Students in each course were pre- and posttested. I taught one of the Writing Workshop sections and to control bias, the second Writing Workshop section was taught by another one of Antillean Adventist University's ESL professors.

Attitudes surveys, pretests and posttest, as well as questionnaires were used to gather information. There is no known ESL Writing Workshop course design in Puerto Rico; therefore I was the teacher and the designer of the workshop.

The Writing Workshop course designed for this study is based on Nancy Atwell’s (1987) book *In the Middle*, and on Richard Bullock’s (1998) book, *Why Workshop? In the Middle* presents information for setting up and running a writing workshop, and *Why Workshop?* offers overviews of workshop teaching, information on specific elements of the workshop, and the basic information one teacher used to create a workshop-teaching environment (Bullock, 1998).

**Limitations of the Study**

The study focused on students enrolled in the intermediate ESL writing course at Antillean Adventist University in Puerto Rico during the first semester of the school year.
2001-2002. The limitations to the study were as follows:

1. The ESL Writing Workshop course was taught in Puerto Rico; therefore it might not apply to other countries.

2. The primary goal of this research was to better understand the effects of Writing Workshop on the learning outcomes in ESL writing of intermediate ESL writers. The generalizability of the findings should be done cautiously.

3. Another limitation of this study was that I was the researcher and also the Writing Workshop teacher. To minimize any biases, another ESL professor was asked to collaborate as a Writing Workshop professor.

4. Workshop training is another limitation to the study. Neither my colleague nor I had formal training in Writing Workshop. However, as a teacher-researcher, I was driven to read and research as much as I could about the use of Writing Workshop with ESL students before using it in my classroom. I shared my knowledge with my colleague, and then I prepared the Writing Workshop course using the information gathered during my self-orientation process.

**Overview of the Dissertation**

Stokes (1984) indicates that Writing Workshop should be used as a means of teaching writing; in other words, a means of helping students discover thinking processes, and finding new strategies for expressing ideas through writing. This study presents the Writing Workshop as a possible alternative to teacher-centered instruction for successfully teaching writing to ESL college students in a university in Puerto Rico.

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the research study with information about the background of ESL teaching in Puerto Rico. The statement of the problem, the
purpose of the study, research questions, rationales, theoretical framework and general methodology help put the study into perspective. A definition of terms presented the key words that are used throughout the study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature that includes general information about second-language acquisition, information about ESL writing, as well as the characteristics of a Writing Workshop and its different components.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodology of the study: description of the instrument, the sampling, and the general procedures. A Writing Workshop rubric is also included.

Chapter 4 discusses the results of the study.

Chapter 5 includes a summary of the study and some recommendations. Then, additional information is presented through a list of references and several appendices.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For more than a quarter century many educational experts and teachers have accepted the primacy of process. The precept that students need to learn how to learn has been the stepping stone for process over product, and hence the stepping stone in workshop teaching (Bullock, 1998). Based on Atwell’s (1987), Graves’s (1983), and Elbow and Belanoff’s (1989) workshop experience with first language learners, writing workshops are being integrated in English as a Second Language classrooms (Chiang, 1991; Paulson, 1992; Peyton et al., 1994; Stokes, 1984).

This investigation studies the effectiveness of Writing Workshop as a model for teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) to students enrolled in an intermediate English as a Second Language class at Antillean Adventist University in Puerto Rico.

The following review of literature presents an overview of ESL writing and of the teaching of ESL in Puerto Rico. Then, a thorough review on the Writing Workshop is presented, and the key elements of writing workshop are discussed. The chapter ends with a discussion about the use of Writing Workshop in the teaching and learning of ESL writing.
Overview of ESL Writing: Summary of the Development of ESL Writing in the USA

Since about 1945 there have been a series of approaches to second language writing. One of the first methods used, from the 1940s until the 1960s, was the Audio-Lingual method. This method focused on the student being able to learn patterns of language, and repeat and mimic them (Brauer, 2000). The Audio-Lingual method was based on the stimulus-response theory of the behaviorist B.F. Skinner. Therefore, the teacher was to provide oral models of language patterns that the student would repeat until these patterns became a language habit (Reid, 1993).

On these premises, writing was viewed as a reinforcement tool for practicing what was learned in the classroom. Free composition was avoided entirely. The teachers provided the writing material; the audience of students' work was the course instructor (Brauer, 2000) and the emphasis was on the product.

In the 1960s, the influx of international students in the United States made it necessary to provide these students the writing skills needed to function in higher education. ESL writing class, at that point, became an integral part of most ESL curricula (Reid, 1993). However, ESL writing was still viewed as an exercise of habit formation, and the student writer was viewed as a manipulator of learned linguistic structures, and the teacher was the reader and editor concerned with formal linguistic features (Kroll, 1990).

In the 1970s, teacher-centered instruction still dominated ESL writing courses, and most ESL writing classes still focused on controlled writing (Reid, 1993). Teachers prepared guided composition activities, but students rarely created text themselves (Leki, 1992). Controlled writing, as stated by Paulson (1972) permitted “busy teachers to give
daily assignments of writing exercises—even in large classes—and at the same time insure that the student’s work was substantially correct and in acceptable form with acceptable usage” (p. 39).

As ESL writing teachers started to focus on native English speaker composition research, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, they began to move toward approaches that focused less on grammatical accuracy. The first of these approaches was “free writing.” Despite its name, free writing was still guided (Reid, 1993). This approach “was limited to structuring sentences, often in direct answers to questions, the results of which looked like a short piece of discourse, usually a paragraph” (Reid, 1993, p. 25). Free writing was followed by other teacher-centered approaches such as language-based writing that emphasized dictation and sentence combining. Advocates of sentence combining believe that it improves students’ sentence structures, and eventually improves their compositions (Johnson, 1992). This approach was then followed by an interest in composition techniques.

Reid (1993) indicates that the shift from language-based writing classrooms to the study of composition techniques was gradual. “It began with the recognition of the need of ESL student in the academic environment” (p. 29). This shift produced the writing-based approaches to ESL writing; therefore, many textbooks in the early 1980s approached writing from a pattern/product perspective. This approach emphasized the concepts of topic sentence, thesis statement, paragraph unity, organizational strategies, and development of paragraphs by patterns.

In the 1980s, ESL conference papers began more and more to explore the idea of using process approaches with ESL students (Leki, 1992). Therefore, since the middle of
the 1980s, many ESL teachers have discovered, accepted, and implemented process writing (Reid, 1993). This approach "called for providing a positive and collaborative workshop environment within which students can work through their composing processes (Kroll, 1990, p. 15); therefore ESL writing class instruction shifted from teacher-centered to student-centered. The teacher’s role became a cooperative one, helping students go through the writing process.

Zamel, one of the first ESL researchers who began stressing the value of process writing, stated that "the act of composing should become the result of a genuine need to express one’s personal feeling, experience, or reactions, all within a climate of encouragement" (1980, p. 74). Following the same thought, Brauer (2000) declares that writing is a process and the writing instructor should help facilitate this process. Furthermore, he emphasizes that "attempts should be made to support the writing process by assigning a variety of drafts in conjunction with peer editing and/or peer conferencing" (p. 11).

Closely related to the process approach is collaborative teaching and learning (Reid, 1993).

The opportunities for collaborative learning in the ESL writing classroom include small group work for idea generation, cooperative work on gathering and organizing material, peer review and advice, and the presence of an authentic audience [other than the teacher] for the writer. (p. 42)

Classroom reports and research on collaborative and cooperative learning indicate that a student-centered classroom includes activities that stimulate students’ participation and lead to language learning (Bassano & Christison, 1988; Marr, 1997). Besides the social constructionism and the expressivism, collaborative learning as a student-centered approach, also, provides the framework for the Writing Workshop approach.
This section presented an overview of the history of ESL writing. The most important approaches to writing were discussed. These approaches have evolved from teacher-centered to student-centered. The following section will focus on teaching and ESL learning in Puerto Rico.

**Teaching and Learning ESL in Puerto Rico**

The movement against teaching English in Puerto Rico started in 1898 after the Spanish American War. That same year, the Treaty of Paris ceded Puerto Rico to the United States. When the American military government took over in Puerto Rico, the illiteracy rate was approximately eighty percent; therefore a much needed public school system was established and English became the language of instruction (Algreen de Gutiérrez, 1987).

Between 1898 and 1949, Puerto Rico had seven official language policies, each named after the incumbent Commissioner of Education responsible for its implementation:

1. **Eaton-Clark policy (1898-1900):** This policy advocated English as the medium of instruction in all grades.

2. **Brumbaugh policy (1900-1903):** Spanish was the medium of instruction in the elementary grades and English was a subject. In high school, English was the medium of instruction and Spanish was a subject.

3. **Faulkner-Dexter’s policy (1903-1917):** English was the medium of instruction; Spanish was taught as a subject.
4. Miller-Huyke's policy (1917-1934): First four grades used Spanish as the medium of instruction. In Grade 5 half the core subjects were taught in English and the other half in Spanish. Grades 6 through 12 used English as the medium of instruction.

5. Padin's policy (1934-1937): Spanish was used in the elementary school and English was used in high school.

6. Gallardo's policy (1937-1945): Spanish was used in Grades 1 and 2. In Grades 3 through 8 Spanish and English were used as the medium of instruction. English became the medium of instruction in high school. In 1942, the policy reverted to Padin's policy.

7. Villaronga's policy (1949- present): Spanish is the medium of instruction at all levels of the public school system with English taught as a preferred subject.

In 1991, Puerto Rico's legislature overwhelmingly approved a bill that made Spanish the island's single official language (Rubinstein, 2001). In 1993, the New Progressive Party came into power, and promptly repealed the Spanish-only law and Puerto Rico again had two official languages (Pousada, 1996). In 2000, the acting government of Puerto Rico implemented bilingual programs in some schools in Puerto Rico. It is yet to be known if these programs are successful.

It is clear that education in Puerto Rico has been dominated by disruptive shifts between English and Spanish as the language of instruction (Resnick, 1993). Yet, as stated by Epstein (1970), the educational problems in Puerto, including language learning and teaching, have been political and pedagogical. It should be noted that teachers resist teaching in English, not teaching English.
Navarro (1997) indicates that teachers oppose bilingualism because they fear the public system is not prepared enough to add English instruction for subjects other than English. Their main reason is that most teachers are not bilingual; therefore they cannot impart instruction in a language they do not master. Many teachers are also concerned that English may be emphasized at the expense of Spanish (Navarro, 1997).

It appears that another reason for students' limited proficiency in English resides in the fact that “English teachers who are unsure of their English rely on mechanical methods of teaching that disguise gaps in their background and give them control over reluctant students” (Pousada, 1996, p. 505). Therefore, students only acquire superficial language skills because they only fill in the blanks and respond to predictable language patterns. When they enter the university, English professors have to remediate their lack of language skills (Pousada, 1996). Teachers indicate, “the department [of education] would do better if it simply strengthened the existing English program” (Navarro, 1997, p. A12).

Clachar (1997) conducted a study to explore students' representation of their own thoughts and concerns about the English-language issue in Puerto Rico. She indicates that despite “the preeminence of English on the island, there has been a persistent resistance to the learning and spread of the language throughout much of the century” (p. 2) because some Puerto Ricans view English as the symbol of the United States imperialism, of class differentiation, and of the erosion of their cultures. Even though, her conclusion states that the English language is seen as a real threat to Puerto Rican cultural and national identity, it also indicates that learning it is necessary for upward social mobility.
Puerto Rican students also understand that mastering English will widen their professional opportunities (Clachar, 1997; Navarro, 1997). They are aware of the importance of mastering English and have the desire to learn it (Clachar, 1997). The challenge is on teachers of English who "can become catalysts for change and make a significant difference in the way scores of Puerto Rican children are prepared to handle challenges in today's modern multilingual world" (Pousada, 1996, p. 509).

The first two sections of this chapter presented the historical background of ESL writing and of the teaching and learning of ESL in Puerto Rico. The different approaches presented can be summarized within two method of instruction: teacher-centered instruction and student-centered instruction. The teacher-centered instruction approach has been prevalent in the Puerto Rican educational system. Becoming catalysts for change may require ESL teachers in Puerto Rico to shift to a student-centered instruction approach to provide students with more meaningful instruction. The following two sections present a brief description of these two approaches.

**Teacher-Centered Instruction**

It seems that traditional instruction, referred to as teacher-centered instruction in this study, has dominated instruction since the very beginning of schooling. In a typical teacher-centered classroom students sit in rows, listen to the teacher give directions, and work on the same worksheet (Cox, 1999).

Cox (1999) places this approach to instruction within the framework of the psychological theory of behaviorism and the transmission model. First, the behaviorist framework states, "language is learned in small increments, called skills. Teachers condition students' learning by modeling behaviors that students are to imitate" (p. 18).
Therefore the teacher has complete control of the students' learning process. Second, the teacher-centered approach [instruction] is related to the transmission position in Miller’s curriculum framework. “The teacher promotes education through the transmission of facts and values in competency-based teaching. The teacher’s professional development is focused on the transmission of information” (p. 2). Standardized, multiple choice, true-false, and comprehension tests are the teacher’s evaluation tools.

In 1968, Huck and Kuhn presented a teacher-centered approach in their curriculum in *Children’s Literature in the Elementary School*. This curriculum was to transmit facts, skills, and values through mastering knowledge. Both authors “emphasize the importance of understanding teacher’s lectures and the contents of textbooks in order to master literacy skills and literary appreciation” (Katsuko, 1995, p. 2).

Therefore, teacher-centered instruction can then be defined as an approach in which “the teacher rather than being a facilitator or advisor, has complete control, and class activities are primarily organized as whole-class activities directed by the teacher” (Deen, 1991, p. 154). Kohn (1999) argues that for teacher-centered advocates “schooling amounts to the transmission of a body of knowledge from the teacher (who has it) to the child [student] (who doesn’t)” (p. 3) through lectures, textbooks, and completing worksheets.

According to Katsuko (1995), the teacher-centered approach promotes competency-based learning, and emphasizes that students accomplish the goals set by their teachers. Consequently, there is no recognition of independent learning or of children’s life experiences. It is then difficult for students to develop into independent learners (Katsuko, 1995).
Table 1 compares what the teacher and student do in a teacher-centered instruction setting, as presented by Cox (1999, p. 19).

Table 1

**Teacher-Centered Instruction: Teacher’s and Student’s Roles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher’s Role</th>
<th>Student’s Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make all decisions for what's to be learned</td>
<td>Is a passive recipient of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses textbooks and commercial materials</td>
<td>Imitates what the teacher has modeled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses teachers’ guides for textbook series</td>
<td>Follows directions of the teacher or textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizes part-to-whole learning</td>
<td>Is evaluate on mastery of skill in a hierarchical order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows a sequence of skills to be mastered</td>
<td>Is grouped by ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes the product is more important than the process</td>
<td>Does the same assignments as other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that motivation is external; uses rewards</td>
<td>Is evaluated by comparing work to that of other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates based on test questions that have single correct answers</td>
<td>Is competitive with other students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teacher-centered instructional approach presents some advantages:

1. The teacher is a source of input and a model of correct and appropriate language (Deen, 1991, p. 154).

2. Interaction is clearly structured since the teacher controls turn-taking and topic nomination (p. 154).

3. The teacher-centered approach provides a clear structure that can be conducive to learning (p. 155).

4. Teachers using a teacher-centered instructional approach establish a high level of attainment as an important learning objective. Students need to work hard to attain a high level of achievement (Katsuko, 1995, p. 7).
On the other hand, teacher-centered instruction has some drawbacks:

1. In a language class, for example, the teacher generally talks about 60 to 90% of time, thereby leaving very little time for the students to actively use the language (Deen, 1991, p. 155).

2. Interaction can be controlled and artificial because there is no mutual transfer of information as in real communication. It is less tailored to the individual student’s level and needs (pp. 155-156).

3. Teacher-centered instruction ignores the ways in which children modify their language as a result of their diverse life experiences (Katsuko, 1995, p. 3).

4. This approach ignores the ideas of sharing and relating with others (p. 4).

Within the teacher-centered instructional approach, teachers are mostly confined to their textbooks and their scopes and sequences. They are the head of the classroom, responsible for students’ knowledge (Kohn, 1999). The student has to fit within the teacher’s instructional framework as a passive recipient.

This section presented some key information about teacher-centered instruction. Even though this approach is still widely used, “recent school reform proposals call for a movement away from teacher-centered, direct instruction toward student-centered, understanding-based teaching (Smerdom, Burkam, & Lee, 1999, p. 5). The following section focuses, then, on student-centered instruction.
Student-Centered Instruction

In 1990, Barbara McCombs, sponsored by the American Psychological Association, directed a task force that was to surface general principles that could form a framework for school redesign and reform. This task force produced the document entitled, *Learner-centered Psychological Principles: Guidelines for School Redesign and Reform*, that provided an integrated perspective on factors influencing learning for all learners (McCombs & Whisler, 1997), and set the stage for a paradigm shift from teacher-centered instruction to student- or learner-centered instruction.

"The student-centered instruction—often called constructivist—affords students opportunities to explore ideas and construct knowledge based on their own observations and experiences" (Smerdom et al., 1999, p. 6). Therefore, because it promotes the idea that people learn better by actively constructing knowledge, the theory of constructionism has provided the theoretical framework for student-centered instruction (Sullivan, 1995). Although student-centered instruction is now viewed as a new approach, its roots can also be traced to John Dewey whose educational concepts suggested, "knowledge and instruction should build on students' experiences, rather than be viewed as fixed or determined (Dewey, 1902).

In 1990, Barton and Booth presented a student-centered approach curriculum in *Stories in the Classroom* that would nurture students' original thinking, connect the learning of literature to their individual needs, and give them diverse experiences (Katsuko, 1995). Underlying student-centered instruction is the notion of the student as an active learner, and the teacher as a guide in the learning process (Conley, 1993; Newmann, Marks, & Gamoran, 1996).
Table 2 describes teachers' and students' activities in a student-centered classroom as presented by Cox (1999, p. 20).

### Table 2

**Student-Centered Classroom: Teacher's and Student's Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiates hands-on, direct experiences</td>
<td>Makes choices about what to read, how to respond, what to learn about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides opportunities for independent learning</td>
<td>Learns by doing; active engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that learning is whole to part</td>
<td>Explores and discovers things on own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes that process is more than product</td>
<td>Works with others in group, which are flexible and can change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides options and demonstrates possibilities</td>
<td>Interacts, cooperates, and collaborates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups students based on interests, which are flexible and may change</td>
<td>Reads self-selected literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives time for sharing and planning</td>
<td>Writes on topics of own choosing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences often with students</td>
<td>Has intrinsic motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors students voices, observes and listens</td>
<td>Is responsible for and has control over learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses interests of students as ideas and interest for thematic learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes that students go through similar process and stages at different pace and manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages cooperation and collaboration among students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses multiple forms of authentic assessment to inform instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As presented in Table 2, in a student-centered classroom students are active, and they learn by doing. The teacher helps them gain control over their own ideas and language through active engagement (Cox, 1999). This dual focus then informs and drives educational decision making (McCombs & Whisler, 1997), and supports the definition that states that student-centered instruction is
the perspective that couples a focus on individual learners (their heredity, experience, perspectives, backgrounds, talents, interests, capacities, and needs) with a focus on learning (the best available knowledge about learning and how it occurs and about teaching practices that are most effective in promoting the highest levels of motivation, and achievement for all learners. (McCombs & Whisler, 1997, p. 9)

Student-centered instruction presents several advantages:

1. It helps students to be unique and independent learner (Katsuko, 1995).

2. It promotes a positive affective climate, necessary for learning to take place (Deen, 1991).

3. Students are encouraged to choose their own topics whenever possible (Smith, 2000).

4. It provides a supportive social context in the classroom, which can help students become more fluent writers (Zellermayer, 1993).

5. Teachers learn to foster a social classroom climate that will encourage students to find their ‘voice’, engage in prewriting, drafting, and revision, and to respond and receive comments from their peers or other intended audiences (Zellermayer, 1993).

On the other hand, student-centered instruction has been criticized because it is not standardized, it does not have formalized tests, and differs in many aspects (classroom control, permissiveness or students’ empowerment); these situations may influence academic achievement (Deen, 1991; Katsuko, 1995). Furthermore, Smerdom et al. (1999) mention that constructivism is a philosophical approach to teaching; therefore “methods of constructivist teaching typically are not spelled out precisely, and moreover are frequently somewhat ambiguous” (p. 9). Teachers who desire to shift to a student-centered classroom should be able to understand and apply the various means available to facilitate this kind of learning (Smerdom et al., 1999) and obtain high
achievement in their classrooms.

This section presented basic information about student-centered instruction. Student-centered instruction and Writing Workshop share the same characteristics. Writing Workshop can be identified as student-centered instruction. In a student-centered instruction classroom and in a Writing Workshop teachers should incorporate students' prior experiences into the learning process, allowed students opportunities to express themselves, and foster collaborative opportunities for their students to work, share and learn. The following section presents the Writing Workshop and its components.

**Theoretical Frameworks of the Writing Workshop**

In the past several decades, writing workshops have become very popular in the United States (Oates, 1997). "In such workshops, students are encouraged to write on topics of their own, to examine their own writing process" (Stokes, 1984). Paulson (1992, p. 3) presents several principles about second language writing at all levels of instruction that are applicable to the writing workshop:

1. Writing should always have a communicative purpose.

2. Writing activities in the classroom should be accomplished in a workshop atmosphere: active, dynamic, collaborative, and cooperative.

3. Writing should be shared in the classroom creating a "discourse community."

4. Writing can be a group effort.

5. Writing should be evaluated by students' peer on occasion.

The very nature of collaboration in the writing workshop places it within
cooperative learning and social constructionism theoretical frameworks. The next two subsections present these theoretical frameworks as they relate to the writing process.

Cooperative Learning and Writing

The concept of cooperative learning was brought to the States in the late 1700s, when Joseph Lancaster and Andrew Bell brought the idea of cooperative groups to America. “Because of the diversity of children attending that school, there was a strong emphasis on cooperative learning to ensure that these students from varied cultures and background were socialized into becoming American” (Marr, 1997, p. 2).

Cooperative learning social interdependence theory presents cooperation as resulting from positive social interdependence individuals’ goals (Johnson & Johnson, 1998).

The basic premise of social interdependence theory is that the way social interdependence is structured determines how individuals interact, which in turn determines outcomes. Positive interdependence, or cooperation, results in promotive interaction as individuals encourage and facilitate each other’s efforts to learn. (p. 3)

The cognitive-developmental theory views cooperation as essential for cognitive growth. Johnson and Johnson (1998) quote Piaget saying that when individuals cooperate “healthy socio-cognitive conflict occurs that creates cognitive disequilibrium, which in turn stimulates perspective-taking ability and cognitive development” (p. 4).

They also mention that Vygotsky believed that “cooperative efforts to learn, understand, and solve problems are essential for constructing knowledge” (p. 4).

Slavin (1989) conducted more than 60 different studies examining studies examining the effects of specific cooperative learning structures. One of the five programs that were found to have made significant impact on achievement and social
development was the Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition program, effective in improving reading and writing (Marr, 1997).

Language teachers have been interested in developing cooperative learning techniques for their courses because in cooperative classrooms learners begin to feel more successful and confident. They converse because they have something to say, they read for enjoyment, purpose, and meaning, and they write because they want to convey their thoughts and work together supportively (Bassano & Christison, 1988). The cooperative classroom provides opportunities for learners to take more control, show more initiative, and learn to work democratically and collaboratively. The teacher only gives structures to the learning process (Bassano & Christison, 1988).

Prapphal (1991) conducted a study to test cooperative learning in a foundation English class in an English as a foreign language setting. Twenty-seven dentistry students participated in the study. Students found the strategy enjoyable; they also indicated that group projects make learning more entertaining. In other words, cooperative learning helps promote positive attitudes toward English, and peer teaching, as well as teaching students to work together and develop their cognitive abilities. Moreover, it helps lower affective filters, which may hinder the process of language acquisition, by creating a relaxing and friendly atmosphere in the classroom. (p. 6)

The next theory that has provided a theoretical base for the Writing Workshop approach is social constructionism.

Social Constructionism and Writing

For the proponents of the social constructionist views, the language focus and forms of a text stem from the community for which it is written (Kroll, 1990). The social constructionist view presents the writing product as a social act that may take place
within a specific context and for a specific audience (Coe, 1987). One of the premises of social constructionism as related to composition derives from Vigotsky's thesis that people learn to use language instrumentally "talking through their tasks with another person and then internalizing that conversation as thoughts" (Bruffee, 1986, p. 785). Therefore, writing re-externalizes the language of internalized conversation. As stated by Paulson (1992) "writing should be shared in the classroom, creating a 'discourse community.' Writing can often be a group effort—it needn't always occur in silent isolation" (p. 3).

The Writing Workshop has, then, evolved within the theoretical frameworks of the collaborative learning and social constructionism. Those frameworks taken together suggest the following premises:

1. The human mind by nature is active, rather than passive, and seeks to make sense out of the world.

2. Positive affect associated with learning is enhanced when learners work cooperatively within social communities.

3. Learning and thought are enhanced as learners actively express their thoughts within social communities.

**Overview of the Writing Workshop**

Donald Graves, Lucy Calkins, and Nancie Atwell are cited as the major contributors of the Writing Workshop. In 1983, Graves published the book *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work*, where he describes the writing workshop approach at the Atkinson Academy. Calkins and Harwayne (1987) have also published a book *Writing Workshop: A World of Difference* based on their work in elementary and early
adolescent classrooms. Nancie Atwell (1987), in her book *In the Middle*, presents how successfully Writing Workshop can be conducted with early adolescents. These three authors and researchers, considered as writing workshop pioneers, focus primarily on elementary and middle school (Stretch, 1994).

The literature related to Writing Workshop is abundant in the fields of elementary and early adolescence education. However, “although both Graves and Calkins work primarily with children the kind of activities they advocate for young writers are appropriate for writers of all ages” (Stokes, 1984, p. 4).

Stretch (1994) defines Writing Workshop as a way of structuring classroom instruction in the writing process. Lensmire (1994) states that Writing Workshop supports the active participation of students by promoting social relations among students and with teachers that sense the needs of student writers. According to Stokes (1984) “Writing workshops encourages students to write on topics of their own choice, to examine their own writing process, and to view their writing as a continuing dialogue between themselves and the emerging text” (p. 4).

Writing workshops help students work together, set goals and attempt to meet them, take responsibility for their work, and complete meaningful tasks, all of this despite differences in ability (Bullock, 1998). In a more traditional or teacher-centered setting, students’ work is conditioned to whatever activity the teacher has chosen for the class. Table 3 illustrates the basic differences between traditional or teacher-centered instruction and Writing Workshop or student-centered instruction as presented by Bullock (1998, p. 2).
Table 3

"Traditional" and "Workshop" Teaching Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher (or school or state) designs and implements the curriculum.</td>
<td>Teacher and students negotiate curriculum, both individually and in groups (within mandate constraints).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students practice skills and memorize facts.</td>
<td>Students actively construct concepts and meanings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content is broken down into discrete, sequential units.</td>
<td>Content is presented whole, in meaningful contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products (finished pieces of writing, answers on tests) are of primary importance.</td>
<td>Processes (prewriting, composing multiple drafts; exploring how answers were arrived at; self-evaluation) are valued as much as the products themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding mistakes is important.</td>
<td>Taking risks is valued as a sign of learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers do the evaluating and grading.</td>
<td>Students learn to assess their own learning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is expected to be uniform.</td>
<td>Learning is expected to be individual and unique.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clippard and Nicaise (1998) conducted a study to examine the efficacy of a Writer’s Workshop approach at promoting the writing skills and self-efficacy of small group of fourth- and fifth-graders who have writing deficits. The population was divided in two groups, Writer’s Workshop (WW) and Non-Writer’s Workshop (NWW). The results indicated that even though the WW students did not score significantly higher on the Spontaneous Writing task, they did score significantly higher on writing samples; they were also more proficient in planning, generating, producing, and revising text, and they had developed a more positive attitude toward writing.

Hyland (2000) points out that creating a writing workshop that is warm, supportive, creative, productive, and orderly can be very difficult to achieve and sometimes frustrate writing teachers. The results of a study she conducted about teacher management of writing workshops prompted her to argue that how teachers organize and conduct their workshops affects the interactions that take place. Therefore, as she points
out "in order to get the most out of workshops, we [writing teachers] need to consider our own workshop management carefully and be clear about what we want to achieve" (p. 14). Ping (2000) also conducted a study using Writing Workshop with 4 ESL Chinese students in a University in Canada from a cross-cultural perspective. The author concluded that more harmonious learning and teaching emerged among the students as the semester progressed.

According to Peelen (1993) Writing Workshop conducted at the work site or through the technical college helps capitalize on the important benefits to be gained from strong writing skills. Furthermore, she points out that "in terms of academic environment, workshops which rely on peer interaction facilitate work at different levels so that one instructor can accommodate learners of varied backgrounds and abilities" (p. 5).

In 1991, Phillips conducted an ethnographic study to examine the impact of a writing workshop on non-academic writers. The workshop was conducted over 10 Saturday sessions in a rural bookstore. He concluded that participants "became more aware of what they were doing because others would/could see their writing" (p. 14). A writer learns from another regardless of context or learning level (Phillips, 1991).

The establishment of a writing workshop may feel risky to teachers because there is no prescribed sequence for teaching skills and strategies (Stretch, 1994). Peyton et al. (1994) also indicate that "teachers implementing writing workshop with ESL students often find that the realities of their teaching situation do not match their original version of what writing workshop could or should be" (p. 469). ESL teachers also have to struggle with their students' writing fluency, conferencing and sharing, revising, and
preoccupations with correctness (Peyton et al., 1994). As they point out, even though ESL teachers feel strongly that writing workshop is excellent for developing literacy, little information is available about the contexts in which teachers implement writing workshop with students learning English and the constraints they face.

Peyton et al. (1994) have described the problems that ESL teachers face who want to implement Writing Workshop. Even though they are focusing on primary and secondary school, ESL college teachers face the same problems. First, there is a lot of trial and error that goes into refining the training or orientation from texts and videos into workable classroom practice. Second, "the disparity between the envisioned model and the classroom experience is heightened by the absence of conditions that seem to be necessary for a successful Writing Workshop" (p. 473). For example, many colleges and universities do not have a classroom equipped for a Writing Workshop course, and sometimes finding the room and the means to equip it is burdensome for the teachers. Third, teachers who want to develop a successful Writing Workshop "have to come to terms with a phenomenon of learning itself: They must own in practice what they have learned in the abstract" (p. 473).

Workshop implementation can also be affected by the English language proficiency of the students (Peyton et al., 1994). "When nonnative English speakers produce extended text in English, they face not only the ordinary struggles of writers but also the challenge of working in a language in which they may be only minimally proficient" (p. 476). Despite this fact, Peyton et al. (1994) reported that the ESOL teachers involved in their study on Implementing Writing Workshop with ESOL Students: Visions and realities indicated that the most notable positive change in students
was in attitude. Students felt more confident about themselves and about their writing.

Second-language writing has often been taught under the assumptions that a writing teacher had to "teach" students to write, rather than inviting them to write (Chiang, 1991) and providing them the tools and the environment to do so. Stokes (1984) reports that the main conclusion she can draw about using writing workshop in her ESL class is that both peer conferences and the discussion of writing experiences among students are the parts of the workshop that should be stressed. She indicates that these elements produced in her class the following behaviors that are necessary in any ESL classroom:

1. Student to student interaction. The teacher was a participant, rather than a dominating presence in the classroom.
2. Verbalization of thinking processes: Students articulated a much clearer idea of what they were trying to say.
3. Introduction of life content into the classroom. After only a few weeks all of the workshop participants had learned far more about each other by writing on topics of their own choice, making the classroom a livelier place.
4. Recognition of difficulties common to students in L2 writing: by recognizing common difficulties students were led to explore ways of dealing with them. (Strokes, 1984, p. 5)

Peyton et al. (1994) in their study also found individual differences and contrasts among the teachers who implemented the Writing Workshop in their ESL writing course. For example, they mentioned that one teacher had tremendous difficulties with conferencing and revising. Another one felt the need to structure the Workshop and maintain a lot of order and control; however one teacher did not need too much structure and control, as she was able to move freely among her students working on different tasks. Some students might also be reluctant to participate in the Writing Workshop and other might accept it enthusiastically. Hyland (2000) also indicates that how teachers
organize and conduct their Writing Workshop affects the interactions that take place and might also affect the outcomes.

In order to get the most out of a Writing Workshop, ESL teachers need to consider their own Writing Workshop management carefully and be clear about the outcomes they want (Hyland, 2000). She further adds that by using a combination of strategies [teachers] could help to ensure that Workshops both function as a supportive collaborative writing environment and equally encourage the development of metacognitive skills in the individual writer. (p. 14)

Despite the drawbacks mentioned earlier, "the writing workshop is an exceptional practice for teaching the writing process. It empowers students and teachers to become competent and self-directed writers" (Stretch, 1994, p. 24).

Activities such as peer revision, dialogue journal, collaborative writing, writing activities, among others, are student-centered activities that become key components of a successful Writing Workshop. Following is a brief description of the key components of a Writing Workshop and their use in the workshop.

**Key Components of a Writing Workshop**

**Peer Revision**

Peer response groups are commonly used in the first language-writing classroom from kindergarten to college (Dipardo & Freedman, 1988). In a peer response group, students have the opportunity to respond to each other’s writing. Bruffee (1984) advocates the uses of writing response groups because students benefits from working together with their peers. Vygotsky’s theory about social interaction has provided a framework for peer-based learning. Guerrero and Villamil (1994) indicate that
Vygotsky’s theory of cognitive development provides a framework for peer interaction in the classroom because of his insistence on the social origin of language and thoughts. Because of the collaborative nature of peer response, it is a very important and adequate strategy to be used with students in a Writing Workshop.

Nelson and Murphy (1993) indicate that collaborative learning and a shift in writing instruction from product to process have prompted second language writing teachers to begin using peer response groups in their writing classes. “The essence of peer response is students’ providing other students with feedback on their preliminary drafts so that the student writers may acquire a wider sense of audience and work toward improving their compositions” (p. 135). Some discrepancies exist in terms of the formation of peer response groups.

Mangelsdorf (1992) states that for beginning or basic ESL students peer review sessions usually consist of three or four students reading or listening to a peer’s draft and pointing out what they found important, what they want to know more about, and where they were confused. However, Mendonca and Johnson (1994) argue that peer response groups give writers a wide range of feedback on their writing, but peer review dyads tend to foster writer-based analysis of written text.

Slavin (1980) on the other side indicates that peer dyads set up roles of tutor and tutee reflecting the teacher-student hierarchical relationship whereas peer groups develop equal relationship between group members. Dipardo and Freedman (1988) indicate that even though peer groups may foster more varied feedback, peer review dyads not only foster learning but also allow student to receive and give advice, ask and answer questions, and act as both novice and expert.
One pitfall of peer revising in a Basic English writing class could be the students' limited proficiency level. ESL students may be skeptical about their ability to respond to writing in English because they do not know the language very well (Berg, 1999). However, Stanley (1992) indicates that coaching ESL writers on ways to be effective peer evaluators helped them to be more engaged in the peer review task, communicate more effectively about their peer writing, and make clearer suggestions for revisions. Encouraging and explaining ESL writers that peer response is not only about grammar and spelling, but also about whether the writer has explained his or her ideas clearly will help them view peer revising as a tool to improving their writing skills.

A study conducted by Mendonca and Johnson (1994) with ESL students revealed that peer review forces these students to exercise their thinking skills as opposed to passively receiving information from the teacher. The findings also support the argument that peer reviews enhance students' communicative power by encouraging them to express themselves and negotiate their ideas. Another study conducted by Nelson and Murphy (1992) revealed that when ESL or second language writers interacted with their peer in a cooperative manner, they were more likely to use their peers' comments. When the interaction was defensive, writers were less likely to use peers' comment.

ESL teachers will surely encounter students' resistance to peer revising. This resistance could be related to the students' lack of fluency, or to their cultural background (Reid, 1993). Lane and Potter (1998) report that Carson and Nelson (1996) indicate that Chinese students because of their desire to maintain group harmony are reluctant to speak in peer feedback, whereas Spanish-speaking students put the task of discussion and helping improve their writing above social considerations.
Coaching second-language writers to become effective peer evaluators will enable them to be more engaged in the peer review activities, to communicate more effectively about their peers’ writing, and make good suggestions for revisions (Stanley, 1992) despite their cultural background. Prior to peer revising, students must understand the purpose of this strategy (Barron, 1991). The teachers should provide them with guidelines about peer revision and should also model the process (Barron, 1991, Berg, 1999).

Moreover, ESL writing teachers should help their ESL students understand that peer editing will help them (1) get a feeling for how they write compared to others and learn from their own and their peers’ strengths and weaknesses; (2) develop self-confidence and grow as individual; (3) help their teacher better understand their strength and weaknesses as he/she looks at their editing; and (4) improve the atmosphere of the class, because by working closely students learn to respect and cooperate with each other (Hafernik, 1983).

Mureau (1993) studied students’ perceptions and attitudes of peer review. In her study, she asked participants if they found peer review to be helpful. One hundred percent of both groups, native speakers and non-native speakers, answered positively.

Finally, as stated by Mendonca and Johnson (1994), teachers should provide ESL or second language students with opportunities to talk about their writings with their peers, as peer review seems to allow students to explore and negotiate their ideas as well as to develop sense of audience.
Dialog Journal

Mlynarczyk (1998), in her book Conversations of the Mind, indicates that dialog journal was first studied beginning 1979 as a result of Leslie Reed use of writing journal with her native English speakers. In 1980-1981, when Reed started teaching English as a Second Language students, she added a new dimensions to research on journal writing by introducing dialog journal to ESL writing (Mlynarczyk, 1998).

Journal writing is widely used in schools but what is being used are personal journals, logs, or diaries in which students write, but the teacher doesn’t respond beyond a few brief comments about the students’ writing (Peyton & Reed, 1990). The difference between these journals and dialogue journal rests in the fact that “one essential feature of dialogue journals is that they be a dialogue” (p. 11) between teacher and student, or between two students as chosen by the class.

Since the 1980’s dialogue journal writing has become a learning strategy that enhances English as a Second Language writing (Holmes & Moulton, 1997). Peyton and Reed (1990) define a dialog journal as “a conversation between a teacher and an individual student” (p. 3). They further indicate that when using dialog journal students write as much as they want and about whatever they choose, and the teacher writes back without grading or correcting the writing. The teacher is a partner in a conversation, who accepts what is written and responds as directly and openly as possible, while keeping in mind the student’s language ability and interests (Peyton & Reed, 1990).

Many teachers of adults learning English have found dialogue journals to be an important part of their classes because they provide natural contexts for language learning.
Limited writers may begin their journals by using only a few words and the teacher’s writing is tuned to the student’s proficiency level (Peyton, 2000).

Holmes and Moulton (1997) studied six English as a Second Language students, who represented a maximum variation sample, to answer the question: “What perspectives do second-language university students have on dialogue writing as a strategy for learning English?” They concluded that English as a Second Language students regard dialogue journal writing as an effective strategy for learning English.

Peyton (2000) cited several benefits of dialogue journal. First, she indicates that dialogue journal extends the teacher’s contact with the students. Second, through dialogue journal teachers receive information that can lead to individualized instruction to each learner. Third, teachers can obtain valuable information about what learners know and are able to do in writing. Finally, “the teacher’s writing provides constant exposure to the thought, style, and manner of expression of a proficient English writer” (pp. 4, 5). An additional benefit is that reading occurs as part of the interaction between teacher and student (Peyton & Reed, 1990, p. 32).

There are also some challenges to dialogue journal. First of all, for many teachers it is hard to find the time to read and respond to students’ entries (Peyton, 2000). Kreeft suggests then that teachers could respond to selected entries or respond while students are on-task in the classroom. He also states that creating writing groups in which learners write and respond to each other can ease the teacher’s answering tasks. To commit to time-consuming task of answering to their students’ dialogue journals, teachers need to believe that their efforts will make a lasting difference in the writing abilities of their students (Holmes & Moulton, 1997).
A third caution is that dialogue journal should not be used primarily to improve reading and writing skills, but to promote more communication between teachers and students. Dialog journal should not be used as a substitute for an entire writing program (Peyton & Reed, 1990). They are only one of the components of the writing program.

Finally, regarding correctness of writing, Peyton (2000) suggests that teachers show students how to compare their writings to the teacher’s and use it as a model; teachers can also conduct a brief class on the mistakes that are commonly made in the entries of several students. Another suggestion is to discuss the mistakes in individual conferences.

Research indicates that teachers who used dialogue journals have reported encouraging results (Kerka, 1996; Peyton, 2000; Peyton & Reed, 1990). Furthermore,

The dialogue journal can be a completely open-ended writing experience, a time when students can write freely about anything they want to, in any way they want to; a time to use writing to think through an issue or problem, without being constrained by the need for perfect form. For some students, this might be their only nonstructured writing experience. (Peyton & Reed, 1990, p. 28)

Writing Activities

“Learners of English as a second Language have often become proficient in speaking, but still have difficulty writing clearly and relatively freely” (Wrase, 1984, p. 6). According to Zamel (1987), for many ESL students the most important thing in writing an essay is avoiding mistakes. Moreover, she adds that some ESL students think that their teachers expect perfect papers. When they cannot follow all the rules and limitations, they get frustrated. Moreover, some ESL teachers correct their students’ works without realizing that there is a meaning-related problem that these students struggle with.
Therefore, it is very important for ESL teachers to remain sensitive to the burden placed on English as a Second Language students trying to survive in writing classes (Leki, 1992). According to Peyton, Staton, Richardson, and Wolfram (1990), it is important to understand what kind of writing situations and tasks are most helpful for moving students toward a more fluent and coherent expression of their ideas, experiences, and feelings.

Street (1984) argues that the qualities of written products are also influenced by the contexts in which they occur. Therefore, as stated by Peyton et al. (1990), "When given the opportunity to write for authentic purposes, for a familiar or known audience who responds with interest and involvement, ESL students tend to express themselves in more creative and sophisticated ways than they do in more restrictive environment" (p. 143). Starting from these premises, students in writing workshops are hence encouraged to explore new forms of writing and find ways to organize and understand their experience (Ritchie, 1989).

Atwell (1987) has identified seven principle related to teaching writing:

1. Writers need regular chunks of time to think, write, confer, read, and rewrite.
2. Writers need their own topics.
3. Writers need a response from their peers and from the teacher.
4. Writers learn mechanics in context from teachers who address errors as they occur within individual pieces of writing.
5. Teachers need to share their writing with their students.
6. Writers need to read.
7. Writing teachers need to become observers and learn from their writings and their students' writing.

Writing activities in a writing workshop involve teachers and students in a process of socialization and of individual becoming (Ritchie, 1989). A complete writing program should focus on different types of writing. As stated by Peyton and others, "writing in a variety on contexts is important for the development of ESL students" (p. 167).

These activities "emphasize the development of individual epistemologies and individual voices within" (Ritchie, 1989, p. 153). Dialog journal, essays, collaborative projects, writing letters, reacting to a text, analyzing and synthesizing information, process writing, and other writing activities should provide students an opportunity to express their own voice. "When students write about topics that come from personal experience, they are invested in their own topics and care about getting it right" (Graves, 1979, p. 573).

In her article "Is There A Difference Between Personal and Academic Writing"? Mlynarczyk (1991) indicates that even though some English as a Second Language teachers foster academic writing and others believe in personal writing; there is no need for a division between those types of writing activities. According to Mlynarczyk (1991):

1. When students have had a chance to find their own voices by writing about subjects that have immediate importance in their own lives can we expect them to write with authority about more abstract subjects.
2. Strong 'personal' element often enters into so-called 'academic' assignments; students who become proficient at personal writing in their ESL courses will be well prepared to handle the personal aspects of their assignments.
3. Students learning a language learn it well and retain what they have learned when they are using that language to express ideas that are significant to them personally. (p. 19)

All great writing is deeply personal and heartfelt. Teachers need to provide
learners with opportunities to write about topics that are relevant to their lives, to participate in various writing activities, and to feel that their writing has value. By integrating writing with content, teachers help learners find their own voices in their new language and develop the ability to communicate effectively in different contexts and with different audiences (Bello, 1997, p. 5).

**Writing Conferences**

"The writing conference is a face-to-face conversation between the teacher and the student, a chance for both parties to address the student’s individual needs through dialogue" (Reid, 1993, p. 220). According to Fletcher (2001) writing conferences are an essential part of the workshop. He states that in Australia, Writing Workshop has been called the conference approach to teaching writing.

In the teacher-centered classroom, the writing conference is set up by the writing teacher who has composition students coming in for a 20-to-30-minute talk (Sperling, 1992) mostly directed by the teacher. In the Writing Workshop setting, writing conferences are kept short (Fletcher, 2001) and are an exchange of ideas between student and teacher. The student participates actively and can take control of the interaction (Reid, 1993). Consequently, it is important for ESL teachers to structure the conference "by giving students responsibility for preparing to take an active role in the conference and by preparing for the conference themselves" (p. 221).

Even though the basic purpose for a writing conference is "to help writers gain the confidence and skills necessary for them to write well independently" (Meyer & Smith, 1987, p. 3), conferencing is not always successful for several reasons:
1. There is a tremendous variation across students in the way they interact with the teacher in a conference (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990).

2. "ESL conferences do not necessarily result in revision, and when revision does occur after a conference, it is not always successful" (Reid, 1993, p. 224).

3. "Student who need help most with their writing are often the least successful at getting help from the teaching during the conference because they are unable to take charge and negotiate meaning" (pp. 224-225).

These pitfalls could be lessened in the Writing Workshop if mini-conferencing is used. According to Hedge (1988) mini-conferences are informal, spontaneous student-teacher conferencing that often takes place in class during small group works or with individual students. The teacher gives support, makes suggestions, or assists with the language.

Reid (1993) points out several advantages in mini-conferencing. First, it occurs during the regular flow of classroom learning; second, there is no dramatic change in the student-teacher relationship; third, the immediate intervention is efficient since it occurs as a natural part of the writing process; and finally, it is not a separate activity but rather is integrated into the student’s immediate needs. These conferences takes place when the students raise their hands while they are working individually or collaboratively, or while the teacher circulate as the students work (Reid, 1993).

In the writing conference, students and teachers trade places. Students ask questions and teachers respond to students and their texts (Florio-Ruane, 1986). Conferences are one of the most exciting and valuable elements of a writer’s workshop because they provide an opportunity for the teacher to offer students individualized
writing instruction in the context of their own writing projects (Nickel, Miller & Hubbard, 2001).

Collaborative Writing

Whereas in a teacher-centered classroom writing is viewed as an individual act, in a student-centered setting it is viewed as a social act. In the real world, collaborative writing is a common occurrence in the community or the workplace (Murray, 1992). Researchers write collaboratively, laws and bylaws are written collaboratively, and in the workplace, teams carry on projects and write their reports or proposals collaboratively. “To incorporate writing in the classroom without understanding its collaborative nature is to teach incorrectly” (Speck, 2002, p. 3) because writing is the result of the interaction between people within a community (Murray, 1992).

Therefore, in a student-centered classroom, such as in a Writing Workshop class, collaborative writing provides the opportunity for students to talk, draft, revise, read, and edit just as they would probably have to do it once they are in the real world (Murray, 1992; Reid, 1993).

Collaborative learning began to interest American college teachers only in the 1980s (Bruffee, 1984). However, Bruffee has been a key figure since the early 1970s in the adaptation of principles of collaborative learning to writing instruction (Hirvela, 1999). Even though there is not a defined theory that harbors collaborative learning, its roots can be traced to cooperative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1998). Furthermore, collaborative learning has become virtually synonymous with collaborative writing (Bacon, 1990) that can be defined as “two or more people working together to produce one written document in a situation in which a group takes responsibility for having
produced the document” (Hirvela, 1999, p. 9).

In the domain of ESL writing instruction, the interest for collaborative writing is constantly growing (Hirvela, 1999). One of the reasons is that groups and collaborative work in a language classroom provides non-threatening situations for developing and integrating conversation and discussion, comprehension of spoken and written text, and information for written composition (Reid, 1993). However, as Bruffee (1984) argues, organizing collaborative writing groups effectively involves much more than throwing students together with peers with little or no guidance.

To successfully integrate collaborative writing in a student-centered classroom, among other things, the teacher needs to form groups that are balanced in personalities, learning style, and have each member tasks well defined (Reid, 1993). Moreover, he or she needs to provide sufficient time over an extended period of time and have students produce throughout the process (Murray, 1992). Finally, the teacher needs to be well acquainted with the five essential components of cooperative learning.

To be cooperative, a group must have clear positive interdependence and members must promote each other’s learning and success face to face, hold each other individually accountable to do his or her fair share of the work, appropriately use the interpersonal and small-group skills needed for cooperative efforts to be successful, and process as a group how effectively members are working together. (Speck, 2002, p. 4)

Despite these challenges, collaborative writing has several practical benefits for the language classroom. First, it helps promote students’ responsibilities for their learning and enables them to develop critical skills (Speck, 2002). It helps prepare ESL students for their life outside the classroom, for the real-world contexts in which they must write (Murray, 1992). Finally, the cognitive conflicts created by collaborative writing give students experience with testing ideas against each other, clarifying their
ideas, and evaluating what works (Dale, 1983).

Furthermore, in three studies conducted in three different classrooms in Malaysia, ESL teachers indicated collaborative writing fostered better interpersonal and intergroup relations, more positive attitudes about English, and more use of high-level thinking skills (Crismore & Fauzeyah, 1997). Nelson and Murphy (1992) conducted a study on collaborative writing group and the less proficient ESL students. Their findings indicated that low-intermediate ESL students working in groups are able to identify problems with organization, development, and topic sentences.

Collaborative writing is indeed an asset for the Writing Workshop because it promotes learning while strengthening a positive classroom climate and building a sense of community where learners take responsibility for their academic achievement and learn to respect each other ideas as they draft, revise, edit, and write together under the guidance of their teacher.

The previous sections presented an overview of several of the components of the Writing Workshop, such peer revision, dialogue journal, writing activities, collaborative writing, and writing conferences. These activities are essential in a student-centered classroom and call for a change in the teacher's role in the ESL student-centered classroom.

Teacher's Roles

Traditionally, in the Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages classrooms teachers are all-powerful and all-knowing (Johnson, Delarche, Marshall, Wurr, & Edwards, 1998). In this setting, the teacher-centered setting, the teacher also provides the model in terms of knowledge of syntax and lexis, and maybe accurate
pronunciation (Johnson et al., 1998).

In a Workshop or student-centered setting, the teacher role can be described as "facilitator and participant in the dialectical conversation in which learning and change take place" (Montgomery, 1992, p. 2). The four roles of a workshop teacher as defined by Montgomery (1992) are:

1. The teacher is responsible for the interpersonal climate of the classroom environment, very important in the collaborative classroom.
2. Second, the teacher promotes a classroom discourse, which facilitates analysis and revision of writing.
3. Third, in a workshop the teacher encourages dialogue, supports ideas, gives others the last word, develops mutual trust, values ideas, and summarizes discussions.
4. Finally, the teacher involves the student writer in the discourse about his or her own writing, depending partly on the willingness of the writer to participate. (pp. 4, 5)

Furthermore, Johnson and others (1998) indicate "the teacher also has an important role as the one who must train students in how to become autonomous, since students come to learning often unaware of how to take an active role" (p. 80).

Feedback

Response or feedback, as it is commonly called, may be defined as any input from reader to writer that provides information for revision (Keh, 1990); therefore "feedback given to student writers should be stated in terms of what they can do, not in terms of what they failed to do" (Zinn, 1998, p. 1). Moreover, according to White (1994) teachers should look for opportunities to give meaningful praise when responding to student work. He also points out that questions work better than statements because questions are more apt to inspire students to think about what they know and are learning about writing, and get them involved and responsible for their own learning as it should be in any Writing Workshop.
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When responding to ESL writing, teachers should take into consideration the student's background knowledge, their proficiency levels, and the fact that most English as a Second Language students have a greater need for help with the language than native English writers have (Graham, 1987). "It is not appropriate to judge student writing strictly on the basis of comparison to other student writers, but, instead, the teacher of composition must see the value of student writing as related to the social structures and cultural boundaries of each student author" (p. 2).

According to Sommers (1982) as teachers respond to their students' writing, they must not bring in their own purposes and beliefs into the comments they give to their students; otherwise they will be appropriating the students' drafts and taking control of their writing. Bardine, Bardine, and Deegan (2000, p. 101) present several implications that could help teachers to more effectively respond to their students' writing:

1. Teachers need to understand their own motivations and commenting styles as they respond to their writers.
2. It is important to give students opportunity to revise their writing. They will rarely look at comments if they don't have the chance to revise their writing.
3. Teachers should allow students plenty of time to write in class. This will enable them, if they wish, to ask their teachers questions about their writing.
4. Students want specifics and clarity in the comments teachers write on their papers.
5. Teachers need to stress that using the responses written on the essays will do more that improving grades, it can help improve their writing.
6. Positive feedback on every paper is important, not only for the students' writing development, but also for their self-esteem.
7. Mini-lessons and conferences used in conjunction with written comments can be a powerful tool in helping students improve their writing. (p. 101)

Effective feedback helps students improve their writing because it is detailed enough to allow students to commit to change in their writing (Reid, 1993). "Whether teachers respond verbally or in writing, they must select their role as respondent and they
must consider the perceptions of the students” (p. 219). The teacher’s feedback should lead to revision and then to the cognitive change that will have students really revise and transfer the change to other pieces of writing (Reid, 1993). According to Reid (1993), teachers can respond to their students’ writings by:

1. Becoming the audience in order to ask questions about the purpose of the essay.
2. Becoming a reader responding to the ideas and content.
3. Acting as a writing consultant by sending the student back to the writing process.
4. Becoming a describer of the main rhetorical features. (p. 219)

Complete effective feedback is not done only by the teachers. Many writing teachers now use peer response or peer editing groups (Leki, 1992). According to Zinn (1998) peer feedback is “a means of informal assessment that should be considered for every writing classroom” (p. 3). Student feedback can be sometimes more valuable than teacher feedback. It provides a context for a variety of thinking, writing, talking, learning and role-play situations (Reid, 1993).

Providing sensitive response to students is crucial. The most satisfying part of teaching writing is helping students to discover what they have to say and then showing them how to say it fully and effectively (Rabin, 1990). Therefore, feedback is very effective “when students have the opportunity to incorporate the comments into their writing rather than if it appears on a dead, final text” (p. 127).

When providing feedback, teachers need to be careful not to overemphasize grammar and mechanics (Graham, 1987). According to Leki (1992) “it makes sense to give feedback on content first” (p. 128). However, she also states that English as a Second Language students seem quite interested in grammatical accuracy and want their teachers to point out all their errors. So, “once the content more or less expresses what the
student was aiming for, feedback on accuracy aids editing of revised versions of a piece of writing” (p. 128).

Feedback comments should also be kept short and focused (Graham, 1987). These comments should help rather than confuse the writer (Graham, 1987). Feedback comments are counterproductive when the students have trouble understanding written on their papers, when the teacher’s handwriting is hard to read, or when the gist of the comment itself is unclear (Leki, 1992).

Zinn (1998) points out that teachers should avoid harsh comments when responding to their students writing. According to Griffin (1982), students respond better to a positive tone in the comments than to a sarcastic one. Students also believe comments are “most useful when they explain why something is either good or bad” (Bardine et al., 2000, p. 95).

Finally, Graham (1987) indicates that when giving feedback, teachers need to keep their comments “text specific,” that are they need to offer specific reactions, suggestions, questions, and strategies for the particular text that we are reading, not vague, global prescriptions. Teachers need to offer positive and corrective suggestions rather than negative ones. It is also very important for teachers giving feedback to be “careful not to demoralize our ESL writers by defacing their compositions by messily scrawling a multitude of corrections and comments” (p. 6).

Classroom Environment

A common misconception about writing workshop is that they are rule free (Avery, 1993). “Writing workshop is actually a highly structured environment, carefully established with clear rules and procedures that continue to develop throughout the year”
Avery presents three rules that she uses in her writing workshop: “We work hard; we work on writing, and we use quiet voices” (p. 14). These rules apply to writing workshop in any setting: elementary, secondary, or college.

Most teachers’ classes, whether teacher-centered or student-centered as in a Writing Workshop setting, have a distinctive climate, which influences the learning efficiency of their members (Anderson, 1970). “No matter how expert the teacher, the class will not achieve success unless the goals, expectations, and values of the class are clear and stated” (Giles, 1959, as cited in Shapiro, 1993, p. 91). Therefore, a primary goal of any teacher is to establish a climate in which students feel accepted by the teacher and the classmates, and experience a sense of comfort and order (Marzano & Pickering, 1997).

Marzano and Pickering (1997) state that a student’s sense of comfort and order affects his or her ability to learn. Consequently, as stated by Reid (1993) teacher must also consider the classroom atmosphere in which learning takes place. To create such an atmosphere, teachers need to establish a positive social environment (Shapiro, 1993).

Marzano and Pickering (1997) present some strategies that will help foster positive social environment among students in any classroom setting:

1. Ask each student to interview another student at the beginning of the year and then introduce that student to the rest of the class.
2. Have students make poster representing their background, hobbies and interests. Ask students to present them to the class.
3. Encourage all students to share about themselves and their heritage.
4. Have student write or her name on a sheet of paper. Ask them to pass their papers around and write one positive comment on each of the other student’s sheet. Return the completed “positive-o-grams” to their owners to keep.
5. Use structured “get-to-know-you” activities periodically throughout the year. (p. 21)
By establishing positive relationship with his or her students, the English as a Second Language teacher will also help the classroom social climate. To create this climate, Marzano and Pickering (1997) indicate that teachers should:

1. Talk informally with students before, during, and after class about their interests.
2. Greet students outside of school, for instance at extracurricular activities.
3. Include students in the process of planning classroom activities, solicit their ideas and consider their interests (p. 16).
4. Make eye contact with each student in the room; freely move about all sections of the room.
5. Give the same attention to high achiever than to low achiever.
6. Ensure that all students are attended positively so that they are likely to feel accepted. (p. 17)

A workshop classroom is very different from a traditional classroom (Bullock, 1998). “Workshop teaching is messy: Students talk together, work together, perhaps sit on the floor, and twenty-five students may be reading twenty different books or working on individualized and very different project all at once” (p. 4). Whereas in the teacher-centered classroom, students sit in row, facing the blackboard, working on the same assignments, and listening to their teacher (Deen, 1991).

Graves (1981) compares a classroom prepared for a writing workshop to an artist’s studio. The artist sets up her/his studio so it has everything needed arranged to suit her/him and her/his art. In the midst of the messy and unpredictable act of creating, the artist knows just where to find any of the material needed to complete her/his work. Just as the studio expects art, the workshop expects writing and has its own rules.

Because of the various activities that are conducted at the same time in the Writing Workshop, classroom discipline, self-discipline, and respect are very necessary for creating a pleasant environment in the classroom.
This chapter presented the review of literature related to ESL writing, ESL learning and teaching in Puerto Rico, and the ESL Writing Workshop. Several key components of the Writing Workshop were discussed based on some the literature available on each topic.

The literature on Writing Workshop is mostly related to elementary and secondary education. Few researchers have focused on using Writing Workshop with ESL college students (Hawes & Richards, 1977; Paulson, 1992). In Canada, a study was conducted in a college setting by Ping (2000); the researcher worked from a cross-cultural perspective. A qualitative study examining a writing workshop in an ESL/EFL setting was conducted in Japan by Matsumoto (1997). The Workshop lasted 40 hours; and the study looked for either resistance or adaptation to the Writing Workshop. Since there was no known Writing Workshop among English learners in Japan, the researcher had to also serve as the teacher and the designer of the workshop.

In Puerto Rico there is no known research on the use of the Writing Workshop approach to teach ESL writing to students on the island; therefore the teacher was also the designer of the workshop. The review of literature indicated that Writing Workshops are mostly a writing classroom strategy. This study used the Writing Workshop as a classroom approach to teaching ESL writing in Puerto Rico; therefore, this study may be the steppingstone in promoting a new approach to teaching ESL in Puerto Rico. The next chapter describes the methodology used to carry on the study.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research was to study the effectiveness of Writing Workshop as a model for teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) writing to students enrolled in an intermediate ESL class at Antillean Adventist University.

This chapter describes the research design used to conduct the study, the setting, the population, instrumentation, research questions, data collection, and data analysis.

Research Design

This is a classroom-based research using the pretest-posttest design. Two pretests were given; the treatment, the Writing Workshop was applied; and then two posttests were given. The results that are examined are the changes from pretest to posttest (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997).

Data were collected by administering a composition pretest, a writing skills pretest, a questionnaire on students' attitudes toward English at the beginning of the course, an assessment of classroom activities questionnaire at the end of the course, a composition posttest, and a writing skills posttest to two ESL Intermediate Writing classes. A copy of each instrument is included in Appendix 1. Statistical analyses were conducted to determine whether Writing Workshop enhanced the students' learning outcomes.
Identification of Variables

Independent variables are variables that the researcher controls or manipulates in accordance with the purpose of the investigation. Dependent variables are measures of the effect of the independent variables. In this investigation, the independent variable was the type of writing instruction used, while the dependent variables included students’ attitudes toward English and students’ ESL writing performance.

Setting

The setting for this study was a liberal arts university, Antillean Adventist University, situated on the west side of the Commonwealth island of Puerto Rico. Antillean Adventist University is a coeducational, residential, privately supported university that offers both baccalaureate and master’s degree programs. Two intermediate ESL writing classes were used in this study.

Sample

The sample for this study was students registered in two Intermediate ESL Writing courses (HUEN 215, sections 1 and 2) offered during the second semester of the 2001-2002 school year. Both classes were taught using the Writing Workshop. The first Writing Workshop section had 19 students and the second section had 17 students. Students were placed in Intermediate ESL writing based on either satisfactory progress in the first two Basic ESL classes, or on their College Board or Placement Test scores. Students who obtain a score of 601 or more on the College Board, or a placement test score of 90-100, are placed in the Intermediate ESL writing courses.
Procedures

The study was conducted during the second semester of the 2001-2002 school year, and was limited to Antillean Adventist University, located in Mayagüez, Puerto Rico. Two Intermediate English sections were used to teach writing using the Writing Workshop, a student-centered approach. One of the sections met on Mondays and Wednesdays from 1:50 p.m. to 3:05 p.m., and the other one met on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 8:50 a.m. to 10:05 a.m. I taught one section and another ESL professor taught the other section.

The semester before implementing the Writing Workshop, the first semester of the 2001-2002 school year, I oriented my colleague regarding the Writing Workshop. Even though, I am not formally trained, I have read extensively studied the Writing Workshop and have used some of its components, such as peer review, collaborative writing, and dialogue journal, previously with a writing class. Besides analyzing several research articles and reading literature on the topic, I have discussed the process of implementing a workshop with one of my professors who had conducted several Writing Workshops. Therefore, through my readings and my conferences with my professor I obtained a strong background and was able to set up this classroom-research study to find out whether Writing Workshop would have a positive effect on ESL students’ writing skills at Antillean Adventist University in Puerto Rico.

My colleague and I met several times before implementing the Workshop, for orientation purposes. We also pilot tested some of the key components in each of our writing classes for better insight. Every other Friday we met (for 60 to 90 minutes) to discuss our experiences with the different classroom activities.
To be certain that both groups followed the same program once the Workshop was implemented, I gave my colleague a copy of the activities for each class preparation. We also used the same handouts, the same portfolio requirements, and the same reading materials, and we administered the same tests. Some of the material that was shared are included in Appendix 2.

At the beginning of the course, students from both sections filled out the Attitudes Toward Learning and Writing English survey. Two pretests were also administered to measure writing competencies: One focused on writing skills, the other asked students to prepare a composition. At the end of the semester, students filled out the Assessment of Classroom Activities questionnaire and were administered two posttests: the writing skills and the composition.

Attached to the questionnaires was a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, the use of the data, and the students' voluntary participation in the study. To comply with the Human Subjects Review Committee of the university hosting the study, the cover letter was signed by the students and then, to ensure anonymity, the letter was removed before the students filled out the questionnaire. Specific directions were also given prior to the students prior to them signing the letter. Appendix 3 presents a copy of each form.

Classroom Procedures

Classes met for 1 hour and 15 minutes at each session. Before class, the teacher had the classroom ready for the session: students' writing folders, reading materials, and paper supplies.
Students who arrived early went directly to their writing folders and worked on any incomplete activity. The writing folders contained all the assignments students were working on: reading activities, grammar practices, and writing tasks. Each folder had a checklist to help students keep track of their work. Once an assignment was completed, students would check it off on their lists. Since students worked on several activities, the checklist helped them keep track of their progress and adjust their working schedule.

Class began with a short devotional and a prayer. Then, the activities for the day started. Students worked at tasks related to where they were in the writing process. During this time, mini-lessons on writing/composition skills were presented to small groups of students according to their needs. After the mini-lesson, students would either work on practice exercises related to the topic discussed, or any other pending activity while the teacher consulted with students, read journal entries, or gave feedback to those who needed it.

Classroom tasks included:

**Collaborative writing.** Students worked in groups on reading activities, classroom projects, or collaborative writing tasks such as evaluating articles or writing a story and revising drafts.

**Peer revising.** Students who had completed their activities would get together and discuss their work. Even though “some researchers argue that peer review dyads set up roles of tutor and tutee and resemble the teacher-student hierarchical relationship rather than the equal relationship that develops in peer response groups” (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994, p. 747), I observed that my students would do their peer revision in dyads.
Individual conference. Whenever students had needs, they would ask me for a short conference. Sometimes they would confer with their peers. These conferences gave them the feedback they needed to progress in their work.

Reading. Some reading selections were assigned from the textbooks. Students also had the opportunity to choose their reading selections from the books and magazines (Reader’s Digest, Times, Newsweek, Oprah Magazine, Campus Life, among others) that were provided to them. They responded to these readings as they chose. Some worked with various creative genre (drawing, poems, letters), others sent electronic mail to the authors of the selections they had read, and even received responses. Some students summarized the information and mailed it to friends who they knew would use it. Students also read to gather resources for their writing assignments.

Writing activities. Writing activities were designed to fit the students’ proficiency level. Some students wrote essays, while others wrote paragraphs. Free writing helped students to generate ideas for their essays or paragraphs. Students were exposed to both academic and personal writing. For example, in the academic realm, they learned to write a standard essay or paragraph, to prepare a resume, and to summarize a text. Their personal writing folder involved writing from personal experience, and creative writing, such as preparing a sign to announce a product or an activity, preparing posters, or any other type of creative writing they chose to do on any given topic.

The classroom environment. Throughout the semester the classroom environment was cordial, friendly, supportive, and student-centered. It was also very busy as students and teachers were working on a variety of activities.
Generally, the Workshop session would end with students sharing from their own writing in small groups, or doing some journaling. Sometimes, students would be so busy working that the teacher had to ask them to put things away until the next session.

Even though students were quite enthusiastic about this new writing approach, because of the Writing Workshop structure, they had the tendency to fall behind in their assignments. To avoid students' procrastination and, also, at the students' own requests, deadlines were set for the different assignments and a calendar of activities was posted on one of the classroom bulletin boards. Students were then able to "work at their own pace within the framework and rhythm of the class" (Bullock, 1998, p. 3). On the other bulletin board, the students and I posted positive thoughts and any other useful information such as the class syllabus, basic portfolio contents, and students' work.

Students from both groups prepared a writing portfolio and shared it with their peers and teachers. The writing portfolio contained their philosophy of life, mission and goals statements, biography, and selected pieces of writing done during the semester. Each student also collected "quotables" and inspirational stories that were meaningful to them and included them in their portfolio. Some students added their personal touch to their portfolios with photos, certificates, and other pieces of writing. During the last week of classes, students had the opportunity to present their portfolios to the class.

**Course Components**

*Peer review:* In the Writing Workshop peer reviews were mostly conducted in dyads. Students were taught not to focus on grammatical mistakes, but to pay attention to form and content. Appendix 4 provides a sample copy of the form they were given to the students. Limited proficient students did not complain, and, when asked, they indicated
that this format was helping to improve their writing. Students liked to discuss their work, but sometimes were reluctant to fill out the forms.

*Dialogue journal:* An important part of the workshop was the dialogue journal. Some students, throughout the semester, “talked” with me on topics of their choice. At the end of every session, students who wrote in their dialogue journal turned it in and I responded and returned it during the next session. The idea was to carry on a real conversation with students. I was careful to write at the students’ proficiency level. Samples of “conversations” are included in Appendix 5.

*Writing activities:* Students wrote about their own experiences. For example, after discussing narrative writing, students selected their topics and wrote a story, a narrative essay, a song, or a poem. Writing assignments varied according to students’ proficiency levels. For example, some students wrote essays; other wrote paragraphs around the pattern of development studied.

*Feedback:* Students commented on assignments and gave each other feedback for revision or completion of their writing activities before consulting with me.

*The classroom environment.* The environment was very informal in the Writing Workshop classroom. Students could work at their seats, or sit in one of the classroom corners if they chose to do so. Those who worked in groups were told to remember that they were not the only ones in the room. The warm, social environment of the room was designed to enhance learning.

*Individual conferences:* Short individual conferences were held during every class session with students who wished to address any writing or class-related issue. Conferences were two-way conversations, not a “this-is-how-to-do-it talk.” For example,
when students came to ask for feedback about how to proceed to write their narrative assignments, I did not tell them the steps to follow. Instead, I would ask questions and have them respond by writing their narrative assignment, thus enabling them to discover the narrating process.

The teacher's role: The students and I worked collaboratively. I was more a facilitator and a mentor than an expert or the one in complete control of the learning process.

Collaborative writing: Students worked together on several tasks. After a mini-grammar lesson, they would get into groups and practice the concept taught. They also wrote stories in groups, and did some collaborative reading activities. Whenever an activity was done collaboratively, students would hand in a group paper. However, if one of the group members did not agree with one of the answers written on the group paper, he or she stapled his or her own answer to the group paper.

These components were present in my classroom. Based on the discussions held with my colleague, they were also present in his classroom. As mentioned before, because of schedule conflict, I was not able to supervise this classroom; I had to rely on his reports.

Instrumentation

Data for the study were collected using five instruments:

1. The Attitudes Toward Learning and Writing English Survey. This survey was used with both groups at the beginning of the term. This survey had three parts. Part One examined students' attitudes toward learning English; Part Two focused on students' attitudes toward writing, finally Part Three contained the demographic data. The
respondents were instructed on the survey to indicate their choices from SD = strongly disagree to SA = strongly agree. One professor, who had prepared several surveys for research studies and program evaluations, and I developed the survey. The questionnaire was also discussed with three of my colleagues for content-validity. In August 2001, the instrument was pilot-tested. As a result, some revisions were made in the demographic section. This questionnaire was administered at the beginning of the course. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) descriptive statistics.

2. The Writing Skills Pretest. An English competency test was administered to all members of the two groups. The test was prepared by a professor from the Humanities Department and measured the English skills that an intermediate-level English as a Second Language student at Antillean Adventist University must have acquired. Two other professors from the same department revised the test for content-validity. Table 4 presents the pretest/posttest cognitive levels based on Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. A copy of the test is included in Appendix 6.

3. Composition Pretest. A composition pretest was also administered. The pretest was the students’ first in-class essay given at the beginning of February. The essays were graded based on the ESL Composition Profile published by Thomson Learning. The students’ compositions were graded in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics as presented in the Composition Profile. This profile was reproduced and used with permission from Heinle & Heinle, a division of Thomson Learning. A copy of the profile and the permission letter are included in Appendix 7.
Table 4

Table of Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Cognitive Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part One. Select the appropriate differences between a paragraph and an essay. Write P in front of the statements that describe the paragraph and E in front of the statements that describe the essay.</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Two. Circle the two items that do not support the topic sentence.</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Three. Add two supporting details for each of the topic sentences below.</td>
<td>Comprehension/Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Four. Complete the following thesis statement by adding a third supporting idea. Use wording that is parallel to the two supporting ideas already provided.</td>
<td>Comprehension/Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Five. Rewrite the sentences omitting needless words.</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Six. See if you can locate the sentence-skills in the following passage.</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Seven. Read and summarize the following selection.</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Assessment of Classroom Activities. The assessment of classroom activities questionnaire was applied at the end of the semester to both groups. Under the supervision of my advisers, I constructed this questionnaire. After reviewing the literature on Writing Workshop, I constructed a configuration rubric using the main elements of the Writing Workshop. The Writing Workshop Configuration rubric that provided the variables for the Assessment of Classroom Activities questionnaire is included in Appendix 8.

The variables incorporated in the instrument are components of the Writing Workshop (Atwell, 1987; Bullock, 1998; Hyland, 2000; Lorie, 1994; Paulson, 1992). The 23 items from Part Two (English writing class profile) were classified as yes or no.
items. The 23 items from Part Three (Effectiveness of components of the class) were rated using a Likert-type scale with choices from 1 = doesn't apply to 5 = very much.

The questionnaire was pilot tested in December 2001 with a sample population similar to the population used for this study. Thirty students from the intermediate English as a Second language course (HUEN 215) were used to pilot-test the questionnaire. It took students approximately 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. After the pilot test, the questionnaire was revised to clarify some items that were unclear to the students.

Two English teachers and another colleague for content-validity then reviewed the questionnaire. A Pearson correlation was calculated for the relationships between the seven scales. A positive correlation was found between the scales indicating a significant relationship. The lowest relationship was found between dialog journal and feedback ($r(29) = .457, p < 0.01$), and the strongest relationship was established between feedback and writing activities ($r(30) = .904, p < 0.01$). The data were analyzed using SPSS.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the data analysis.

The following scales were constructed.

1. Effectiveness of component peer review
2. Effectiveness of component dialogue journal
3. Effectiveness of component writing activities
4. Effectiveness of component individual conferences
5. Effectiveness of component feedback
6. Effectiveness of component environment
7. Effectiveness of component teachers' role
The alpha reliabilities of the scales ranged from .66 to .91. Table 5 presents the reliability analysis.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Reliability Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review (ECPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialog Journal (ECDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Activities (ECWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Conferences (ECIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback (ECF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment (ECE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Role (ECTR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Questions

The following questions were addressed in this study:

Question 1. What are ESL students' attitudes toward learning English in general?

Question 2. What are ESL students' attitudes toward writing in English?

Question 3. What is the relationship between Writing Workshop (WW) and students' attitudes toward writing?

Question 4. What is the effectiveness of Writing Workshop on ESL students' writing skills?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Question 5. What are students’ perceptions of their experiences in Writing Workshop? Students were asked to answer some open-ended questions. The answers were categorized and analyzed. The result of the analysis is discussed in chapter 4.

Summary

This chapter described the methodology used for the study. A description of the design, the setting, the sample, the procedure, the instruments, the research questions, and the data analysis were presented.

The next chapter presents the results and data analysis for each research question.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Overview

The purpose of this study was to study the effectiveness of Writing Workshop as a model for teaching English writing skills to students enrolled in two sections of intermediate English as a Second Language class at Antillean Adventist University.

The data analyses and results are presented in five sections. The first section describes the sample. The second section presents the students' attitudes toward learning English. The third section focuses on students' attitudes toward writing in English. The fourth section deals with the relationship between the Writing Workshop and the students' writing skills using paired t-test samples. The last section describes the students' perceptions of their experiences in Writing Workshop.

Sample Characteristics

The sample for this study was composed of 36 students, 19 and 17 in each group respectively. One student dropped the class at the beginning of the semester, leaving a sample of 35 students. However, because of students' absences to classes, the number of students who filled out the surveys or took the pre- and posttests varied.

The demographic data come from the 35 students who answered the Survey on Students' Attitudes Toward Learning and Writing English. From those who filled out
this section, 17 (54.8%) were females and 14 (45.2%) were males; four students did not fill out the demographic section. When asked about the type of school they attended from elementary until high school, 64.5% indicated that they attended public school and 29% private school. Two students or 6.5% attended public bilingual schools. The data are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6
Demographic Background of Students (n = 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Bilingual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/private/private bilingual*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Of the 31 respondents, 7 students also attended a public, a private, or a private bilingual school at some point during their schooling; therefore they chose 2 or more options.

Students' Attitudes Toward Learning and Writing English

A survey was used to gather information about students' attitudes toward learning English. This survey was administered to the two Writing Workshop groups during the second-class session. A total of 35 students filled out this survey.
Students' Attitudes Toward Learning English

The data indicated that 62.8% of the respondents agree that learning to speak English should be secondary to Spanish. Even though most of the sample agreed that English should be secondary to Spanish, 91.4% of the sample thought that learning English would be important to them in the future. Furthermore 51.4% stated that English should be a requirement and not an elective.

Of the 35 respondents, 71.4% indicated that they enjoy speaking English; 77.2% enjoy reading in English, and 85.7% enjoy listening to radio, television, or videos in English. Sixty-nine percent also indicated that, after they graduate, learning English will not be less important to their lives than Spanish. These data are summarized in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning to speak English should be secondary to Spanish</td>
<td>9 25.7</td>
<td>13 37.1</td>
<td>8 22.9</td>
<td>5 14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think English will be important to me in the future</td>
<td>26 74.3</td>
<td>6 17.1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In PR colleges, English should be an elective rather than a requirement</td>
<td>8 22.9</td>
<td>7 20.0</td>
<td>7 20.0</td>
<td>11 31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy speaking English</td>
<td>11 31.4</td>
<td>14 40.0</td>
<td>7 20.0</td>
<td>3 8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy listening to radio-TV/videos in English</td>
<td>16 45.7</td>
<td>14 40.0</td>
<td>4 11.4</td>
<td>1 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy reading in English</td>
<td>10 28.6</td>
<td>17 48.6</td>
<td>8 22.9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After I graduate, learning English will be less important to my life than Spanish</td>
<td>3 8.6</td>
<td>8 22.9</td>
<td>11 31.4</td>
<td>13 37.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students' Attitudes Toward Writing English in General

The instrument also examined students' attitudes toward writing in English. From the two groups, 35 students answered the survey. Eighty percent of the respondents indicated that they enjoy writing English; 54.3% thought their writing was good; for 61.8% writing was not an unpleasant experience; 62.9% liked having the opportunity to write in English, 68.6% expected to do well in the writing course, and 74.3% did not consider writing a waste of time. Finally, 65.7% considered writing in English a lot of fun. Table 8 presents the data.

Table 8

Students' Attitudes Toward Writing, Part I (N = 35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy writing in English</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think my writing is good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing is a very unpleasant experience to me</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like having the opportunities to express myself in English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect to do well in my Writing course</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing my ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing in English is a lot of fun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students' Attitudes Toward Writing Compositions

Students were also asked questions about their attitudes toward writing compositions. Fifty-four percent of the 35 respondents indicated that they feel frustrated when they think about writing in English in school. For 54.3% it was difficult to write a good composition in English, and 60% indicated that they like to have friends read what they have written, and 65.7% stated that they had no difficulty writing essays on specific topics. Fifty-four percent also indicated that they were afraid of writing essays/paragraphs when they knew that their teacher would evaluate them, and 52.5% did not like to have their compositions evaluated by their peers. Finally, 68% indicated that writing about personal experiences makes writing even more meaningful to them. The data are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I think about writing in English in school, I feel frustrated</td>
<td>2 5.7 14 40.0 14 40.0 5 14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to write a good composition in English</td>
<td>3 8.6 13 37.1 14 40.0 5 14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to have friends read what I have written</td>
<td>4 11.4 17 48.6 11 31.4 3 8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing essays or paragraphs on specific topics is difficult to me</td>
<td>5 17.1 6 17.1 20 57.1 3 8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid of writing essays or paragraphs when I know my teacher will evaluate them</td>
<td>6 14.3 14 40.0 12 34.3 4 11.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't like my composition to be evaluated by my peers</td>
<td>4 11.4 13 37.1 15 42.9 3 8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing about personal experiences makes writing meaningful to me</td>
<td>8 22.9 16 45.7 10 28.6 1 2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section presented the data related to students' attitudes toward learning and writing in English. Overall, students' attitudes appeared to be quite positive. The data will be further discussed in chapter 5.

**Pretest-Posttest I: Effect of the Writing Workshop on Students' Writing Skills**

To measure the effect of the Writing Workshop on the students' writing skills, the two Writing Workshop courses were considered separately, and were labeled "Group 1" and "Group 2." Twenty-nine percent of the students from Group 1 and 41% from Group 2 registered directly in the Intermediate ESL writing class because they were proficient enough to start at this level. Seventy-one percent of the students from Group 1 and 59% from Group 2 were limited proficient, but were registered in the class because they had taken and passed the Basic Skills and Basic English classes.

Even though these students had passed these basic classes, they were considered limited proficient because they still functioned at a level 5 based on Valdés and Sanders (1999) proficiency scale. Two pretests and posttests were applied to each group. Because of the proficiency level difference between the groups, I examined, analyzed, and reported the data for each group separately.

To measure the effect of Writing Workshop on the students' writing skills, a writing skills pretest and a posttest were administered to each group. Seven paired samples were used to answer the research question: What is the effectiveness of Writing Workshop on ESL student writing skills? Each pair identified one topic related to writing:

1. Pair 1 related to selecting the appropriate differences between a paragraph and an essay (paragraph/essay differences).
2. Pair 2 tested the students’ ability to recognize adequate support for a topic sentence (topic sentence).

3. Pair 3 tested the students’ ability to work with supporting details to topic sentences (supporting details).

4. Pair 4 asked students to complete a thesis statement using wording that was parallel to the two supporting ideas already provided (parallel structure).

5. Pair 5 tested students’ ability to rewrite sentences, omitting needless words (wording).

6. Pair 6 was related to editing sentence-skills mistakes (sentence-skills).

7. Pair 7 asked students to read and summarize a short passage (summary).

Group 1. A paired sample t-test was calculated to evaluate the differences of the mean between the two variables of each pair for the Writing Workshop section labeled Group 1. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest in pairs 3 (supporting details); 5 (wording); and 7 (summary); \( p < 0.05 \). These results are presented in Table 10.

The posttest means were significantly greater in these three pairs than the pretest means: (1) pair 3, the posttest mean \( (M = 1.7647, SD = .3999) \) was significantly higher than the pretest mean \( (M = 1.3824, SD = .8010) \), \( t = -2.193, p < 0.05 \); (2) pair 5, the posttest mean \( (M = .6863, SD = .3813) \) was significantly higher than the pretest mean \( (M = .3922, SD = .2697) \), \( t = -3.665, p < 0.05 \); (3) pair 7, the posttest mean \( (M = 3.1765, SD = 1.5098) \) was significantly higher than the mean for the pretest \( (M = 2.2353, SD = 1.5624) \), \( t = -2.175, p < 0.05 \).
Group 2. A paired t-test was calculated to evaluate the difference between the means of the pretest and posttest in all paired variables for the Writing Workshop section labeled Group 2. Significant differences were registered only for pairs 1 (paragraph/essay differences), 5 (wording), and 6 (sentence-skills).

Table 10

*Paired Samples Statistics Pretest/Posttest 1– Group 1 (N= 17)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-Values</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph/essay Pretest</td>
<td>0.8655</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.1711</td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph/essay Posttest</td>
<td>0.8403</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic sentence Pretest</td>
<td>1.4118</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.5372</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic sentence Posttest</td>
<td>1.2353</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting details Pretest</td>
<td>1.3824</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.8010</td>
<td>-2.193</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting details Posttest</td>
<td>1.7647</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel structure Pretest</td>
<td>0.6275</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3309</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel structure Posttest</td>
<td>0.6471</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording Pretest</td>
<td>0.3922</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2697</td>
<td>-3.665</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording Posttest</td>
<td>0.6863</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence-skills Pretest</td>
<td>0.4874</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.4074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence-skills Posttest</td>
<td>0.4874</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Pretest</td>
<td>2.2353</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5624</td>
<td>-2.175</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Posttest</td>
<td>3.1765</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The correlation and t cannot be completed because the standard error of the difference is 0.*

The posttest means, reported in Table 11, were significantly higher than the pretest means for pairs 1, 5, and 6: (1) pair 1: The posttest mean ($M = .7403, SD = .2101$) was significantly higher than the pretest mean ($M = .5844, SD = .1623$), $t = -2.292$, $p < 0.05$; (2) pair 5: the posttest mean ($M = .4848, SD = .3114$) was significantly higher than the pretest mean ($M = .3333, SD = .3333$), $t = -2.193$, $p < 0.05$; (3) pair 6: The posttest mean of this pair ($M = .3896, SD = .2641$) was significantly higher ($M = .1169,$
$SD = .1541), t = -2.863, p < 0.05$. Three students from this section did not take the posttest; therefore their pretest scores were eliminated; four students did not answer one to two sections of the pretest, and two different students did not answer pair 6 of the pretest and posttest respectively.

Table 11

*Paired Samples Statistics Pretest/Posttest 1 – Group 2 (N = 11)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-Values</th>
<th><code>Sig. (2-tailed)</code></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph/essay Posttest</td>
<td>.7403</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2. Topic sentence Pretest</td>
<td>.5909</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.4908</td>
<td>-2.292</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic sentence Posttest</td>
<td>.5909</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting details Posttest</td>
<td>1.2273</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4. Supporting details Pretest</td>
<td>.4848</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.3453</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting details Posttest</td>
<td>.3939</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5. Wording Pretest</td>
<td>.3333</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.3333</td>
<td>-2.193</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wording Posttest</td>
<td>.4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6. Sentence-skills Pretest</td>
<td>.1169</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.1541</td>
<td>-2.292</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence-skills * Posttest</td>
<td>.3896</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 7. Summary Pretest</td>
<td>1.6364</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8586</td>
<td>-.978</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Posttest</td>
<td>2.2727</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section presented the analysis of the data for the pretest and posttest on writing skills. There was a significant difference between pair 3 (supporting details), pair 5 (wording), and pair 7 (summary) for Group 1. For Group 2, a significance difference was found between pair 1 (paragraph/essay differences), pair 5 (wording), and pair 6 (sentence skills) for Group 2. Chapter 5 discusses these results.
Pretest/Posttest II: Effect of Writing Workshop on Students’ Composition Writing Skills

Students’ writing performance was also evaluated through a composition pretest/posttest. Students’ first and last in-class compositions were used as pre- and posttest respectively. The compositions were evaluated based on Hartfiel’s ESL composition profile, reproduced with Heinle & Heinle’s permission. Six variables were taken into consideration: overall composition, content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

Group 1. A paired sample t-test was done to evaluate whether there was a significant difference between the mean of the two variables of each pair. The results indicate that there was a significant difference between the pretest and the posttest in paired variables 1, 3, and 4. The results are presented in Table 12.

1. The posttest mean for pair 1 ($M = 86.00, SD = 5.79$) was significantly greater than the pretest mean ($M = 82.41, SD = 8.34$), $t = -3.851, p < 0.05$. The composition posttest means were significantly greater than the composition pretest means between the following paired sample variables:

2. Pair 3, organization, posttest mean ($M = 17.53, SD = .72$), pretest mean ($M = 16.88, SD = 1.54$), $t = 2.524, p < 0.05$.

3. Pair 4, Vocabulary, posttest mean ($M = 17.53, SD = 1.12$), pretest mean ($M = 16.71, SD = 1.90$), $t = -2.746, p < 0.05$.

Group 2. A paired sample t-test was calculated to evaluate the mean differences between each pair. Three students did not take the posttest; therefore their pretest scores were eliminated from the sample’s scores. The results indicated that there were no
significant differences between the pairs of the pretest and the posttest. All values were greater than 0.05, \( p > 0.05 \). The results are presented Table 13.

Table 12

*Paired Samples Statistics Pretest/Posttest 2 - Group 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-Values</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1. Writing Pretest</td>
<td>82.41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>-3.851</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Posttest</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2. Content Pretest</td>
<td>24.82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>-2.030</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Posttest</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3. Organization Pretest</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-2.524</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Posttest</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4. Vocabulary Pretest</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>-2.746</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Posttest</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 5. Language Use Pretest</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>-2.095</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use Posttest</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6. Mechanics Pretest</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-0.808</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics Posttest</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section presented the analysis of the data gathered on students' writing performance in the Writing Workshop. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest only with Writing Workshop Group 1, in five areas, namely, overall writing, content, organization, vocabulary, and language use. These results will be further discussed in chapter 5.
Table 13

*Paired Samples Statistics Pretest/Posttest 2 – Group 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-Values</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1. Writing Pretest</td>
<td>83.08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Posttest</td>
<td>83.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2. Content Pretest</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Posttest</td>
<td>25.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3. Organization Pretest</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.298</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Posttest</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 4. Vocabulary Pretest</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.561</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Posttest</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use Posttest</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 6. Mechanics Pretest</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.432</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics Posttest</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students' Perceptions of Their Experiences in Their Writing Courses**

At the end of the semester, students from both Writing Workshop groups were asked about their perceptions of their experiences in their respective writing courses through the Assessment of Classroom Activities survey. A total of 31 students completed the survey. Four students were absent when the survey was given. Table 14 summarizes the data from both groups.

The most significant results for Group 1 were as follows: 93.3% of the students indicated that the writing class has helped them understand the writing process better; 53.5% were very enthusiastic about reading and writing, 46.7% about speaking, 40.0% about peer response, and 33.3% about collaborative writing. Thirty-seven percent were
enthusiastic about dialog journal, 46.7% about classroom environment, and 33.3% about the teacher's role. Seventy-three percent of the students stated that they enjoyed the class format.

From Group 2, 100% of the group stated that the writing class helped them understand the writing process better, and that they were enthusiastic about reading. Seventy-five percent indicated that they were very enthusiastic about writing, 43.8 about speaking, and 31.3% about peer response. Fifty percent indicated that they were enthusiastic about collaborative writing, 37.5% about classroom environment, and 37.5% about teacher's role. Finally, 87% stated that they enjoyed the class format.

Both Writing Workshop sections were asked to select the workshop components they were less enthusiastic about. The frequency is presented in Table 15. Seven percent of the students from Group 1 were less enthusiastic about reading, 13% about writing, 20.0% about speaking, and 13% about peer response. Twenty percent of the group was less enthusiastic about collaborative writing, 33.3% about dialog journal, and 40% about individual conference. Finally, 20% were less enthusiastic about feedback, 20% about classroom environment, and 7% about teacher's role. Seventy-three percent of the students indicated that they enjoyed the class format.

Of students from Group 2, 12.5% indicated that, at the end of the semester, they were less enthusiastic about reading, 25% about writing, and 19% about speaking. None of the students were less enthusiastic about peer response, class environment, or teacher's role. Six percent were less enthusiastic about collaborative journal, 44% about dialogue journal, and 6% about individual conference and feedback.
Table 14

*Students’ Perceptions of Their Experiences in Writing Workshop, Part I*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Workshop Components</th>
<th>Group 1 (N=16)</th>
<th>Group 2 (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This writing class helped me understand the writing process</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very enthusiastic about:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Response</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Writing</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialog Journal</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Conference</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Environment</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Role</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy the class format</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15

**Students' Perceptions of Their Experiences in the Writing Workshop, Part II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Workshop Components</th>
<th>Group 1 (N=16)</th>
<th>Group 2 (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very enthusiastic about:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Response</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Writing</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialog Journal</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Conference</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Environment</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Role</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students’ Perceptions of the Elements of the Components of the Writing Workshop**

Part II of the questionnaire on Assessment of Classroom Activities was related to the writing class profile. Students from both groups were asked to indicate which elements of the components of Writing Workshop were present in the writing course. Table 16 summarizes the data from both groups.

**Group 1.** Seventy-five percent of students from Group 1 indicated that they checked each other's work, and 69% that they gave oral and written suggestions to each other about improving their work. Fifty-three percent indicated that students and teachers wrote to each other in their journals, and 94% that they wrote about whatever they wanted to. Eighty-six percent stated that they wrote about their own experiences,
produced different types of writing, and learned to write paragraphs and essays. Forty-three percent mentioned that some specific assignments were done independently, and for 69% the evaluation guidelines helped them and their teacher evaluate writing assignments.

From this same group, 25% indicated that students scheduled individual conferences with their teacher, and 88% stated that students and teachers talked about their work. One hundred percent of the students indicated that the teacher and the students commented on assignments, giving suggestions for revision. For 69% the classroom environment was great for social interaction, and 94% indicated that the environment was warm and supportive. Finally, 88% of the students stated that the teacher and the students worked collaboratively.

**Group 2.** Eighty percent of the students stated that they checked each other’s work, and 53.5% indicated that they gave each other suggestions about improving their work. Eighty-seven percent mentioned that students and the teacher wrote to each other in their journals, and that they wrote about whatever they wanted to. The same percentage of students also indicated that they wrote about their own experiences, and that they produced different types of writing. For 67% of the students, some specific assignments were done independently, and 60% indicated that the evaluation guidelines helped them and the teacher evaluate different writing assignments.

Sixty percent of the students indicated that the students scheduled individual conferences with their teachers. Eighty percent stated they talked with their teacher about their works, and that their teacher and they commented on their assignment, giving suggestions for revision. For 80% of the students, the classroom environment was great
for social interaction and the environment was also warm and supportive. Seventy-three percent of the students indicated that the teacher worked collaboratively with the students.

Table 16

Elements of Components of Writing Workshop Present in Writing Course (in Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of Components</th>
<th>Group 1 (N=16)</th>
<th>Group 2 (N=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students checked each other is work in class regularly</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students gave oral and written suggestions to each other about improving their work</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and teacher wrote to each other</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students wrote about whatever they wanted</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students wrote about their experiences</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students produced different types of writing</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students learn to write paragraphs and essays</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific assignments were done independently</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation guidelines helped students and teachers evaluate the different writing assignments</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students scheduled conferences with teacher</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and teachers talked about students' work</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and students comment on assignments, giving suggestions for revision or completion</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment was great for social interaction</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom environment was warm and supportive</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher worked collaboratively with students</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the Writing Workshop Components

Part III of the questionnaire on Assessment of Classroom Activities asked students to indicate to what extent the elements of the components of the Writing Workshop had helped to improve their writing skills. The Workshop had seven components: Peer Review, Dialogue Journal, Writing Activities, Individual Conferences, Feedback, Environment, and Teacher's Role. Table 17 summarizes the data for both groups.

Group 1. Forty-four percent of the students from Group 1 indicated that giving oral and written suggestions to each other helped them improve their writing skills. For 75% of the students, checking each other’s work also helped their writing skills. For 100%, writing back and forth to the teacher, and for 94%, writing about whatever they wanted to help enhanced their writing skills. Moreover, 88% of the students said writing about their own experiences was very beneficial. Ninety-four percent indicated that producing different types of writing assignments and learning to write paragraphs and essays had a positive impact on their writing skills. Doing specific assignments individually was helpful to 81% of the students, while using evaluation guidelines to evaluate the different writing assignments was helpful to 88% of the students.

Fifty percent of the students also indicated that scheduling individual conferences with the teacher had a positive impact on their writing skills. For 75% of the students talking with their teacher about their work helped improve their writing skills. Eighty-one percent of the class stated that commenting on assignments and giving suggestions for revision or completion also helped their writing. Classroom social interaction and the warm and supportive environment of the Workshop have helped 75% and 94% of the
students, respectively, to improve their writing skills. Finally, working collaboratively with the teacher helped enhanced the writing skills of 88% of the students.

**Group 2.** Forty percent of the students from Group 2 stated that giving each other oral and written suggestions about improving their work helped their writing skills. For 27%, checking each other's work also helped them in their writing. Writing back and forth to the teacher and writing about whatever they wanted to has had a positive impact on 60% and 80% of the students respectively. Eighty percent of the class indicated that writing about their own experiences and learning to write essays and paragraphs helped them improve their writing skills.

For 33% of the class, scheduling individual conferences with the teacher was beneficial. Sixty percent indicated that talking to their teacher about their work helped their writing skills. For 80%, commenting on assignments and giving suggestions for revision or completion of their writing activities helped them write better. The classroom social interaction positively impacted 73% of the class, and the warm and supportive environment of the classroom helped 60% of the students improve their writing. Finally, 53% of the class indicated that working collaboratively with the teacher helped enhance their writing skills.

This section presented students' perceptions of their experiences in the Writing Workshop. Even though students from both groups were exposed to the Writing Workshop for the first time, their overall attitudes indicated that they felt positive about the Workshop approach to writing. An analysis of the results of this section is presented in the following chapter.
This chapter presented an analysis of the data in relation to the sample characteristics and the research questions. Major findings related to the research questions were also presented. The analysis was presented in five sections. First, the analysis of the sample revealed the characteristics of the students in terms of gender and schooling. The second section presented the results related to the research.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Group 1 (N = 16)</th>
<th>Group 2 (N = 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral and written suggestions</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking each other's work</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students wrote back and forth to teachers</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students wrote about whatever they wanted to</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing about own experiences</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing different activities</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to write paragraphs and essays</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing specific assignments individually</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using evaluation guidelines</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling conferences</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to teacher about work</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and students gave suggestions for revision.</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom social interaction</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm and supportive environment</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked collaboratively with students</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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question about students' attitudes toward learning English, and the third section presented the findings related to the students' attitudes toward writing in English. Then, the fourth section dealt with the findings related to the effect of the Writing Workshop on students' writing skills using the paired sample t-test. Finally, section 5 presented the students' perceptions of their experiences in the Writing Workshop.

A discussion of all the findings is presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this investigation was to study the effectiveness of Writing Workshop as a model of teaching English writing skills to students enrolled in an intermediate English as a Second Language class at Antillean Adventist University. This study examined Writing Workshop not as a component of the writing class, but as a teaching approach, for the writing class.

Specifically, the research addressed several questions, namely: What are the ESL students' attitudes toward learning English? What are ESL students' attitudes toward writing in English? What is the relationship between Writing Workshop and ESL students' writing skills? What are students' perceptions of their experiences in the Writing Workshop? These questions formed the background for the study, and the answers are found within the results presented in chapter 4.

Learning English (reading, writing, speaking) has been and still is an issue in Puerto Rico (Algreen de Gutiérrez, 1987; Clachar, 1997; Resnick, 1993; Rubinstein, 2001; Schweers & Vélez, 1992). Even though it is well known that socio-political agendas have affected the teaching of ESL in Puerto Rico, other factors have contributed to the weaknesses of the English teaching program on the island.
The Department of Education in Puerto Rico has identified teaching methods as one of the failures of public bilingual education in Puerto Rico (Resnick, 1993). In a study done in Puerto Rico, Clachar (1997) indicates that Puerto Rican students recognized the need to learn English and have the desire to learn it. The challenge is to provide them with the kind of classroom instruction that will encourage them to develop their English skills while they are studying in Puerto Rico.

This study focuses on developing ESL writing skills in college students in Puerto Rico. Different approaches have been implemented for the teaching and learning of ESL writing throughout the history of ESL writing, namely: the audio-lingual approach, the content-based instruction approach, and the English for academic purpose model, among others (Kroll, 1990; Mohan, 1979; Raimes, 1991; Reid, 1993).

These teaching approaches are usually used in a teacher-centered classroom. According to Smerdom et al. (1999), a teacher-centered classroom is “a classroom where this type of teaching predominates, teachers typically conduct lessons using a lecture format” (pp. 7-8). Therefore, education, in this type of setting, is viewed as externally controlled by the teachers, with no recognition of students’ differences, of independent learning, or of the students’ life experiences (Katsuko, 1995).

In the 1980s, ESL conference papers explored the idea of using process approaches with ESL students. The shift toward process writing caused ESL writing to become more student-oriented. The student- or learner-oriented approach recognizes that self-learning and experience encourages students to become unique and independent learner (Katsuko, 1995; Smerdom, et al., 1999). In this setting, the classroom becomes “a
place where a community of learners engages in discovery and invention, reflection, and problem solving” (Kohn, 1999, p. 3).

As stated by Stokes (1984), a pedagogical outcome of the research on the writing process is the use of Writing Workshops in classrooms. “Writing Workshop is an approach that encourages students to become involved in the writing process by using their own topics” (Stretch, 1994). Teachers of English to speakers of other languages feel strongly that the Writing Workshop is a valuable tool for developing literacy (Peyton et al., 1994). Students learn by engaging in the activities that have meaning for them (Bullock, 1998), in communicating with others, and in helping each other while revising and editing their works.

“Learning to write and teaching writing involve us and our students in a process of socialization and of individual becoming, and therefore they cannot be reduced to one scenario or one script” (RITCHIE, 1989). Therefore, collaborative learning and collaborative writing are at the heart of the Writing Workshop. As stated by Wilhelm (1999), “Language use and language learning are social activities; they occur best in situations which encourage negotiation of meaning and learner collaboration with other learners, instructors, and community members” (p. 16).

My desire to find a strategy for teaching writing that might help my students understand the writing process better and improve their writing skills prompted me to become a teacher-researcher in my intermediate ESL writing course, and start the first in a series of studies to determine how effective the Writing Workshop is in helping ESL students in Puerto Rico improve their writing skills. Following are the discussion of the
results, the conclusions drawn from this initial study, and some recommendations for further studies.

Discussion of the Results

This section presents a summary of the research sample and research instrument followed by the discussion of the results obtained for each research question.

Research Sample and Research Instruments

The research sample for this study consisted of students registered in two ESL intermediate writing classes at a private, nonprofit, religious-affiliated, liberal arts university. Since this was a classroom-based research, a pretest-posttest design was used. Data for the study were collected using six instruments: a writing skills pretest, a composition pretest, a Survey on Attitudes Toward English, a writing skills posttest, a composition posttest, and an Assessment of Classroom Activities questionnaire.

The Survey on Attitudes Toward English surveyed the students' attitudes toward learning and writing in English. This survey was divided into three parts: The first section surveyed the attitudes toward learning English, the second section focused on attitudes toward writing in English, and the third section contained the respondent demographic information. This survey was validated through content-validity.

The writing skills pretest and posttest tested students' general skills in English. The composition pretest and posttest tested the students' writing abilities based on the ESL Composition Profile published by Thomson. The students were tested on content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

The Assessment of Classroom Activities questionnaire was given at the end of the semester. This questionnaire consisted of three sections. Section 1 focused on general
information about the Workshop; section 2 gathered information about the writing class profile, and section 3 gathered information about the effectiveness of the components of the class. Sections 2 and 3 had 23 items each. The alpha reliability of the scales constructed from this instrument ranged from 0.67 to 0.92. The correlations for the relationships between the instrument's seven scales were significant at $p < 0.01$.

Discussion of Findings

This section presents a summary and discussion of the results of the analysis presented in the previous chapter. The section is divided into four parts, each part focusing on a specific research question. The first part presents the attitudes of students' toward learning English; the second part, their attitudes toward writing in English. Part three focuses on the relationship between Writing Workshop and the students' writing skills, and finally part four relates to students' perceptions of their experiences in the Writing Workshop.

Survey 1: Students' Attitudes Toward Learning English and Writing English

The Survey on Attitudes Toward Learning and Writing English was administered at the beginning of the semester to both Writing Workshop groups. A total of 35 students filled out the survey. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The instrument was discussed with some colleagues for content-validity.

Students' Attitudes Toward Learning English

The first part of the survey examined students' attitudes toward learning English. The data indicated that students, generally, have a positive attitude toward English. Even though 62.8% of the sample agreed that learning English should be secondary to Spanish,
91.4% acknowledged that English will be important to them in the future, and 51.4% did not agree that English should be an elective rather than a requirement. This seems to indicate that students are well aware of the importance of mastering the English language as a second language.

The data also indicted that students like speaking, writing, reading, listening to the radio, or watching television or videos in English. A possible explanation for this finding could be that most people watch cable TV in English. In Puerto Rico, cable TV exposes students to English from an early age. Moreover, most popular magazines (Sports Illustrated, Family Circle, Lady's Home Journal, computer-related magazines, and so on) are in English, and movie theaters exhibit movies written in English (sometimes with Spanish subtitles); therefore, it could be concluded that this exposure to the language may help students develop a more positive attitude toward learning English.

These results might also indicate that the language controversy that exists in Puerto Rico is mostly political, and that there might not be such a resistance to learning English, at least from this generation.

**Students’ Attitudes Toward Writing Compositions**

Students were also asked about their attitudes toward writing. The data indicated that students are not reluctant to write in English. Actually, 55% of the respondents rated their writing as good, and 64% indicated that writing in English was not an unpleasant experience. Also, a large percentage (65%) expected to do well in their writing course. Overall, the students’ response indicated a positive attitude toward writing in English.

However, 52% of the respondents stated that it was not easy for them to write a good composition in English and 48.4% said that they were afraid to write when they...
knew their teachers would evaluate their work. There are two possible explanations for these statements. First of all, students' deficient writing skills could be responsible for their responses. Second, the feedback given by the teachers hinders their confidence in their writing skills. In the teacher-centered instruction that is prevalent in language instruction in Puerto Rico, teacher's feedback consists of, in most cases, pinpointing with a red pen all spelling, grammar, and sentence-skills mistakes. As stated by Bardine et al. (2000), students “believe that the main reason teachers respond to students’ writing is to tell them what they are doing wrong” Therefore, they are always very apprehensive when turning in written work.

Two of the Writing Workshop components mentioned in the survey were peer revision and writing about personal experience. Fifty-eight percent of the sample indicated that they do not like their composition to be evaluated by their peers. Students, in general, are not trained for peer revision. Their first concept of peer revising would be of their peers pinpointing their mistakes. However, after being properly trained over a reasonable period of time, students view peer revising as an opportunity to improve their writing skills (Barron, 1991; Mangelsdorf, 1992).

A large percentage (71%) of the students indicated that writing about personal experiences makes writing more meaningful to them. As stated by Mlynarczyk (1991), “students learn a foreign [second] language well and retain what they have learned when they are using that language to express ideas that are significant to them personally” (p. 20). Writing about personal experiences does not hinder academic writing. On the contrary, when students have had a chance to find their own voices by writing about subjects that are related to their personal experiences, they are better prepared to write
with authority about more abstract subjects (Mlynarczyk, 1991).

As I observed in my Writing Workshop by the end of the semester, many more students voluntarily teamed up to discuss their compositions before turning them in. It is worth mentioning that 63% of the students viewed writing in English as somewhat fun. Therefore, it can be concluded that writing does not really pose a threat to the students. They like to write, and when given the proper tools within the appropriate environment, they will most likely write will do well.

In summary, students' attitudes toward learning and writing were quite positive. This finding supports the statement that Puerto Rican students hold the learning of English as an ideal (Resnick, 1993) because it is the language that provides them good professional opportunities, as well as the "language that allows them to communicate with the world at large" (Clachar, 1997). As stated before, they do not want English to become their first language, however, they want English to be secondary to Spanish.

**Pretest-Posttest 1: Effect of the Writing Workshop on Students' Writing Skills**

A writing skills pretest and a writing skills posttest were administered to each group to measure how effective the Writing Workshop was in enhancing students' writing skills. A paired sample t-test was used to analyze the relationship between the two variables of each sample in each group independently.

**Writing Workshop Group I.** The results of the paired sample t-test indicated significant difference between the pretest and posttest in three paired samples ($p < 0.05$). The posttest results were significantly higher than the pretest results in paired sample 3 that tested the students' abilities to add supporting details to topic sentences or thesis statements; in paired sample 5 related to eliminating wordiness in sentences; and in
paired sample 7 related to summarizing a short reading selection. This indicates an improvement in students' writing skills. Peer revision was an ongoing process during the semester in Writing Workshop Group 1. The teacher asked students to first discuss their writings with their peers before turning them in, therefore peer revision may have had a positive impact on students’ revising process and their writing skills.

Writing Workshop Group 2. A paired $t$-test was also calculated to evaluate whether there was a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between the pretest and the posttest. For this Writing Workshop section, the posttest means were higher than the pretest means for paired samples 1, 5, and 6. A significant difference was obtained in paired sample 1 related to selecting the appropriate differences between a paragraph and an essay, in paired sample 5 that tested the students’ abilities to rewrite sentences omitting needless words and paired sample 6 related to editing sentences in terms of grammar skills.

Students from Group 2 did better in rewriting sentences omitting needless words. A possible explanation could be that 23% of the students were English proficient in Group 1, but 41% were English proficient in Group 2. Therefore, it would be easier for these students to write correct sentences.

One possible reason for Group 2 not doing better in pair 3, supporting details to topic sentences, could be that students did not follow the instructions that asked them to circle the two items that did not support the topic sentences. Many students selected the items that supported the topic sentence.

Pretest-Posttest 2: Effect of the Writing Working on Students’ Composition Skills

Students’ first and last composition provided the data to answer this research question. The components of the ESL Composition Profile were used as variables. The
composition yielded an overall score obtained by combining the ESL composition components, scores and provided data across these variables: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

*Group 1.* The pretest and posttest grades were paired, and a paired sample *t*-test analysis was used to find out if there was a significant difference between the pretest and the posttest. The paired *t*-test analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between the pretest and the posttest in paired variable 1 related to writing a composition, paired variable 3 related to the organization of the composition, and paired variable 4 related to vocabulary use.

The significant difference found between the pretest and the posttest could be the result of the collaborative work and the revising process that was part of the Writing Workshop process in the classroom. Students had the opportunity to write, revise, rewrite, and discuss their compositions with some of their peers and the professor. Furthermore, by talking with their peers, students had an opportunity to learn new words and discuss the meaning of unknown words with their classmates; this process helped them to improve their vocabulary.

*Group 2.* For this group, no significant differences were found between the pretest and the posttest in any of the paired samples. The statistical analysis provided insufficient evidence to verify significance between the paired samples. All *p* values were greater than *p* > 0.05.

A possible explanation about this finding could be that 41% of the students were quite fluent in English, but only 23% of the students in Group 1 had mastered English. It appears to be easier to see the progress in students who begin at a lower level of English.
proficiency. Another factor, that I have observed as an ESL professor, is that because of the limited number of English-proficient students, the class becomes less challenging to the proficient students; consequently, students who master the language have the tendency to assume that they will do well in the class since they find it to be relatively easy. Therefore, they adopt a nonchalant attitude that could result in their grades actually dropping or staying at the status quo.

Moreover, the professors' teaching style might also have influenced the results. The professor's teaching style for Group 1 is more congruent with the Writing Workshop strategy. This professor is at ease in a classroom environment where students work on different projects at the same time, where students develop their own style, and where collaborative learning takes place. The professor of Group 2 is more comfortable in a teacher-centered classroom; therefore, peer revision might not have taken place as often in Group 2 as it did in Group 1. The data show that 40% of the students from Group 1 were very enthusiastic about peer response, and 31% were enthusiastic about peer response in Group 2.

Students' Perceptions of Their Experience in the Writing Workshop

The first part of the questionnaire on Assessment of Classroom Activities was related to students' personal opinion about the Writing Workshop. Students from both Writing Workshop groups acknowledged that the Writing Workshop had helped them understand the writing process better. A large percentage (53.3% in Group 1 and 75% in Group 2) indicated that they were very enthusiastic about writing. Nearly half (46.7%) the students in the Writing Workshop Group 1 stated that they were very enthusiastic about speaking and the classroom environment, and 40% were very enthusiastic about
peer response. In the Writing Workshop Group 2, students were very enthusiastic about collaborative writing (50%) and about speaking (43.8%). Therefore, it can be stated that these components were the most effective in helping students improve their English skills, and in enhancing their experience in the Workshop.

Even though students were not very enthusiastic about the other components of the Writing Workshop, they were not less enthusiastic about them at the end of the semester. Their interests in these components seemed not to have changed much. This could be explained by the fact that this is a new class format to which all of them had been exposed for the first time; 7 of the 10 components, namely peer response, collaborative writing, dialogue journal, individual conference giving the student voice, teacher's role, writing process, and class environment were new concepts for the students as well as for the teachers. Students not being less enthusiastic about the class at the end of the semester could indicate a positive attitude toward this new classroom approach.

The second part of the questionnaire required students from both groups to mention which elements of the components of the Writing Workshop were present in their writing course. The components are included in the configuration rubric in Appendix 9.

Students from Group 1 indicated that all the elements of the components of the Writing Workshop mentioned in the questionnaire were present in their writing course except for students scheduling individual conferences with their teacher. In this group, students did not have to schedule conferences. Individual conferences took place in the classroom as the students call on the teacher for help. This is supported by the answer to the second statement, 88% of the students indicated that students and teachers cordially
talked about students’ work. Students from Group 2 indicated that all the elements were present in their writing class. The survey did not ask how often were the elements present.

The third part of the survey was related to students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the Writing Workshop components in improving their writing skills. For Group 1 all the elements were important in helping students improve their writing skills. The lowest rated element was one of the elements of peer review: Students (more than the teacher) gave a number of oral and written suggestions to each other about improving their work. Only 44% of the students indicated that this element was effective in helping them improve. However, 75% of the students stated that checking each other’s work in class on a regular basis was effective in enhancing their writing skills. A possible explanation could be that students understood that the teacher gave more oral and written suggestions about improving their writing than they themselves did.

The elements that were the most effective in improving the writing skills were: (1) students and teacher writing back and forth to each other through the dialogue journal, (2) students writing about whatever they wanted to, (3) students producing different types of writing, (4) students learning to write paragraphs and essays, (5) the warm and supportive environment of the classroom, (6) the evaluation guidelines, (7) students and teacher working collaboratively, and finally (8) teachers and students giving suggestions for revision or completion of assignments. It is worth noting that both types of writing, personal and academic, have had a positive impact on students’ writing skills. As stated by Mlynarczyk (1991), these two approaches need not be mutually exclusive because in many academic assignments the personal elements are much closer to the surface.
An analysis of the results reported in chapter 4 indicates that the peer review did not help students improve their writing skills. This supports the possible explanation that these students did not improve in the composition posttest because peer revision might not have taken place as often as it did in Group 1. The most important elements that helped improve students’ writing skills were students writing about their own experiences and students learning to write paragraphs and essays. Again, a combination of personal and academic writing proved to be effective in helping ESL students improve their writing skills. Teachers and students giving suggestions for revision and completion, in other words, feedback, and students writing about whatever they wanted to were the next higher scored elements.

Students’ evaluations of the effectiveness of the elements of the components of the Writing Workshop suggest that the impact of the Workshop was not as strong in this Group as it was in Group 1. As stated earlier in this chapter, the teaching style of the professor might also have had an effect on students’ perceptions of the Workshop. It is clear that if a professor does not feel comfortable using an instructional, outcomes might not be as expected. However, more training, orientation, and practice could reverse the situation.

Students’ Perceptions of Their Experiences in the Writing Workshop
Based on Answers to Open-ended Questions

Few students answered the open-ended questions. People tend to answer questions that do not require writing. Furthermore, the questionnaire was administered on final exam day. It could be that most students did not take time to answer the open-ended questions because they viewed it as wasting time they needed to study for final exams. Another reason could be that precisely during this semester, students filled out
more than seven surveys related to the Institution’s Self-Study process and two surveys for other studies that were being conducted on the campus.

In the Writing Workshop Group 1, 6 out of the 17 students indicated that they enjoyed collaborative writing because they like discussing their ideas with their peers, and writing together helps them with their writing skills. Seven students from both groups indicated that they enjoy peer response because revising their work with their classmates gives them ideas and helps them produce better papers. Nine students from both groups stated that they enjoyed the writing activities because they were different, more personal.

From both groups, four students indicated that they did not enjoy either collaborative writing or peer response because they would rather work alone. Five students enjoyed the class format because it was different and was not routine. One of them stated that the format was more interesting because the student became part of the process, and his/her voice counted. However, three students noted that the class format was somewhat confusing to them, and that sometimes it was hard for them to know what to do next. This is understandable because students are used to a teacher-centered classroom where the teacher is in control, where everyone works on the same activity for the same amount of time, and where the teacher dictates what to do and when. However, in the Writing Workshop, the student has control for his or her own learning process and has to schedule his or her class assignments within a given time frame.

Three students from both groups also stated that they did not enjoy the dialogue journal because it was hard to find something to write about. The concept of dialogue journal was new for both groups. Students are familiar with journaling where they talk
about their daily activity or about some specific topics assigned by the teacher. Sustaining a written conversation with the teacher was a new experience for them. However, at least in Group 1, three students were very faithful in their dialogue journal and enjoy it a lot, as they told their professor.

Summary of Findings

The primary issue that prompted this study was the number of ESL students who had a hard time developing and improving their writing skills in a teacher-centered classroom. In most ESL classrooms in Puerto Rico, the teacher controls the learning environment and students are assigned the same activities regardless of their language proficiency levels. Therefore, in this study, writing proficiency was linked to teaching strategy. The study focused on discovering if the Writing Workshop, a student-centered approach, could help ESL students improve their writing skills. The findings from this study can be summarized as follows:

1. ESL students in my study have a positive attitude toward learning and writing in English.

2. Students in my study understand that mastering the English language is an important asset for their future.

3. In my study, the Writing Workshop was effective in helping students improve their writing skills. Significant differences were found between the pretest and posttest pairs on writing skills: pairs 3 (supporting details), 5 (wording), and 7 (summary) in Group 1, pairs 1 (paragraph/essay differences), 5 (wording), and 6 (sentence skills) in Group 2. Significant differences were also found between the pretest and posttest pairs on writing performance or composition in five areas, namely, overall writing, content,
organization, vocabulary, and language use. There was no significant difference for Group 2.

4. A large percentage of students (93.3% in group 1 and 100% in group 2) indicated that the Writing Workshop helped them understand the writing process. Students also indicated that they enjoyed the class format (73% and 87.5% respectively).

Conclusions

The purpose of this investigation was to study the effectiveness of Writing Workshop as a model for teaching English writing skills to students enrolled in an intermediate English as a Second Language class at Antillean Adventist University.

The Writing Workshop course grew out of my desire to provide my students with a writing approach that would empower them and help them understand and master the writing process as they go through the workshop. As classroom action research by an individual teacher, this study has allowed me to provide student-centered instruction to my ESL students.

My intention is to become an expert in Writing Workshop and then go beyond the boundaries of my classroom with this approach to teaching ESL writing in Puerto Rico. My hope is that this study will set the stage for more classroom action research using Writing Workshop to test whether this approach succeeds in helping learners from all academic levels improve their writing skills, and, by extension, their reading, listening, and speaking skills. The ultimate result is to help students develop their skills by promoting awareness about the importance of the writing process and about student-centered instruction.
This study provides evidence of an effective tool that can be used to enhance ESL students’ writing skills in Puerto Rico. It has been a promising beginning that calls for much refining and study, but it has laid the premises for an innovative teaching approach to help ESL students in Puerto Rico develop and improve their writing skills.

**Recommendations**

Based on this study using Writing Workshop to teach ESL students, the following recommendations are submitted:

**Recommendations for replication of the study:**

1. Teachers who plan to use Writing Workshops should be very knowledgeable in: (a) using cooperative learning strategies; (b) implementing peer revising; (c) managing the classroom; (d) sharing their power with their students and helping students become accountable for their own learning; (e) maintaining a positive climate in the classroom where students work on different activities during the same class period; (f) defining the teacher’s role is in a writing workshop and maintaining this role; and (g) training students for peer revision and collaborative writing.

2. This study should be replicated in other public and private institutions on the island so that it can be generalized.

3. It is also recommended that the study be replicated in non-academic settings, such as government offices, banks, and corporations, to validate the effectiveness of the Writing Workshop in improving ESL writing skills.

**Recommendations for further study:**

A review of relevant literature indicates that little research has been done on ESL teaching strategies, whether it is reading, writing, listening, or speaking, in Puerto Rico.
Therefore additional research is needed to support the effectiveness of the Writing Workshop to enhance students’ English skills at all academic levels.

1. A comparative study should be conducted to study the effectiveness of the Writing Workshop on both limited-proficient and proficient students’ writing skills, respectively.

2. A longitudinal study should also be conducted using Writing Workshop with the same group of students from the Basic Skills in English course through Basic English I, Basic English II, and Intermediate Writing (four courses over four consecutive semesters).

3. Further research is also needed to explore teachers’ responses to participating in and implementing a Writing Workshop course.

4. A comparative study should also be done using Writing Workshop group and a control group with limited-proficient students.

**Recommendations to the University hosting the study:**

The Humanities Department should consider the students’ proficiency levels when registering them in the Intermediate ESL writing class. An advanced ESL course should be created for the English-proficient students who need to improve their English skills before taking Freshman Composition. Creating this course would allow ESL professors to present more challenging material to these students.
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RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS
Andrews University
Antillean Cohort

Survey on Attitudes Toward Learning and Writing English

Instructions: We would like to know more about students' attitudes toward learning and writing English. Please help us by choosing the letter that best describes your response to the following statements. This is an anonymous survey, so please do not write your name on the paper. Thank you for your participation.

SA = Strongly agree   A = Agree   D = disagree   SD = Strongly disagree

Learning English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Learning to speak English should be secondary to Spanish</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I think learning English will be important to me in the future</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In Puerto Rican colleges English should be an elective rather than a requirement</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I enjoy speaking English</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I enjoy writing English</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I enjoy listening to the radio/TV/videos in English</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I enjoy reading in English</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. After I graduate, learning English will be less important to my life than Spanish</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Writing in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I think my writing is good</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Writing is a very unpleasant experience to me</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I like having the opportunities to express my ideas in writing</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I expect to do well in my ESL writing course</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When I think about writing in English in school, I feel frustrated</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It's easy for me to write good composition in English</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I'm not good at reading</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Expressing my ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I like to have friends read what I have written</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Writing about my personal experience makes writing more meaningful to me</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I am afraid of writing essays/paragraphs when I know my teacher will evaluate them</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Writing essays/paragraphs on specific topics is difficult to me</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Writing in English is a lot of fun</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I don’t like my composition to be evaluated by my peers</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic background**

1. Gender: Male_____ Female_____

2. Academic Department ____________________________

3. How many years of English instruction did you have: 2___ 4___ 6___ 8___ 10___ 12___ Other___


5. Schooling: Public___ Private___ Public bilingual___ Private bilingual ___ (Check all the options that apply).

6. Years in schooling: Public___ Private___ Public bilingual___ Private bilingual ___ (Fill in all the options that apply)
Assessment of Classroom Activities

General Instructions: I would like to know about your experience in this writing course. Please take a moment to fill out this form. The information given is confidential, so please do not write your name on the form. Your answers will not, under any circumstances, affect your final grade. Thank you for cooperation.

PART ONE. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE CLASS

1. This writing class helped me understand the writing process better (circle below)
   [ ] Definitely, yes! [ ] Yes, somewhat [ ] Not really [ ] Definitely not!

2. This is what I liked best about this class: (check all that apply)
   ___ Reading ___ Writing ___ Speaking ___ Peer Response ___ Collaborative writing ___ Dialog journal ___ Individual Conference ___ Feedback ___ Classroom climate ___ Teacher’s role

   Explain the reasons why you liked the things you checked above_________________________

3. This is what I liked least about this class: (Check all that apply)
   ___ Reading ___ Writing ___ Speaking ___ Peer Response ___ Collaborative writing ___ Dialog journal ___ Individual Conference ___ Feedback ___ Classroom climate ___ Teacher’s role

   Explain the reasons why you disliked those things the things you checked above_________________________

4. I enjoyed the class format: Yes ___ No ___

   Explain: _______________________________________

   _______________________________________

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
## PART TWO. ENGLISH WRITING CLASS PROFILE

Which of the following elements were present in your English Writing class this term? If present, circle “Yes”; If NOT present, circle “No.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Circle each below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEER REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students extensively checked each other’s work in class on a regular basis</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students worked independently more than in small groups</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students (more than the teacher) gave a number of oral and written suggestions to each other about improving their work</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIALOGUE JOURNAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers assigned interesting topics for students to write about</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students kept a journal. In the journal, students and teachers wrote notes to each other during the entire term.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students wrote about whatever they wanted to</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students wrote about their own experiences</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• During writing class students produced in different types of writing works (paragraph, posters, letters, songs, poems, pen pals..)</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students learned to write paragraphs and essays</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific writing assignments were done independently rather than collaboratively</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The evaluation guidelines helped students and teachers evaluate the different writing assignments</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students scheduled individual conferences with the teacher</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers were glad to schedule individual conferences with their students</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students and their teachers cordially talked about the students’ work</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEDBACK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers and students gracefully commented on assignments, giving suggestions for revision or completion</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students improved their writing skills because only the teacher gave them feedback</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Circle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The classroom provided a great environment for social interaction while students were writing individually or collaboratively</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The class environment was very structured to allow students to work individually</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students and teachers enjoyed working in a warm, supportive, and productive environment throughout this term</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The classroom environment was occasionally collaborative</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TEACHERS' ROLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Circle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers spent much of the class time presented well-organized lectures</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The tone of this classroom was more formal than informal</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers worked collaboratively with the students.</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART THREE. EFFECTIVENESS OF COMPONENTS OF THE CLASS

**Instructions:** To what extent did the following elements of the components of the class help you improve your writing.

1 = Does not apply 2 = never 3 = Little 4 = Much 5 = Very much

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEER REVIEW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students extensively checked each other's work in class on a regular basis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students worked independently more than in small groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students (more than the teacher) gave a number of oral and written suggestions to each other about improving their work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIALOGUE JOURNAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers assigned interesting topics for students to write about</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students and teacher &quot;talked&quot; back and forth on paper during the entire term</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students wrote about whatever they wanted to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRITING ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students wrote about their own experiences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• During writing class students produced in different types of writing works (paragraphs, posters, letters, songs, poems, pen pals...)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students learned to write paragraphs and essays</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific writing assignments were done independently rather than collaboratively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The evaluation guidelines helped students and teachers evaluate the different writing assignments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES
- Students scheduled individual conferences with the teacher
- Teachers were glad to schedule individual conferences with their students
- Students and their teachers cordially talked about the students' work

FEEDBACK
- Teachers and students gracefully commented on assignments, giving suggestions for revision or completion
- Students improved their writing skills because only the teacher gave them feedback

ENVIRONMENT
- The classroom provided a great environment for social interaction while students were writing individually or collaboratively
- The class environment was very structured to allow students to work individually
- Students and teachers enjoyed working in a warm, supportive, and productive environment throughout this term
- The classroom environment was occasionally collaborative

TEACHERS' ROLE
- Teachers spent much of the class time presented well-organized lectures
- The tone of this classroom was more formal than informal
- Teachers worked collaboratively with the students.

PART FOUR – DEMOGRAPHIC DATA
1. Gender _____ Male______ Female______

7. How many years of English instruction did you have: 2___ 4___ 6___ 8___ 10___ 12___ Other___

8. Secondary schooling: (Check all that apply)
   - Public nonbilingual ____
   - Private nonbilingual ____
   - Public bilingual ____
   - Private bilingual ____

Please give us your impression how this class has influenced your writing ability this term, if at all.

[Use the other side for more space. Thank you!]
APPENDIX 2

SAMPLE CLASS MATERIAL
WRITING WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

1. To introduce students to the complete writing process.
2. To familiarize students with the patterns of essay development.
3. To help students sharpen their reading abilities and develop critical reading skills.
4. To help students understand the rules and conventions of writing.
5. To teach students the peer revising process.
6. To encourage students to write from their own experiences.
7. To promote collaborative writing.
8. To encourage students to seek feedback from their teacher and their peers.
9. To foster social interaction in the writing classroom.
10. To provide students the opportunity to strengthen and or develop a sense of moral and Christian values.
11. To give students and their teacher the opportunity to write to each other during the entire term.
12. To foster collaborative work between the students and their teacher.
13. To help students understand the importance of mastering English for the workplace and for everyday communication.
14. To help students improve their English as a Second Language writing skills.
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TEACHER'S ROLE

1. To keep track of what students are writing, where they are in their writing, and what they need as a writer.

2. To write every day and finish pieces of writing.

3. To prepare and present mini-lessons based on what I see students need to know next.

4. To help students find topics they care about.

5. To provide a sociable, comfortable classroom structure in which students will feel free to take risks as writers.

6. To help students learn specific editing and proofreading skills.

7. To give students opportunities to publish their writings.

8. To listen to students and to respond to their writings by asking thoughtful, helpful questions; to help students listen and respond to other writers' pieces in thoughtful, helpful ways.

9. To make a record of what happens in my conferences with my students.

10. To help students discover what writing can do for them.

11. To make sure no one does anything to disturb or distract any students when he or she is writing or conferring.

12. To help you edit your pieces.

13. To grade your writing taking into consideration students' proficiency level, their growth and effort as writers.

14. To work collaboratively with the students.

(Adapted from Nancie Atwell 1987, p. 126.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
WRITING PROCESS GUIDE

Pre-writing: Making plans, gathering information, organizing ideas
Drafting: Putting down ideas in rough form
Revising: Focusing, expanding, refining, and re-writing
Editing: Checking relevancy and clarity, deleting, fixing mechanics
Publishing: Meeting the audience

Writing tasks:
Individual writing: compositions, journal, specific activities, creative writing…
Collaborative writing: compositions, creative writing, stories, other activities
Peer revising
Free writing
Activities to Foster Writing (Anderson, n.d.)

Approaches to help the class generate ideas for their writing tasks:

*Brainstorming:* This is a useful technique to pool the ideas of the class, especially when focusing on a particular topic. Whole class brainstorming will help students generate ideas for writing while developing an awareness of a broad range of topics as they listen to their peers. It should also reinforce the concepts of acceptance and valuing.

The teacher (later student) serves as a facilitator asking open-ended questions and recording answers on the board. All responses are recorded, in no particular order and without value judgments.

The purpose is to conclude with a quantity of ideas for the students to play with, stretch, ponder, and adapt for their particular writing projects.

*Listing:* This is a simple variation of brainstorming. Students make lists of ideas (as long as possible). These may revolve around a particular topic. This process is very easy, and one especially good for small group activity. The teacher may start by having each writer list for 1 or 2 minutes, then the student writers move into small groups to combine and add to individual lists, and finally present “completed” group lists to the class.

*Visualization:* is a technique that expands the students’ ability to generate more specific details from a sensory perspective.

Have the students sit in a relaxed manner, eyes closed. (Going back to “when you were a little kid” is a favorite with many students). Have them visualize in their mind where they are: outdoors, inside, in a vehicle; what season? What is the weather? What time of the day is it? Are they alone or with someone? What do they see, hear, smell? … Continue to ask mood-setting questions for a minute or two then instruct the students to write a description of the picture in their mind.

It is important that students realize that writing will be a type of “freewriting” in that they don’t edit or worry about structure. The goal is to get down as many descriptors of the experience as possible. Remember this is a pre-writing activity.

*Marathon writing:* is a good “variety” tool if the class seems to be stuck and you feel some additional interaction would be helpful and fun. This process generates many writing ideas that students may develop in later writing sessions. It is conducted in the following manner:

1. Divide the students into three groups; give each student three slips of paper.
2. Ask each student to write a possible writing topic on each paper. Collect the papers in a single container.
3. Draw three slips from the container and read the ideas to the class. Instruct them to "freewrite" on one of the topics (or one of their own) for 3-4 minutes.
4. Give the members of one group an opportunity to what they have written. (A student may decline to read, but encourage all to read once in the marathon.)
5. Draw three new topics and read them to the class. Direct all students to write on one of these topics, a topic of their choice, respond to someone else's writing or continue to work on their former topic.
6. At the end of the second timing, have the members of another group respond.
7. Repeat the process for the third time. At the close of timing ask the third group to share what they have written. This could be an appropriate time to encourage anyone who has not shared to do so.
(THE READING-WRITING WORKSHOP)

1. Students must read for the allotted time.
2. They cannot do homework or read any material for another course.
3. Students may read a book, magazines, newspapers, stories…
4. Students can choose to read the same selection individually or take turn reading their selection
5. Students will either discuss the story they read with those who have read the same story, or present their story to their group.
6. The teacher reads too.
7. Students respond to their reading in written as they wish to (poem, song, letter, poster, essay, position paper…). The written response may be individual or collaborative.
8. KEEPING A JOURNAL

1. Dialogue journal:

A dialogue journal is a conversation between a teacher and an individual student. This conversation is written and takes place continually throughout the semester. Students write regularly in the journal, as much as they want and about whatever they choose, and the teacher writes back, not grading or correcting the writing, and not responding with simple platitudes or evaluative comments. (Peyton 1990). The teacher writes back to the student as if she was answering a friend’s letter.

2. Academic journal

In this workshop academic journal refers to journal writing activities from the textbook.
MINI-LESSON PLAN

Grammar Unit: Correct sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions for the teacher</th>
<th>Responses from the Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How will you help students know where they are headed and why?</td>
<td>Explain the importance of writing good sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major assignments</td>
<td>Present description of the performance tasks at the beginning of the unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance tasks</td>
<td>Present scoring rubrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criteria by which the work will be judged?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you hook the students through engaging and thought-provoking experiences (issues, oddities, problems, and challenges) that point toward essential and unit questions, core ideas and performance tasks?</td>
<td>Begin mini lesson by giving each group a paragraph with incorrect sentences. Ask them to identify the incorrect sentences and tell why they think the sentences are incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What learning experiences will engage students in exploring the big ideas and essential and unit questions? What instruction is needed to equip students for the final performances?</td>
<td>Writing for the real world: letters, editorial for magazines, etc...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The planned learning activities will support work on tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How will you cause students to reflect and rethink to dig deeper into the core ideas? How will you guide students in revising and refining their work based on feedback and self-assessment?

Students will write a paragraph, essay, or story using correct sentences (Collaboratively)

Students will have an opportunity to revise each other sentences.

How will students exhibit their understanding through final performances and products? How will you guide them in self-evaluation to identify the strengths and weakness in their work and set future goals?

The tasks will provide evidence of understanding.

Unit will conclude with an assessment of students’ understanding (Test on sentences)

Identified Desired Results

What overarching understandings are desired?

Element of a sentence

- Subject
- Verb
- Complement

What are the overarching “essential” Questions?

- What is a complete sentence?
- Why is it important to compose correct sentences?
What will students understand as a result of this lesson?

- Students will understand that correct sentences are essential for good writing.
- Students will understand the importance of each part of a sentence.
- Students will understand the function of each part of a sentence.

"Essential" and "unit" questions

- What is a correct sentence?
- What are the parts of a complete sentence?
- What are the different types of sentences?
  
  Simple
  Compound
  Complex

Determine Acceptable Evidence

What evidence will show that students can write correct sentences?

Performance Tasks, Projects

- Students analyze different sentences.
- Students edit sentences
- Students write sentences collaboratively: simple, complex, compound
- Students will put what they have learned into practice while composing

Quizzes, Tests, Academic Prompts

In-class activities: edit sentences

Test: Different types of sentences

Prompt: Describe a problem that could arise as a result of writing an incorrect sentence.
Planning Learning Experiences and Instruction

What knowledge and skill are needed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students will need to know…</th>
<th>Students will need be able to…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Parts of a sentence</td>
<td>Write correct sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Types of sentences</td>
<td>Revise each other sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incomplete sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What teaching and learning experiences will equip students to demonstrate the targeted understandings?

- Introduce essential and unit questions
- Present material
- Categorize sentences
- Have students revise sentences and edit them
- Have students write correct sentences collaboratively
- Assess and give feedback on sentences
- Have different types of exercises on sentences in the activity folder. Students will choose the activity they want to complete individually or in group
- Conclude the unit with a test on the material presented
## INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

COVER LETTER AND INSTRUCTIONS TO STUDENTS
Dear student:

Would you just take a moment and complete this questionnaire. There is no obligation attached to this form. No one will call you or visit you. We just want to gather information on students’ opinion about their English writing classes to complete a study on English as a Second Language writing.

The study is being done by Mrs. Marie J. Agesilas, doctoral student at Andrews University, Curriculum and Instruction Department. For more information on this study you can contact her at 787-834-9595, ext. 2252 or 2569.

Your participation in this survey is voluntary. We assure you that this information is completely confidential. There will be no way of identifying your answers because you will not write your name on the survey. Remember: DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THE SURVEY. SIGN THE COVER LETTER JUST TO LET US THAT YOU AGREE ON FILLING OUT THE SURVEY, AND TURN IT BACK TO THE INSTRUCTOR BEFORE ANSWERING THE SURVEY.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sign here: __________________________________________________

(Turn the cover letter to your instructor and start answering the survey)

Start now

Box 118, Caribbean Christian University, Mayaguez, Puerto Rico 00681
Phone: (787) 834-9595 - Fax: (787) 834-9597
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INSTRUCTIONS TO THE STUDENTS

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this questionnaire. Please, listen carefully as I explain the instructions.

1. Your participation in this study is confidential and voluntary. You may choose not to answer the questionnaire.
2. Please do not write your name on the form.
3. Please be honest answering the questions. Only honest answers will guarantee honest findings.
4. Please, use a pencil to answer the questionnaire. If you do not have one, raise your hand and I will give you one.
5. Do not share your answers with your classmate.
6. Your participation or nonparticipation will not affect your grade.
7. Please read the cover letter carefully, before filling up the study.

Thank you for your attention.
APPENDIX 4

PEER REVIEW FORM
Reviewer: _______________________________________

Title of Work Being Reviewed: ____________________________

Date: ________________________________

Things the reviewer likes:

Things the writer should add or change:

Question the reviewer has:

TO BE FILLED OUT BY THE WRITER

From the feedback from my reviewer(s), I think I should make these changes.
APPENDIX 5

SAMPLE DIALOG JOURNAL
Responses

If I feel depressed and incompetent in a school that offers what I want academically, would you advise me to stay?

Yes. Your depression might not be related to the school but with some unhealth issues in your life. Incompetent. All I can feel incompetent from time to time. Again, this feeling of incompetence might be related to remarks from people in the past. Before making the decision to leave the school, it would be good for you to try to understand why you feel depressed and incompetent. Find someone you trust and talk to that person. Do not leave your depression untreated.
Responses

How many years have you been working in college? Have you noticed any changes in the students of the past from the ones that study today?

I have been working in the past semester. I have noticed a lot of differences in the students. Students now are more active and take their studies seriously. I am proud to say that you are at the top of the list of every honest student. Keep it up.
Responses

Do you think it's good to have some quiet time once in a while?
If you think it's good, do you ever try it? Tell me how you spend your quiet time?

I love to spend time alone. Even though I don't have much time to be alone, I really try to slow down to have some quiet. I enjoy a good book, or I do some embroidery. Sometimes I watch a good movie by myself. I simply lay back on a sofa and do nothing for 30 minutes. It's so refreshing.
Part One. Select the appropriate differences between a paragraph and an essay. Write P in front of the statements that describe the paragraph and E in front of the statements that describe the essay.

__1. Start with an introductory paragraph containing the central idea, expressed in a sentence called the thesis statement or thesis.

__2. Body contains specific details that support and develop the topic sentence.

__3. Made up of sentences.

__4. Body contains paragraphs that support and develop the central idea.

__5. Starts with a sentence containing the main point, called topic sentence.

__6. Ends with a closing sentence that rounds it off.

__7. Ends with a concluding paragraph that rounds it off.

Part Two. Circle the two items that DO NOT support the topic sentence.

1. Topic sentence: Some doctors seem to think it is all right to keep patients waiting.
   
   a. Pharmaceutical sales representatives sometimes must wait hours to see a doctor.
   b. The doctors stand in the hallway chatting with nurses and secretaries even when they have a waiting room full of patients.
   c. Patients sometimes travel long distances to consult with a particular doctor.
   d. Some doctors schedule appointments in a way that ensures long lines, to make it appear that they are especially skillful.
2. **Topic sentence**: Several factors were responsible for the staggering loss of lives when the Titanic sank.

   a. Despite warnings about the presence of icebergs, the captain allowed the Titanic to continue at high speed.
   b. The Titanic, equipped with the very best communication system available in 1912, sent out SOS messages.
   c. Over 1,500 people died in the Titanic disaster; only 711 survived.
   d. When the captain gave order to abandon the Titanic, many passengers refused because they believed the ship was unsinkable, so many lifeboats were only partly filled.

**Part Three.** *Add two supporting details for each of the topic sentence below.*

1. **Topic sentence**: The managers of this apartment building don't care about their renters.

   a. Mrs. Harris has been asking them to fix her leaky faucet for two months.
   b. ______________________________________________________________
   c. ______________________________________________________________

2. **Topic sentence**: After being married for forty years, Mr. And Mrs. Lambert have grown similar in odd ways.

   a. They both love to have a cup of warm apple juice just before bed.
   b. ____________________________________________________________
   c. ____________________________________________________________

**Part Four.** *Complete the following thesis statement by adding a third supporting ideas. Use wording that is parallel to the two supporting ideas already provided.*

1. Sticking to a diet, keeping a schedule, and ___________________________ are the most difficult challenges I face.

2. Fights with my wife usually stem from disagreements about money, child raising, and ___________________________.

3. My neighbors are most annoying when they play music late at night, borrow items and never return them, and ___________________________.
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Part Five. Rewrite the sentences in the spaces provided, omitting needless words.

1. A total of eight students in our class were given failing grades for the exam we took.

2. During the time that the Millers were off on vacation somewhere, their home was burglarized by unknown persons.

3. If you want to make sure that the answer you have come up with is correct, you should refer to the answer key that you will find by turning to the back of the book.

Part Six. See if you can locate the ten sentences-skills mistakes in the following passage. The mistakes are listed below. As you find each mistake, write the number of the word group containing it in the space provided. Then, in the space between the lines correct each mistake.

2 fragments ______ 1 missing apostrophe ______
2 mistakes in subject-verb agreement ______ 1 irregular verb mistake ______
1 missing comma after introductory words ______ 2 run-ons ______
1 missing comma around an interrupter ______

More young people are living with their parents than ever before. 2 According to the United States Census Bureau about 50 percent of people aged eighteen to twenty-four live either at home or in college dorms. 3 There appears to be several reasons for this situation, in the past, children often left home when they got married. 4 Today, however people tend to get married at an older age. 5 Than they once did. 6 Also, the high divorce rate among Americans have brought many of them back home to their parents. 7 In
addition, the high cost of college keeps many students from moving into their own apartments. However, even entering the job market does not guarantee that young people will finally leave home, many simply do not earn incomes that allow them to support themselves. Children from well-off families are even more likely to stay home longer. Waiting to be able to support themselves in the lifestyle they grew up with. Of course, most eventually do leave home. The Census Bureau statistics show that only 9 percent of men and 5 percent of women aged thirty-four are still living with their parents.

Part Seven. Read and summarize the following passage

How many homeless people live in the United States? Estimates range as high as 3,000,000. Today’s homeless include not only single people but also families with small children. Run-down boardinghouses and hotels, the places where the poor once lived, have been replaced by expensive houses and condominiums. Although some of the homeless have jobs, they do not make enough money to pay for food, rent, and other necessities. Others are unable to find work. Many of them have been released from mental hospitals but are still ill. A few of the homeless refuse to live in shelters, but most of them live on the street because they have nowhere else to go. They are often seen sleeping in boxes or huddled in doorways. To find enough food, they search through garbage cans or accept handouts. Life on the street is dangerous and short. Our society is slow in realizing that these dirty, poorly dressed people have not brought their problems on themselves. They cannot solve their problems without help.

(Langan, 2001)

Summary:
APPENDIX 7

COMPOSITION PROFILE AND PERMISSION LETTER
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-27</td>
<td>Excellent to Very Good: knowledgeable. Substantive - thorough development of thesis - Relevant to assigned topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-22</td>
<td>Good to Average: some knowledge of subject - Adequate range - limited development of thesis - Mostly relevant to topic but lacks details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-17</td>
<td>Fair to Poor: limited knowledge or subject - Little substance - inadequate development of topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-13</td>
<td>Very Poor: does not show knowledge of subject - non-substantive - not pertinent - OR not enough to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-18</td>
<td>Excellent to Very Good: fluent expression - ideas clearly stated, supported - succinct - well-organized, logical sequencing - cohesive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-14</td>
<td>Good to Average: somewhat choppy - loosely organized but main ideas stand out - limited support - logical but incomplete sequencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-10</td>
<td>Fair to Poor: non-fluent - ideas confused or disconnected - lacks logical sequencing and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-7</td>
<td>Very Poor: does not communicate - no organization - OR not enough to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-22</td>
<td>Excellent to Very Good: effective complex construction - few errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-18</td>
<td>Good to Average: effective but simple construction - minor problems in complex construction - several errors of agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions but meaning seldom obscured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-11</td>
<td>Fair to Poor: major problems in simple/complex constructions - frequent errors of negation, agreement, tense, number, word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions and/or fragments, run-ons, deletions - meaning confused or obscured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-5</td>
<td>Very Poor: virtually no mastery of sentence construction rules - dominated by errors - does not communicate - OR not enough to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Excellent to Very Good: demonstrates mastery of conventions - few errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good to Average: occasional errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization paragraphing but meaning not obscure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair to Poor: frequent errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing - poor handwriting - meaning confused or obscured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very Poor: no mastery of conventions - dominated by errors of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, handwriting illegible - OR not enough to evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This ESL Composition Profile has been reproduced with permission from Thomson Learning. Not to be reproduced without permission from the publisher.
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Marie J Agesilas  
Humanities  
Antillean Adventist University  
Box 118  
Mayaguez, Puerto Rico 00681

RE: R-8551 esl composition profile

Heinle & Heinle is happy to grant you one-time permission to use the following material for educational purposes only during the length of time and in the manner specified below.

Item: Pages 90-91
Title: LEARNING ESL COMPOSITION, 1st edition
Author(s): HARTFIEL
ISBN: 0838427855
Year: 1985

For use by: Marie Agesilas of Antillean Adventist University
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For inclusion in a research paper, master's thesis or doctoral dissertation. If at a later date the paper is published, additional permission will be required.

The permission granted in this letter extends only to material that is original to this text and not to material that originated elsewhere. Such material is acknowledged by a credit line below the material on the page, or listed in a credits section. For any such material, you will need to request separate permission from the original source.

A credit line must appear on the first page of the copied material:

APPENDIX S

CONFIGURATION RUBRIC
### Innovation Configuration Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Review:</strong> Students respond to respond to each other drafts</td>
<td>Help students read critically. Students are trained. Teamwork. Involves all members. Politeness. Teacher is a resource. Target language is used. Real collaboration</td>
<td>Teamwork. Helps students read critically. Most team members are involved. Teacher is mostly a resource. Politeness. Target language is not always used. Students are trained</td>
<td>Students are not trained. Teacher has too much influence No respect for others’ work. No real collaboration. Team members are critical, but do not respond to drafts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialog Journal:</strong> Reflexive writing. Students write about whatever they want to. No mechanics evaluation.</td>
<td>Students own voice is heard. Teacher responds to journal. Journal entries are not controlled or graded. Students write at least twice a week. Written in English</td>
<td>Journal entries are not graded. Sometimes they are controlled. Teacher doesn’t respond regularly. Written in English. Students write at least twice a week.</td>
<td>Topics are assigned. Teacher doesn’t respond to journal. Written in Spanish, sometimes translated into English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual conference:</strong> Students one to one with teacher.</td>
<td>Scheduled or in class. Related to assignments. Two-way conversations.</td>
<td>Scheduled. Not always related to assignments. Two-way conversations.</td>
<td>not scheduled. Not related to assignments. Teacher talks, student listens.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback:</strong> Teachers and students comment on assignments and give suggestions for revision</td>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong> Positive, corrective comments either oral or written. Short. Peers and teachers give feedback</td>
<td><strong>Very Good/Good</strong> Positive, corrective comments either oral or written. Teachers might have too much input. Suggestions for correction</td>
<td><strong>Poor</strong> Negative feedback. No suggestions for correction. Teacher’s input.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher’s Role:</strong> Teacher’s interaction and participation in the workshop</td>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong> Facilitator. Establish trusting environment. Create an interpersonal climate. Share power over texts with students. Respects students’ opinion. Mentor and role model</td>
<td><strong>Very Good/Good</strong> Facilitator. Sometimes lectures. Establish trusting environment and interpersonal climate. Share most of his or her power with students. Mentor and role model. Show respect for his or her students</td>
<td><strong>Poor</strong> Lecturer or becomes invisible. No much input in classroom climate. Does not know his or her role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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VITA

Marie Jacqueline Agésilas

Box 118
Mayaguez, PR 00681: (787) 834-9595 xt.2960
j_agesilas@yahoo.com

Objective
As a Christian professor my primary objective is to prepare my students to become responsible, efficient, and ethical professionals. As a curriculum developer, my goal is to design curriculum that will be relevant, practical and based on God’s given educational principles.

Education

Teaching Experience
1988- Antillean Adventist University, Mayaguez, PR. Teaching English as a Second Language.

Professional Association
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Membership: Current
Pi Lambda Theta. International Honor Society and Professional Association in Education. Membership: Current.
Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages Puerto Rico Chapter. Membership: In progress.

168